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


LABBAIKA. [See TALIBYA.]

LABID b. RABI' ĀBŪ 'AKTI, an Arab poet of the pagan period, who lived in the days of Islam (muḥaddram), belonged to the family of BanûDJâ'far, a branch of the Kindāb, who belonged to the Banû Āmir and therefore was Arab. According to Ibn Sa'd, vi. 21, he died in 40 (660/661) in the night on which Mu'awiyah arrived in al-Nukhaila to conclude peace with Ḥasan b. 'Alī. Others, like Ibn Ḥadjar, iii. 657, whom Noldke (Fünf Mo'allaqāt, ii. 51) thinks ought to be followed, give 41 A.H., others again 42. He is said to have reached an unusually great age (al-Sidjistânî, K. al-Mu'annamartin, ed. Goldziher, ch. 61). In fact he makes several allusions to this in his poems. The date of his birth can only be approximately fixed. Even before 600 A.D. he seems to have attained a prominent position in his tribe by his command of language. As quite a young man he is said to have accompanied a deputation from his tribe to the court of king Abī Kâliba Nu'mân of al-Hira (c. 580-602), and when the latter was invited against the Banû Āmir by his friend Abī Rabi' b. Ziyâd al-'Abiti (of the tribe to which Labid's mother belonged), Labid succeeded with a satirical ṭaḡţa (Divan, No. 33) in so ridiculing him to the king that he restored his favour to the Banû Āmir. A verse from Nu'mân's answer to his courtier who sought to defend himself from the lampoon on him became proverbial (cf. al-Mufaḍḍal, al-Fâhîr, i. 43 sq.; al-'Askârî, Amālī, on the margin of Maidānî, ii. 427, 7-18; al-Maidānî, ii. 33; K. al-Aghānî, xv. i 94 sqq., 91 sqq., xvi. 222 sqq., 21 sqq.; Abū al-Kâdir, Khânān al-Adâb, ii. 79 sqq., iv. 171 sqq.). In his later poems Labid also often prides himself on having helped his tribe by his eloquence. He remained loyal to his tribe even when a famous poet and scorned the profession of a wandering singer, practised by his contemporary al-Askârî. But the coming of the Prophet Muhammad threw him out of the usual groove. We do not know the exact date of his conversion to Islam. As early as Djamâd al-akhirūl of the year 8 the chiefs of the tribe of Āmir b. Ṣaṭīra, Āmir b. Tufail and Arbag b. Kâis, a stepbrother of Labid, seem to have negotiated in Medina about the adhesion of their tribe to the new constitution without reaching any result (see Caetani, Annali, ii. 90 sqq.). Both men are said to have soon after come to an untimely end, Āmir from plague and Arbag from a lightning stroke; the latter story seems to find confirmation in Labid's lament for him (Divan, No. 5). The accusation on the other hand that Arbag attempted to kill the Prophet is quite incredible; for in that case Labid could hardly have composed several elegies on him and they would certainly not have been included in his Divān. In the year 9 the tribe again sent a deputation to Medina which included the poet and an agreement was reached. Labid is said on this occasion to have become a Muslim. He later migrated to Kāf, where he died. Of his family only a daughter is mentioned who is said to have inherited his talent (see al-Maidānî, ii. 49, 15 sqq.; al-Ghazullî, Mafâlî al-Budûrî, i. 52, 7 sqq.).

Labid's poems were very highly esteemed by the Arabs. Al-Nabigha is said to have declared him the greatest poet among the Arabs or at least of his tribe group, the Hawārin, on account of his Mu'allaqāt. He himself is said to have claimed third place after Imru'l-Kais and Tārafa. Al-Djamâbi (Tubâsî al-Shilârî), ed. Heil, p. 29 sqq.) places him in the third class of pagan poets along with Al-Nabigha and Al-Djumâbi. Abû Dhuqâb and Al-Shammâdh. Labid showed himself equally master of the kihjâ, the masārîya and the baṣîrâ. One of his kasha's was adopted into the collection of mu'allaqāt and is thought by Noldke (Fünf Mo'allaqât, ii. 51) to be one of the best specimens of Beduin poetry. Labid uses the traditional pictures from the animal world — wild asses and antelopes fleeing before the hunter and fighting with his dogs — as charmingly as the usual compliances about drinking bouts. He seems on the other hand to have only cultivated the morix, because it had been traditional. He deals far less with the subject of woman's love than with the description of the Aṣfâl which he likes to compare with
LABID — LÄDHİK

artistic calligraphy. He is also fond of recalling memories of places of his native district, the palm-groves and irrigation works of which continually move him to charming descriptions; indeed in one such connection he gives the whole itinerary (Divân, No. 19, v. 4 sq.) of a journey from central Arabia to the coast of the Persian Gulf (see von Kremer, op. cit., p. 12). As his almost contemporary Abû Dhâlib is fond of doing, in the "Meâlabâqa, v. 55 sqq. he turns however once more to his beloved and thus combines the nasiḥ with the main part of the kaşida to an organic whole; but for him this is simply a mode of transition to a new descriptive passage. His poetry is however distinguished from that of other poets of the pagan period by a certain religious feeling which seems to have been not exactly rare among his contemporaries, even before Muhammad's mission. While Zuhâr, for example, still expresses his practical wisdom derived from the experience of a long life, in plain though impressive language, Labîd on such occasions always strikes a religious note. He certainly did not profess Christianity nor can we see in him a representative of the so called Hanîf of the Stîr, as von Kremer wished to do. In him rather we find the belief in Allâh as the guardian of morality finding particular expression, a belief widely disseminated in Arabia by the preaching of the Christian church. Such passages naturally invited the Muslim traditionalists to increase them. Indeed a later author went so far as to ascribe to him a verse by Abu 'l-'Aṭâ'îya (fig. 18). But many passages of his Divân seem to owe their inspiration to the Kurân. The statement that he wrote no more poetry after his conversion to Islam is obviously an invention (see Ibn Sîdî, vi. 21, 4, repeated later; e.g. by al-Ghârînî, Mutâfi'î, i 52 infra); it is contradicted by the simple fact that poems 21 and 53 of the Divân were only composed shortly before his death (K. al-'Aţâ'îya, xvi. 101) The description of Paradise (Divân, No. 5, 4) is certainly inspired by the Kurân like the idea that precedes it, that a record is kept of the doings of men. Under the influence of Islam in No. 39 and 41, verse 11 of which, as Ibn Kûtâiba (K. al-'Aţâ'îya, p. 155, 3) already points out, certain parts must, after his conversion, if it is not to be considered an interpolation, he replaces the nasiḥ by pious admonitions. Thus he creates a new artistic form that of poetical paraphrases on the transitoriness of human life; besides the Kurân he may of course have been influenced by Christian preaching. He only follows older models in the connection when he combines admonition with the averting of blame from a woman in No. 14, as in Farâ's Muðallâla, verses 56 sqq. 63-65 (cf. Casel. Das Schicksal, p. 9), where this is however only an episode in the kaşida.

Labîd's Fûzan was edited, according to the Fûzan, p. 158, by several of the greatest Arabic philologists, al-Sukkât, Abû 'Amr al-Shâhînî, Abû-Imâm, al-'Abî and Ibn al-Sukkât. Of these editions only half of that of al-Tâ'i with a commentary has survived in the manuscript edited by al-Khâlî (see below) of the year 589. All other MSS are much later, e.g. those in London, Strassburg and that in Cairo not yet edited which also contains the Fûzan of Abû Dhâlib, ed. by J. Hell.


LÄDHİK (Lâdhîk, Greck. Aâsîhûkê), the name of several towns in Asia Minor.

1. The ancient Aâsîhûkê (Lâdhîk) is probably derived from the smelting furnaces which it had around it as the centre of the quicksilver mining area. It was in Karaman north of Konya on the great military road which ran through Asia Minor. Hâdi'dî Khâlîf already knows it by its modern name of Yor-gân Lâdhîk or Lâdhîkîya in Karaman.

LĀDHIKī — AL-LĀDHIKīYA


2. Lādhīkī (Hadjī Khālīfā: Lādhīkīya), the ancient Lādhīkīya or Lādhīkī (or Lādhīkī) in the south of Djemīyān. Al-Battānī calls it, following Greek sources, Lādhīkīya Frūdīs (=Φρούδης while Ptolemy places it in Caria). According to Ibn Baṭīṭa it was a large town with 7 Friday mosques, beautiful gardens, flowing rivers and springs and fine markets. The Greek women there made remarkably beautiful and durable woollen goods, embroidered with gold. Ibn Baṭīṭa also praises the hospitality of the inhabitants but censures the freedom of their morals. Slave girls were sold and prostitution practised even in the public baths. On the history of the town (now Eski Hıçar) see Δέκα.


3. Lādhīkī, the ancient Λοδηκία Περιφήκη of Amāsiya.

Bibliography: Ibn Bīlī, ed. Houtsma, passim; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 146. (E. HONIGMANN)

AL-LĀDHIKīYA, a sea-port in Northern Syria, the ancient Λοδηκία Περιφήκη of Amāsiya. It was founded by Seleucus I, who called it after his mother Laodike, and towards the end of the Seleucid empire it was a member of the alliance of the four most important Syrian cities, the πέτες ἄλλες, Antiocheia, Apameia, Seleuceia and Laodicea. In the reign of Justinian I it was made the capital of the newly founded province of Ḥablūt. When the Arabs under the governor of Ḥims, ‘Uthāb b. al-Ṣamīt al-Anṣārī, advanced on the town, the inhabitants made a determined resistance. ‘Uthāb encamped near Lādhīkīya and had deep trenches dug in which even horsemen could advance unobserved. After a pretended retreat he returned in the night and was then able to surprise the inhabitants who had unsuspectingly opened the great gate of the city, and to enter the town. The citadel was then stormed and ‘Uthāb proclaimed upon the walls Allāh akbar. A section of the Christian inhabitants fled to al-Busaid (Horişān, Bā’ta al-Balad, ed. Gonzalez, p. 133, should thus be corrected for Yūsufiyād; Ed. Schwarz in Wellhausen, Ζ. D. M. G. i., lx. 246). Their request to be allowed to return to the town was granted them on payment of a fixed sum as kharāj. They retained possession of their church, while ‘Uthāb had a new mosque built which was later enlarged (al-Baladhirī, ed. cit., p. 132 sqq.). About 97 (according to al-Baladhirī: 100 A.H.), the Greeks attacked the coast of al-Lādhīkīya with a fleet, burned the town and carried off its inhabitants as prisoners (al-Baladhirī, ed. cit.; Brooks, T.H.S., 1878, xvii., p. 195). Umar had al-Lādhīkīya rebuilt, fortified and ransomed the inhabitants from their captors. Yazid completed the restoration of the city after ‘Umar’s death and he also put a garrison in it. According to another story however, Yazid’s services to the town were only the renovation of the defences and the strengthening of the garrison (al-Baladhirī, ed. cit.; Masʿūdī, Murādj al-Dhahab, Paris, viii., p. 281).

2. Al-Nicephoros Phokas the Patrician, town and the whole of Northern Syria from the Byzantines (Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṭākī, ed. Kratzkovsky and Vasiliev in Patrolog. Oriental., 1924, xviii., p. 816). In 980, according to Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd, who, Rosen thinks, took his statement from a local chronicle of al-Lādhīkīya, the emperor Basil II appointed a certain Karmarūk, who had distinguished himself in an expedition against Tarabulus which belonged to the Fātimids, to be governor of the town. When it was besieged by the Arabs Nazāz and Ibn Sīkīrī, he was captured during a sortie, and beheaded in Cairo (Rosen, Zephist. Imp. Akad. Neud., xiv., p. 16 sqq., 153 sqq.). Michael Burtzes (al-Burtīzī) in 992 put down a rising of the Muslims in the town and had them deported to Bilād al-Kūn (Yaḥyā, ed. Rosen, op. cit., p. 30, 237). In 1086 al-Lādhīkīya belonged to the Banū Munṣūdī, Saṭīr (Derenbourg, Conqu., p. 27 sqq.) who had, however, to cede it to the Salāḥī Mulk Shāh. In August 1098, the Count of Normandy took the town; it then passed in rapid succession to the Byzantines, to Bohemund of Taranto, to the Byzantines again and finally after 18 months’ siege, to Tancred of Antioch (Nohrich, Gesch. der Kreï., Jerusalem, p. 45, note 8). In 1104 we again find the Greeks besieging it by land and sea, and Bohemund promised the Emperor Alexis Comnenus in the treaty of Devol (1105) the cession of this πρωτεύον of other places (Anna Comnena, Alexias, Bonn, ii., p. 241, 4). Tancred however soon afterwards with the help of a Pisan fleet took the town which in the meanwhile had again passed to the Muslims. The governor of Ḥablūt took and sacked it in 1156; in 1157 and 1170 it was visited by two severe earthquakes, in which only the principal Greek church remained intact. On July 13, 1160, Saʿīd al-Biḍ al-Baṭūlī took the town (‘Imād al-Dīn, Fath, p. 141; Alī Shīrāzī, Kitāb al-Rauṣūṭ, ed. Cairo 1257/1258, ii., p. 128 = Hist. Orient. des Crois., iv., p. 361). In autumn 1197 Bohemund III succeeded once more in conquering al-Lādhīkīya or a part of the town at least. In 1223 the Ḥalābīs destroyed the town or its citadel out of fear of the Christians approaching on the Fifth Crusade. But even after this (since 1197), half the city remained in possession of the Franks. Baibars in 1275 demanded that they should hand over this part of it. In 1281 al-Lādhīkīya belonged to the emir Sonqor of Dimashq, to whom the Sultan of the xuṭūt century was placed in the new province of Tarabulus (‘Umarī, Tūṣfī, p. 182, in R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., 1916, p. 35; Khālīl al-Zāhirī, Zubdā, ed. Ravisse, p. 48; Dīwān al-İnābī,}
Laghuit, a town and a oasis in Southern Algeria, 250 miles south of Algiers in 30° 55' East Lat., 33° 48' N. Lat., at 2,400 feet above sea-level. In 1911 it had 5,958 inhabitants of whom 555 were Europeans. Laghuit which forms part of the "Territoire" of Ghardaia is the capital of a mixed commune and a native commune of 6,650 square miles with 19,810 inhabitants.

The town and the oasis lie on the right bank of the Wèd Méi, which comes from the Diebel Amîr and finally under the name of Wèd Djedi enters the Shîj Melghir in the south of the province of Constantine. The houses lie in terraces on the slopes of two rocky hills, spur of the Diebel Tisgrine, the European quarter on the north-west slope and the native quarter on the north-east slope. It is defended by a wall and two forts on the summit. The oasis extends in a semicircle north-west and south-east of the town. The north-west part is the most extensive and contains palmgroves and fields of cereals. A canal led by a dam from the Wèd Méi called the Wèd Lekhier provides for the irrigation of the gardens. The palm-trees to the number of 30,000 produce dates of mediocre quality, but they supply the food of the inhabitants. The situation of Laghuit between the southern Oran and southern Constantine at the point where roads diverge to the west, to the Ulûd Sidi Shâhîk, to the south of the Mabr and to Wargà, to the east to the Ziban and Biskra, makes this place a considerable centre of commerce.

History. In the tenth century A.D. there was already on the banks of the Wèd Méi a little town, the inhabitants of which, after having recognised the authority of the Fatimides, took part in the rebellion of Ali Yazid. The country round was inhabited by wandering Berbers of the family Maghrâwa. The Hîlîfî invasion brought other tribes of the same stock into this region, notably the Kiel, driven out of the Zab, who founded a village called Ben Bala. Another Kûr (Bu Mentala, Nadjâl, Sidi Mimmun, Badja, Khashat Ben Fortî) were built by other refuges, some of Arab origin (Dawawida, Ulûd Bu Zayan), others came from the Mabr. These groups together took the name of al-Aghuat.

We know very little of the history of this town down to the xvith century. At the end of the
xvith century it paid tribute to the Sultan of Morocco; in 1666 the Ksour of Badila and of Kasbat Fotah were abandoned. In 1698 a Marabout originally from Tlemcen, Si al-Hadjdj Aissa, settled at Ben Btta, imposed his authority on the people of the three other Ksour and on the neighbouring tribe of the Larba. Under his leadership the people of Laghut defeated the people of Kasrt al-Ajafta but were forced to pay tribute to the Sultan of Morocco, Mlly Isma'il, who camped under the walls of the town in 1708. After the death of Si al-Hadjdj Aissa (1738 A. D.) the history of Laghut is reduced to that of the struggle between the two wiks who disputed control of it, the Ulad Serghine, of the south-west quarter and the Hallaf who inhabited the north-east quarter. In the middle of these feuds which bathed the oasis in blood, the Turks made their supremacy recognised. In 1727 the Bey of Titteri had imposed an annual tribute on the Kfitrians. The Mzabis driven from the oasis where they had acquired a part of the gardens, formed with the nomads of the south a confederation, over which the people of Laghut triumphed with the help of the Larba. Towards the end of the xvith century the Turks reappeared and enforced once more their suzerainty over Laghut which had gradually casting off. The Bey of Mdea fell in the first expedition (1784), but the Bey of Oran, Muhammad al Kabir, seized the town and destroyed the quarter of the Ulad Serghine (1786). His successor Othman then took the field against the Hallaf whom he scattered (1787).

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


LAHIDJ, a sultanate in South Arabia with its capital of the same name north-west of 'Aden, bounded by the Hâshâbi territory on the north, the Fatl territory on the east, the 'Akhrâbi land in the south and the Subâbi territory in the west. The capital, called Lahidj or el-Hôta lies at a height of 350 feet above sea-level between the two rams of the Wâdi Tuhar, which leaves the Mzab and the Wâdi Kabir, in a fertile oasis which, occupying a wide valley, owes its existence to its irrigation by canals fed from the mountain streams and wells of excellent water as much as 15 feet deep. The town is surrounded by palmgroves and fields on which cereals are grown, notably durra (coleus sorghum) and various vegetables; in addition to date-palms there are all kinds of fruit trees, including citrons and cocoa-palms, this being one of the most northerly points in Arabia where the latter are found. The town which was visited in 1593 by Ludovico di Barthema and in 1810 by V. G. von Schetz and which Niebuhr still found small, while it was not until 1878 (1504) houses and 800 straw or reed huts with almost 5,000 inhabitants, owes its prosperity to the Russo-Turkish war in the course of which in 1878 England temporarily proclaimed a state of siege in 'Aden and evicted the Arabs and Somalis from 'Aden. The latter went to Lahidj where they built themselves thousands of huts close to the town, which now form extensive suburbs and considerably increased the number of inhabitants. The sea of houses is dominated by the palace of the Sultan, built by Indian architects and four to five stories high with extensive subsidiary buildings; it is entirely built of clay and painted white. The palace is surrounded by a clay wall, to the east of which lies the town with its numerous rectangular flat-roofed houses, all built of sun-dried bricks made of a mixture of dung, clay, straw and dried grass and one or two stories high. The monotony of the picture is broken only by the very simple, insignificant mosques which are outlined in white round the roof. To the east of the palace in the shade of beautiful leafy trees and palms is a pleasant looking one-storied bungalow built by the Sultan for foreign guests. Round the town are scattered little groups of low straw huts, made of durra stems and surrounded by a hedge which are inhabited by Somalis and their families. In addition to these there are also Sawahills settled in Lahidj. The great mass of the inhabitants however are Yemen Arabs, who live in the numerous houses and mud-huts, which form the town with its narrow, winding, dusty streets. A part of the town is reserved for the Jews, who look wretched and are merchants and artisans. There are also a few Muslim Jews who are traders. All types of the population are met with in the bazaar street which is barely six feet wide. Not far from this is the armourers' market where smiths, Arabs and Jews have erected their simple workshops in open booths. The principal weapons made here are the fine grembanas while the long cavalry lances, which are used by the Yemen Kabulis are made in Dâlîna, Ansâb or Hawir and brought for sale to the Lahidj market. In
Wellsted’s time there were also 30 silk-weavers here, who got their yarn from India. The oasis is very well watered and the numerous little canals are fed by the perennial stream which passes not far from the town. Lahidj which plays an important part in the caravan traffic is connected by a road with ‘Aden and in 1907 was to have been linked up by a railway with ‘Aden and ‘Arib, part of which was actually surveyed but the plan was abandoned. England took up the scheme again in 1915 during the war and laid a strategic railway of 1 mile gauge for 25 miles to Lahidj; in 1921 it was extended a few miles beyond the oasis of Lahidj and now reaches Habil al-Humaisa, 8 miles N.W. of al-Hujat. The continuation of the railway to ‘Asir would open up Southern Yemen and increase the importance of Lahidj.

History. The name Lahidj (Lahij) which means a damp low lying area intersected by water channels, a place-name that admirably suits Lahidj, is connected by the genealogists with the Himyar Lahidj b. W Bair b. al-Ghawth b. ‘Abd b. Zuhar b. Abyan b. al-Humaisa and is applied by the geographers to a district in Yemen which forms part of the territory of Abyssinian north-east of ‘Aden. Al-Hamdani mentions it among the towns of the Yemen Tahama and says that in the time of Abyah b. ‘Amir b. al-Hithri dhi Abyah b. Malik b. Zaid b. al-Ghawth b. Sa’d b. ‘Afif b. ‘Abd b. Malik b. Zaid b. Salat b. Zuma al-Himyar al-Aqghar were alive. Vakiti says the same for the district of Lahidj which included the towns and villages. A number of poets, particularly South Arabsians, are familiar with the town, e.g., Kas b. Makshuk ‘Amir b. Madikarri, Khudai b. ‘Amir, Saliyd al-Himyar, ‘Amir b. al-Salimi and especially the famous ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Salih, who had property there.

After Yemen had been won for Islam, Lahidj shared the fortunes of this extensive province of the Arab empire Lahidj thus passed with Yemen under the Sa’di and then to the Abdūsins during their absorption by the Lakhīs in the time of Mu’izz al-Din Salāḥ. Lahidj was a favourite of the Lakhīs, who passed on to the Turks and to the English who finally ruled it. Lahidj was the capital of the short-lived kingdom of Lakhīs which arose after the break-down of the Lakhīs. It was the capital of the Lakhīs in the 10th century and was the seat of government. It was destroyed by the English in 1918 and has been rebuilt.

The town of Lahidj was the capital of the Lakhīs, who ruled the district for a short time. The town was destroyed by the Turks in 1897 and has been rebuilt.
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The town of Lahidj was the capital of the Lakhīs, who ruled the district for a short time. The town was destroyed by the Turks in 1897 and has been rebuilt.
the Sultan, or his sons were to enter or leave Aden free of duty. In spite of this treaty the Sultan, who was still sore over the loss of Aden, continued to intrigue against the English and supported the attack of the Arabs on Aden in 1840 and even had the English representative in Aden, Hasan Kahtib, murdered and regularly adopted a hostile attitude towards the English. His constant failures however forced him to change his policy and on February 11, 1843 he concluded a new agreement with England which was renewed in a more stringent form on February 20, 1844, before his monthly allowance was again paid to him. Muhsin b. Fadil, who had again allowed himself to be involved in a war with England in 1846 in which he was defeated, died on November 30, 1847. His son and successor Ahmad maintained friendly relations with England as it was in his best interest to do so. He died in 1849 and was succeeded by his brother Ali who resumed a policy of hostility to England and roused the hostility of the tribes against Aden. On March 7, 1849 a treaty was however concluded with the East India Company which was ratified on October 30, by Lord Dalhousie, but an attitude of constant friendship to England was not thereby secured. The Sultan even cut off supplies and it finally came to open fighting in which the Sultan was defeated on March 18, 1858 at Sheikh Othman so that he had again to reconcile himself to a peaceful policy. When in 1873 the Turks in their reconquest of the Yemen advanced on the hinterland of Aden, the English occupied Lahij and the Turks had to retire as a result of English diplomatic negotiations with the Sublime Porte. Whether these negotiations were instigated or approved by the Sultan had who had lost his independence — only nominal it is true — by the Turkish occupation of his territory, is not known. In any case in 1887, as E. Glaser records, Sultan Fadil b. Ali was receiving a monthly allowance of £1,250 dollars from Aden.

GENEALOGICAL SURVEY OF THE SULTANS OF LAHIDJ.


Ali b. Fadil (1742-1753)

Abd al-Hadi (1753-1777)

Muhsin (1827-Nov. 30, 1847)

Ahmad (1847-1849)

Ali b. Fadil (1849-1866)

Ali b. Fadil (1866-?)

† July 1915

Abd al-Karim (since July 1915)

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


Lahidjan, the capital of the county of Saftli-Rud, and of the western region of the mountain Dulfak (cf. the ancient name of a people *Avesta*), which is the modern city of the same name, on the river COM-KHALA (Purdasar) which is 8 miles higher up flows through Langarud, the present capital of the district of Rani-i Kuh.

Lahidjan is the most important town in the Kuh region. It has a population of about 10,000 and is one of the largest towns in the region. Its location on the river COM-KHALA has made it an important trading center.

The district of Lahidjan is divided into seven cantons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kūhpeya</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavandak</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qand-Parida</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūh Shāh-i Balka</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowka</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ĉerdz</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laštta Nigha</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attested in the Caspian dialects (it is regular in Tætì; in Mæzandarān we have the parallel forms ṣamãdãj/a, Melgunof, p. 221). The fact that we have districts of Lāhidjān and Lāridjan in the adjoining provinces of Gilân and Mæzandarān is remarkable, but still more significant is the fact that Lāhidj of Shīrvān represents an idlet of Iranian Tæt surrounded by Turks (the Tæt are now found scattered throughout Daghistan, the country round Teherān, Ardabālādjan, etc.). Their present name has a rather general and vague character, cf. Tæt. The colony of Lāhidj may have retained the original dialect formerly spoken in the metropolis. The name of the silk ṣamãdãj suggests the former existence of a place called Lād, which produced silk (cf. Vâkût, s. v. Lāhidj). [Vâkût says that Lāhidj produces the silk called "Lāhidj" which is not of high quality]. With the suffix -ī, the word Lāh-li would mean the people of Lāid. It remains to be seen if the region of Lāhidjān is not the ancestral home of numerous Lāhidj colonies. At the present day it is spoken in Lāhidjān — although with certain local peculiarities — the Gilaki dialect but this parent dialect has here exercised a levelling influence, of which the foreign Turkish was incapable in the case of the local Turkic of Shīrvān. As Lāhidjān of Kûrdistan we may recall the hypothesis of Andreas that the name "Dimîv" by which the Zâzî call themselves (north of Dîyâr-bakr) is a metathesis of Dîlâm (Dailam). The emigrations from Gilân, still very obscure, certainly penetrated far to the west. — [To the names mentioned one might add perhaps that of Kâfâ-ī Lâhâjî in Kûhzistân (?); cf. Târîkh-i Guzîda, G. M. S., xiv., p. 240].

LĀHŌR, capital of the province of the Pandîb, British India, situated on the river Râwî, at 31° 35' north latitude, 73° 20' east longitude. Population in 1911, 223,687, of whom 129,531 were Muhammadâns. The foundation of Lāhōr is ascribed to a Turkish prince Vâlî, grandson of the political Lava or Loh, son of Râma, after whom it was named Lohāwâr. It is not mentioned in the chronicles of the invasion of Alexander the Great, nor is the town described either by Strabo or Pliny; but it may be the Labokla of Ptolemy, which Sir Alexander Cunningham (in his Ancient Geography of India) explains as Lâvâlaka, "the abode of Lava". In the Mahâbhârata, the Pandîb is called Tâkadesa, or the country of the Tâkas. According to Huien Tsâng, Tâkâ was the capital of the Pandîb in 633 A.D. He makes no mention of Lāhōr by any name capable of identification as such, though he traversed the entire province and stayed in it for quite two years. Possibly the Lohkot of the Purânas is Lāhōr. The Dēvān Bîgû (a compilation from the Purânas) gives an account of a battle between Bānnâl, Râdja of Lâvâpûr, and one Bîhêm Sen Kanêksûn, the mythical ancestor of the solar Râdja princes of Central India, is said to have migrated south from Lohkot, an event assigned by Colonel Tod to c. 145 A.D. One of the city gateways is known as the Bāhî Gate; the Solankhis and Bâtis of Râdjûtpûr point to Lāhōr as the seat of an earlier settlement. The first distinct mention of Lāhōr occurs in the history of the campaigns of Subûktâgin, and of Mahmûd of Ghârîn, when the Brahman kings of the Kâbûl valley, being driven from Pâshâwâr and Ohind, established their new capital first at Bêra on the Dêhâlám, and then at Lāhōr. Both Dji Pâl, and his son Anang Pâl, the successive antagonists of the Ghârizi invaders, are called Râdjas of Lâhōr by Fârîsha, according to whom the Hindu dynasty was subdued in A.D. 1031, when Lâhōr became the residence of a Muslim governor under the king of Ghârizi. A final insurrection of the Hindu was quelled by Mawûdûd in 1042, and the city was left in charge of Malik Ayâr, whom Muhammadan tradition regards as the founder. During the reign of Mâshûlî III (1099—1114), Lâhōr became the capital of the Ghârizi dynasty, but was captured in A.D. 1186 by Shâh Shâh-al-Dîn, known as Muhammad Ghûr, the Muhammadan conqueror of India. The town was sacked by the Mongols of Cîngiz Kâhân, and of Timûr, and in the reign of Mubârâk Shâh it was "a desolate waste in which no living thing except the owl of ill-omen had its abode" (Elliot-Dowson, iv. 56, 57). Lāhōr remained insignificant throughout the period of the Pathân dynasties. In 1356, Baholulodî seized Lâhōr as a first step to power. It was plundered by Bâbâr's troops in 1524.

Even at this time the Pandîb was an almost uninhabited waste, except for a few walled cities in which the Hindu could exist in some security from the frontier raids. As Lâhōr and Kâbûl every year used to make raids on the Pandîb, and for this reason the province the decadendent was depopulated for a long time, and very little agriculture was carried on. Rai Râm Deo Bâht, of Pâtîlâ, rented the whole Pandîb from the governor of Lâhōr for 900,000 takâs (£ 2,000) (Bâbâr's Memoirs).

Under the Great Mughals, Âgra, Dîhit, and Lâhōr were the three chief cities and mint-towns of the Mughul Empire. Akbar held his court here from 1584 to 1598, and repaired and enlarged the fort. In the time of Âjâhârângh, who made it a secondary capital, Lâhōr reached its zenith of wealth and splendour; the tombs of his emperor and Kâbûl every year used to make raids on the Pandîb, and for this reason the province the decadendent was depopulated for a long time, and very little agriculture was carried on. Rai Râm Deo Bâht, of Pâtîlâ, rented the whole Pandîb from the governor of Lâhōr for 900,000 takâs (£ 2,000) (Bâbâr's Memoirs).

The flat landscape included in the misfortunes which attended the decline of the Mughul Empire. Situated on the high-road from Afghanistan, it has been exposed to the visitation of every Western invader, and suffered from the successive conquests of Nadîr Shâh, Ahmad Shâh Durrânî, and other less famous depredators. Lâhōr was a bone of contention between the Sikhs and the Muslims, and the great city of the Mughul princes and their viceroys was reduced to little more than a heap of ruins. But the rising of Sikh power under Ranjit Singh (1798 A.D.) made Lâhōr once more the centre of a flourishing realm. It relapsed into anarchy after Ranjit Singh's death. Then followed the First and Second Sikh Wars, and annexation to British India in 1849. Since that time the capital of the Pandîb has grown steadily, and a new town covers a large tract which was recently a wilderness.

The native city is a walled town with thirteen gates. It has been a municipality since 1867. The old crafts are moribund, but have been replaced by trades of a modern character. There are power mills — cotton, flour, iron — and a large agricultural market. The European quarter, or Civil Station, lies to the south and east of the city, and is a large administrative, educational, and business centre. The older part is known as Anârkâlî, and here are the buildings of the Government Secretariat,
Lahor is a great railway centre, and the headquarters of a big system, the North Western Railway, with extensive workshops and a large railway colony.

**Bibliography:** Syad Muhammad Lati, Lahore, its history, architectural remains and antiquities, Lahore 1892; T. H. Thornton, Lahore, Lahore 1876; Gazetteer of the Punjab (Provincial and District); G. W. Forrest, Cities of India, London 1905; J. D. Cunningham, A History of the Sikhs, London 1819 (reprinted, Lahore 1899; Calcutta 1904).

**Laila (A), night, Laiat al-bar'a, Laiat al-Kadr, see Kamāsīn.**

**Laila 'Akhyaliya, an Arab poetess, daughter of Abdul-lah b. al-Kahfāli (a) b. Ka'b b. Mu'aywa of the tribe of 'Uqai b. Ka'b. She got her name from the fact that her father — according to other traditions one of her ancestors Ka'b or Mu'aywa — was known as al-Akhayl (= "the falcon"); perhaps it was a common name in her family and the phrase hāyūn laul-ahshā in her verses glorifying her family may refer to this (Al-Ghámī, x. 80; Hamdān, p. 711). Laila is usually mentioned in connection with her fellow-tribesman Tawba b. Humayyir al-Khafadji; fragments of her laments for him are preserved in the Kitāb al-A'zāhī. She also wrote an elegy on the death of the Caliph 'Uthmān. It is also recorded of her that she exchanged lampoons with Ṣabīqa al-Dā'ī. Her conversations with Mu'aywa, 'Abd al-Malik and Ḥaḍīl lātīb b. Yaṣuf are several times recorded. She begged the latter, in her old age to take her to her uncle Kutaba b. Muslih in Khorasan and she is said to have died on the way. She must therefore have lived in the second half of the first century A.H.

**Bibliography:** Al-Ghámī, x. 67—84; Ibn 'Abd al-Malik and Ḥaḍīl lātīb b. Yaṣuf. She was related to him and always retained a grateful memory of him as is shown by her elegy full of deep feeling on his death. In her case the lack of information about her is characteristic of the old Turkish conception of women about whom very little is spoken in public. She was Carly married but divorced very soon afterwards. She had the reputation of a Leb-ban. She cared very little about the opinion of the world. She lived for her pleasures and her writing. A few anecdotes relate to her infringements of the social code of Turkish ladies. She joined the

Mewlewī and was buried in the Mewlewī convent in Galata. She died in 1264 (1848).

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

**Bibliography:** Faţa, Tutikker, Constantinople 1271, p. 363—364; Mehmed Dhiḥīm, Mehdîh b. Nadjī, Constantinople 1295, ii. 195; Ahmad Rifa't, Lughat-i ta'rikhīyeh wa-diyārgrāfiyeh, Constantinople 1300, vi. 154; M. Nadjī, Ésiām, Constantinople 1308, p. 271; Ahmad Munkhār, Shāhīr Khamārānīmī, Constantinople 1311, p. 51—52; Turaylū, Siyāsī-ī ʻotamānī, iv. 95; Sāfī, Ḥānūm b. Alī, vi. 4060; Brusil. M. Tahtīr, ʻOyūnmānī Mekelīffīyeh, Constantinople 1325—1343, ii., p. 406; Ibrahim Nadjīm, Ta'dīb-ī Edibārī Derstīry, Constantinople 1338, i. 262; Konsaniūmī, Mīntūkhtābāt-ī Aḥtār-ī ʻotamānīyeh, Constantinople, i. 228, p. 276—279; Smirnow, Obrasoviya protevstenijsa Osmanskoj literatury, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 271; histories of Ottoman poetry by Hammer-Purgstall, Gibb (iv. 342—349). Basmandjan etc. (TH. MENZEL)

**Laila U-Madinun.** [See MADINUN.]

**Laith.** [See KANNA.]

LAK, 1. the most southern group of Kūrd tribes in Persia. According to Zain al-Abīdin their name (Lak, often Lāk) is explained by the Persian word lāk (100,000) which is said to have been the original number of families of Lak. The group is of importance as the Zand dynasty arose from it. The Lak now living in Northern Luristan are sometimes confused with the Lur (Zain al-Abīdin), whom they resemble from the somatic and ethnical point of view. The facts of history now show that the Lak have immigrated to their present settlements from lands further north. The Lākī language, according to O. Mann, has the characteristics of Kurdish and not of the Lūt dialects [cf. LŪK]. Čirikov, Futovets Journal, St. Petersburg 1875, p. 227, says: "the Lur and the Lak speak different dialects and hate one another".

The Lak appear in the Sharaf-nāmeh, i. 323 alongside of the Zand, among the secondary Kurd tribes, subjects of Persia. According to Rabin, the Lak were settled in Luristan by order of Shāh Abbās who wished in this way to create some support for the new wāli of Luristan, Husain Khān, whom he had chosen from among the relatives of the old Shāfswardi Atābāgh (Tābih-i-ʻAlam-u-ărī, p. 369). Of these tribes, the Sīsīla had formerly lived at Māhidāsh (S.W. of Kirmānshāh); the Dīlīn take their name from Aft Dūlāf [cf. the article al-Kāsim b. 583] whose fields in the third (ninth) century lyeng in the north of Lurīstan [cf. SULLY], the Bādījūn of Zohīb (q.v.) as well as of Lurīstan say they come from Mawjīl and are evidently one tribe. The Lurīstan branch seems to have exchanged its Kurmandī dialect for
Lakki during its sojourn among the Laks in the time of Shah Abbas. Even after Shah Abbas there were several Lak tribes outside of Luristan. Zain al-Abidin (beg. of the 6th century) mentions among the Laks: the Zand, the Mafi, the Badjiyan and the Zandi-yi Kala (?). To the last tribe (according to Houtum-Schindler: Begele) belonged Karim Khan Zand (born in Perija, the modern Pari about 20 miles from Dowlatabad on the Suljanabad road). When at Shiraz, Karim Khan sent for the Lak tribe of Bairanwad. In 1212 (1797) the Bairanwad and the Badjiyan actively supported Muhammad Khan Zand in his attempt to take the power from the Kajjar (H. J. Brydges, A History of Persia, London 1833, p. 46, 58; R. G. Watson, A History of Persia, London 1866, p. 116). Under the Karim Khan several Lak tribes were broken up. The Zand have almost completely disappeared; in 1360 remnants of them were to be found among the Badjiyan of Khankin (Khurshid-Efendi, Siyaha-namii Huiia, Russ. transl., p. 112, 221); there are still a few Zand families in the Dorah-Farman district to the S.E. of Kirmanshah (R. M. M., xxvii., p. 39); a section of the Amala of Push-t-i Kahr claims to be descended from the Karim Khan tribe. At the present day there are Mafi at Waramin, Tirhan, and Kazvin.

According to a good list compiled by Rousseau at Kirmanshah in 1807 (cf. Fundgruben d. Orients, Vienna 1813, ii. 529) the following Lak tribes are listed as Lak: the following tribes: Kalhur, Mafi, Namaki, Djalilwam, Payarwalm, Kalyia, Siftwam, Bahramwam, Karkki, Tawalli, Zifyarwand, Kakti, Namawlan, Ahmawlan, Bohii, Zilina, Harsini, Shaihwa. 

According to O. Mann and Rabino, the Lak tribes of Luristan are as follows: Silsila (9,000 families), Diltifan (7,470), Tirhan-Amaria (1,352 families), the Bairanwad (6,000 families) and Diltifan (1,000 families) forming part of the Balagi-Girawi group, a total of about 15,000 tents. The Bairanwad and Diltifan live to the east of Khurramabad around the sources of the river which flows through this town; the Silsila and the Diltifan live on the right bank of the Shahr and Khawa respectively while the Tirhan (perhaps = Tarkhan, i.e. "exempt from taxes") live between the left bank of the Saimara and the lower course of its left bank tributary from Khurramabad. The territory occupied by the Lak and including N. and N.W. Luristan is sometimes called Lakistan.

The cohesion of the Lak tribes is evident from the fact that even before 1914 the Silsila, Diltifan and Tirhan were united under the authority of Naazar 'Ali Khani of the Amiria clan. In addition to the bonds of tribe and language, there is that of religion for all the Diltifan and many of the "Amali of the Tirhan belong to the extremist Shia sect of the Akhi Hak (cf. Suılan Iskii).


On the other hand the term Lak in Armenian and Leki (plural Lek-ebi) in Georgian means the Legzi/Legzii of Daghistan (where the e may certainly name the value of aji: Legzi). This last name seems to have been applied to the highlanders of Kuh, living in and around the sources of the Samur, and later to have been extended to all the people of Daghistan, although no people of the Caucasus actually call themselves Legzi/Legzi. Marquart, Beiträge z. Geschichte und Sage v. Iran, Z. D. M. G., 1895, xxh., has attempted to explain the Arabic al-Lozk by the addition of the Persian suffix -i to the name Lek (or Lak), cf. Sago, "inhabitant of Sistān".

LAKHM (HAN). With the exception of the Lakhmid clan in the 'Irak, so frequently celebrated in the old Arab poetry, the pre-Islamic history of this family is not well known and is full of legend. Their traditional genealogical tree is given in the article DJUHĀM. According to it Lakhm was of Yemen origin and was the brother of Djūhām and Šamila. These genealogical tables may be taken for what they are worth for Daghistan. As to Lakhm, Yemens and Ma'addis claim descent from the powerful Ibrāhīm b. Hira. As to the reputed relationship of Lakhm with Djūhām and Šamila, it must correspond to facts sufficiently established in the century when Išām first appeared. It shows that the three groups were then connected by community of aims and interests. This forms a solid guarantee of a genealogical connection even if open to criticism in other respects.

Of the three sister-tribes, Lakhm was undoubtedly the most illustrious and the oldest also. Legend connects it with the descendants of Abūnām. A Lakhmid is said to have taken Joseph out of the well into which his brothers had thrown him. But by the year of the Hijra, the Lakhm had been ravaged while the Šamila [q.v.] and notably the Djūhām who under the Omayyads played a leading part, had increased in importance. Two centuries before the Hijra, the surplus Lakhmid population had spread over the lands in the north of the Peninsula in Syria and Palestine and in 'Irak where they established the Lakhmid phylarchate of Hira [q.v. and the article DJADIMA], continually at war with the Qassāns of Syria. In Syria we find the Lakhm settled in the same cantons as the Djūhām. Like the latter, they had adopted Christianity which had also become the official religion of the Lakhmids of Hira. When Išām appeared, the Lakhm had practically absorbed their relatives, the Lakhm, of Syria, a peaceful absorption by mutual agreement. In the first century A.D. the two tribes were usually named together as forming one group, and even when reference is made to a "chief of Lakhm" we can hardly be wrong in thinking he also ruled the Djūhām. The nisak Lakhm becomes rare in comparison with Djūhām. In the wars of Išām, during the conquest of Syria, at Yarmūk, at Siffin, and later in the course of the campaigns under Yazid I, against the sacred cities of the Hijāz, the two tribes fought under the same chiefs and under the same banner. "Lakhm" became
practically reduced to little more than a title of honour. Its archaic flavour, the glorious memories which it recalled of the phylarchs of "Irak", very impressive in the "Burke" or "Almanac de Gotha" of the Arabs. But as to the Lakhmids, they no longer have a separate existence from the Djughdam. When in the lands to the west of the Euphrates, we find them mentioned alone, the name must be taken to mean the Djughdam. It is the latter that the chroniclers usually have in mind.


(L. Lammens)

LAHKNAU, former capital of the province of Oudh (Awadh), now secondary capital of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in British India; situated on the river Gomti, at 26° 52′ N. L., 80° 56′ E. L. Population at the 1911 census, 197,812, of whom 4,461 were Muhammadans. Nothing is known of its history prior to the foundation of its town; even the derivation of the name is uncertain, though the first syllable is a contraction of Ṭakmān or Lakhman. The oldest part is the Lāmān Tīlā, which was colonised by Šahīkh at the close of the thirteenth century. A member of this fraternity, Šāh Mīnā, who died in 1478, gained much saintly repute and his tomb is an object of pilgrimage. Lakhnau's prominence began in the time of the Sūrī kings of Bihīlī. It was occupied by Ilmāyīn in 1526, and taken by Bābur in 1528; under Aqbar it was the chief town of the Ṯārī. The decay of the Moghul Empire enabled Saqādat Khān (1724) to found the dynasty of the Nawāb-wāzers of Oudh, who ruled as independent governors, and latterly as kings of Oudh, till 1856. Saqādat Khān, a Siyājī from Persia, of the Šāh's sect, a waizir of the Empire, destroyed the power of the Šahīkh of Lakhnau, but retained his capital at Faizāhād. He adopted the Ṭāh as the dynastic hādīr. The grandeur of the city dates from the time of Ṭāh al-Dawla (1775—1797), the fourth of his line, whose reckless munificence has passed into a proverb, and whose reign was the golden age of Lakhnau, which he made the capital of Oudh. East of the beautiful Victoria Park (1857) is a fine group of buildings, the Kām Darwāzā, the Great Imāmābārā, and a mosque, also by Ṭāh al-Dawla. The second and third are in the Māchi Bāwan, or old fort; here also is the Lakhmān Tīlā, surmounted by the mosque of Awrangzēb. The Great Imāmābārā is the chief architectural glory of the city. To the same period belong the Martiniere, built by General Claud Martin, first as a residence for himself, afterwards converted into a school Saqādat Ṭāh Khān (1797—1814) constructed the Dilkhuspah palace and the Sikandra Bāgh. He and his successors continued to adorn the suburbs with public ornamented parks and country seats. The meretricious style of the period marks the decay of Indian Muhammadan architecture.

Ghāzī al-Dīn Haidar assumed the title of king of Oudh. He built the Chattar Manzil palaces, and the mausoleum called the Shāh Nadjaf.

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

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

Modern developments have been stimulated and controlled by the wise generosity of the Local Government, and Lakhnau with its suburbs is regarded by many as the finest city in Northern India. As a centre of Urdu culture, it is the rival of Dīhil itself and is a seat of learning with unusual facilities for female education. The Canning College (1864) in the Bāshās Bāgh, King George's Medical College (1910), and the Isabella Thoburn College for women, are now included in the University.

Secondary establishments include the Colvin School, and the Reid Christian College. The Provincial Museum is also in Lakhnau. The Cantonment is the largest military station in the United Provinces. The city is a great railway centre, and the head-quarters of the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway are here. There used to be an extensive native manufacture of gold and silver brocade, muslin, embroidery, brass and copper ware, but here as elsewhere indigenous arts have fallen on evil days.


LAHKNAUT. [See Gaur.]

LAKIT. [See Luka.]

LĀL-EZĀNĪ. [See Mehmēd Lāl-e-Zānī.]

LĀM (BANT LĀM), an Arab tribe living in the mountainous region of the Tigris ("Ali Ġheri, "Ali Ġharī, "Amira). According to the statistics of Khurāshī Efendi (middle of the sixteenth century) there were over 4,400 families of Bani Lām west of the Tigris (between "Amira and Shatt al-Hai) and 5,070 east of the Tigris, along the Persian frontier from Mandali to the region of marshes (Khāh) into which the Karkhāh disappears. 17,450 families of the Bani Lām went over to Persian territory between 1788 and 1846 (the southern parts of the Punji Kūh, the domains of the wāls of Khwāz), some columns were also established east of the Karkhāh and at Fallāthīya. The Bani Lām claim to have originated from...
the neighbourhood of Mecca (Lyclama a Nijeholt, *Voyage*, iii. 225) and their eponym was their chief Fardād Lām. The Bani Lām, for the most part Shīʿīs, were on friendly terms with the wālis of Hūwaizā (the Muḥāṣṣaʿa, Arab sayyids, q.v.) who played an active part in Persian politics in the time of the Safawīs. In 1678, 1715, 1742, 1748 the Bani Lām in connivance with the chief of Hūwaizā rebelled against the pāshās of Baghdād. Less happy were the relations of the Bani Lām with the Lūr wālis of Pusht-i Kūh who deprived them of the villages of Bāyāt, Deh-i Lūrān and Baksāy, but as a rule the Bani Lām got on well with their Lūr neighbours.

`Ali Riḍā Pāshā (in 1836) and Nadīb Pāshā (after 1843) inflicted heavy defeats on the Bani Lām. The central Persian government also (expeditions of Muʿtamid al-Dawla in 1841) drove the Bani Lām from the left bank of the Karḵa but, protected by the mountains of Pusht-i Kūh to the north and on the east and by the dependency, the Bani Lām kept till 1914 a position of autonomy between Turkey and Persia. The presence of the Bani Lām and the Sagwān Lūrs in Deh-i Lūrān, Pūsht-i Pul and Dūstād had stopped commercial traffic by this direct route. The unity of the tribe was lost in the sixteenth century; the section on the right bank and that on the left of the Tigris had each its own shākīh. In 1821 the energetic Madhḵūr (Matḵūr), son of Djanḏil, succeeded the deceased Shāhik Aḵtar but Layard noticed that he had already little authority over his rivals. Lady Blunt says of Shāhik Mīrbān and her son Boneye, Shāhik Ghūḏān, son of Boneye, at the beginning of the war of 1914 attacked the English force at Ahwāz but was soon disposed of.


(V. MINORSKY)

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

**LAMAS-SŪ** (Turk. "river of Lamas"; Ar. Lams), a river in Cilicia, coming from the Taurus, a day’s journey from Ṭarsūs between Ayāsh and Mersina; in ancient times it marked the boundary between the two Cilicias (of the mountains and the plains). On the banks of this river exchanges of prisoners with the Greeks and the payment of ransoms were several times made. Some of these took place in the reigns of Hūrān al-Rashīd and the emperor Nicolephoros I in 180 (805); the second under the same caliph and emperor in 192 (908); the third in the reigns of the caliph al-Walīḥ and the emperor Michael III the "Drukad" in Muḥarram 231 (Sept. 845); the fourth in 241 (856) and the fifth in 246 (860)

under the same emperor and the caliph al-Muṭawakkil; the sixth in 283 (996) under the caliph al-Muḥtafd and the emperor Leo VI; the seventh called "redemption from treachery" under the same emperor and the caliph al-Muktāfi in 292 (905); the eighth three years later in 295 (907); the ninth took place in 305 (917) under the caliph al-Muṭādīr and the emperor Constantine Phorphyrogenetos; the tenth took place in 313 (923) under the same rulers; the eleventh in 326 (938) under the same emperor and the caliph al-Ḫājī; the twelfth took place in 335 (946) in the caliphate of al-Muḏf through the intermedial of Saif al-Dawla the Ḥamīdīd, lord of Aleppo. This river had at this place either a ford or a bridge which the ransom prisoners crossed. There was also a town of the same name (أدغ، Lamus) on this river not far from the sea.


(CT. HEARTY)

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

**LĀMĪ, nom de plume (taghālit) of SHĀHĪK MAḤMŪD b. ḤOṬHM b. ṬĀLĪ AL-NAYṢĀKĪ, a celebrated Sufi writer and poet of the early part of the reign of Sulaimān I, the era, not only of the greatest political development of the Turkish empire, but also in which literature was most cultivated. He was born in Brussa, the son of the *defterdar* of Sulaimān Bāyāzid’s treasury. His grandfather had been taken by Timurlenk after his invasion to Transoxania (Samarkand) where he learned the art of *nāʿābālīk* (embroidery and painting) there highly cultivated and on his return to Asia Minor introduced the first embroidered saddle. On the completion of his theological studies with Mollā Akhawain and Mollā Muḥammad b. al-Hādījī, Hasan-zāde, Lāmī, who had an inclination to *Sūfism*, became *muwīd* with the Nayṣākī Shāhīk Aṭīf b.-Ṭāhir Sāyīd Ṭāhe Ṭāhkitā, who spent his whole life in the calm retirement of a Sufi, free from external cares and favoured by the patronage of Sulaimān Selim and Sulaimān who frequently showed signs of their favour to him and his numerous family; he lived in Brussa writing industriously till his death in 938 or 940 (1532 or 1533). He was buried in the mosque built by his grandfather on the citadel of Brussa.

The versatility and quality of his literary output in prose and poetry is really astonishing. But his work was not so much original as translations and
adaptations, as was characteristic of the period which regarded Slavish attachment to Persian models as the highest ideal. He usually took as his model "Lāmā" then the most celebrated poet of Persia with whom he had a further link in their both being Naṣḥījānīs and therefore was called "Lāmā-i Rūm." His proximity is greater than that of any Turkish writer. We have a cycle of nine romantic poems from his pen. His importance to "Turkish literature is considerable but is greatly exaggerated by von Hammer who devotes the longest monograph in his Gesch. d. osm. Dichtkunst (119-209) to him. Lāmā’s style is still eumorphically laced and simple. There is not yet any trace in him of the overwhelming turidity of the later artificial classicism, yet it must be confessed that most that is beautiful in him is due to his Persian originals. Zīyā Pāsha in his Kārāštāt has for this reason paid no attention to him.

The list of his works as given in the Sharaf al-Insān numbers 24, but in reality there were more. His prose writings are: the translations of Djami’s Sufi works: Naṣḥāt al-Casr (biographies of Sufis with the sub-titles Fatih al-Majdhūbat il-Turāb ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Dībādžī-i Mēkāh, and Sharāhāt al-Nuṣrahāt (*The witnesses of prophecies*), printed at Constantinople in 1293); the Sharaf al-Insān: "The worth of man," considered by Lāmā to be his masterpiece which is a Turkish version of Part 22 of the 51 Arabic tractates (Kasāʿīl) of the Ikhwān al-Safā, the struggle between man and animal (ed. and transl. by Dietrich, Berlin 1858, Leipzig 1879 and 1881: Thier and Mensch vor dem Konige der Genien). His works of a religious character are Mūmānī ʿaswāt al-Insān, translation and commentary on the 100 verses of Ḥirūsīn Nuṣrāw ar-Rāyī. He also wrote a collection of letters, Munazara, a commentary on the Diwān-i Gulistan of Šūrūl, and Tharīya. "Book of examples," a collection of tales and allegories, Int. Constantinople, n.d.; a Madgha al-Lajwāf, or Latāf al-nūmā (a collection of often very daring anecdotes, quite in the style of Boccaccio’s Decameron, which received its final form from his son, ‘Abd Allāh Lāmī, also known as a poet). Finally as a kind of transition to pure poetry he wrote two munāzara (disputations in prose and verse later so popular), namely: Munāzara ʿAbd Allāh Ṭāh̄ā ("Disputation between summer and winter"), Constantinople 1290, with the title Munāzara-i Sultan Ṭāhā ʿālā Shahrīyā Ṭāh̄ā and Munāzara ʿAbd Allāh ʿalā Shahrīyā ("Disputation between Soul and Spirit").

His very much more important poetical works include a large Dīwān of about 10,000 verses which contain much that is beautiful and original; besides Lāmā’s, also contains the Shahāts in 1288; transl. by Pfrimmer. 'Vorbericht der Engel's Barza (separately printed at Constantinople Stadt Ferâ'at Vienna 1839).

His great Mālqāwā poems were of permanent influence; some deal in a popular faṭuwa with stories from Persian legends, namely: Salāmīn a.-l. al-Salām (d. dedicated to Sulṭān Selim), from Djami’s original; Wāz al-Rūmīn (d. dedicated to Sultan Sulṭān); from the original of Fakhrī Qanānī (d. 440 = 1530) and a version of the original of Naṣḥījānī al-Arūzī al-samarqandī; Wāz al-lāf al-Salām (from the Persian original of Tūṣūrī (d. 441 = 1650) translated at the express desire of Sultan Sulṭān (transl. by von Hammer, Vienna 1833); Forhād-nāma (transl. by von Hammer, Stuttgart 1812); Heft Paikar, "The seven beauties" (based on Hāfīz’s Heft Munāzara, which again goes back to Niẓāmī’s Heft Paikar). Besides the two allegorical dramas Gūrū al-Qizān ("Ball and Bat") and Ṣāmīn al-Parvānā, "Candle and Butterfly", the latter probably from the Persian of Ahī Shirāzī, he also wrote two Māhkāsāt’s of a religious nature, the Naṣīhāt-i Ṣahāwa (illustrated MS. in the Aṣḥāb Library, No. 249) and Manzuh (or Manzūhī Uwātī al-Karnī). Finally there are his political allegories Ḥusān al-Dīn (ed. translation and annotated with Lāmā’s Turkish version by R. Dvorš, Ḥusān u dīn, persische Alle- logrie von Fattālī aus Niẓām). For the Persian literature of Lāmā, see Lāmā-i Rūm., ed. Flugel, Leipzig 1835-1848.

(TH. MENZEL)

LAMTA, a large Berber tribe of the Banū family. Its exact origin does not seem to have been known to the Arab and Berber genealogists, who simply make them brethren of the Ṣanḥiṭā, Haskura and Gazūla; others give them a Himyarite origin like the Ḥawwārā and the Lawītā.

The Lamta were one of the nomad tribes who wore a veil (mālqāwā). One section lived on the south of the Māzū, between the Massufa on the west and the Targa (Tuareg) on the east; they even seem to have extended as far as the Niger In the south of Morocco, in al-Sūs, where there were Lamta who led a nomadic life, in company with the Gazūla, the Lamta occupied the territory nearest to the Atlas. On the coming of the nomad Arabs of the Banū family, the two sections of the Lamta were absorbed by the Ḣawwārā; the remaining sections then joined the Shabānāt, another Banū tribe, to oppose the Gazūla who joined the Ḣawwārā in the territory of the Lamta of al-Sūs at the mouth of the Wādī Nūl (now Wādī Nūn) lay the commercial town of Nūl or Nūl of the Lamta, the first inhabited place one reaches on coming from the Sahara. Several Morocconic dynasties have struck coins there.
The jurisprudent Waggāq b. Zallī of Sidjūlmīsā, a pupil of Abū Imrān al-Fass, was a member of the tribe of Lamța; one of his pupils was ʿAbd Allāh b. Yāsīn al-Gazālī, founder of the Almoravid empire.

The country of the Lamţa was noted for the lamţa bucklers made at Nīl with the skin of the lamţ antelope.

Bibliography: al-Idrīsī, al-Bakrī, Ibn Khāl- dūn, Kitāb al-Ībār, indices, s.v. Lamţa and Nīl; Leo Africanus, Description de l'Afrique, ed. Schleifer, iii. 272, 437.

Lamţuna, a large Berber tribe belonging to the ethnic group of the Šāhūdā who lived in tents, and led a nomadic life in the desert to the south of Morocco with other tribes whose members veiled their faces with the Ḳīkān (q.v.)...

At first idolators, the Lamţuna embraced Islam and converted also the Negro peoples who lived around them. After having had a series of independent kings, they fell into anarchy until Yahyā b. Ibrāhīm al-Gudallī took control of them; having gone on a pilgrimage to Mecca in 440 (1048-1049) he brought back from Nāfīs the jurist ʿAbd Allāh b. Yāsīn al-Gazālī, who after having instructed the Lamţuna in the principles of religion and Muslim law, made himself their chief, conquered their neighbours, the Gudallī and Massūfī, and led them to the conquest of Morocco. He was the founder of the Almohad empire, also known as the empire of the Mulāththimūn or Lamţuna (cf. Almoravid). At the fall of the Almoravid empire the Lamţuna disappear from the history of Morocco. Their name is still borne by some tribes of Mauritania.

Bibliography: The first paragraphs of the chapter devoted by the Arab historians to the history of the Almoravid dynasty especially: Ibn Abī Zar, Raudū al-Kītāb; Ibn Khālādūn, Kitāb al-Ībār, ed. de Siane, i. 235 and 237; al- Bakrī, Kitāb al-Muḥiddīb, ed. de Siane, 1911, p. 164.-165.

(L. S. Collin)

LANKORAN (LENKORAN), the capital of the district of the same name in the province of Baku. Lankoran is the Russian pronunciation of the name which was at one time written Langur-Kusun (anchorage), or perhaps Langur-Kanun (place which pulls out the anchors) which is pronounced Lankarān in Persian and Lankon in Tālīšī. The ships of the Bākū-Enzeli (q.v.) line call at Lankoran, which has an open roadstead but at 8 miles N.E. of the town is the island of Sarā, which has an excellent roadstead which shelters the ships in bad weather.

In the district of Lankoran, de Morgan found monuments of very great antiquity (dolmens, tombs, cases of exposure of bodies in the Mazdaēan (†) fashion), but it is not known at what period the town of Lankoran was founded. Certain statements (cf. Tārīḫ-i Alām-ārād under the year 940 [1533] in Dobr. Arz. zusange, IV, 283; and Sha'īb `Alī Hāna [about 1725 A.D.], Tārīḫ-e Lārābād, ed. Balfour, p. 157) suggest that the capital of Tālīšī was originally at Asṭārā; towards the end of the xviiith century Lankoran became the capital of this khanate. The whole district was annexed by the Russians under Peter the Great (treaties of 1723 with Tāmāsāb II and 1729 with the Afgān A chcraf) but returned to Persia by the treaty of 1732. Retaken by Count Zubow in 1796, Lankoran was retaken in 1812 by the Persians who fortified it. On the 9th Muḥarram (Zaḥrūr) 1228 (Jan. 1, 1813), Lankoran was taken by storm by General Kotliarewski after a brave resistance of the Persians. This event hastened the conclusion of the treaty of Gūlīstān (1813) by which Persiaced to Russia part of Tālīšī to the north of the river Aṣṭārā. From 1846 Lankoran was the capital of the district. The fortress was dismantled in 1865. Since 1921 Lankoran has formed part of the republic of Aḏharbājān, a member of the Soviet Union.

The population of the town, which was 3,920 in 1867, had reached 11,100 in 1897. The district of Lankoran has an area of 5,000 sq. miles and in 1840 had 30,000 inhabitants and in 1861 99,082. Later the district was reduced to 2,000 sq. miles; in spite of this, its population in 1897 was 125,895 of whom 46.5% were Aẓāri Turks, 46.2% Russians, 6.9% (in the north) and Armenians (2.0%).

The district is composed of 3 zones: to the north, an eastern continuation of the steppes of Mūghān; to the east, a marshy littoral intersected by lagoons and covered with a rich subtropical vegetation; to the west are wooded mountains running from 5,000 to 7,500 feet above sea-level which rise from the Russian frontier forming the border with the Persian province of Aḏarbastābī. The district is rich in forests and has good fishing.

Bibliography: Cfr. the article Tālīšī; Zain al-Abīdīn Shīrwanī, Būstān al-Shīrāzī, Tihrān 1335, s.v. Lankarān; Bérézina, Dichtung po Đuchatān, Kazan 1849, ill. 113; Semenov, Geogr.-statist. slower Ross. imperii, St. Petersburg 1867; La Grande Encycl. russe (ed. Brockhaus-Ehlon); G. Radde, Reisen an d. persisch-russ. Grenze, Leipzig 1886; Radde, Talish, Pet. Mitt., xxxii., 1875; de Morgan, Mission scient., Études géogr., i. 231-289; Études archéol., i. 13—125, with an archaeological map; N. V. Mair, Talīšī, publ. by the Acad. des Sciences Pétrograd 1922 (with a detailed bibliography); B. Miller, Fischeb. Fischerei u. Fischzeitung zu Tālīšī, Baku 1923 (mainly linguistic).

(L. S. Collin)

LÄR. 1. Capital of the district of Lārīstān, to the southeast of Fārs. Very little is known of Lārīstān and its early history. The country appears to correspond to the land of the dragon Hafṣūn-bōkht which was killed by Ardāshir Pāpakān. According to Persian legend, Ardāshir's adversary lived in the village of Ālār in the rustāk of Kudjarān which was one of the maritime rustāks (rūstāk al-isl) of the province Ardāshir-Khūra (Tabari, i. 820; Noldke in his translation of the Kūrmānak (p. 50) gives the variants Gallūr (?) and Kūchārār; the Shāh-nāme, ed. Mohl, v. 308: Kudjarān. Lastly the Armenian geography of the seventh century mentions a Kοδζάξχαται in Persia (Khūrdratāna) (cf. Marquart, Erdkarte, p. 44). The preencing of an a to the name Lār is also found in the name of the island of Lār (cf. below). Marquart identifies Kūchāhrān with the castle of Dūḡnān near Šīrāz; on the other hand the Fārs-nāme-yi-Yażūrī mentions a village of Kudjar-Khūrār in the canton of Gallāz-dar (the ancient Fāl [Fal] Bāl of Ibn Baṭ̄ūṭā; Kūhndžal = Kūndž + Bāl) immediately adjoining Lārīstān. According to a verse attributed to Firдавsī (cf. Vullers, Lexicon, s.v. Lād) but not found in the known editions of the Shāh-nāme, the town was
originally called Lār (and fell to Gurgin Milād, one of the heroes of the cycle of the Kayānīd Kai Khusrav). This would be a very curious case of the changing of d to r found especially in Armenian and in the Caspian Tati dialect (Darmesteter, *Ét.-iranien*, i. 73). The Fārs-nāma-yi-NAZRĪ mentions another legend according to which the people of Lār in Fārs had come from Lār in Dāmāwand (cf. below) the cold of which they could not endure.

The Arab geographers do not mention Lār, for apparently the old routes linking up the chief towns of Fārs, with Shāf and Kāīš, or Hurmūz (by Fāsā and Furg) avoided the town of Lār (cf. N. I. N., *Fārs*, p. 185, 187). According to Jamdalī, this was a wilayet near the sea and Ilūn Bātūta alone talks of Lār as a "large town, with springs, considerable rivers and gardens".

Lār had a local dynasty. Its princes, relying on the evidence already mentioned regarding the presentation by Kai Khusrav of the town of Lār to Gurgin, son of Milād, traced their descent from this hero. They were even crowned with the crown of their ancestor and this treasure was among the booty taken by the Šafāwīs in 1610.

The first prince of Lār to be converted to Islām (about 100) was Djalāl al-Dīn Ḥejāq. The dates given for the foundation of the town are 1415 and 1419 (Murad Šāb.-Khwād.). Fourteen of his successors are known but their order is not so certain; when in 1403 (1334), Ilūn Bātūta passed through Lār, the Sultan of Lār, or Turkom man origin, was called Djalāl al-Dīn, while according to the genealogy of the Milādnās, the Kābulīnlar (r) was ruling there between 1231 and 1253. The dependence of Lār on the Muzaffarids is shown by a gold coin of Shāh-Nuḏār (760-786) struck in Lār (S. Lane-Poole, *The Coins of the Mongols in the British Museum*, 1881, p. 240). In 1070 the troops of Muhammad Sultan, grand-son of Timūr, ravaged the eastern part of Fārs on the lines of Darab; Djalāmār-Lūr (Ez. Fasād, Fārs, i. 809).

There are Timūrid and Ghurān coins struck at Lār (O. Codrington, *A Manual of Medieval Nomismatics*, London 1904, p. 183). In the reign of the Milādnā Djalāh-dān (859-883), the Russian merchant Alānāsi Nikūn, passed through Lār in 1409 on his way to Hurmūz and India and in 1472 on his way from Hurmūz to Shīhz. The Milādnā Nikhrūsān "the just" (930-948) was a poet, musician and author; he died by the hand of a slave. His successor Ibāhim Khān submitted to the Šafāwīs and received the title of Amir Pāvān. His son Nār [Nawr] al-Dīn lived in the time of Sultan Muhammad Šafāwī. Under Abdāl-Ibrāhīm Mirāzī "Ali" al-Mulk, son of Nār al-Dīn, was authorized to take the name of Ibrāhīm Khān II. The young Khān showed signs of independence and oppressed merchants and travellers. This could not be tolerated at a time when Lār lay on the great road between the capital and the sea. As a preparation for the occupation of Gumbūn (= Bandar-Abbas) in 1614 (f) and of the island of Hurmūz in 1615, he began the fortification of Lār. Alalwādī Khān, in 1609 and 1610 (1609) marched against Ibrāhīm Khān and seized his possessions. Ibrāhīm Khān II had to surrender to the mercy of Alalwādī who treated him honourably and took him to Shīhz, where he died during an epidemic. The government of Fārs was then entrusted to Khādīkhān of Lār, a sincere Shīta (tarīk-i shāhī sewānt [q. v.]; paīmandā), Tarīkh-i Alavī-ārān (Iran), p. 423-426. Buildings of the Milādnā are still to be seen at Lār — a mosque and a bazaar of hewn stone covered with stucco. The bazaar was restored in 1615 by Nānbar Kālīr Beg Djalāmār Lūr, ważir of Lār.

The memoirs of Shāhī Ali Ḥazīn contain interesting notes on the domestic life of Lār at the beginning of the sixteenth century (rule of the Afgān Khudābād-Khān, passage through Lār of the route of Shāh Aḥsan, etc.). According to Ḥazīn (p. 120) the people of a part of the Lār lands (gān-zāl) of Lāristān were Shītas. They had prospered under the Afghāns but Nādir, wishing to reduce them, sent against them the sardar of Fārs, Muhammad Khān Balāc. The latter met with difficulties at Lār and having come to terms with its inhabitants returned to Fārs. In 1146, Muhammad Khān rebelled against Nādir and tried to raise the Shītas of Lār. The latter maintained a waiting attitude but by order of Nādir they were massacred and scattered. Lār was later annexed by a certain Nāsir Khān, formerly a brigand in the bulāk-ī safra (a region between Lāristān and Kirmān) who received from the Shīh the title of Khān. His family (the beger-leg) remained in power from the beginning of the sixteenth century when the governor-general of Fārs sent troops to Lār and appointed a simple kalāntar there (Fārs-nāma-yi-NAZRĪ).

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Bālbī Mihīb Khān invaded Lāristān. The conquest of Fārs was very frequently visited by European travellers in the eighteenth century when they lay on the direct road between Shirāz-Djalāmār-Lūr Bandar-ī Abbās: Figueiron (1617), Sir T. Herbert (1627), J. A. Mandelslo (1635), J. B. Tavernier and Thevenot (1665), Struys (1672), Chardin (1673), Dr. J. Fryer (1676), Le Brun (1703). At this time there was a factory of the Dutch East India Co. at Lār (Thevenot, *voyage*, Amsterdam 1727, iii. 460-476). After the fall of the Šafāwīs, Bandar-ī Abbās became the port for the province of Kirmān only, while Būshīr became the principal port of the Persian Gulf. Lār conducted a local trade with the ports of Bandar-ī Abbās, Līngā (q. v.) and Tāhir (the other Šafāwī, q. v.); of especially Stinck, *ancient trading centres of the Persian Gulf*, C. F., 1895, p. 166-173. In the sixteenth century, Lār has been described by Daprè and Stack.

Of the 76 bulūks of Fārs, that of Lār called lāristān is the most extensive (57 47 farshks, i.e. about 45,000 square miles). It is bounded on the N.W. by Barāntū, on the S.E. the bridge of Lūtarūn separates it from the nāghiya of Bandar-ī Abbās. This latter had a separate dynasty (the Kullānī princes of Hurmūz). To the south Lāristān is washed by the Persian Gulf (the ports of Kung, Lūga, Mokhīā, Čārak, Nakhū). In 1917 A. T. Wilson found Lār quite prosperous (Notes on a journey from Bandar-Abbās to Shiraz, Geogr. Journ. Series 1909, 151-170). On the west it is bordered by the canon of Malik, Ālā marwashī, and Khūnd, on the north-west by the buluk of Dāyūn; on the north by the buluk of Darāb; on the northeast by the Bulāk-i Safla.
The country is full of mountain ranges running parallel to the shore of the Persian Gulf and has a torrid climate. Water is scarce and brackish. The river of Lārīstān, variously known as Rūdkhāna-yi Shūr-i Galladār, Shūr-i Hing, Rūdkhāna-yi Lamān etc., runs from west to east and flows into the sea a far away east of Kung.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Nāhiya</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Lār</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shūr-i Kūh-i-Lārīstān</td>
<td>Bandar-i Čarāk</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Linga</td>
<td>Linga</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dihāngriyā</td>
<td>Bastak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Karrastân</td>
<td>Kašshī</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mazādājdān</td>
<td>Īzād-Khāst</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bīghā-yi Abshān</td>
<td>Bairam</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bīghā-yi Fāl</td>
<td>Aškānān</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fūmīstān</td>
<td>Gawbānd</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term bīghā in the local dialect means a valley shut in by two ranges of mountains. Fūmīstān is derived from the word fūm, corn.

The population of Lārīstān is thinly scattered. The most important towns are Lār (Dāpré: 15,000 inhabitants; Stack: 1,400 houses: 5,000 inhabitants) and Linga [q.v.]. The majority of the population is Persian. In canton No. 6 there are some Bahārū Turks and Nos. 2 and 3 are inhabited by Arabs.

Lārīstān has Persian dialects of its own (O. Mann, Die Tajik-Mandariten der Provinz Fars, Berlin 1909, xxxiv. 126—131) and there is even a local literature in them. The Fārs-nāma mentions Akhūnd Mullā Muḥammad Bākīr ("Suḥ-bāt") who was well acquainted with Arabic, Persian and "Darī". Romakwī has collected some of the poems in the local dialect of the poet Mahdīār as well as Persian quartains by several popular poets, natives of Lārīstān (Romakwī, Pers. narod. zecirowostihyia, in Ẓafti, 1916, xxii. 313, 340).


2. An island in the Persian Gulf now called Aībū Shu‘ābī. Near Chus had touched at it on his perilous but does not give the name, which according to Tolemy was Ξέγης (in Semitic isle of seaweed). The Greeks praised the pearl fisheries of Lār. Ibn Khūrdadbhīs calls the island Mūnadjjdīm-bāshī. Other variants in the Arab geography according to Le Strange are Allān and Lān. The Fārs-nāma, ed. Le Strange, p. 241 makes it a dependency of the island of Ardaschir-Khwāra. Yağıt (iv. 341) places it between the island of Kāis and the port of Sirāf. The Portuguese called it Ilha de Lazão from the village of Lār (should this be Lāshī?—at the end of it). It is 13½ miles in area. To the east of it lies the little isle of Shīwār (Cīvār). Some ten miles north of Lār on the coast of Fārs lies the little harbour of Nāhūlū. We do not know if there is any connection between the names of the town and of the island Lār. An island "Lārak" ("little Lār") lies south of the island of Hurmānā.


3. A high valley lying in Māzdār-dār, on the sources of the Harat-xpei. The altitude of Lār is from 8,500 to 6,500 feet. It lies west of Damānwād. The valley is deserted in winter. In summer the nomads pitch their tents there. The people of Tīhrān also go there for summer quarters. Stahl however (Petterm. Mittel., Ergänzungsheft No. 118, 1869, p. 619) found traces of ancient dwellings on the right bank of the river Lār. The locality is sometimes called Lārdīnān, which must be a plural of Lārdīnā, "inhabitant of Lār" (in the suffix -īn cf. Marquart, Beiträge, Z.D.M.G., 1895, p. 666). The same derivation explains the Arabic transcription al-Lāriz (Baladhuri, p. 8), one of the cantons of Tābaristān (not however found in the list in Ibn Rusta, p. 146). Al-Lāriz formed part of the possessions of al-Maṣmūghān taken in 131 (748) by Abū Muslim (Marquart, Einl. u. d. t., p. 127, 137). The term Lārdīnā seems to have been applied especially to the place below the high valley of Lār near the modern bridge of Pāltūr; cf. Dīh-Falūl in Ibn Isfandiyār, transl. Browne, G.M.S., p. 67. Lārdīnā is said to have been the longest inhabited part of Tābaristān. Its village Warak was said to have been the birthplace of Farīdīn. In the villages lying on the slopes of Damānwād, Stahl saw a festival celebrated in memory of the death of Zokh (Aug. 11; cf. Morier. Second Journey, p. 357). At Lārdīnā there was a special marzubān under the ispahanāb of Tābaristān (Ibn Isfandiyār, ibid., p. 15, 183, 283). On the district of Lāhdūn (Lārdīnā) cf. Lārdīnā. — Spiegel (Varenna, Z.D.M.G., 1876, xxvii. p. 716—726) was inclined to suppose a connection between Warak (Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 15: Waraka, native place of Farīdīn = Thāraţāna) and the Aveitic country Varena. The site of Waraka is unknown but in Lārdīnā there exists a village Wana; on the disappearance of v in Persian dialects, cf. Grundrisse d. iran. Phil., ii, p. 59, 351.

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

Bibliography: 'Ali Djawad, Dzeghwyä Lughät-i, p. 606; Haddjî Khalifa, Dzikhan-namä, p. 616; Ibn Ba'ttûta, Paris, ii. 284; Simi Bey, Kitâmî al-Allâm, v. 5644, s.v. karanduni; Texier, Asie Mineure, p. 658. (Cl. HUART)

LARI MEHMED. [See MEHMED LARI]

LARIN (v. lari), a silver coin current in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean in the xvith and xvirith centuries. It takes its name from Lär [q. v.], the capital of Läristän [q. v.], at which it was first struck; cf. Pedro Texeira (Travels, Hakl. Soc., 1902, p. 341): "There is also the city of Lär, where are called laris, a money of the finest silver, very well shaped and current throughout the East" and Sir Thomas Herbert, speaking of Lär in 1627 (Some Years' Travels, London 1665, p. 130): "Near this byzar the larees are coined, a famous sort of money". The larin weighed about 74 grains (4.9 grammes) and had a high reputation for the purity of its silver. It was worth ten pence in English money (Herleti) or one-fifth of a French crown (Tavernier) or 60 Portuguese reis.

The larin is in shape quite unlike any other coin. It is a thin silver rod about 4 inches long, doubled back and then stamped on either side with inscriptions from dyes like any other coin. It is admirably described by William Parrett in his account of the moneys of al-Serja in 1580 (Hakluyt, P. descript. Voyages, Glasgow 1904, vii. 12): "The silver larin is a strange piece of money, not being round like all other current money of Chrisitianitie, but is a small rod of silver of the greatness of the pen of a goose feather where with we use to write and in length about one eighth part thereof, which is so wrested that the two ends meet at the just half part and in the head thereof there is no Turkish writing and the be the best current money in all the Indies and six of the larees make a ducat".

The kings of Lär ceased to issue these coins after its conquest by Shah 'Abbâs, the Great of Persia (Chardin, V. i. p. 236; Amsterdam 1735, iii. 128), but its popularity led to this type of coin being adopted by other states of the Indian Ocean. The kings of Hormuz of the latter part of the xvith century issued larees as did the Shâhs of Persia at Shiraz and the Ottoman Sûfisân at Basra. In India they were struck in the xvith century by the 'Abîl Shâhî dynasty of Bidjûr and other rulers and the frequent finds of them in Western India show how extensive was their circulation there. In the Malabar Islands in the early xvith century the king struck his own larees as we know from the Voyage of F. Pyrard de Laval (Hakl. Soc., 1857, vol. i., p. 232 sqq.). In Ceylon they were also struck, not only by the natives but also by the Portuguese merchants at Colombo; in this island they were twisted roughly into the shape of a fish-hook, whence the term "fish-hook" money. These pieces are either uninscribed or bear rude imitations of the Arabic script. In Ceylon the "fish-hook" money survived into the xvith century. A degenerate descendant of the larin still exists (Philipy, Heart of Arabia, ii. 319) on the Arabian side of the Persian Gulf, in Hasa where it is known as a fustula, i.e. the "long" (coin). It is only an inch long and of very base silver, if not copper, without any trace of inscription. It is described by Palgrave (Journey, etc., London 1865, ii. 179) who adds that there is a proverb like a Hasa fustula", applied to any one who like the local currency is of no use away from home.


(J. ALLAN)

AL-LÄT, an old Arabian goddess. The name (from al-lahat; cf. al-lät) means "the goddess" but was the proper name of a definite deity, according to the Arabs themselves: e.g. Ibn Wâsî, ed. Jahn, p. 44, 23 the sun. She is found as early as the Nabataean and Palmyran inscriptions and was later worshipped by various beduin tribes (e.g. the Hawæzin; Ibn Hisâm, p. 849, 13). An oath by al-lät is frequently found in the poets, e.g. Abû Sâdîn in Ibn Hisâm, p. 567, 7, Mutallamis, ed. Vollers, p. 2, 2, Aabs b. Hadjar, ed. Geyer, p. 11, 2, and even in al-Akhâl, Kûbâ al-Akhalâ, vii. 173. She had her principal sanctuary in the valley of Wa'djîd near Tâ'if, where the Mu'attib (Attâb) b. Mâthîk b. Khâ' held her priestess and a white stone hung with all kinds of decorations was her symbol. She is frequently mentioned along with al-Üzzi (Ibn Hisâm, p. 145, 7; 206, 2, 871, 5), where Wudd also is mentioned; Aabs b. Hadjar, p. 11, 2 and among the Kuraish, she, along with this goddess and Manâî, was held in such high esteem, that Muhammad once went so far as to recognise these three goddesses as intercessors with Allah but soon afterwards withdrew this (Sûra, lii. 15 sqq.). According to Tabâshi, i. 1395, 3 Abû Sufâyân carried al-Lât and al-Üzzi with him into the battle of 'Uhd. After the capture of Mecca, al-Lât was destroyed with her sanctuary in Tâ'if by al-Mughîrâh, who were related to her priest. But she was not forgotten, for, according to Doughty, there are still in Tâ'if blocks of stone which the people call al-Üzzi, Hulal and al-Lât, at which they secretly seek help in cases of illness.

Baethgen, Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte, p. 97 sq., 125; Lagrange, Études sur les Religions sémitiques, p. 76, 135; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, p. 29—34, 61; Lammens, Mil. de l'unité, Boyrouth, viii. 202 sq.; Doughty, Travels in Arabia, ii. 511, 515 sq.

**FRUHL**

**AL-LATIF (A.), “the Kind”, one of the names of Allah [q. v.].**

**LATIFI,** properly AND AL-LATIF CELEBR OF KSATUMI, secretary to the office for administering pious foundations (imedaret blatiit). He was secretary in Belgrade, came in 950 (1543) to Constantinople to the waqf office of Eyub, then went to Rhodes and Egypt. He died in 990 (1582) on the voyage from Egypt to Yanba on the Red Sea.

Latifi was a good poet and an even better stylist. He is famous for his collection of biographies of poets, Tezdheke-i Shuradar, which he finished in 953 (1546) and like Sehi, whose example he was the first to follow, dedicated it to Sultan Sulaiman the Great. His love for his native city tempted him to attribute to it a whole series of poets not born there so that his work was jokingly called Ksatumuni-nama. In spite of several inaccuracies, the book, which was printed in 1314 in Constantinople, is indispensable for our knowledge of the older poets of whom he deals with 502 from the time of Murad Khusn to his own day. His able critical remarks show that he had excellent insight into the nature of the poet’s art, but the standard that he imposes on the poets for adoption into his work is not too strict. He never published any continuation to his work although he lived for over 40 years after writing it; other works of his are: Munziqara, which was edited in 1287 by Tewfik Bey; a regular Duana; a collection wrongly attributed to Kemal. Pasha-zade of 100 hadiths with paraphrases in Turkish verse; a Rizale-i Eswafi Istanbul; also: Nafir al-Latif, Kabir al-Ashar, Ans al-Fiszla, Fuquli arba. A translation of his Tezdheke was made by Thomas Chabert, Zurich 1800: Latiff oder Biographische Nachrichten von vorzüglichsten dtirischern Dichtern nebst einer Blumenlese aus ihrer Zeit.

**Bibliography:** Sehi, Hishit Bihiti, Constantine 1235, p. 138; Thauriay, Sidiqul-i eshmani; Sano, Kamus al-Asham; Brusali M. Tahiri, Ottomali Muellifisi, i. 134—135; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst, i. 286 and do., Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches; Smirnow, Oterk istorii tureckoii literature, St. Petersburg 1891 (Kors iv.), p. 456; Basmadjian, Essai sur l’histoire, Constantinople 1910, p. 50; the catalogues of the various collections of manuscripts.

(TH. MENZEL)

**LAWATA, a Berber ethnic group, belonging to the family of Butr, whose eponymous ancestor was Lawa the younger, son of Lawa the older, son of Zeph. Ibn Khdan disputes the view of certain Berber genealogists recorded by Ibn Halim who consider the Lawata as Sadaaniata and the Mazata as of Coptic origin. Others say the Lawata with the Hawwara and the Lamara were of Himyarite origin. In any case they were the oldest home of the Lawata seems most likely to have been the eastern part of North Africa. They were found in Egypt to the north between Alexandria and Cairo; to the south in the oases and in al-Sa‘id. Some Lawata led a nomadic life in the region of Borka. In the Maghrib they lived in the aljabal Lawata (south of Gabes and Sfax) and it is probably this section that is mentioned by Corippus under the name Iluguten = Berber: Ilawaten; others lived in the country round Bougie and in the region south of Tiaret (Tahert) where they had adopted the Iblis heresy. In Morocco there were Lawata in the Tadla (the Zanara section), in the south of Fas and in the land between Tangier and Arzila.

**Bibliography:** al-Iridi and al-Bakri, indices; Ibn Khdan, Kitab a'zfar, ed. de Sane, i. 147—150; transl. i. 171, 231—236.

**LAWH (A), board, table; the first meaning is found in the Kur’ân, Sura, liv. 13, where Noah’s ark is called ilaq atilawh. The second meaning is that of lawh as writing material, e.g. the tables of the lawh (Sura, v. 142, 149, 153, where the plural alawid is used; see Livian, ii. 421). Al-lawâd se la’lawh (Bukhari, Tafsir al-Kur’ân, Sura, iv., bâb 18) corresponds to our “paper and ink”. The expression mân bâna il’lawâh “what lies between the two boards” is found in Hadith, to describe the whole Kur’ân (Bukhari, Tafsir, Sura lxx., bâb 4; Livian, bâb 84); cf. mâ bâna il’lawâh (Bukhari, Tafsir al-Kur’ân, bâb 16). In modern linguistic usage alawid also means a school-child’s slate.

Al-lawh thus means the tablet kept in heaven which in Sura, xxxv. 22 is called lawh mubah (cf. ii. 1066a, 1076a). According to this passage, it is usually described as the “safely preserved” tablet. But it is not certain whether the words in this passage are really syntactically connected. If we read mubah, the word does not go with lawâh but with the preceding kur’ân and the translation is: “Verily it is a Kur’ân, famous, preserved on a tablet” (see the commentaries); “preserved” i.e. against alteration.

In the commentaries on Sura, xxvii. 1, the tablet is again mentioned: “We sent it down (the Kur’ân) in the night of the decree”; this refers either to the first revelation made to Muhammad or to the descent of the Kur’ân from that tablet which is above the seventh heaven.

The tablet as the original copy of the Kur’ân is thus identical with umm al-kurâb.

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

a. The tablet as the original copy of the Kur’ân. This idea is found in the pseudopigraphical literature. In the Book of Jubilees, iii. 10, it is said that the laws relating to the purification of women after childbirth (Lev. xxiii. 11) are written on tablets in heaven. Jub. xii. 28 says the same of the law regarding the “feast of booths” (Lev. xxiii. 40—43) and Jub., xxxii. 15 of the law of tithes (Lev. xxiii).

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

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

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

In mystical and philosophical literature Levi is given a place in the cosmic system and sometimes explained as aššu šašil and sometimes as maššu bulli or umm al-kuli.


(A. J. WENKIN)

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

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

The earliest Greek writers do not mention the Laz. The name βαζίσα, βαζία is only found after the Christian era (Pliny, Nat. Hist., iv. 4; Periplus, of Arrian, vi. 2; Ptolemey, v. 9, 5). The oldest known settlement of the Lazoi is the town of Lazos or "old Lazik" which Arrian puts 680 stadia (about 80 miles) south of the Sacred Port (Nоворозсиск) and 1,020 stadia (100 miles) north of Pityus, i.e. somewhere in the neighbourhood of Persope. Klie-glend sees in the Lazos a section of the Kerkesti, who in the first centuries of the Christian era had to migrate southwards under pressure from the Yazgi (i.e. the Cerkes [i.e. the] who call themselves Adlige (Adzlige); the same author regards the Kerkesti as a "Georgian" tribe. The fact is that at the time of Arrian (second cent. B.C.), the Lazoi were already living to the south of Sukhum. The order of the peoples living along the coast to the east of Trebizond was as follows: Colchi (and Samni); Machelones; Henichori; Zydritae; Lazai (βαζία), subjects of king Mahussus, who owned the sovereignty of Rome; Apilae; Abaci (cf. Arziba); Sangae near Sebastopolis (= Sukhum).

During the centuries following, the Laz gained so much in importance that the whole of the ancient Colchis had been renamed Lazica (Anonymous Periplus, Fragm. Hist. Græc. i. 180). According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, In habit. Imperii., Ch. 53. in the time of Diocletian (285--305), the king of the Bosporus, Saromatus, invaded the land of the Lazoi and reached Halys (N. Marr explains this last name by the Laz word meaning river) Among the peoples subject to the Laz, Procopius (G.R., G.t. iv. 2 and 3) mentions the Abah-gi and the people of Sumia and Skynania (= Lečkhum; it is probable that the name Lзиza referred to the most powerful element and covered a confederation of several tribes. The Laz were converted to Christianity about the beginning of the 5th century. "In the desert of Jerusalem" Justinian (527--665) restored a Laz temple (Procopius, De Aedificiis, v. 9) which must have been in existence for some time before this. The Laz also sent bishops to their neighbours (Proc., Bell. Got., iv. 2). In Colombia the Laz were under the suzerainty of the Roman emperors who gave investiture to their kings and the latter had to guard the western passess of the Caucasus against invasions by the nomads from the north. On the other hand the monopolistic tendencies of the commerce of Rome provoked discontent among the people of Colchis. In 456 King Gobazes sought the help of the Sānsānīn YezdegîrII against the Romans. Between 539 and 562 Lazien was the scene of the celebrated struggle between Byzantium (Justinian) and Persia (Khusraw II).

According to Procopius, who accompanied Belisarius on his expeditions, the Laz occupied both banks of the Phasis but their towns (Archaeopolis, Sebastopolis, Pitius, Skanda, Sarapans, Rhodopolis, Mochoresis) all lay to the north of the river while on the left bank which was desert land the lands of the Laz only stretched for a day's march to the south. Nearer to Trebizond were the "Roman Pontics" which only means that the inhabitants were direct subjects of the Roman emperor and not of the Laz kings; from the ethnical point of view the "Roman Pontics" could not have been different from the Laz. This strip of shore continued longest to shelter the remnants of the Laz.

In 1204 with the aid of troops lent by queen Thamar of Georgia, Alexis Comnenus founded the empire of Trebizond, the history of which is very closely connected with that of the southern Caucasus. Nicephorus Gregora (v. 7) says that the founder of the dynasty had seized "the lands of Colchis and of the Lazes". In 1252 John Comnenus received the title of "Emperor of the East, of Iveria and of the lands beyond the sea". In 1341 the princes Anan Archilutha ascended the throne with the help of the Laz. The lands directly under the authority of the emperors of Trebizond seem to have extended as far as Makriâla while Gongala was under a local dynasty (cf. the Chronicle of Panaretos, under the year 1376).

In 865 (1461) Sultan Muhammad II conquered Trebizond and as a result the Laz came into contact with Islam, which became their religion (شافي). The stages of their conversion are still unknown. The fact is that in the central regions of Georgia (Ахалтейское) Islam seems to have gained ground gradually from the 13th century (N. Marr in the Bull. of the Acad. of St. Petersburg, 1917, p. 415--446, 478--506).

In 926 (1519) Trebizond with Batum was made a separate eyalet. According to Ewliya Celebi who went through this region in 1600 (1649) the five sandjaks of the eyalet were: Djanikha (Джаиинк = Samiani), Trebizond, Guniya (Gonia), Lower and Upper Batum. The modern Lazisân was governed from Gonia, for among the kâfis of this fortress we find Atina, Sumia, Witia and Bele (= Belevetis) and Arkhavi: Ewliya and the version of the Ḍhāhān-nāma in Fellman's, Original-fragmente, Abh. d. Bayer. Acad., 1846). Hīdūdul Khâlīfa and Ewliya Celebi were deceived by the similarity in sound of Caucasian
names (as also was Vivien de St. Martin) proposed a theory of the identity of the name Lezgi and Laz. Ewliyâ calls Trebizond "former Lezgi vilayet". Hâddjud Khallifa after enumerating the peoples of the district (Lezgi): Mingrelians (Megrîl), Georgians, Abkhaz (Abaza), Cerkess and Laz, adds that the latter are those who live nearest to Trebizond. To the S. E. of Trebizond in the Cepni mountains he mentions the Turks who "worship as their God (mu'âdd) the Şah of Persia (i.e. are extreme Shi'is) and are associated (mewčtarîl) with the Laz". Hâddjud Khallifa and Ewliyâ do not agree on the number of the siefs of Trebizond; Ewliyâ only says that the value of the eyâlet has depreciated through the unreason of many of its 41 nahiye (Djîkân-numâ, p. 429; Ewliyâ, ii. 81, 83—85).

The first serious blow to the feudal independence of the dere-bey of Lazistan was only struck at the beginning of the sixteenth century by the Ottoman Pasha of Trebizond, but Koch who visited the country after his expedition still found most of the hereditary dere-bey's power, although shorn of some of their liberties. He counted fifteen of them: Atlina (two), Bulep, Artashin, Witse, Kapiste, Arkhawe, Kisse, Khopa, Makria, (Makrâli), Gonia, Barum, Maradit (Marâdîl?), Perlawan and Cat. The land of the last (the western) lay however on the Corolk behind the mountains separating this valley from the river of Lazistan in the strict sense. On the other hand among the dere-bey of Lazistan was the lord of Hamshin, i.e. of the upper valleys of Kalopotamos and of Furtuna inhabited by Muslim Armenians. According to the Armenian historian Lewond, transi. Chahnazarian, Paris 1826, p. 162, the latter with their chief Hamam of the Amatuni family had settled in the district in the time of Constantine VI (780—797) (the old Tambur was given the name Hamshin < Hamamhem, "built by II."). It is evidently this region that Clavijo (1403—1406), ed. Srezewski, St Petersburg 1851, p. 383, calls "tierra de Arraquiel". He adds that the people, dissatisfied with their king Arraquiel (Arâkîl), submitted to the Muslim ruler of Isipir. The Laz Muslims are not only those of Khopa have not forgotten Armenian. A Hamshin lexicon was published by Kipashidze.

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

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

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

The Laz language is closely connected with Mingrelian (which is a sister language of Georgian) and with N. Y. Marr finds it sufficiently peculiar to consider it a Mingrelian language rather than a dialect. In the Lazo-Mingrelian group he believes he can find resemblances to the more Indo-European elements in old Armenian (Grabar). There are two Laz languages, eastern, and western with smaller subdivisions (the language of the Chkhala). Laz is very full of Turkish words. It has no written literature but there are local poets (Râşid Ǝlmî, Pehlivân-oghlu, etc.). The Laz are forgetting their own language, which is being replaced by the Turkish patois of Trebizond (cf. Písarew in Zap., 1901, xiii., p. 173—201) in which the harmony of the vowels is much neglected (cf. a specimen in N. Marr, Teksti i rozhkaniya, St. Petersburg, viii., p. 55). The Georgians call the Laz Čan but the Laz do not know this name. Čan is evidently the original of the Greek name Sannoi/Tzannoi and it survives in the official name of the sandjak of Samsun (Djianâ). From the historical point of view the separation of the Laz and Čan seems to have taken place in spite of the close relationship between the two of them. In the time of Arrian, the Sannoi were the immediate neighbours of Trebizond. In an obscure passage in this author (cf. the perplexed commentary of C. Müller in Geogr. Graece Minores, ad Arranî Periplo, 8) he places on the river of the frontier between the Colchis (Lazii) and the Orminvi (?). Koch mentions the interesting fact that the people of Of speak a "language of their own" and according to Marr, the people of Khoshnîn (near Atina) speak an incomprehensible language. Procopius places the "Sannoi who are now called the Tzannoi" on the area adjoining the mountains separating Corokh from the sea (the Parayades range, the name of which survives in the modern Parakhar/Balkhar). The researches of N. Y. Marr have shown that the Čan (Tzannoi) had at first occupied a larger area including the basin of the Corokh and its tributaries on the right bank from which they were temporarily displaced by the Armenians and finally by the Georgians (Kharrtli). The chronicles of Trebizond continue to distinguish the Laz from the Tziaîdès (Τζιαίδες). The latter in alliance with
the Muslims attacked the possessions of Trebizond in 1348 and in 1377 were punished by the Emperor. At this period the Thānāids must have been in the southwest of Trebizond (besides, the sandjak of Ğanik is to the west of this port). Thus the Georgian application of the name Ǧan to the Laz may be explained by the confusion of the two tribes, one of whom (the true Ğan living to the south and west of the Laz) was ultimately thrust to the west of Trebizond.


(V. Minorsky)

**LAZARUS** is the name in the Gospels of 1) the poor man who finds compensation in Abraham’s bosom for the misery of this world (Luke. xvi. 19—31); 2) the dead man whom Jesus raises to life (John xi.). The Qurān mentions neither one nor the other, but among the miracles with which it credits Jesus is included the raising from the dead (Sura, ii. 43). Muslim legend with its fondness for the miracle of resurrection is fond of telling of the dead whom Jesus revives, but rarely mentions Lazarus. Tabari (Annies) talks of these miracles in general. According to him, Ǧâm b. Nūh is revived by Jesus (i. 187). Al-Kisūf only mentions Ǧâm son of Nūh’s of those restored to life by Jesus. Thābilī relates closely following St. John’s Gospel: “Al-‘Azīr died, his sister sent to inform Jesus, Jesus came 3 (in the Gospel 4) days after his death, went with his sister to the tomb in the rock and caused al-‘Azīr to arise; children were born to him”. In Ibn al-Ḥāṭir the resurrected man is called “‘Azīr”, the el of Elāzīr was taken for the article, as in al-Yāsā’ (Elissa) and Alexander (al-Iskandar) or in Azar in the Qurān, whose name Fränkel derives from Elizer. In Ibn al-Ḥāṭir we find Muslim legend endeavours to increase the miracle, Jesus raises not only ‘Azīr (Lazarus) but also his wife (children are born to him), and Sām (son of Nūh), the prophet “‘Azīr and Yahyā b. Zakariya (John the Baptist).


**LEBARAN.** [See 'a-Atl-Fitr.]

**LEO AFRICANUS, AL-ḤASAN b. MUHAMMAD AL-WAZZĀN AL-ZAYYĪT, called Yūḥānān al-Ḳāṣid al-Gharbī, in Latin Johannes Leo Africanus, born at Granada in 901 (1465) was brought up in Fās. Entrusted with three diplomatic missions to the South of Morocco by the Banū Watfīn, he went to Mecca in 921 (1516) and then to Stambul. Captured on his way home by Sicilian corsairs he was taken to Naples in 926 (1520), then to Rome where the Pope baptised him “Johannes Leo”. At Rome he compiled the following works, only the first of which has come down to us in the original Arabic text: 1. Arabic-Hebrew-Latin Vocabulary composed in 930 (1524) for the physician Jacob ben Simon (MS. Escorial 598; cf. H. Derenbourg, *Cat. ms. arabes de l’Escorial*, Paris 1884, i. 410); 2. *Description de l’Afrique*, which he translated into Italian on March 10, 1526 (divulgated since 1531; publ. by Ramusio, *Navigations, viaggio*, Venice 1550, i. 1—103; French transl. by Temporal, ed. Schefer, 1896; Latin by Florianus; English by Forry, ed. Browne, 1896; Dutch by Leers; German by Lortbach); 3. *Libellus de viris illustribus apud Arabes*, finished in 1527, Latin transl., ed. by Hottinger, then by Fabricius. These works gave the west the earliest materials for a history of Islam; cf. in the economic and social monograph on the city of Fās, *Descriptions*, Bk. iv., Ch. 23—34, a remarkable resume from the Mālikī point of view of the historical development of theology. Before 957 (1550) Leo returned to Tunis where he died, a good Muslim.


(L. Massignon)

**LEPANTO**, is the Italian form of the name of the Greek town Naupactos in which the Turks call line Bakht. This is how the Turkish form is transcribed, e.g. by Leunclavius (*Annales Turcici*, p 32) while von Hammer (*G.O.R.*, iii. 318) transcribes it as Aina Bakth, which he translates
“Spiegelglück”; in view of the Greek form however it is very probable that the Turks originally pronounced it Ine Bakhti. The town is situated in the ancient Locris, north of the stream which leads from the Ionia Sea towards the Gulf of Corinth, known since the middle ages as the Gulf of Lepanto.

After from the xiii century part of the despoty of Epirus, Lepanto fell into the hands of the Venetians who made it one of the strongest places in Greece, Muhammad II during his war with Venice therefore undertook an expedition to take the town by land. In 1477 Khâdim Sultan Pasha was given the task but did not succeed (Taṣawwîr-i Âlî Othmân, ed. Cairo, p. 115). It was Bayazid II who ultimately took the town in 1499 with the help of the Turkish fleet after the latter had defeated the Venetians near the island of Sapienza (Buriç Reis Adaşı) in July. The town was already being besieged by Mustâfa Pasha, beglerbeg of Rûm III; Bayazid joined the army later. The commander of the garrison had declared be would never surrender until Turkish vessels should enter the strait. This happened after the battle of Sapienza, for the Venetians made a feeble resistance. The Venetian commander capitulated on Aug. 26, 1499 (cf. Taṣawwîr-i Âlî Othmân, p. 127 and ʿAsli Pasha Zâde, p. 267–258, which gives the date as 3 of Muḥarram = Aug. 26, 1499). Immediately afterwards Bayazid built two forts to defend the entrance to the Gulf.

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

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

The defence of Lepanto consisted of 3 successive lines of fortifications on a cone-shaped hill; it was the residence of a sângîkh-bey of the sütâr of the Kapudan Pasha (Ḥâdîddi Khalifa, Taṣawwîr-i Kâbulî, p. 67). Its great strategic and maritime importance is explained by Ḥâdîddi Khalifa in Rumûlî und Bosnê, transl. by von Hammer, p. 125.


Lerida, the ancient Êrîdû, the Arabic Lârîdî, a town in nîthern Spâin, halfway between Saragossa and Barcelona, now the capital of the province of the same name, with a population of about 29,000. It lies at a height of about 600 feet on the right bank of the Segre (the Wâtî Şîkîr of the Arabs; Yâkût, Muğfâm âl-Bûtûnî, s.v., wrongly makes this another name of Lerîdî), and forms an important strategical point at the entrance to the plains of Aragon.

Lerida, which is undoubtedly of Iberian origin, was taken by Julius Caesar in 49 B.C. in the first Civil War between him and Pompey. In 546 a council met there and it was occupied by the Muslims in the first half of the eighth century. It seems to have henceforth shared the fate of Saragossa and to have been an important point for the defence of the Upper Frontera (al-ḫaźl al-dâ). It was later part of the independent kingdom of the Banû Hûd of Saragossa. At the division which took place on the death of Sulûman b. Hûd al-Mustâmî b. i'lâh (1046), it fell to his son Yâsûf but was again taken by the ruler of Saragossa Aḥmad al-Muqṭadîr. Bibliography: al-Ibrîn, Šifît al-Andalusî, ed. Dozy and de Goeje, text, p. 190, transl., p. 231; Abu 'l-Fâţî, Tâkûvas al-Bûtûnî, p. 180–181; Yâkût, Muğfâm al-Bûtûnî, vii. p. 313; Fâgman, Extracts inçîsîs reliâsi al-Mustâmî, cf. Index; Ibn 'Iţârî, al-Bayân al-muğfâmî, vol. iii., ed. E. Levi-Provençal, Paris 1927, cf. Index.

(É. Levi-Provençal)

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

The *lewends* were a soldiery almost without discipline whom it was impossible to make use of when the navy came to be regularly organised. Even in the time of Muhammad II the use of *lewends* had been begun for the naval service and under Bayazid I, the first regular body of marines was formed, consisting of 400 *lewends*. About the same time the *lewends* were employed on the galleys as *kurdjâl* in place of the less loyal Christians (Hâmidji Khalîfî, *Tarîfât al-Khân*, p. 108). Thus the true *lewends* were gradually removed from the navy. We find however that the word *lewend* is still used at a later period to indicate the soldiers of the navy, especially the riflemen (*füsîkîjî* of Dâvud Pasha); in Constantinople there were two barracks of *lewends* belonging to the organisation of the arsenal. In a figurative sense, the great naval captains of the 16th century are also called *lewend* (e.g. by Şafvat Bey in his article *T. O.,* xi, p. 24).

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

From the end of the 16th century, the government of Constantinople itself forced it to take steps to abolish the bodies of *lewends* still in existence. Ordinances of 1695, 1718 and 1750 gave them permission to join the new corps of the *diş* and *şâtwa* (Kâzûl, *Tarîqât*, Constantinople 1827, v. 13, 123) and at the same period of military expeditions in 1737, 1742, 1752, 1759 and 1763 exterminated the last bands of this turbulent soldiery, who still existed in different parts of Asia Minor (Kâzûl, *Tarîqât*, p. 25, 30, 78, 209; Wâzi, *Tarîqât*, p. 117, 234).

**Liân** (a), an oath, which gives a husband the possibility of accusing his wife of adultery without legal proof, but not becoming liable to the punishment prescribed for this, and of denying the paternity of a child borne by the wife. *In the language of the Sharî'ah*, evidence given by the husband, strengthened by oaths, by which the husband invokes the curse (*Ia'na*: from this the whole process is a *pœtori* named) and the wife the wrath of Allah upon themselves, if they should lie; it frees the husband from *hadd* (the legal punishment) for *khadij* (accusation without proof of infidelity by persons of irreproachable character) and the wife of *hadd* for incontinence (*A. Sprenger, Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Sciences of the Muslimans, Bibl. Indica, Old Series, ii., 1309). On the technical use of the related verbal forms, cf. the Arabic lexicons and Dozy, *Suppl. aux Dict. Arabes*, v. v.; al-Kastallâni, commentary on al-Bukhârî, *Taḥāf, 25*, at the beginning; al-Zurqâni, commentary on the *Muwatta*, Bâb *mâ dâ'î fi 'I-Liân*, at the beginning.

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

These verses belong to a part of the Kur'ân, apparently composed at one time, containing various regulations about adultery and consisting of xxiv. 1—10, 21—26; verses 11—20, which certainly belong to the year 6 were inserted later; our verses must therefore be older (cf. Nöldeke-Schawлы, *Geschichte des Qorans*, i. 210 sq.; H. Grimme, *Muhammad*, ii. 27, puts the *Sûra* between the battles of Badr [2 A. H.] and Uhud [3 A. H.]).

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

The disputes concerning *liân* are almost entirely (the oldest probably exclusively) exegetical and occasion is given to the occurrence of the revelation of the *Kur'ânic* verses in question; they are to some extent contradictory (attempts to harmonise them are found in al-Zurqâni, commentary on the *Muwatta*, Bâb *mâ dâ'î fi 'I-Liân*).

For the use of the term *liân* in the first sense, see the use of the word *liân* in the language in the second sense (as a verb) in their s.:

1. The husband (unnamed) laments his sad case to Prophet in covert language whereupon the verses are revealed (oldest form); 2. Lu'aimir b. Harîth asks in the same way, first through the intermediary of a friend and then directly of the Prophet (a development of the first type); 3. Lu'îb b. Umayya accuses his wife of adultery and is to be punished with *hadd*
for this, when Allah saves him sometimes by the revelation of the verses (this type probably a development of the first, in which Sa'd b. Ubadah also is often involved, who had previously with scornful criticism called attention to the possibility of the dilemma which has now actually happened, has of the three the most schematic and not original appearance); 4) some one marries a young woman and finds her not a virgin while she disputes his assertion; the Prophet therefore orders talaq (not exegetic). There are of course other transitional and mixed forms. In so far as the hadiths yield nothing new about talaq, this brief outline is sufficient; they are only of importance when they afford evidence for the oldest juristic adaptation of this Qur'anic institution.

2. The first subject of the earliest legal speculation was the question, not touched upon in the Qur'an, whether talaq makes separation between the husband and wife necessary. In many hadiths this question is so expressly (sometimes polemically) affirmed that there must have been a school which approved the continunity of the marriage after the talaq. The statement that al-Musab b. al-Zubair is said to have held this view (Muslim; Nasai'i) is however based only on an inadmissible interpretation of another haddith, in which he appears as a contemporary; on the other hand that Uthman al-Batti held it may be considered sufficiently proved (al-Zurkhani on the Mishatta). Among the oldest representatives of the other view which later became predominant, that a continuance of the marriage was impossible after talaq, may be included with some probability 'Abd Allah b. Umair and with certainty al-Zuhri in whose time it was already sunna, and Ibrahim al-Nakha'i (Kitab al-Ajadi); the tracing of this opinion back to 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbas, which we find in the hadiths, must however be regarded as unhistorical.

Next arises the question how this annulment of the marriage as a result of talaq is to be carried through, whether by a triple talakah, which the husband has to pronounce against his wife or by the decision of the judge before whom the talaq is taken or by the talaq itself. The first view is undoubtedly based on a large number of traditions, while no trace of its use in law has survived; these traditions are rather interpreted in favour of the second view (cf. the Haddith of al-Zuhri in al-Tabari, Tafsir and al-Buhari, Talakah, bab 30 and Hadith, bab 43; the tradition in Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 330 sq. forms in its abbreviated form only an apparent exception; a polemic against the first view in al-Tabari, N. 2067). The second opinion survives in the later legal Talakah; apart from the ample testimony to the haddiths, the oldest representatives known with probability or certainty are 'Abd Allah b. Umair, al-Zuhri, in whose time it appears as sunna, and Ibrahim al-Nakha'i (Kitab al-Ajadi); its ascription to 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbas is again not historical. For the third there is no evidence in tradition; it is only found after the rise of the madhhab. We seem therefore to have a tendency to development in a particular direction.

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

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

3. The teachings of the separate madhhab develop the views of their earliest representatives, not entirely on the same lines (c.f. from the Mushatta); it is to be assumed with probability that Malik followed the second view regarding the element in talaq which annulled the marriage (cf. above), while his school later held the third opinion entirely. The most important regulation of the Fiqh regarding talaq that go beyond what has been so far discussed are as follows: if the husband accuses the wife of adultery or denies the paternity of his child without being able to prove it in the legally prescribed fashion and she denies his charge, recourse is had to the process of talaq. If the husband refuses to pronounce the formulae prescribed for him, he is punished with the haddi for Talakah, according to Abu Hanifa, however, imprisoned until he pronounces the formulae, whereby he is set free or is declared to have lied, whereupon he is liable to haddi. If the wife refuses to pronounce the corresponding formulae, she is punished with the haddi for adultery, according to Abu Hanifa and the better tradition of Ahmad b. Hanbal, however, imprisoned until she pronounces the formulae, whereupon she is set free or confesses her transgression and is then liable to haddi. On the question whether talaq is possible if one partner is both not Muslims or not free or not 'ard, there is wealth of Talakah, which cannot be detailed here; the same applies to the possibility of talaq during the pregnancy of the woman, with the object of denying the paternity of the child On this point the strength of the principle that the marriage decides the descent of the child is remarkable, as is the distinction between two objects of talaq (accusation of the wife of adultery and denial of paternity) which is only a result of later developments. In the whole of the earlier period these two objects coincide from the juristic point of view. The divorcing element in talaq is, according to the Malikis (on their presumed divergence from Mlik himself on this question; cf. above) and a tradition of Ahmad b. Hanbal, the talaq of the wife, according to al-Shafi'i that of the husband, according to Abu Hanifa and the
better tradition of Ahmad b. Hanbal however the verdict of the judges pronounced after the Fā'īn of both. Opinions also differ regarding the legal consequences of a later withdrawal of the Fā'īn by the husband; according to Abū ʿIynāfa and one tradition of Ahmad b. Hanbal, a new marriage of the two people is possible in this case, according to Māturīdī and the better tradition of Ahmad b. Hanbal it is not; among older authorities only Ṣaḥīḥ b. Dzhūbair is in favour of the first view, while ʿUmar, ʿAbd Allāh b. Maʿṣūd, ʿAbdallāh b. ʿUmar, ʿAṭīr and al-Zubairi are quoted as in favour of the second (not all have historical confirmation) which was also held by al-Awzāʾī and Ṣufyān b. Ṣaḥwī. Finally it is a disputed question whether the Fā'īn can only be performed orally or (in the case of a dumb person) by gestures; al-Bukhārī devotes chapter 25 of his Kitāb al-Talāq to the discussion of this question and the reasons for his attitude to it.

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


LIYYĀN, or Arab tribe, a branch of the Ḩudhail [q. v.]. Genealogy: Liyyān b. Ḧudhail b. Mūdirī b. al-Yās b. Mūjrūl. Settled like the other branches of the Ḩudhail in the country N. E. of Mecca, the Liyyān do not seem to have had in the period just before and after islam a history independent of their brethren: it is only rarely that they are mentioned apart from them, e.g. in Ḩumaydī, p. 34, a propos of their battles with the warior-poet Ṭala'bṭa Ṣalāḥ; Muḥṣīl, Māqūṣ, ed Wüstenfeld, ii. 272: iv. 104 (cf. Ḩumaydī of al-Buhurī, p. 80—81; Ḣudhail Ḧajjāh, ed. II. H. Brn, No. 86 = S. F. A. W. 203, 4. 1927, p. 31), u 614 of a battle with the Khuzā'īa. The poets of this tribe are as a rule reckoned among those of the b. Ḩudhail — e.g. Mālik b. Ḩuṣayn al-Khunā'ī, al-Muṣṭanakhkhul al-Khunā'ī, etc. At the time of the preaching of Islam we find them like the rest of the Ḩudhail under the political influence of the Kuraish. This explains their hostile attitude to Muhammad, which resulted in the murder of their chief Ṣufyān b. Ḩuṣayn b. Nuhān by ʿAbdallāh b. ʿUmar at the instigation of Muhammad. This murder was cruelly avenged by the Liyyān who slew several Muslims in their turn (ṣam al-Rabīʿi, 4 a. h., cf. Ḥumaydī). There is no further mention of hostile relations between the Muslims and the Liyyān; it is probable that the latter were included in the submission which the Ḩudhail made to Islam.

After the triumph of Muhammad and in the periods following, there is an almost complete lack of information about the Liyyān and there are very few persons of note belonging to this tribe: the grammarian al-Liyānī, whose full name was ʿAlī b. Ḧāmid (Ḵāzīm) or b. al-Mubārak, d. in 222 or 223 (cf. al-Zubairī, Tabbārī at-Nakha, ed. Krenkow, Res/ e, viii. 145, No. 125, with bibliography; Flagel, Die gramm. Schulen, p. 51) perhaps belonged to it, but other sources (Yakūṭ, Ṭabaḥi, ed. Margoliouth, v. 229; Tādī al-ʿArās, x. 324, 10) trace his našba al-Liyyānī to the unusual length of his beard (liyyān).

There was some reason to suspect that the Liyyān at a remoter period of Arab history had played a more important part than that almost unnoticed, which they did later: this seems evident from a passage in Ibn al-Kalbi (K. al-Aṣmā'ī, p. 57 = Yakūṭ, Muḥṣīl, iii. 181, 19) who assigns to the Liyyān certain priestly functions (ṣadūm) in the cult of the Ḥudhail idol Ṣawā' (cf. Wellhausen, Rāch Arab. Heidentums, p. 18—19); but as the dates of their inscriptions and graffitis in the north of the Ḥijāz has not only confirmed this suspicion but revealed the existence of a Liyyān state several centuries before the coming of Islam. These inscriptions, first known from the imperfect copies of Doughty and Habel, were later collected in large numbers (over 900) by Euting and deciphered by D. H. Muller after preliminary work by J. Halévy. They are now available in still larger numbers and better known as a result of the discoveries and publications of Fathes Jaussen and Savignac. They are almost all in the vicinity of the village of el-ʿUllā (especially in the area full of archaeological remains) called el-Khawīk and in the rocky cliffs to the east of this not far to the south of the great Nabataean centre of al-Hiḍār [q. v.], Mada'in Ṣālīb; some have even been found here although in much smaller numbers. Their epigraphy closely resembles that of the Minaean inscriptions (which are also found in very large numbers east of el-ʿUllā) of which the Liyyān inscriptions represent a dependent or parallel form, but in any case of a decidedly later date (against D. H. Muller who wrongly thought them older). Their language on the other hand is quite like that of the Thamudean and Safaitic inscriptions, in Northern Arabic and only differs from classical Arabic by several peculiarities (especially the use of ha in place of al for the article, and of a participle of the form nisba in contrast to the form mūsā'il of the classical Arabic).

From these inscriptions we learn that el-ʿUllā — the old name of which is given in the form D D N identical with the Dehdān of the Bible — was the capital of a 'kingdom of (or of the) Liyyān', of which some of the kings were Talmai I and II (cf. the name of Talmai, king of Gešhūr, father-in-law of Ab-ḥolam, ii. Sam. iii. 3 and xii. 17). Takhmān, Lawdhān, Hanūmah M-SH-M, Kairīb. This kingdom seems to have been for a long period of remarkable size and importance; before it was formed or became quite independent el-ʿUllā Dehdān was a colony of the Minaeans and formed one of the stages on the great trade route which brought the merchandise of the Yemen and India to the ports of the Mediterranean. After the fall of the Minaean kingdom (according to M. Hartmann between 230 and 200 B.C.) the Nabataeans
replaced the Mineans in the control of trade and settled in al-Hidjr; but at the same time the Liyhānīs, who had absorbed Minean civilization formed an independent kingdom and arrested the southward advance of the Nabataeans; the frontier of the two states must have been between al-Hidjr and el-Ola. It is probable that these Liyhānīs were simply a section of the Thamūd [v. v.] whom we find mentioned in the annals of Sargon of Assyria, while there is no ancient reference to the Liyhānīs until Pliny who mentions them (Hist. Nat., vi. 33, 3) under the name of Lēchiēnī. Their power must have increased after the fall of the kingdom of Petra (106 A.D.) and it seems that from this time onwards, they also held al-Hidjr, abandoned by the Nabataeans.

When and how the Liyhān fell in their turn to the position in which we find them in the sixth century forming part of the tribe of Hudhaihl, and settled in a territory considerably to the south of their original home, we cannot tell, on account of the complete absence of documents. Muslim tradition has lost all memory of them and confounds them apparently under the general designation of Thamūd with the Thamūd proper and the Nabataeans of al-Hidjr; a memory but a very vague one of the old kingdom of Liyhān may perhaps have survived in the isolated mention in a tradition that the Liyhānīs were "remnants of the Dārjūnī" who later became part of the Hudhaihl (Tabari, Annales, ed. de Goeje, i. 749, 11-12; cf. Dūrhum) following Ibn al-Kalbī; Taqī al-Ārūsī, x. 324, 1-3, following al-Hamdānī, probably in al-Ikīl and the passage is not found in the text of the Qissat al-Ārāh. The Thamūdianic graffiti (which used to be called proto-Arab) are a development (later or parallel) of the Liyhānī script, the last stage of which is seen in the Āfīlīcīc graffiti; but we are completely ignorant of the historical relations of the peoples who used these similar scripts.

The ruins of Dādān-el-Ola, although they have so far only been superficially explored give us some idea of the advanced stage of civilization to which the Liyhānīs had attained; besides tombs, some of which are decorated with sculptures in high relief, Fathers Jausser and Savignac have discovered a sanctuary with a central basin circular in form (for ablutions?) and ornamented with large statues several important fragments of which have been discovered. An inscription in this sanctuary mentions an afkāl of the god Wādī; this term, which certainly is the name of a sacrificial office, is not unknown to Muslim Arab tradition (Akbānī, xxxix. 686; Ibn Duraid, K. al-Iṣṭihāb, p. 197, 7). Among the deities worshipped by the Liyhānīs we find alongside of typically Arab ones like Allāh, al-Īšā, Wādī, Yaghūth and a god Dūh Ghābāt of whom we know nothing definite, gods of Aramaean origin, like Bālsāmīn, the god of the sky and, in a theophoric name, Sāmil; in these names as well as in the use of other Aramaic terms (among them nafish in the sense of "tongue") there is apparent the influence of the Nabataeans undoubtedly contributed with the Mineans to form the character of Liyhānī civilization. The presence of Judaean elements, which Muller and Glaser thought they could recognise is on the other hand more than doubtful.

Bibliography: Wüstenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, M. 8 (Register, p. 275); Ibn Kutaiba.

LIMNI, Turkish form of the name of the island of Lemnos in the Aegean Sea between Mount Athos and the mainland of Asia Minor about 50 miles S.E. of the entrance to the Dardanelles. In ancient times a possession of Athens, in the middle ages it belonged to the Byzantine empire; in this period, in 901, the island was sacked by the Muslim inhabitants of Crete. Towards the end of the middle ages Lemnos had passed into the hands of the Italians who called the island Stalincene (formed with the addition of the Greek preposition οἷς and the article). When the Turks took Constantinople the island belonged to the Genoese lords of Lesbos (Midillu), the Gateius. Under Bayazid I, who had fortified the Dardanelles, Lemnos passed with the other islands under Turkish rule. But when Constantinople became the Turkish capital it was inevitable that Lemnos, the largest of the three islands commanding the entrance to the Dardanelles (the others are Lemnos and Tenedos, or Bozja Ada) entered the direct domination of the Turks. In 1456 took place Muhammad II's expedition against Ainos as a result of which the Conqueror became lord of the islands of Thasos, Samothrace and Imbros. Negotiations had been going on between the lord of Lesbos and the Sultan regarding the payment of tribute. But in the course of these negotiations the people of Lemnos, dissatisfied with the rule of Nicolas Gateius, brother of the lord of Midillu, voluntarily submitted to the Sultan who appointed Hamzah Beg governor of the island and entrusted him, according to an account of Gallipoli, with the task of installing him there. Gateius succeeded in leaving the island before the arrival of the Turks. The date of these happenings which are recorded only by the Byzantine historians Ducas (XIV, 190) and Chalcedonias (vii. 248) is not certain; but Ducas who was representative of the princes of Lesbos at the Sultan's court, may be considered a reliable authority. In 1457 a Papal fleet drove out the Turks — the Pope had intended to establish an order of Knights on Lemnos — but some time afterwards the same Isma'il Beg recovered Lemnos with the adjoining islands (Zinken, ii. 235 sqq.). In 1462 Muhammad became master of Lesbos also. In the following year the Turkish possession of Lemnos was disputed by the Venetians whose Admiral Canale in 1467 (A. S. 772 in Neshri and Sa'd al-Din, according to von Hammer) took Ainos and the islands in this part of the Aegean Sea (cf. also Menoudjīm Bâghi, iii. 354); these conquests resulted in Muhammad's great expedition against the island of Euboea or Negropont (in Turkish:
Eghribos) in 1468. Soon afterwards the Turks retook Lemnos and by the peace concluded with Venice in 1479 this island remained definitely a possession of the Turks. In this last year the island of Tenedos was fortified by the Sultan so that the system of defences of the Dardanelles was completed.

In July 1566 the Venetians won a victory over the Turkish fleet before the Dardanelles and as an immediate result took Tenedos, Samothrace and Lemnos. These conquests were such a threat to the capital that the grand vizier Muṣṭafā Koprulu took energetic measures and sent an army of 4,500 men under the Kapudan Paşa Topal Muḥammad; the latter besieged the citadel of Castro for 63 days, after which it was concluded on November 15, 1567. Tenedos was regained from the Turks by the same expedition (Naʿima, ii. 579, 585, 633). Finally in 1770 in the Russo-Turkish war Count Orloff laid siege to Castro and after 60 days had obtained its surrender, when the Kapudan Paşa Husan attacked the Russian fleet in the harbour of Mudros (Turkish: Munduros), forced the Russians to withdraw on October 24, 1770 (Wasi'i, ii. 118).

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

In the old administrative division of the Turkish empire the island formed part of the sanjcak of Gallipoli which was the sanjcak of the Kapudan Paşa; after the reforms of the sixteenth century Limni became a sanjcak in the Balār-i Safīd Wilāyet including the kildas of Limni, Boğaz Ağa (Tenedos) and Imros (Imброс). Castro, a little harbour on the west coast, was always the seat of the governor and had the garrison. Cuinet gives 27,079 as the total of the population, which has always been predominantly Greek. Cuinet gives the Muslims as 2,450. One of the specialities for which Lemnos has always been celebrated since ancient times is "terra sigillata" (Turkish "timi mokkum"), a kind of earth found near the village of Koskinon on the south coast (where it has been sought to locate the site of the ancient Hephaestia) which is credited with medicinal virtues. This bed of clay was unearthed once a year (August 16) to the accompaniment of certain ceremonies at which the Greek priest and the Turkish hajja both assisted (Naʿima, ii. 586).

Bibliography: Zinkeisen, G.O.R., i. 169; ii. 231, 235 sqq., 315; iv. 953 sqq., 943 sqq.; von Hammer, G. O. R. ?, i. 81, 186, 438 sqq., 494, 534; iii. 457, 482; iv. 685; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Afrique, i. 475 sqq., 480 sqq. (J. H. Kramers)

LINGA, a little seaport on the Persian Gulf which lies between Lārīstān [q.v.] and the desert. The old port was at Kung, 8 miles east of Linga; the Portuguese had a factory there where they ruled long after the loss of Hormūz (to 1711). In the reign of the Zand dynasty, 1,000 Dāwāsīm Arabs (Bānī Dāwāsīm, Dāwāsīm, Kowāsīm) with their chief Shaikh Sallīm came from Ras al-Khaima (Umān) and took Linga from the khātīr of the district Dāhānīrī. In 1887 the Persian government took possession of Linga and deported the Teherān the last hereditary shaikh (Kādīb). The present population is very mixed (Arabs, Persians, Hindus, Africans). On the shore at Linga are wharves for building boats for local traffic and the port is fairly busy, but the mountains which rise from 3,500—4,000 feet behind Linga make communication with the hinterland difficult (Lār is 45 farsākhs from Linga).


LISĀN AL-DIN. [See Ιβν Χάθιβ.]

LISBON, Portuguese Lisbon, a city at the mouth of the Tagus, now the capital of Portugal, with 435,000 inhabitants; tradition ascribes its foundation to Ulysses and it originally bore the Phoenician name of Olīptūp. Under the Romans it received the name of Felicissimus, or Limni, and formed a municipium. It was under the rule of the Alans from 407, of the Visigoths from 585 to 715, when it passed into the power of the Muslims.

For the Arabic transcription of the name of Lisbon we find the two forms Līthūnna and Lūthānna with or without the article (cf. especially, David Lopes, Os Arabes nas obras de Alexandre Herculano, Lisbon 1911, p. 58—59 and the references there given). The most usual ethnic is Al-Usbānī. Lisbon was not a large town in the Muslim period but it was nevertheless frequently descripted by the Arab geographers. Al-Kistī speaks of its ramparts and its caravans and of the springs of warm water which rose in the centre of the town. It is built, he says, opposite the fort called al-Maḍān (Almada), so called from the gold dust washed up on the bank by the Tagus. It is also from Lisbon that this geographer followed by several authors makes the legendary expedition of the "Adventurers" set out (no doubt to the Canary Islands; cf. above ii., p. 886, s. v. AL-KHILĀDIY).

Lisbon very early (by 711) fell into the hands of the Muslims and under the Omayyad caliphs of Cordova formed a part of the district of Balṭa, along with Santarem and Cinta. The Arab chroniclers record several risings there which were quickly suppressed. It was however from the Normans (Mādīrūs) that Lisbon suffered most in this period. During their first invasion of al-Andalus in 1229 (844) it was there that they disembarked for the first time. According to Ibn 'Idārī, their fleet consisted of 54 galleys and 54 vessels of less
importance; the alarm was given to the caliphs of Cordova by the governor of Lisbon, Wahib Allāh b. Ḥarm. Again during the invasions of 966—971, in the reign of al-Īṣākam II, the Normans began by ravaging the plains of Lisbon after landing at Alcacer do Sal (Ḳaṣr Abī Dānīm). For further details, cf. the article Māsūsī and the literature there quoted.

After the fall of the Omayyad caliphate of Spain, Lisbon formed part of the independent kingdom founded by the Ṭafsids [q. v.] with Badajoz (Batallawa) as capital. Under the Almoravids, it seems to have been taken for a brief period by the Christians and retaken at the end of 1104 (1110) by the Emir Sir b. Abī Bakr, at the same time as Santarem, Badajoz, Porto and Evora. It was only some 40 years afterwards, in 1142 (1147) that it was finally conquered by Afonso I Henriques of Portugal with the help of a body of Crusaders who were on their way to Palestine under Arnold van Aerschot.


LĪTHĀM (A.) (sometimes also pronounced Ṭīṭām), the mouth-veil, is a piece of material with which the Beduins concealed the lower part of the face, the mouth and sometimes also part of the nose (see the commentary on Ḥarrī, ed. de Sacy, Paris 1821, p. 374, q). It served the practical purpose of protecting the organs of respiration from hot and cold as well as against the penetration of dust (cf. Ibn ʿUmmama, No. 5, 43; also No. 39, 24, and 73, p; and the commentaries on Mutanabbī, p. 464, 27 and Ḥarrī, p. 374, 2). It also made the face more or less unrecognisable and thus formed a protection against the averger of blood (Goldziher in Z. D. M. G., xli. 101). The ʿlīthām was therefore also sometimes worn as a deliberate disguise by people who did not usually wear it; thus in the 100 Nights (ed. Macoughan, i. 878) it is worn by a princess, who disguises herself as a man, and (ibid. ii. 58) by a woman for similar reasons. A denominative verb has been formed from ʿlīthām, the fifth form of which in particular means “to put on the ʿlīthām” (e.g. Aghānī, viii. 102, 20; xxi. 55, 19; Ḥākānī, ed. Kosgarten, p. 121, 13; Wright, Obras de al-Andalus, p. 111, 2; Ḥarrī, Masāḥīṣ, ii. 433, 2), while the eighth form in the meaning “to put on something as liṭham” is generally used only metaphorically (see below) Tālḥīmān usually means a woman’s veil (Cherbonneau in J. d. A., s. v. Ṭalḥīmāt, i. 64), but talḥīmāt al-kayyīf is also found as the distinctive dress of a particular office under the Fātimids; their chief kādī wore it along with the turban and talḥīmāt (de Sacy, Christi, ii. 92). In general however, the ʿlīthām does not seem to have been worn by town-dwellers.

The ʿlīthām has no considerable importance for Islam from the purely religious point of view; it is forbidden along with certain other garments for the mubīn (Bukhārī, i. 390, below). The custom of wearing a ʿlīthām was generally disseminated among the ʿAnṣābīd tribes [q. v.]. In N.W. Africa, who are therefore described as ʿlīthām-wearers, mulʿāthāmah or aṣwāl al-mulʿāthāmah; as the Almoravids originated in one of their clans, the Ṭamūmā, the ʿlīthām thus came to have a certain political significance. The custom of wearing a ʿlīthām (below the nīḥā, see Bakri, p. 170) was found in other parts of Africa also, e.g. in Kāmān (Maẓrīzī, i. 103, 31 ]._
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LIWA’ (A. “flag”, from lwa to “enroll”) means in Turkish official terminology an administrative area, several of which form a vilayet “province” and one is in turn divided into kazas “districts”. It corresponds pretty much to the département in France. It is synonymous with nanglik (t. “flag”) and is used alongside of it. The sanjak is governed by a mutasarrifi, whence a third synonym mutasarriflik. The institution of the liva" goes back to the early days of the Ottoman empire but it was under Mahmud II in 1814 that the present administrative organisation came into being. Bibliography: Uciniti, Lettres sur la Turquie 3, Paris 1853, i. 44, 50. (CL. HAURT)

LIWAN (Λ, for ak-lawan; Dozy, Supplément, 563) in eastern houses is a hall, enclosed by walls on three sides and open through an arch on the fourth; it is raised two or three steps and forms the focus of the house, all the rooms of which open on to it or on to an arched corridor which is ornamented with plants and trees. This is a type borrowed from the Sasanian palaces, of which a specimen has survived to the S.E. of Baghídád, in the ruin called Tám-kirá, “vault of Chosroes”, or Támín-kirá, “hall of audience”. It corresponds to the fiilár of the modern Persians. It is open on the north side to get the cool air. Bibliography: A. von Kiémer, Topographie von Damascus, Denckers, Ab. Wien, 1854, vol. v., p. 19; Lane, Modern Egyptians, London 1837, i. 78, 20: ii. 45. (CL. HAURT)

LODI, the name of a clan of the Ghilzai tribe of Afghanistan. A family of this tribe was established in Multan before India was invaded by Mahmud of Gharní, for that district was ruled, in 1005, by Abu'l-Fath Dáwid, grandson of Shaikh Jamal Lodi who had established himself there, but the importance of the tribe dates from the reign of Firuz Tughluq when some of its members entered India for purposes of trade, but soon occupied themselves with politics. Dawlat Khan Lodi competed with Khizr Khan [q. v.] for the throne on the extinction of the Tughluq dynasty. Malik Paham Lodi took service under Malik Mardán Dawlat, governor of Multán, and his eldest son, Sulcán Shah, served Khizr Khan at Multán. After the battle on Nov. 12, 1405, in which Khizr Khan defeated and slew Mållí (Ikbál Khan), Sulcán Shah received the title of Islam Khan and the sif of Sirhind, where he settled with his four brothers and assembled a body of 12,000 horse, mostly of his own tribe. His next brother, Khal, had a son named Buhlul (usually called “Baholol” in India), whom Islam Khan adopted, to the exclusion of his own son, Kutb Khan, and married to his daughter. Kutb Khan fled to Dihlí and entered the service of Muhammad Sháh the Sayíd, to whom he described his relations as a danger to the state. Muhammad sent a force against them and they were defeated and fled to the hills, but almost immediately recovered, recovered their possessions, and defeated the minister, Hisam Khan, near Sidhawa. In 1442 Dihlix was threatened by Mahmud Khalaji II, of Malwa, and Muhammad Sháh appealed to Buhlul, who demanded, as the price of his assistance, the execution of his enemy, Hisam Khan and the appointment of Hamid Khan as minister. The feeble king complied, and Buhlul marched to Dihlí with his contingent and took command of the army. The battle with the army of Malwa was indecisive, but Mahmud was recalled by the news of a riot in his capital and Buhlul was hailed as the saviour of the kingdom, and received the title of Khan Khánan and the government of the Pándíb. He shortly afterwards picked a quarrel with Muhammad and besieged him in Dihlí, but retired to Sirhind without capturing the city. In 1443-1444, Muhammad died, and was succeeded by his son *Alam Sháh, a feeble monarch who, after a brief and troubled reign in Dihlí, retired to Buhlúd, which he made his place of residence. Buhlul then marched to Dihlí and *Alam Sháh abdicated in his favour. Buhlul ascended the throne on April 19, 1451, and reigned for thirty-eight years. He was succeeded, on July 17, 1459, by his son Síkandar, who reigned until November 21, 1517, when he died and was succeeded by his son lbrahím, who was defeated and slain by Dábur on the field of Pándíb on April 22, 1540. Bibliography: NieÁín al-Dín Almad, Tábshá-i akbarí; Khwáfi Khlán, Muntasíb al- Tawáriosh, ed. and translation by G.S. A. Rankine, all in Bib. Ind., series of the A.S.B.; Muhammad Kásim Fíradi, Gulshan-i Hárshí, Bombay 1832. (T. W. HAIG)

LOJA (λ, Lovegra), a little town in Andalusia, 35 miles S.W. of Granada, on the left bank of the Genil at the foot of an imposing limestone mountain, Periquetes. It has now rather less than 20,000 inhabitants but seems to have been more important in the Arab period. It was the birthplace of the famous Ibn al-Khaṣṣáb Lísaín al-Dín [q. v.] who wrote an enthusiastic description of it. One can still see there the ruins of the fán which commanded the town in the Arab period. It was repopulated in 280 (893) in the reign of the caliph "Abd Allah b. Muhammad. This *key of Granada* was besieged in 1498 by the Catholic Kings who took it after a month’s siege with the help of a body of English archers. Bibliography: Vákutí, Mádjam al-Buldan, vii. p. 543; F. Simonet, Descripc Ion del reino de Granada, Granada 1872, p. 95—96. (E. LÉ: PROVENCAL)

LOMBOK (usually called by the natives Tanah Sasak), the second in order of the Little Sunda Islands lying east of Java; the Strait of Lombok separates it from Bali, the Strait of Alas
from Sumbawa. A not very broad, rather flat, strip runs from east to west approximately through the centre of the island, which is in part extremely fertile and is shut in by hills on the north and south. In the north is the volcano of Kintjani revered as holy by a large section of the population. The island is one of the richest parts of the Archipelago; the main industries are agriculture and cattle-rearing, the first being on a particularly high level. A quantity of the rice which is in part grown on fields excellently irrigated is exported. Even if we exclude the foreign traders settled on the island (especially Buginese, Arabs and Chinese) the population is not homogeneous but consists of two groups which are sharply distinguished territorially also; the smaller western part is inhabited by Balinese, the centre and the east by the much more numerous Sasaκ. The inhabitants of the western part are descendants of the Balinese, who came as conquerors to Lombok in the xvith and xvith centuries and gradually extended their power over the whole island; they intermarried very little with the native population, so that they do not differ very much from the people of their original home; their language is Balinese, and they profess the religion of Java, whereas the Sasaκ, who are found in their mother island, with a few exceptions (they have for example adopted a dewastram into their pantheon and the sacrifices to this Muslim god must not include pork).

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

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

The Sasak are of course no more orthodox Muslims than any other people in the East Indian Archipelago, but Islam has so far influenced them that we may see in it the reason why, in spite of the low level of the religion, there has been assimilation between Balinese and Sasak. They are divided into two groups or sects: Waktu lima and Waktu tiga (Islam). The former, who live mainly in the plain of Central Lombok are the Orthodox among the Lombok Muslims; their name shows that in (theory at least) they observe the obligations prescribed by Islam of performing 5 (=lima) salah a day. In keeping with this, the name of the Waktu tiga (who live mainly in the mountains) would mean that they are of the opinion that three (tiga, tiga = 3) prayers a day are sufficient. This is however an improbable explanation. Many are of the opinion that the name is to be explained by the fact that the Waktu tiga only know of three times of prayer, namely fajr (or aurat of Brunei), asad and maghrib; they only observe or in other, the Muslim principal festivals and their marriage ceremony also shows that they wish to be regarded as Muslims. At the same time pagan sacrifices and pilgrimages (which however can also be found among the Waktu lima) play a prominent part in their life. In their villages, there is always in addition to the Muhammadan fiisti i s fimangku, i.e. one who acts as an intermediary at the worship of all kinds of spiritual powers from the world of animism. It is particularly among the Waktu tiga that we find the custom that the village headman keeps two coarse pieces of cloth woven out of different coloured threads (the one "male" and the other "female") to which offerings are made in cases of illness etc.; every household makes a copy on the pattern of these pieces of cloth, which are also treated with reverence.

Practically nothing is known of the early period after the conversion of Lombok to Islam; the island was divided into little principalties often at war with one another; the eastern part was under the influence of Macassar and Sumbawa, the western under the influence of Bali. In 1674 the Dutch East India Company concluded its first treaty with the princes of Lombok. Soon afterwards in 1692 took place the first serious Balinese invasion and about 1740 the king of Karangasem succeeded in bringing the whole island under his sway. Four small Balinese kingdoms thus arose on Lombok which were frequently at war with one another until in 1838 the king of Mataram overthrew his opponents and ruled over the whole of Lombok. Down to 1849 he regarded himself as a vassal of the King of Karangasem on Bali; he then placed himself under the suzerainty of the government of the Dutch East Indies. The Sasak repeatedly rebelled against their Balinese rulers until finally in 1894 the Dutch intervened with the result that they conquered Mataram; since 1895 Lombok has been directly under Dutch rule and administered jointly with Bali.

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


LÜBNÂN (LEBANON). The Arabs have a somewhat confused, almost mysterious idea of Lebanon. Here they place the sojourn of the Akar [q.v.]. They do not distinguish it from the Anti-Lebanon for which they have no special name. "Djabal Sanir" means to the Arabs the section of Anti-Lebanon to the north of the valley of the Barad [q.v.] The massif of Hermon has been known since the time of Hassan b Thabit as Djabal al-Thady; it is the Djabal al-Shâri of modern writers. Nor are the Arab geographers agreed about the northern boundary of Lebanon. Some include al-Jamkám (Amanus) in it. This confusion has been facilitated by the vague popular appellation Djabal, which has been applied from the Middle Ages to the present day to the range parallel to the Mediterranean running through Syria from the mouth of the Orontes to Galilee; from this comes the name Akit al-Djakal, Djabaliya, "mountaineers", applied by the Muslim chroniclers to the Nuṣairis, Mutawalls, Druzes etc. A hadith tells us that stone from Lebanon was used in building the Ka'ba. This tradition perhaps explains why the Arab geographers see in Lebanon the continuation of the long arête which separates the Hujjaz from Najjd and Syria and Anatolia to the Black Sea. The southern frontier of Lebanon is usually made to coincide with the lower valley of the Lajjîn, the modern Kâsimiya. Current usage, conforming to local tradition, makes the Lebanon lie between this river and the Nahr al-Kabîn (the ancient Eleuthera) on the north. This is the region which our historical survey will cover. The backyard and the shattered population of the Anti-Lebanon has always gravitated in the orbit of the towns of Eastern Syria, while Lebanon with its towns opening to the sea and its flanks watered by the abundant rains yielded by the moisture from the sea, which it gives to the rest of Syria by its rivers, is in economic and political dependence on the centres of the ancient Phoenician country.

Lebanon is rarely mentioned by the pre-Muslim madan poets; for example by Nâbirgha Dhubyanî, whose patrons were phylarchs of Ghassân. The name becomes more familiar to their Muslim successors, e.g. Abû Dhabal al-Djumâh, Nâbirgha al-Sâlihînî and Abû al-Râmîn b. Hassân, from their attendance at the Omajied court. Its territory, covered with forests, mezâne, wet forests, and mountains, difficult of access, cut up by deep valleys and torrentous rivers, from the Arab conquest has offered a place of refuge to several small nationalities, increased from time to time by the influx of all the oppressed and persecuted.

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

Each sect, often each district, lived under the rule of petty native dynasties, supposed to be founded by suzerains in Damascus, Bagdad or Cairo. They received grants of investiture and were in return liable to certain obligations and military service, when the actual authority was able to force them to it. With a remarkable agility, the feudal chiefs of the Lebanon practised the art of manoeuvring through all the turmoil that saw successively installed in the east the rule of the caliphat, Sallân, Saljûck, Ayyûbid, Franks, Mamlûk, and Turkish pâshas. Not realising its strategic importance, the Omajieds and 'Abbyssids did not think of occupying Lebanon, still thinly populated except in the districts on the coast; they were less far-seeing than the Crusaders, who built massive fortresses on the frontier of the "Mountain"; Husn al-Akrâd [q.v.] and Shākif Arūn. This negligence enabled the Djurâdṳna [q.v.] to enter Lebanon. The establishment of the Maronites in the upper regions of northern Lebanon must have coincided with the coming of these Anatolian invaders and have facilitated the organisation of this Christian group, which was destined to play a preponderating part in the Mountain. At the end of the ninth century,
Arabs of Tanūkh, coming from the region of Aleppo, had established themselves in southern Lebanon, a principality, that of the "emirs of al-Gharbi" in the middle of peoples, partly Arabised and influenced by Shi'a teaching. The development of this emirate was arrested in the eleventh century by the creation of the Frankish dukedoms of Saydā (Saida) and Barut (Bairūt). The lordships of Gibelet (Djebail), Batrun (Bayroun) and the county of Tripoli depended for support on the Christians of northern Lebanon.

After the expulsion of the Franks, the Mamluks of Egypt entrusted the defence of Bairūt to the Tanūkhids. In the xiii and xiv centuries, the rising against the Mamluks followed by the extermination of the Mutawwīls and Druse rebels of Central Lebanon made it easier for the Maronites to occupy the lands south of the Nahr Ibrāhīm (Adonis). In the beginning of the xvth century the Tanūkhids joined the Ottomans who were conquering Syria. Weakened by internal dissensions they had soon to yield to the Banū Ma'n of whom Fakhhr al-Dīn [q.v.] was the most noteworthy representative. In 1696 on the death of the last of the Mamluks, the Ottoman governor passed to their relatives, the Banū Shihāb who came originally from the Wādī 'l-Tāin, on the western slopes of Hermon.

The fall of Fakhhr al-Dīn had opened Lebanon to Turkish intrigues. They were not long in undermining the authority of the Shi'ahids, constantly struggling with the insubordination and encroachments of the Druse feudal chiefs. In the interests of agriculture the Ma'nids had encouraged the immigration of Christians from the north into southern Lebanon. This policy was intensified by the Shi'ahids who were on good terms with the Maronites. The next famous among these amirs was Bahshir [q.v.] a Christian by birth (b. 1769). Resuming the scheme of the Ma'nids Fakhhr al-Dīn, he worked for half a century in forming a great state of Lebanon. Deposed in 1840 he died in exile. Direct Turkish rule in Lebanon (1840—1860) perpetuated anarchy and insecurity there and fighting between the Maronites and Druses. This ended in the massacre of Christians by the Druses and the landing of French forces to restore order. An international commission was appointed to elaborate a "Règlement Organique", the charter of a new autonomy for Lebanon, under the control of Europe. At the head of it was a Catholic governor-general, appointed for five years with the approval of the Powers in whom was centralised all the executive power. As a counterpoise to this authority, an administrative council was elected in such a way as to secure representation to the various communities. From this "Règlement Organique" arose modern Lebanon which owes to it fifty years of prosperity and peace such as it had never before known.

The Great War upset everything. Turkish forces occupied the Mount Lebanon and a Turkish governor was appointed; famine and disease soon decimated the population. On April 25, 1920, the conference at San Remo entrusted to France the mandate for Syria and Lebanon. On Sept. 1 of the same year, at Bairūt, General Gouraud, High Commissioner of the French Republic, solemnly proclaimed the creation of "the Grand Liban" with Bairūt as its capital. In addition to the "Autonomous Lebanon" created in 1860, this new state included the districts of Tripoli, Sādā and Tyre. It stretches from the Nahr al-Kabir in the north to the borders of Palestine and is bounded on the east by the chain of the Anti-Lebanon. Grand Liban is governed separately from the "Confédération Syrienne", with which it reserves the right to conclude agreements. It is administered by a French official until a native governor is appointed. A representative council of 30 members elected by vote discusses matters of general interest and the budget.

According to the last census (1921—1922) the population is 620,000. The Christians number 350,000 of different sects of whom 200,000 are Maronites; 275,000 Muslims (125,000 Sannīs, 105,000 Mutawwīls or Shi'is, 43,000 Druses etc.); 3,500 Jews; 20,000 foreigners.


Ludd, a town in Palestine, S.E. of Yaffa, is mentioned in the Old Testament (only in the later books: Chr. ii. 33; Neh. vii. 37, xi. 35; I Chr. viii. 12) under the name of Lod, in the Greek period as Lydda; the Greek name of Diopolis given in the Roman period did not drive out the old name, the preservation of which was helped by Acts, ix. 32 for example. It was an important place in the early centuries of the Christian era; the capital of a papacy; it had a rabbinical school and was the see of a bishop at quite an early date. It was particularly famous for the alleged tomb of St. George above which a church was built. It was conquered with several other towns in Palestine by 'Amr b. al-As and at a later date was the temporary capital of Salāḥān whom his brother, the Caliph Walīd (705—715), had appointed governor of Filastīn, until he rebuilt Ramla, after which Lydda began to decline. In the tenth century, 'Ukkādāsī mentions the splendid church of St. George and the Muslim legend connected with that of the dragon-
LUDD — LUHAIYA

sleven, according to which Christ will one day slay Antichrist at the door of this church. After the church had been destroyed by the Fatimid Caliph Hakim (996–1020) and rebuilt once more, it was destroyed in 1099 by the Muslims on the approach of the Crusaders, so that the victors only found the splendid tomb when they arrived. Under Christian rule Lydda again became the see of a bishop and a new church was built immediately adjoining the ruins of the old one but was destroyed by Saladin. The town never recovered from its complete destruction by the Mongols in 1271. A mosque was erected on the site of the earlier church while the ruins of the church of the Crusaders were handed over to the Greeks who restored them in modern times.


LUDHIANA, is the name of a district and town in the Pindârî Division of the Pândîrî province of British India. The tract is an alluvial plain bounded on the north by the river Sutlej and traversed by the old bed of that stream; the area is 1,455 square miles. There is some irrigation from the Sirhind Canal. The early history is obscure; Sunet is a site where ancient coins are found peculiar to the place. The tract is prominent in the annals of the Sikhs. In the year 1809 Ludhiana town became the British frontier cantonment, and the district assumed almost its present limits at the conclusion of the first Sikh War in 1846. The population of the district in 1921 was 1,25,622, of whom 80,000 or were 1,25,622 Sikhs, fine men and excellent farmers. Gudjas, Arains and Muhammadan Radjputs come next in numbers.

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


(1. R. W. BIRTLEY)

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

Nothing definite is known about the origin of Luhaiya. A. Sprenger identified the town with the Mağâlûn kâmû of Ptolemy but this equation seems at best only possible. The identification of Luhaiya with the old town of Samborchathe or the harbour of Laupas or Naçfûlâ kâmû which E. Gosei supports, is very improbable. Niebuhr supposed that the inhabitants of Luhaiya owed their name when the demands of the export trade in coffee from the interior required it. Here also, as at Mokhâ, the hermitage of a Muslim saint is said to have been the nucleus around which the admirers of the saint gradually collected and built the town. A chapel was built over his tomb, the vicinity of which was considered auspicious for living and dead. At the beginning of the xviith century the Portuguese who call the town Luya for the first time became acquainted with Luhaiya. In 1513 Alfonso d’Alboquerque entered the harbour on an expedition into the Red Sea. Luhaiya then formed part of the territory of the Imam of Sanû’a to whom it paid tribute. In the second half of the xviith century Luhaiya suffered from the raids of the Hâshih and Bâshik tribes, who on one occasion burnt it down. In spite of this the trade of the town must even then have been not inconsiderable, for about 1760 in Mawsim (April to July) it paid 3,000 dollars from the harbour revenues to the Imam of Sanû’a. At the beginning of the xixth century the governor of the Imam of Sanû’a made himself independent in Luhaiya; but when the Wahhabis invaded the Yemen and defeated the Qâdî of Luhaiya, the latter went over to the victors and took from the Imams of Sanû’a the whole of Tihãma from Luhaiya to Bîb al-Mandab along with ‘Ad al-Fakh and a considerable part of the coffee-growing country. Luhaiya now seemed to
have a brilliant future before it; for it was to be the main harbour of export not only for the whole of this vast area but of the Wahhabi country also and negotiations were opened with the East India Company, who were invited to establish a factory in Laḥiya. Laḥiya's prosperity was again interrupted by the invasion of Muhammad ʿAli who occupied Laḥiya in 1833. In 1869 he found it in possession of the Turks under whom the port and its hinterland formed a bayd in the sanduq of Ḥodeida. Laḥiya was also used by them as a base of operations against the neighboring completely pacified highlands of ʿAṣir, which obtained independence with the collapse of Turkey in the world war. Saḥiy ʿAli b. Muhammad al-Iṣrī, lord of ʿAṣir who is considerably under Italian influence, has held Laḥiya and Ḥodeida since 1918.


(ADOLF GROHMANN)

**LUKATA** (Ar.), an article found (more precisely: "picked up"). The leading principle in the Muslim law regarding articles lost and found may be said to be the protection of the owner from the finder, sometimes mingled with social considerations. The picking up of articles found is generally permitted, although it is sometimes also said to be against religious scruples, the article which he has found (or taken) for a whole year unless it is of quite insignificant value or perishable. The particulars of this advertising are minutely regulated by special rules. After the termination of the period, the finder, according to Malik and al-Shafiʿi has the right to take possession of the article and do what he pleases with it, but according to Abū Ḥanifa, only if he is "poor"; but the use of the articles as religious alms (ṣadaqa) even before the expiry of a year is permitted in a preferential clause in Abū Ḥanifa and Malik. If the owner appears before the expiry of the period he receives the object back, as he does after the expiry; but if the finder has disposed of it in keeping with the law, he is liable to the owner for its value; Dīwān al-Zahrār alone recognised no further claim by the loser in this case. The establishment of ownership is facilitated, compared with the ordinary process in Mālik and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (in al-Bukhārī also; cf. his supersession to Lūkata, bāb 1). As regards the finding of domestic animals in the desert, there are special regulations which are less onerous for the finder in the case of injured animals and more onerous when they are not injured. Al-Shafiʿi and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal have similarly some special regulations for articles found in the Ḥaram, the sacred territory in Mecca, which at the bottom go back to the old idea of a special right of ownership by Allāh in the Ḥaram and articles found in it.

These prescriptions of the Fiṣḥ are based on certain ḥaddātīs which have been handed down with several variants (cf. al-Bukhārī, Lūkata; Muslim, Constantiniopole 1329 sq., v. 133) which need not be quoted in detail here as they agree with the principles in all conditions. But it may be mentioned that in a very old stratum, later worked over, there is mention of a two or three year period. In the conception of the primitive jurists the article found is sometimes described as deposited (waḍda); further, out of special religious scruples, one is careful not to pick up found dates and eat them, as they might belong to the zakāt; finally there is a ḥaddātī which forbids the Meccan pilgrims (ḥajj) to pick up articles found at all. From the supersession by Bukhārī to Lūkata, bāb 1, it is evident that found articles might be handed over or used to be handed over by a government office, their retention in the finder's care is justified by quoting a special tradition.

None of these traditions can be considered historical; at most the prohibition by the Prophet in his address after the occupation of Mecca from keeping articles found in the Ḥaram without advertising the index (cf. above) may be genuine on account of its antiquated terminology; Lūkata is not mentioned in the Kurʾān.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the pertinent sections in the Fiṣḥ and Ḥaddātī collections cf. Th. W. Juyboll, Handicraft to de kennin van de meermelodamische wêr, p. 386; E. Sachau, Muhəmmədenisches Recht, p. 659 sq.; D. Santillana, Istituzioni di Diritto Musulmino Malabita, i., p. 325—329 sq.

(J. SCHACHT)

**LUKMAN,** a legendary figure of the period of Arab paganism, who was adopted into the Kurʾān and later legend and poetry. The story of Lūkman shows three main stages of development: I. The pre-Kurʾānic Lūkman al-Muʿāmmar, the long-lived hero of the Dāhliyya; II. The Kurʾānic Lūkman, the wise maker of proverbs; III. The post-Kurʾānic Lūkman, the writer of fables.

I. **LUKMAN in the old Arab tradition.**

Even the earlier legends already show Lūkman in several aspects: 1. as Muʿāmmar; 2. as a hero; 3. as a sage. — He is offered a long life. He chooses the duration of the lives of seven vultures; he brings up a vulture; when it dies, he keeps a second one and so on for six vultures, which he survives, but he dies at the same time as the seventh, Lubad. The vulture was by far the most popular emblem of longevity among the Arabs (Pa. ciii. 4; Goldziher, Abh. zur arabisch. Phil., ii., p. li. sqq.); R. Basset (Leypọn Bùibō, p.
Lūkān

xxvii.—xxix.) finds a remarkable parallel in the interpretation given by Șidūnūs Apollinaris, for example, of Romulus’s watching for birds: Romulus sees twelve vultures, which means the twelve periods through which Rome will endure. The Kitāb al-
Mu'ammarīn of Abū Ḥātim al-Saljīstānī gives Lūkān second place for longevity: Ḥādir was the longest lived man, and Lūkān the second, who lived seven times the length of a vulture’s years, i.e. 7 × 80 = 560 years; but the figure is increased in different stories to 1,000, 3,000 or even 3,500 years. The last of the vultures rested by Lūkān was called Lubad and endured; when Lubad finally let his wings droop, Lūkān stirred him up to fly again, but in vain; Lubad dies and with him Lūkān. Lūkān, as Iamnīr noted, was already celebrated by Nābīgha. — Various adventures are ascribed to Lūkān such as the heroes of the Dāhiliyya always had to go through; he was the first to punish the adulterer bystoning and the thief by cutting off his hand. — Lūkān be-
longed to the tribe of ʿĀd. Here we have the old Arab saga coalescing with the Kur’ānic legend: ʿĀd, sinful like Sodom, is devastated by drought. An embassy is sent to Mecca to pray for rain and Lūkān goes with it. In the enjoyment of the holy city, given them by ʿĀd, he forgot the purpose of their journey. Reminded of their duty, one of them obtains by prayer a black cloud. This cloud brings to the tribe of ʿĀd the destruction which was to be their punishment for rejecting the Prophet Ḥūd.

Lūkān was already known in the pagan period as a sage. His wisdom is celebrated by pre-Muslim poets (Hörvitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, p. 133). It is natural to suggest that the old stories refer to more than one person. Lūkān’s wis-
dom forms the transition from the Dāhiliyya to the Kur’ān.

II. Lūkān, the maker of proverbs.

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

This great hyperbole is found in hundreds of variants (N. Reinhold Kohler, Grundzüge der Himmel von der Welt, in Orient und Ockland, n. 246—559; Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Urgan, i. 341—
323, 441—453). It is recorded that this saying arose out of a dispute with the abūr of the Jews. The abūr insisted that all knowledge was contained in the law, and the saying is directed against them. Does this really mean that Muhammad borrowed this hyperbole from the Jews, to whom it really belonged originally? In the admonition of Lūkān: “Moderate thy pace, lower thy voice, for all voices, that of the ass is most hateful” (Sūra xxvi. 18) Kendall Harris has found the model in Akhīrān: “Lower thy head, speak quietly, and look down! For if a house could be built by a loud voice, the ass would build two houses in a day”.

Once Muhammad had consecrated Lūkān as the wise utterer of proverbs, everything that was thought puns or sen-sole could be attributed to him. Wāḥib b. Ma‘āsumī is credited with saying that he had read 10,000 chapters of Lūkān’s wisdom. The Arabic collections of proverbs (notably Mādīnī) attribute much to Lūkān (see R. Basset, op. cit., xlv.—liv.). Taḥlabī devotes a chapter of his Madījātī to the wisdom of Lūkān. Many sayings seem to link up with the Sūra of Lūkān. Sūra xxxi. 14 advises reverence for parents but warus against being led astray by parents to worship false gods. Taḥlabī’s authority makes Lūkān say: “Be amenable to your friends but never so far as to act against God’s laws”. There are many other sayings which Taḥlabī recalls. Akhīrān: Lūkān teaches that the rod benefits the child like water the seed. In Akhīrān we have: “Spare not thy son for strokes of the rod are to a boy like dung to the garden”. Lūkān says: “When thou seest people who re-
member God, join them; hast thou knowledge it will be useful to you with them and they will increase it; if thou hast none, they will teach thee; when thou seest people who do not remember God, do not join them; for if thou hast knowledge, it will not avail thee, and if thou art ignorant, they will increase thy ignornace”. Akhīrān says: “Join the wise man, then thou wilt become as wise as he, but join not the brawler and babbler, lest thou be caught up in his net”. Lūkān gives excellent advice for one going on a journey and also adds that he should be armed, similarly Akhīrān. In Mādīnī’s Arabic proverbs Lūkān is credited with the following admonition: “My son, consult the physician before thou fallst ill!” This corresponds to the first saying in Ben Sūra’s alphabet: “Honour the physician before thou re-
quirest him”. On the other hand Lūkān’s warning against hypocrisy is found in similar form in the Disciplina clericalis.

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

III. Lūkān, the writer of fables.

Lūkān was honoured by Muhammad and after him as a maker of proverbs. A few centuries later he became a writer of fables also, perhaps because anṭālīya meant both proverbs and fables. Lūkān thus became the Aesop of the Arabs. Much was transferred to Lūkān that was told in Europe of Aesop. The tendencies to this can be traced quite early. While the very earliest legend saw in Lūkān the hero and Muslim legend makes him a sage, judge, vizier, or even a prophet, the later Oriental legend delights in describing him as a carpenter, a shepherd, a deformed slave, an Egyptian, Nubian or Ethiopian slave, a feature which is obviously modelled on the story of Aesop. Lūkān’s master orders him to set the best before his guests. Lūkān gives them the tongue and heart of a sheep. On another occasion his master tells him to set his worst before them. Once again Lūkān sets a heart and tongue before them, for there is nothing better than a good tongue and a good
heart and nothing worse than an evil tongue and an evil heart (in Plutarch and in the *Vita Aesopi* of Maximus Planudes the tongue only is mentioned and not the heart). — Lukmān's fellow-slaves on one occasion eat their master's figs and accuse Lukmān. At Lukmān's suggestion the master makes them drink warm water. Lukmān vomits water only, the other slaves figs and water. — Lukmān's master in his cups had wagered he would drink up the sea. Sobered he asks Lukmān's advice. The latter demands of those who had taken up the wager that they should first dam back all the rivers flowing into the sea, as his master had promised to drink up the sea only but not its tributaries. The latter is a widely disseminated motive in fairy tales of the type of the Emperor and the Bishop (Walter Anderson, *Kaiser und Abt*, F.F. Communications, No. 42, p. 134—140, especially p. 139 where reference is made to Lukmān; Chauvin, *Bibliographie*, viii. 60—62). These anecdotes are also found in the *Vita Aesopi* of Planudes (xivth century), but they are known as early as Plutarch, *Consvivium septem Sapientum*.

The older Arabic literature does not know fables of Lukmān. They first appear in the late middle ages. The Paris manuscript published by Jos. Derenbourg belongs to the year 1299 and contains 41 fables. These fables have often been published and thoroughly discussed, especially by Derenbourg, R. Basset and Chauvin. Out of the 41 fables, No. 22 alone has no parallels: the thornbush bgs the gardener to tend it so that kings may delight in its flowers and fruits; the gardener waters it twice a day and the thornbush overruns the whole garden. R. Basset recalls the fable of Jotham of the thornbush which destroys everything (*Judges*, ix.). All the others with the exception of the thirteenth (the midget and the bull) are found in the Syritic fables of Sophos (= Aesopus) published by Landsberg. All are found in Aesop except No. 9 (the gardener and the wasp), No. 22 (man and the thornbush) and No. 40 (the man and the snakes).

It has been further observed that in these fables the very animals indigenous among the Arabs, the ostrich, the hyena, the jackal and the camel play no part. As these fables first appear in the late middle ages there can now be no doubt that we have to deal with a selection of Aesop's fables translated into Arabic.

IV. Related legendary figures.

Lukmān is a many-sided figure: he is *Muhammad*, hero, sage, maker of proverbs, and writer of fables. It is no wonder then that he has often been compared with the other legendary heroes, Prometheus, Akhiqar and Solomon. Abu 'l-Faraj makes Lukmān the teacher of the epedoeles. Three of these equations deserve closer examination: 1) with Balaam, 2) with Akhiqar and 3) with Aesop. The identification with Balaam is old. Arabic legend gives the following genealogy: Lukmān b. Ba'ār b. Nāhār b. Tārīkh. It is evident that the Kurān exegists sought for something corresponding to Lukmān in the Bible. They found this in Balaam as the *voces balae* and *abam* both mean the same: *to devour*. This then became a Muslim tradition, which entered the Hebrew *Midrash* in which Lukmān is one of the seven wise teachers of the king's son (ed. Casdel, p. 220 sq.) and also the *Disciplina clericatis* of Petrus Alphoncns, where the correct text is *Balaam qui lingua arabica vocatus Lucamam* (ed. Hilka-Soderhjelm, p. 3). The Kurān exegists had no doubt about this identity. The question arises however: did Muhammad himself see Balaam in Lukmān — and next: is Lukmān really Balaam? Derenbourg, Basset and Eduard Meyer (*Die Islamischen und die rheinischen Geschichte*, p. 379) answer in the affirmative. But it is quite incredible. The pre-Kurānic tradition about Lukmān, the Kurān Sūra, which shows deep reverence for Lukmān, have no single feature of the hated Balaam of the Bible and the Haggada. This identification was only made later by Kurānic exegists, who wished to connect Lukmān with the Bible at any cost, and made him the son of Bērō, i.e. Balaam, just as they sometimes made him the nephew or cousin of Job.

Lukmān's similarity to Akhiqar was also noticed long ago, but it is only quite recently that the identification has found a vigorous champion in Rendel Harris, who devotes the chap. vii. of his *Story of Akhiqar* to it. He bases his identification on the agreement of Sūra xxxi. 18 with Akhiqar's warning about the voice of the ass, and on Arab hypotheses which compare Lukmān with other figures in legend and history, notably to the relationship of Lukmān, Akhiqar and Aesop. The story of Aesop shows originally a close relationship to that of Akhiqar. The later legend of Lukmān has borrowed much of the story of Aesop and thus becomes like the Akhiqar story but in reality Lukmān is not directly connected with Akhiqar but with Aesop.

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

THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME LULI

The origin of the name *luli* has not yet been investigated. The term seems to be applied to the inhabitants of the town of Sind which the Arab authors call Atur or al-Kur (cf. Arabs > al-Rai; Alum > al-Lun). This town had been conquered by Muhammad b. al-Kasim before 95 (714) (al-Tabari). The town is called Alur. This town, the old capital of the Hindu rajas of Sind, is now in ruins (on the Indus, cf. the *Stop* of Kohri in the district of Sukkur: cf. *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Oxford 1907, vii. 441 and xxi. 308: Atur and Rohri). The change of *Atur* to *Lur* is readily explained by the phonetic law of dissimulation of the two *v*’s especially after the change from Atur (Indian) to al-Rai (Arabic). The descendants of the Indian musicians of Kabarim (cf. above) seem to have been joined after the most important town that the Arab invaders had known, and perhaps before them, the Sasanians. This explanation would locate precisely the original home of the *luli*; but, without in any way prejudicing the ethnical relationship of this tribe.


The Lūr/Luli gipsies (cf. the reference above to their dark skin) must be clearly distinguished from the Lūr (q.v.) highlanders who live in the southwest of Persia, have a fair skin and speak an Iranian dialect with no trace of Indian elements. The situation is however slightly complicated by Lūr/Turk斯坦 points. In the first place the use of the terms Lūr, Luri, Lur, etc. is not always quite clear. In the confirmation of Arabic tribes of Fars there is a Luri clan; Sykes, *Ten thousand Miles*, p. 320: Rittich, *Peydaka v Bulūkstān*, Lew. Geogr. Obšči, 1902, xxxiii., p. 69 speaks of a Luri section (Persian pronunciation of Luri”) among the Lūr of Kūrub. Edmonds notes the existence of a Luri (q.v.) clan in Kuristān in the Dashtān division of the Bārānwand group. In Kūrub there is a clan Luri-Kullār (cf. SENNA). Still more confusing is the fact that some Lurs follow the profession of acrobats, bear-leaders, rope-dancers (cf. Cirkow, p. 277). As early as the 19th century, Shāhīb al-Lūr al-Marmī mentions the talent of the Lurs in these directions and in our own day we find wandering troops of Lurs as far north as Tabriz where there is a permanent colony of Kārāt gipsies, professional actors and singers. It is possible that the special qualifications of the Luri and gipsy players differ somewhat; the Sāmūnāt of Kuristān (cf. SARFUL and SENNA) who excel in singing and dancing are not acrobats. But we must first of all wait till a special investigation settles to what precise section the wandering Luri artists belong.

There is nothing impossible in a gipsy infiltration into Lūristan. Whatever was the ethnical entity covered by the name Zut in the first century of the Zuṭ with the Luri see above: Hamza, Ibn ‘Allab, al-'Umarī, al-Razzak (sic) and Nawara (cf. Hawāmat al-Zuṭ between Aradżīn and Kūni-Hormūz in the modern town of Hindyu in the “Indians” may have a similar origin). According to Rakīchī, p. 382, when in the second quarter of the 1st century a. h. the Zuṭ had apostatised from Islam. they were joined by the local Kurds, which provoked the punitive expedition of Abd Alīh b. ‘Amīr to Ishaq (Mālamir, the future capital of the Būurq). The alliance of the Zuṭ and Kurds (435 Luri; q. v.) at so early a date is curious. Under al-Rān, Bāzīlī, 435 mentions two places in Sind and a small district (mālsīyā) under Alwāz in Khurīsān. Schwarz, *Persien im Mittelalter*, v. 665, identifies this Rūr with the district of al-Lur (cf. LUISTĀN). In the light of what has been said above one might suppose the existence of the Luri in a very ancient Indian colony. But as our sources contain no positive confirmation of this hypothesis (according to Ibn Hakawī, p. 176, the “Kurds” were predominant in al-Lur) the questions of the origin of the name al-Rūr in Khurīsān of the identity of this al-Rūr with al-Lur and of the remoter origin of the name Luri must for the present be left open. In any case even if the name Luri came from the town of
al-Lür, the origin of the name would not necessarily settle the question of the ethnical origin of this people.

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

in Khōtātān: Kīrshmāl (in which a fantastic popular etymology sees ghair-i shāmār, interpreted as “innumerable”; in Transcausian Turkish dialects kirshmal means “vaarien”; cf. the comedies of Fath ‘Ali Achkundow, q.v.);

in Astarabād and Māzandarān: Dżūtgi and Gādōrī;

in Ḍadharītūn: Karāqī (and cagītān Turk means “faithful servant, person near the khan”); Abu l-Ghārī, p. 145 and Baghadow, ii. 45;

in Fārs (and elsewhere): Kāollī (= Kāhūlī).

The names mentioned may correspond to slight local distinctions not yet fully known. Gobineau collected the following names of particular tribes leading a nomadic life in the north of Persia: Sanānī (?), Kāsā-tarshā, “cap-makers”; Budavighī, Adeneṣtrī [Adhar-narsī]; Zargar-i Kirmān, “goldsmiths of Kirmān”, Shahīyīrī (winter at Hamadān, summer near Dānmandārān), Kargī, Tūrā-tarāb (daravār + tabī “sheep-doctor”); Gūzbān, Bāzh-kāpūn (in Turkish, Bāzh “head” + kāpūn “the who sees”); Gādōrī (bold hunters in Māzandarān; cf. de Morgan), Kēhīt, Bādjūmbān. According to Newbold the Persian gypsies fall into two classes: Kāollī (or Ghurbati) and Gādōrī.

As names applied to Persian gypsies in general Gobineau gives Bejšawa/Waghawa (cf. the name of the Armenian and Transcausian gypsies, the Boshqo) and Odīlī (?). The following names have a general and neutral character: Ghurbati, “living in a foreign land”; according to Ivanow, the Persians who confuse 闸 and 闸, see in kurbati an offensive allusion to the promiscuity (kurbat, “relationship, consanguinity”) of which isolated communities in all ages have been accused; the name is sometimes transcribed kurbati and kurbatī, Fīyūd (from the Arabic, fayyūd, “couriers”); Ustākār, Aghā, Ghurbāl-bānd (“sieve-makers”).

The number of gypsies in Persia may be estimated at 20,000 families, or 100,000 souls, of whom 5,000 families are in Ḍadharītūn and 300–500 families in Kirmān (Sykes). The gypsies have an organisation of their own at the head of which is the chief of the Shah’s nomads under whom are the provincial deputies (kułantār).

In western Persia the gypsies are very little different from the Persian peasantry (Sykes, Ivanow). In Khōrāsān they play a considerable part in the life of the rural community as artisans, making and repairing sieves, chains, combs etc. In Astarabād the Gādārī are coppersmiths, carders of wool and cotton (de Morgan). Throughout Persia one sees the black tents of the nameless ilāt who must be gypsies. It remains to be seen if the Kurd tribes bearing names like Khārssat (“turners”); Lūr-ī Kīlāshār (“shutters”) are not of gypsy origin (cf. the article Persia). In the towns, such as Sabzawār, Nāhāpūr and Tābriz, the gypsies have quarters of their own. There are troops of gypsy dancers and musicians in Persia but they do not seem to be very popular. Ouseley gives a description of the dances and of the marionette theatres of the Karāqī (Tābriz). The dancers and singers of the Sūmān tribe in Kurdistan have often been described by travellers; cf. notably: Lycklama and Nijenholt, Voyage, iv., p. 30–76; Cirkow, Patrolo Journal, p. 282, 299, 350; Kwardi-Efendi, Niyeh-ī-nimāt Ehdūd, Russian translation, p. 119; cf. T. Thomson, The Surnames: are they Gypsies, fn. 40. Gipsy Lore Soc., ii, 1909, p. 275–276.

The language of the gypsies of Persia (Sykes, de Morgan, Ivanow) has taken its morphology from modern Persian; its vocabulary also is full of Persian words (cf. the lists in de Morgan); Indian elements seem to be rarer than in the Romanii of Europe; the language of Kirmān and Khōrāsān (Sykes, Ivanow) contains a large number of unrecognisable elements. Longworth Dames out of 96 words in Sykes’s vocabulary found 12 Indian, 4 Arabic, 8 Persian and 52 of unknown origin. He would regard this dialect rather as an artificial secret jargon. Denys Brey (quoted by Ivanow) in any case confirms the fact that the Lōrī of Balūčistān is learned by the children as a separate language (“is at any rate acquired naturally by Lōrī children, as a language for the home circle”).

The Sūmānī, or Kurdish mainly. According to Cirkow they are called Dūmmī, which must correspond to Dūmān (plural = Dūm), the name of a large caste in Indian (which comprises the well-known name for gypsies: Rom). The vocabulary of the Dūmān (Baghdād, Aleppo) as collected by Newbold. J. R. A. S., 1856, p. 503 from an informant from Allum-kōprū, is full of Kurdish words: kānmūr, “stone”, kūhī, “salt”, ēvāz, “boy”. A Kurd tribe in the east of Bohtān bears the suggestive name of Sindī/Snλiyān (the * Sindians *). According to the Shāh-āf-nāma the chief of the Kūrdīkān clan (of the Zākī) had married a gipsy woman. In discussing the relationships of gypsies and Kurds, it should be remembered that in 220 (875) a section of the Zung settled in Shānīkīn, i.e. at the gate of Kurdish territory; cf. Ouseley, Mācre, p. 30; Tabārī, iii. 1168.

According to Sampson, two categories of gipsy speech may be distinguished according to the fate of the primitive Indian aspired mādāc: the one changes them into aspirated temere, i.e. Pīkrīt, bhhānt > phir (Armenia, Europe), the other deprives them of aspiration, bhhānt > ban (Persia, Syria, Egypt). The interest of the Persian dialects in the fact that Persia was the first country in which the gipsies sojourned after leaving India (probably in the 8th–9th period). In the gipsy dialects of Persia, as yet very insufficiently studied, we may expect to find traces of a rather archaic phonetic system. Ouseley for example found among the Karāqī of Tābīz the word bōhā “sister” which must be older than phēr or ban (cf. also bohā in Gobineau).

Bibliography: See the articles: LUR, SARPIL, SENNA, ZÜTT. — Don Juan of Persia. Relationes, Valladolid, 1604, p. 17 (on the looseness of gypsy morals); English translation by G. Le Strange, London 1926, p. 57; Ouseley, Travels in various Countries of the East, London 1819–1823, i. 309; iii. 400, 405 (the Karāqī of Tābīz); Ker Porter, Travels in Georgia etc., London 1822, ii. 528–532: the Karāqī near Marāğāh; Die Zigeuner in Persien und Indien, Das Ausland, Munich 1833, p. 163–164; Bataillard, Nouvelles recherches sur l’affiliation et la dispersion des Bohémiens ... avec un appendice sur l’immigration en Perse entre les années 420 et 440.
al-Din Arslân Shâh his successor and Lu'lu' his regent. When Imâd al-Din seized the fortress of al-Imādiya in Ramadan of the same year (Dec. 1218), Lu'lu' sent an army against him. Lu'lu's troops besieged al-Imādiya but had to return with nothing effected, whereupon the other fortresses in al-Hakkâriya and al-Zawâzin surrendered to Imâd al-Din when the latter made an alliance with the lord of Irbil, Muṣafar al-Din Kubbûrî. Lu'lu' sought the assistance of the Ayyūbid al-Malik al-Ashraf, who ruled the greater part of Mesopotamia, and recognised his suzerainty, whereupon al-Ashraf sent an army to Naṣîbin to help Lu'lu' if necessary. Ibn Mūḥarram, (Alif, 1219) Lu'lu' was defeated by Lu'lu's forces near al-Âṣyr and had to flee to Irbil. Peace was however soon afterwards concluded through the intervention of al-Ashraf and the Caliph al-Nâṣîr, but when the sickly Nūr al-Dîn died in the same or the following year and his brother Nâṣî al-Dîn Mahmûd, who was some three years old, succeeded him, Imâd al-Dîn and Muṣafar al-Dîn began to raid and plunder the district of al-Mawṣîl whereupon Lu'lu', who had first sent his eldest son with an army to al-Ashraf to help him against the Franks, appealed for help to Abîeg, al-Ashraf's general in Naṣîhin. Abîeg set out at once and joined Lu'lu'. On Ḥāraja 20, 616 (Oct. 1, 1219) Lu'lu' was defeated near al-Mawṣîl but while he was again collecting his followers around him Muṣafar al-Dîn retired. After the conclusion of peace, 'Imâd al-Dîn occupied the fortress of Kawâşgîn, and Lu'lu' had again to appeal to Aṣhraf. Muṣafar al-Dîn however induced a number of emirs, among them Ibn al-Masîţûb to secede from al-Ashraf and take up a position at Dânumûr to prevent the latter's passing. The emirs however soon changed their views with the sole exception of Ibn al-Masîţûb who went to Irbil. He was twice defeated, first by the governor of Naṣîbin and then by the troops of Farrûq Shâh, lord of Sindjâr, who took him prisoner.

When he had been released, he collected a plundervor horde around him and ravaged the country far and wide. He was defeated by an army of Lu'lu's and took refuge in the fortress of Tell Afîr. The latter was besieged and Lu'lu' himself came up from al-Mawṣîl. On Rabi' 17, 617 (June 21, 1220) he had to capitulate and Ibn al-Masîţûb was taken prisoner and brought to al-Mawṣîl. After al-Ashraf had made peace with Muṣafar al-Dîn he handed over to Lu'lu' the fortresses of Jîltûda, Naṣîbin and the governorship of Mesopotamia, to which other fortresses were later added. After the death of Naṣîr al-Dîn (619—1222—1223) or according to others not till 631 = 1233—1234) Lu'lu' was recognised as Aṭībeg of al-Mawṣîl and assumed the name of al-Malik al-Rahîm. In 635 (1237—1238) he became involved in war with the Ayyûbid al-Nâṣîr Nadîm al-Dîn. The latter took the Khârâzmiyân into his service and granted them Harrân and Fëdass whereupon they seized al-o the town of Naṣîbin. About three years later they were defeated by the ruler of Halab and Hamân and Lu'lu' regained Naṣîbin with Dârâ. Lu'lu' had also to fight the lord of Halab, the Ayyûbid al-Nâṣîr Yusûf. In 648 (1250—1251) he was defeated and Naṣîbin, Dârâ and Karkhîsîl into the hands of the Aleppo forces. Lu'lu' died in 657 (1259) aged 80. After recognising the suzerainty of Hâlidâ [v.]

Bibliography: Ibn al-Athîr, ed. Tornberg,
LU'LU', I. A Mamük of Salif al-Dawla, the ruler of Aleppo, vizier of his son Sa'd al-Dawla and his grandson Sa'id al-Dawla. On the latter's assassination, he became guardian of his sons and from 394-400 (1003-1009) independent governor of Aleppo under Fātūmī suzerainty; cf. the article HAMATAN where the bibliography also is given.

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


(M. SORBERNIK)

LU'LUA (L'ùlù), a fortress near Taršīn in Cilicia, which was besieged by the Caliph al-Mā'mūn in 217 (832). It was the strongest of the Greek citadels and the one that wrought most havoc among the Muslims; it had a large garrison and was well supplied with arms. The caliph, not having succeeded in taking it, blockaded it for a hundred days with two forts, the troops of which routed the Emperor Theo-

philus; as a result of this defeat, the people of Lu'lu'a appealed to 'Uqalī b. 'Abnās who was their prisoner to negotiate for them and capitulated on obtaining safeguards (amān) granted by al-Mā'mūn.


(ČL. HUart)

LUR (in Persian Lūr with a short), an Iranian people living in the mountains in S.W. Persia. As in the case of the Kurds, the principal link among the four branches of the Lurs (Māmāsan, Kūhgilū, Bakhtiyārī and Lurs proper) is that of language. The special characteristic of the Lur dialects suggests that the country was iranised from Persia and not from Media. On the ancient peoples, who have disappeared, became iranised or absorbed in different parts of Luriān, cf. the latter article.

The name. Local tradition (Ta'rikh-i Guscā) connects the name of the Lurs with the place Lūr in the defile of Mān-rūd. This tradition is perhaps based on a memory of the town al-Lūr mentioned by the early Arab geographers (Iṣākhār, p. 105 etc.), the name of which survives in Saḥā-īy Lūr (to the north of Dhipūl). There are several other place-names resembling lur, namely Lū, a district of Ḥūndalī Sāhīr (Schwarz, Persien, p. 668; cf. the Kūhgilū tribe: Lūsār), which may be Lū with juu 'money in Persian'; a Lurs tribe (Yāhūd Lūrān) ascribed to the前述 tribe, according to Iṣākhār, capital of the sultān of Sardān (between Kūh-Gilū and the Bakhtiyārīs) and lastly there is a place called Lūr (Lūr) near Saimara.

Masūdī, in his list of 'Kurd' tribes, speaks of the Luriya tribe (which may mean the Lurs connected with the district of al-Lur). In the 13th century Yākūt uses the names Lūr, Lūr to mean the 'Kurd tribe living in the mountains between Kūhgilū and 1-fahān'; he calls the country inhabited by it bālīd al-lūr, or Lūistān.

These facts show the stages of evolution of the geographical term (perhaps pre-Iranian) into an ethnical name. If however we seek an Iranian etymology for the name Lūr, its connection with the first element in Lur-brap (already proposed by von Bode) at once suggests itself. According to Just, Iranisches Namenvok. Lūr is explained by raθlah a 'red'. The place-name Lūr in Yākūt may supply an intermediate form. The Ta'rikh-i Guscā gives a popular etymology Lūr < ḥar a "wooled hill" in Lūr.

Ethnology. If the linguistic data connect the Lurs with Fārs, local tradition only regards as true Lurs the tribes who came from the defile of Mān-rūd. According to the Ta'rikh-i Guscā, p. 539-547, there is in the valley of Mān-rūd a village called Kūrd near which there is a defile. The place called Lūr is situated in this kūl (the word means in Lūr a "little ravine", cf. O. Mān). The name Mān-rūd much resembles that of Mā-diyān-rūd (the word mādi-yān is found as mān-mūn in Lūr; Ḫakwān, vi, 138) but certain historical considerations make us look for it near Mangarra-Mūngarra (cf. Ta'rikh-i Guscā, p. 548 on the place lying between Mān-rūd, Sānāl and Mangarra). The clans (marāk) of the natives of Kūrī Mān-rūd
were later called after the places where they had settled, like the Dangi (Dangi, Dangard) and the Utari (Aztari). The governing family of the Atabegs of Little Lur belonged to the Dangaw (the name of their clan, the Sahl, Sahl should be corrected from Salwari, 'Ahmar, p. 369; Salwari, 'Ali Hazin, Tadhkira, p. 135 and Salwari in Houtum-Schindeler). The Turki-i Guradi concludes by enumerating the 8 clans (qalab) of the two principal sukk and the 18 other tribes (ajwadina) of the Lur.

A few names (Mangar, Anaraki, Djaidaki) correspond to modern names. Finally 4 clans are mentioned: Sathi (Sami), Arsat (Ashtan, Asan), Arch and Bashi, who, although speaking Luri, are not Lurs; the people of the other villages of Manrud were peasants (razafit).

About 500 (1106), a hundred (or 400) Fadlulli Kurd families arrived from Syria. They came by the north (Shottar-Kuh) and settled at first on the lands of the Khunjariq wazirs (cf. the article TURK). At the end of the 14th century, 24 new families (xi'thi) were produced. One of these tribes (Shiab) belongs to the Mansuri tribes. The Turks (Hawwani, Shati), the Goywand (Alfki, cf. the name of this place below Shishhtar), and 18 other tribes (mutafa'ir) are mentioned. Among whom we find the Bakhtiyari (Shakhiri), the Idrasani (Narahsh), the Shishpar, the Laki, the Shishti, the Mamadsan, etc. According to the Sharaf al-huda (l. 26), all these tribes also came from Syria. These waves of immigration must have had a considerable effect on the ethnic composition of the Great Lur. It is probable that the immigrants were Kurds and that traces of them still survived among the Kurds whom Ibn Bata'li (ii. 21—30) found at the beginning of the 15th century near Bahshshah and Kisi Hormuz when on his way to the capital of the Grand Lur. There has long been a village of Kurdistân on the Davush and it had even given its name to this river. Shishah al-Din al-Umar (v. i, viii. p. 330—332) mentions the existence of Lurs in Syria and Egypt and tells how Saladin (563—589), alarmed by their dangerous ability to climb the steepest ramps, had them massacred en masse. This anecdote throws a light on the causes which produced the arrival of the return to Luristan about 600 a.h. of numerous Iranian tribes.

The southern part of Little Lur was exposed to militation by Kurds, especially through the valley of Kashi (cf. 1 ak). Last to the north of Susa is a tree dari-e Bashi, bearing the name of a clan of the Kurd tribe of Dawkân, celebrated in the history of the Hasanawis (cf. Ibn al-Asri, iv. 146, 219) and exposed to Turkish and Mongol invasions (cf. the desperate fighting of the Atabegs of the Luri-i Khic against the Bayat and Aliawa [= Baharl] Turi).

In the Sii'awai period, Turkish tribes were introduced into Luristan from the direction of the Kuh-Gill (where traces of them still exist) and Georgian and Armenian colonics to the north of the Kakhchayli country. On the movements of the population under Nader, the Zands and Kadars see below. The ethnic situation gradually stabilised at the beginning of the 16th century.

The names of the Lur tribes and groups are now quite well known and we have lists going from 1586 to 1922 a comparison enables us to note the changes that have taken place meanwhile. Regroupings seem to be taking place more rapidly among the Lurs than among the Kurds but the general framework of the tribal groups remains essentially the same.

In 1881 (Curzon, III. 274) there were 421,000 Lurs of whom 170,000 were Bakhtiyari, 41,000 Kuh-Gill, and 210,000 Seni. According to Rabin this last tribe settled in the Mandamand mountains (or 50,000 individuals) in Pish-Kuh, and 10,000 tents (or 50,000 individuals) in Pusht-i Kuh (this last figure seems too low).

The Mamassani (Mamassani) group includes 4 main tribes: the Bakash, Djawilti (Djawi), Dushmanziari and Rustami (cf. the article SHIL). The Kuh-Gill group (Kuh-Gill) includes 3 large tribes (Akgadi, Bawi and Dikati). The first of these tribes (cf. the name of the old Turkish tribe of Aghajari) is of a composite character, for of its 7 clans four (Ashar, Bekhalt, Caghatali and Kura-Bagh) are Turkish (evidently the remains of the Shah-Senian) to whom the government of Kuh-Gill has been given under the title of khans (Tikhaliki) bears the name of a district in Kurdistân of Senna (q.v.). On the second tribe, Bawi, O. Mann notes that it bears the name of an Arab tribe of the neighbourhood of Asha; but there is also a mountain called Bawi to the south of Khursamabad. The third tribe, Dikati, is purely Luri and is composed of two main sections: Carvanik and Lurawi with very many subdivisions. This threefold composition of the Kuh-Gill group is typical of many of the Lur tribes.

As to the Bakhtiyari, Sawyer as long ago as 1894 said that their territory was thoroughly surveyed on a scale of 8 miles to the inch, nearly every tribe visited in their own encampment, everything appertaining to the Bakhtiyaris may now be said to be known. But Curzon's tables (1890) are still the last word available to the student. Of the two Bakhtiyari groups: Cahar-lang and Hafs-lang, the latter is the more important at the present day. The Cahar-lang, who used to in the south are now mainly on the outskirts in the district north of the northern barrier (between Burudjird and Gulpaygan). The main groups of Lur are: Tarhan, Dihar, Bashi (cf. 1 ak) and Bakhtiyari. The tribes of the last group are the Lurs par excellence and have important subdivisions: Dirigand, Sagwand, etc. It is possible that the Dirigand are the real nucleus of the Lur race. Their chiefs are called mir.

In contrast to what we find among the Kurds, where the individual members of the tribe are usually much attached to their hereditary chief, the Lurs proper (Bakhtiyari) are distinguished by a more democratic feeling. The power of the hereditary families of Khans is based on their 'guard' (i'asat) but this power is considerably reduced by the authority of the chiefs of the clans (tewekel). The Khans are forced to court the favours of these wild, petty chiefs (Edmonds: 'uncouth headmen'); the latter are amenable to the solicitations of their neighbours and in this way the tribes are broken up and new groupings take place. Little is known of the ethnology of the Lurs. The notes of Duhouisset (who commanded a Lur regiment in 1859), Études sur la pop. de la Pers., p. 25, of Khanhoff, Mm. sur l'ethnogra-
phic de la Perse, Paris 1866, p. 15, 110 and 138, and of Danilow only touch the surface of the subject. Dahouset particularly notes the peculiar (compressed) form of the skull of the Lurs. Edmonds emphasises the difference between the Lurs and the Laks; the latter are taller, have purer features and aquiline noses. Their women are much more beautiful than those of the Lurs. The hair of the Lurs is often chestnut-coloured; very heavily bearded men are found among the Lurs. (The Persians call Luristan: ma'adan-i rizh, “mine of beards”). The women do not seem to have such liberty among the Lurs as among the Kurds. According to Edmonds there are no cases among the Kurds of women acting as chiefs of tribes. But v. Hammer (ii. 239) mentions under the year 1725 the warlike exploits of the two daughters of the Wali 'Ali Mandān Khān.

The domestic life and manners of the Bakhthiārs have found enthusiastic panegyrist in Layard, Mrs. Bishop and Cooper, Grove, New York 1925. On the other hand the Lurs have been very severely judged by most travellers, cf. Edmonds, Geyr. Journ., 1922 (ibid. the speech of General Douglas who was wounded by the Lurs in 1904).


Religion. The Christian and Jewish colonies (cf. the evidence of Benjamin of Tudela) settled in the village of Karkha since the Sassanians period (cf. Mānbūdān) may have left some traces in the country. A very curious tradition is the story of the conversion of the Bakhthiāris to Christianity in the time of Constantine the Great (?) (Hanway, lii. 168). A mention in the Ta'īb-i Bāqrašān, G. S. M., xvi/2, p. 216 shows that in 650 the mukkhir (Imādullāh) had gained a footing around Gird-Kūh. The Hurūf heresy had probably also a following in Luristan, for the mawla of its founder Faḍl Allah who attempted the life of Sultan Shāhrukh in 1427 was called Aḥmad Lur (Brown, Pers. Lit. under Tatār Dominān, p. 366). In the Safavid period the wars of the Little Lur claimed descent from 'Abbās, son of the Caliph 'Alī, whose tomb is shown near Sirwān (Masbaqāthān), cf. Rawlinson in Ritter, ix., p. 402. The esoteric doctrines of the extremist Shi'ah are wide spread in Luristan. The great majority of the Lak are Ahl-i Ḥak (Ašl-i-išār: q. v.). The Sagwand, Pāpi and Badrāi tribes are also followers of this secret religion. In the belief of the Ahl-i Ḥak, Luristan is the scene of the activities of the third avatar of the divine manifestation who is called Bābā Khosrān and numbers among his "angels" Bābā Tāhir [q. v.]. An important sanctuary of the sect, the tomb of Shāh-īzde Aḥmad (the alleged son of the imām Māshākiša), is in the district of Kūs near Br-āw (territory of Kaławand) and is kept by Saiyids of the Pāpi tribe; these Saiyids wear red turbans which recalls the predilection for red of the old Muḥammad = Khurramiya [q. v.] whose flags were of this colour.

The religion of the Lurs was so little orthodox even from the Shā'-a point of view that at the beginning of the xvi. century prince Muḥammad 'Alī Mirzā had to send for a mudājahid to convert the tribes to Islām (Rabino, p. 24). All the Lur and Lak tribes are officially Shi'is (contrast the attachment of the true Kurds to Sunnī orthodoxy).

Language. Down to the beginning of the xvi. century our knowledge of the Lur dialects was confined to 88 words collected by Rich, to 4 Bakhthiāri verses in Layard and to some thirty words collected by Houtum-Schindler. As late as the Grundris d. irdan. Phil., 1/2, 1898-1901, p. 249, we find the thesis stated that Luri is closely related to Kurdisch and may even be described as one of its dialects. The materials of Zakoǔski (collected 1832-1856) were finally published the day after the death of the author (d. 4/1914). The merit therefore of having first established the important fact that Kurb and Luri are quite separate ("sine riegehende Scheidung des Kurdischen vom Luri") is due to O. Mann. This scholar has shown that although there are Kur dialects in Luristan (cf. the article LAK), the true Lurs speak dialects which belong undoubtedly to the S. W. Iranian group (like Persian and the dialects of Fārs) and not to the N. W. group (like Kurdish and the "central" dialects). The Luri dialects which have none of the asperities of Kurdish (cf. KURD) fall into two categories. To the first belong the dialects of the Great Lur: Māmbāsān, Kültūh and Bakhthūyār (the latter has a few insignificant peculiarities of its own); to the second belong the dialects of the Little Lur, i.e. of the Feili Lurs.

Even the first group possesses very few special features compared with modernPersian. From the point of view of phonetics: Mām at the end of a word becomes -um, -um (mukkamātān; dawām; dūram); a changes into: bāṭī; inter-vocalic a gives dh (y): mukkāmātām; the combination māt give -māt and mā (d): māštāk-bārāh, rāf-tahr; initial bh becomes: bāštāk-shām, etc. Peculiar to Bakhthūyār are the change of inter-vocalic M to: gūsuwar-gūso; and the occasional change of sh to: shā = 1shām. It is remarkable that some of these phonetical peculiarities were long ago noted by Handahāh Mustawfī (Tārīkh-i Gīlān, p. 537-538). He says that Lurs (though full of Arabic words) does not have the peculiarly Arabic sounds, like kā, gā, xā, š and kā. Inflexion: Plural in -mānt; 1st pl. in -mānt; 2nd pl. in -mānt. This form of the present: M instead of Persian māz; first Persian plural ending in -mānt (zhārā: māntūm = miktām). Luri usually forms the pronominal of active verbs as in Persian with the help of personal endings (active construction) and not like Kurdish and the majority of Persian dialects (including those of Fārs) which
give the preterite a passive construction. Vocabu-

As to the Feili group, their dialect differs very little from ordinary Persian (Mann: "weeter niets als ein stark abgeschlifene Persisch").

There are in Luri a few islands of Kurds of some importance. Such are in the north the Lak tribes [?]. Among the Feili, the Makhli group (on the frontier of Kirman-shah, at Halulatun, and farther south) speaks a southern Kurdish dialect like that of the Kullur. The Kurd-khï̂a group (to the south of Pashk-i-Khi) speaks a "curmantji" Kurdish. Linguistic conditions in the Pashk-Khi still require further study.


Literature. The Luri tribes and especially the Bakhgitji have a rich popular literature, fairy tales, epic fragments—celebrating the exploits of their heroes (like Muhammad Taok Khan Ca-Lang and Haji Chandiki Haff-Lang), songs sung at marriage (ژوژو) and cradle-song (ژوژو). These pieces are often pretty and full of sentiment; of the collection by O. Mann and Zukowski (the latter published an article on Persian and Bakhgitji lullabies in the brain. Min. Var. de. Pers. ond. Jan. 1896); D. L. R. Loizer and E. G. Luminu, Persian Tales, London 1919, p. 107-351; Bakhitji Tales (translations only).


History. On the participation of the tribes of Khûzistân and Fâr in the fighting between Arabs and Persians in the early centuries of the Hijra cf. the article Kurdi. The Caliphs interfered directly in the affairs of the country, especially in Kûh-Kûk [q. v.]. The fortunes of the Lurs were more closely associated with the Iranian dynasties ruling in Khûzestân, at Shiraz, Isfahan, Hamadan and on the Zagros; the Safarcis, Bûyids, Kâlâwinds, Hasanwinds and their successors of the family of Abu T-l-Shak (cf. the article Kûrds).

We have coins of the Bûyids struck at Hidaj (Cordringon). In 322 the âlûjî army marched through Luristan (Sîs — Shâoop-khâwast — Karadî). The Hasanwinds Kûrds whose capital was at Sarmâdd (south of Bâsîn) extended their dominions into the valley of the Karkha, Shâoop-khâwast (= Khurramabad) formed part of their possessions about 400 (1009) (Tân-i Ahîar, ix. 89); Zafâyâ ed-lîmân, ed. Amedroz, ii. 291, et. 451). The Kâlâwînd Gâshâshup sustained a siege by the Sal-aids in Shâoop-khâwast (548 = 1052). The amirs of this last dynasty later settled in the eastern Luristan the family of Zangi b. Bursuk in Shâoop-khâwast before 499 (1050). Hisam ed-Dîn Abâghûl at Dî-i Maskh on the Karkha before 549 (1154) (Khiwar al-Sâdû, G. M. S., p. 285). A Turk Hîva ed-Dîn Shâhâ and Aqshâ is mentioned as lord of Luristan and of a part of Khûzestân between 547 and 570. A long inscription (Kâfe) on a stone near Khurramabad is still undeciphered (cf. a copy in this volume, ii. 298; Rawlinson thought he recognised in it the name of the 'Abâbin Shâfîdî ed-Dîn but according to Curzon it has an earlier date (570 = 1131)).

In any case all attempts from outside to subdue Luristan or to take posses of its territory affected the tribal system very little, the development of which came to a head at the evening of the A'thebs.

The principal source for the domestic history of the country is the Tarîkh-i Gûzûla (750 = 1330) based in turn on the Zubât al-Tarîkhâ of Ijzâmî al-Dîn al-KâshâÎ (of which the Perseische Manuskriptbibliothek only has the first volume, No. 528 of Persischen Catalogue). The Magdâm ed-Anîb (c. 743) is based on an independent oral tradition but is less accurate. The Dîmâr Bâzrâ although late (its author Zâd Ahmad died in 975) uses unpublished data. The Zâfar-nâma (1105 = 1750) is based on the Zubât al-Tarîkhâ or perhaps a good copy of the Tarîkh-i Gûzûla. According to these sources which supplement the statements of the Arab geographers, the situation in Luristan about 300 (912) was as follows:

The Shîl [f. v.] — who are not mentioned by the Arab before the Mongol epoch — occupied a part ("half") of Luristan. The will of Shû-ân and proper (Tarîkh-i Gûzûla, p. 557 and 539, 15) had a governor named Nadjm ed-Dîn Akbar (according to the Magdâm ed-Anîb the title Nadjm ed-Dîn was hereditary among the Shîl) while the Lur territory under the Shîl (probably Kûh-Gilâ) had a shahvâwî Saif ed-Dîn Mâkâm whose family had been prominent in the country since the Sâdîn period; he was the Rûshîbîna tribe which the Tarîkh-i Gûzûla mentions among the Lur tribes. The rest of Luristan was ruled by a family of Lur princes (independent of the Shîl) of whom Badr ruled in the Great Lur and his brother Mansîr in the Little Lur. Their dates are uncertain. Badr's successor was his grandson Na'm ed-Dîn Muhammad
b. Khlil b. Badr (according to the Madjma’ al-Antab, Nasir al-Din was a nephew of Awrang [Rang] b. Muhammad b. Hifil). Nasir al-Din was deposed by the Fadlawi Kurds who founded the dynasty of the Antab family in the Great Lur and relied for support on tribes who came from outside Luristan (cf. above under Ethnology). The same Fadlawi drove the Shul out of their settlements.

We know nothing of Mansur, brother of the above mentioned Badr. The tribes of Little Lur were directly under the caliphs and in the north were subjected to the invaders. The founder (about 580) of the native dynasty of the Antab family of Lur-i Kuchik [q. v.] had to dispose of a rival Sorkh b. Ayiar (probably a scion of the dynasty of Abu ‘l-Shawk which was called ‘Ayiar/Ainaz; cf. the article KURDS).

The history of the two dynasties of the Antab is filled with feuds, murders and executions but in domestic affairs the state of the country was fairly prosperous. The Antab built bridges and madrasas (Ibn Batuta) and secured a peaceful existence for the inhabitants (cf. Tarikh-i Guzida, p. 550). The revenues of each of the two Antab were estimated at a million dinars while each of them paid to the Mongol treasury tribute of 91,000 dinars only (Mu’ayyad al-Kubh, p. 70).

In the interval between the Mongols and the rise of Timur, the two Antab were vessels of the Muafarids. In 758 and 795 Timur ravaged Little Lur but treated the lord of Great Lur more kindly. In 795 Timur passed through Kuh-Gilu and Shulistan. The Timurids (cf. the article BAKARA) consolidated their power in Luristan and in 837 the last Antab of the Great Lur disappeared.

Shafawi period. The lords of the Little Lur maintained their position and by intrigue even succeeded in extending their power over the plain to the west of the mountains of Pughti Kuh. After the execution of Shahwardi Khan, Shah ‘Abbas installed in his place a vahi descended from a lateral line of the old family. The possessions of this Wali, Husain Khan, were, however, somewhat reduced.

After the disappearance of the dynasty of the Great Lur the power had passed to the chiefs of the tribes composing this federation. Under Shah Tashmak we find the title of Shuwardi of the local chieftain of the principal clan, the Astaraki. Tadj-mir, having neglected his duties, was executed and replaced by Mih Djahlungir Baktiyari (the Astaraki and Baktiyari had come to Luristan after 600; cf. Tarikh-i Guzida). Djahlungir under the guarantee of Shah Rustam of the Little Lur pledged himself to supply annually to the Shafawi treasury 10,000 mules. In 974 the governor of Hamadan was sent to remind him of his obligations (Sharaf-nama, i. 48). Henceforth the Baktiyari tribe becomes of the first rank and, as usual, gives its name to the whole confederation.

As to the Kuh-Gilu territory, it was governed by Khans of the Turkman tribe (Shahsevan) of Afshar settled among the Lurs. In 988 (1580) a devish impostor claiming to be Shah Ismai’l II had a considerable success among the Djarik, Djanwani and Bandani tribes who killed several Afshar governors. In 1005 as a result of the excesses committed by the Afshar as well as by the Lurs, the governor of Farah, Alikhward Khan, established the direct centre of his government in Kuh-Gilu (Tarikh-i ‘Alam-din, p. 195, 358).

We do not know under what circumstances at the end of the Shafawi dynasty (Parshana-yi Naziri) the group of Manjikani tribes, who had migrated into the Great Lur (after 600) occupied the ancient Shulistan (cf. n. 77).

After the Shafawi family, during the troubles provoked by the appearance of the Afghans before Isfahan, the wali of Luristan, ‘Ali Mardan Khan Feili (a descendant of the Husain Khan appointed by Shah ‘Abbas), played a considerable part. With 5,000 of his men he took part in 1137 (1722) in the defence of the capital. He was even appointed commander-in-chief of the Persian troops but the other Khans refused to take orders from him. When the Turks invaded Persia in 1725, Mardan Khan abandoned Khorasan (which was occupied by Ahmad Pasha) and retired to Khuristan from which he undertook a diversion against Bagdad. The Turks who had gone through the Baktiyari country and reached Firuzan had to retire. Cf. Ali Hazin, Tarikh-i Afsari, ed. Balfour, London 1831, p. 115, 134, 137, 143, who was an eye-witness of the events; Hannway, The Revolutions of Persia, ii. 135, 159, 168, 238; Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1829, ii. 60-64; von Posd. Travels, ii. 281-285; Hammer, G.O.R., iv. 227.

About the same time several Baktiyari khans (Kasim-Khan, Sadi-Khan) are mentioned as resisting the Afghan and Ottoman invaders but they did not agree well with ‘Ali Mardan Feili. In 1137 (1724) ‘Ali Muhammad Husain Khan Baktiyari recognised as his suzerain a certain pretender who claimed to be prince Sadi Mirza. The latter’s headquarters were in Kuh-Gilu; he was not taken before 1140 (1727) (Hannway, Karta, p. 168, 172). Mardan Khan, Tarikh-i Djahan Guzida-yi Naderi, Tabriz 1284, tran. into French by Jones, London 1770, p. xxvii). The Afghans do not seem to have penetrated into the Baktiyari country and their expedition in 1724 against Kuh-Gilu was a fiasco. (v. Hammer, ii. 210; Malcolm, op. cit., ii, p. 449).

By the treaty of 1140 (1727) the Afghan Afras provided Luristan to Turkey with other western provinces. The Turks kept it (nominally) till 1149 (1736) when Nader re-established the status quo (Hannway, ii. 254, 347; von Hanauer, G.O.R., iv. 355, 317).

Under Nader a certain Turkman chief named Baba Khan Capshu (Capskhu) was appointed beglerbeg of Luristan-i Feili. On the other hand ‘Ali Mardan II Feili was entrusted by Nader with diplomatic negotiations in Constantinople. Nader in 1732 passed through Kuh-Gilu with his troops where Muhammad Khans Babul (the claimant to Shiraz) was defeated. The local Afshar had to support Nader, who was one of their tribe. Several expeditions were sent against the Baktiyari among whom a new chief ‘Ali Murad Maniwand (Caharlang) had collected together the malcontents. In 1732 Baba Khan Capshu was sent against him for the first time. In 1149 (1735) Nader Shah took the field against him in person going via Djalpa and Barmal. The Baktiyari country was several times invaded but the main blow was directed against the little explored country south of Shuturistan—‘Ali Murad was captured and executed. The Baktiyari were decimated and deported to Djan and Langar (in Khorasan). A little later a Baktiyari detachment distinguished itself in the assault on Kandahar (Maliki Khan,
LUR — LUR-I BUZURG

cf. loc. cit. p 116, 134. contains interesting geographica details; transl. Jones, i. 185, ii. 18; 'Ali Haqin, p. 231, 253; Malcolm, ii. 21.

The deposed Bahk'tiyari returned from Khurasan immediately after the death of Nādir (Tābī`ī-bi-`Abd-Allāh Nādir) and in the dynesty of the latter was extinguished the Bahk'tiyari chieftain 'Ali Mardān Kān (who is not to be confounded with the two Wahls of Luristan-i Feli) attempted to play a big part. In 1163 (1750) along with Karim Kān Zand he set up at Isfahān a s combos of the later line of the Safawīs (Ali Dāwūd under the name of Ismā'īl III). The career of "guardian of the sovereign" acted by Nādir seemed to be certain for him also but Karim Kān gained the upper hand; the troops of 'Ali Mardān who included Lak of the tribes of Kalkh and Zangana were defeated in 1752; he escaped to Başgūdād but died there by the hand of an assassin; cf. Mirzā Šadīq, Tābī`ī-bi-`Abd-Allāh, quoted by Malcolm, ii. 61 and note r; Hammond, C.O.R. xvi. 475, 477; R. S. Poole, The Coins of the Shahs of Persia, London 1887, p. xxxv; Curzon, ii. 289.

Karim Kān (q.v.) who had disposed of his Bahk'tiyariv rival was himself a Lak of the tribe of Zand, settled in the immediate neighbourhood of Luristan-i Feli. On the movements of population in his time, cf. the articles Kurīs and Lār. In 1200 (1785) when 'Ali Kān Zand had to fall back on Shīrāz a number of Lāris and of Turks assembled at Isfahān under former partisans of 'Ali Mardān Kān but the town was soon occupied by Akh Muhammad Kādjar who had nothing better to do than attack the Bahk'tiyarīs (Cab-d-`Abd-Allāh Shīrāzī, Tābī`ī-bi-Zandiyā, ed. Beer, p. 29; Malcolm, cf. cit., ii. 179 sq.) which injured his popularity among the tribes.

The Lur Bahk'tiyari country was never completely assimilated during the century and a half which the Kādjarīs reigned. A resume of the history of the Bahk'tiyarīs in the sixth century has been given by Curzon in Ch. xxiv. of his Persia. At first the Kānūrzī family, descended from the brother of 'Ali Mardān Kān (cf. above), came to the front but the expedition of the governor of Isfahān Manuchīr Kān Muhammād al-Dawla (whose real name was Yemikolopow; he was an Armenian from Tūls) in 1814 put an end to the career of the Isfahān Muhammad Taşi Kān and the family did not recover. About 1850 the Bahk'tiyarīs (or Bāˈīrīs, a family which claimed to be descended from a shepherd named Tānī) rose to prominence in the Isfahān group and in spite of the assassination in 1882 of its chief Husain Kāh Kān (Hādji Ikhānī) by order of prince Zoll al-Sulṭān retained its wealth and importance. The Bahk'tiyarīs played a considerable part in the Persian revolution which ended in the deposition of Muhammad 'Ali Shah Kādjar in 1909. The Bahk'tiyarī country all this time enjoyed perfect autonomy under the rule of its lādān and lāri. The centralising efforts of the Kādjarīs had more effect in Luristan-i Feli (formerly Luri Kūčik) in as much as, as a result of the governorship in Khurāsān of the energetic prince Muḥammad 'Ali at the beginning of the sixth century, the family of the wāls of Luristan found its rights restored to the possession of Pūchs-i Kāh (q.v. and Ğirikow, p. 227). The Pūchs-Kāh formed the Persian province of Luristan, Muhammād 'Ali Mirzā with troops and artillery marched through this province. In 1836 Rawlinson followed him at the head of his Gūrānī regiment. After the famous expedition of Manṣūrīn Khān (1841), his nephew Sulaimān Khān Saḥām al-Dawla, governor of Khurāsān, maintained order in Luristan but for the second part of the sixteenth century Luristan was plunged more or less into a state of anarchy. It was not till 1900 that prince 'Ain al-Dawla was able to restore order in Luristan and at this time several explorers travelled freely in the disturbed province. But in November 1904 two British officiers (Col. Douglas and Capt. Lorimer) on their way to Khurramābād and wounded by Lurs. A considerable agitation was stirred up among the Lurs (and in western Persia generally) by the appearance among them of the rebel prince Saḥār al-Dawla (several times since 1905). In spite of the efforts of the Persian government Luristan remained closed till 1917, when with the help of foreign representatives several campaigns went from Dieul to Barādūrīah. About the same time the Persians claimed the rank of wāli of Pūchs-Kāh on Nāṣr 'Ali Khān Amrā (cf. the article Lur); cf. Edmonds in the Geogr. Journ. 1922.

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

LUR-I BUZURG, a dynasty of Atāhēgs which flourished in Eastern and Southern Luristan between 550 (1155) and 827 (1425) the capital of which was Lūshān (Malamfī). The eponymous founder of the dynasty, also known as Faḍlāwī, was a Kurd chief of Syria named Faḍlūya. His descendants (the Diḥān-ārān mentions 9 predecessors of Abū Tābīr) migrated from Syria and passing through Miṣr and Adhārba`ījān (where they made an alliance with the Amīr Diḥābīdah [?] of Gilān) they arrived about 550 (1100) in the plains north of Usturūn-Kāh (Luristan).

Their (chief Abū Tābīr b. Abīl Naḥm) disinguished himself in the service of the Saljuq Sunqur (543—556) and 827 (1425) an expedition against the Shāhānkūhīs (q.v. As a reward Sunqur gave him Kūh-Gilāya and agreed to send him to conquer Luristan. He succeeded in this. Abū Tābīr assumed the title of Atābeh and later quarrelled with Sunqur and made himself independent (c. 550). (The Muḥamīd-ān-Ahsāb seems to confuse several individuals under the name Kādī Abīl Ali, to whom it attributes the following successes: the defeat of the Shīl [q.v.], the deposition of Nāṣr al-Dīn, last descendant of Badr, ruler of Luristan, and the defeat of the Khūzistān troops commanded by the Tāzh ᵉxēh.)

Under the son of Abū Tābīr, (2) Malik (sic) Hazārasp (600—626 or 650), Luristan prospered and new Arab and lamian tribes flocked into it. Hazārasp drove out of Luristan the last remnants of the Shīl and invaded Luristan proper. The Shīl migrated to Fās. Hazārasp disputed with the Saljuqs the possession of the fortress of Mandaḵ (Mungash, S. W. of Mālamfī). The possessions of Hazārasp were extended up to a distance of 4 farsāhs from Isfahān. The Caliph
Nāṣir (575–622) confirmed his title of Atābeḵ. On the other hand, Hazarāsp maintained friendly relations with the Khwārizmshāh Muhammad and gave his daughter in marriage to his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn (Dījkān-su'b, G.M.S., xvii/2, p. 113, 204). (The Dījan-ārā mentions two sons of Hazarāsp: 'Imād al-Dīn (d. 649) and Nuṣrat al-Dīn Kaṭīla (d. in 649); the former became Zarda-Khān, where several members of the family were afterwards interred.)

(3) Timāku (c. 655–656), son of Hazarāsp and his Salghurid wife, successfully withstood four attacks on him by the Salghurid Atābeḵ of Fārs, who was indignant among other things at the expulsion of the Shīl from Luristan. Timāku took from Ḥissān al-Dīn Khālīl (d. in 650) certain districts of Lur-i Kūčik. He defeated the generals sent against him from Khużistān by the caliph. During the Baghdād campaign of Ḥulagū Khān (653), Timāku accompanied him in Khitavāsun’s division in Būšān. He did not however conceal his feelings about the treatment inflicted on the caliph and Muslims. Ḥulagū took umbrage at this and Timāku fled to Luristan and shut himself up in Mānĝajašt. Ḥulagū pardoned him but later changed his mind and had him executed in Tabźn. Timāku was buried at Zarda-Khān.

(4) Shams al-Dīn Alp Arghūn succeeded to his executed brother and ruled for 15 years. He led a nomadic life. His winter residence was at Ḫādī and at Sus (probably Susān on the Kārān above Shīštar) and his summer one at Dīja-y-i sard (on the upper waters of the Zanda-rūd) and at Bārof (source of the Kārān).

His son (5) Yūṣūf Shāh had spent his youth with Abaḵa Khan (663–680) and even after appointed in his father’s stead remained at the Mongol court with 200 horsemen. He took part in the war against Burāk-Khān (q. v.) and distinguished himself in a skirmish with the Dahālam. To the possessions of Yūṣūf Shāh Abaḵa Khan added Khużistān, the region of Kāh-Gilīya and the towns of the modern Luristan (including Tustar above Isfāhān) and Djarbdhaḵān (Gulpāyagān). Yūṣūf Shāh went to Kāh-Gilīya and attacked the Shīl settled in the modern Manmasanti county east of Kāh-Gilīya. After the death of Abaḵa, Yūṣūf Shāh was forced against this will to go with 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 foot to the help of ʿAlīm Tukkāl. The latter was defeated (683) and the Lara retreated from Tabāz to Natanz across the desert where the majority died of thirst. After the accession of Arghūn, Yūṣūf Shāh went to pay him homage and interceded on behalf of the former vizier Khwāzī Shams al-Dīn, who had taken refuge in Luristan (cf. d’Ohsson, lv. 5).

His son (6) Afrāṣiyāb sent his brother Ahmad to the court of Arghūn while he himself remained in Luristan where he put to death the members of the former vizier family. Their relatives having taken refuge in Isfāhān, Afrāṣiyāb sent his kinsmen in pursuit of them. At this moment arrived the news of the death of Arghūn (690). The Lara killed the Mongol governor of Isfāhān, Afrāṣiyāb appointed members of his family to govern in Hamadān, Fārs and in the territories reaching to the Persian Gulf and even began to march on the capital. The Mongol general Amir Tarāk was defeated at Kūhrūd (Kohrūd, near Kāshān). Kaïkhātu Khan sent Mongol troops against Afrāṣiyāb and troops from Lur-i Kūčik. Afrāṣiyāb shut himself in Mānĝajašt but after some time went to Kaïkhātu who pardoned him. Returning to Luristan, Afrāṣiyāb massacred his own relatives and a number of the notables. Ghiyāth Khān (694–703) at first showed himself favourable to Afrāṣiyāb but in 696 on the complaint of Amīr Ḥurkūdā of Fārs, Afrāṣiyāb was tried and executed at Mahāwīnd (5) of Turān.

The rank of Arghūn was next conferred on his brother (7) Nūṣrat al-Dīn Aḥmaḏ (from 695 to 730 or 733) who had spent most of his life at the court of the Ilkhāns. According to the 校友 in Dījan-ārā he introduced Mongol institutions (zīyār-i magzūl) into Luristan. Ḥamдалlah Mustawfī praises his able and prudent administration which repaired the damage done by Afrāṣiyāb. He was a friend of men of religion and several books were dedicated to him, like the Turajīk Dāvudān fi Aḥṣāṭi Mālik-ī Basalī al-Dīn Shāh Shīktūf (663). The Ilkhān 校友 in Aḥmaḏ gives him the title of ʿār. According to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa he built 160 madrasas (‘hermitages’) of which 44 were at Ḫādī and he had roads cut through the mountains.

His son and successor (8) Rukan al-Dīn Yūṣūf Shah II (733–740) was also a just ruler. His lands (校友 in Aḥmaḏ) extended from Bāšā and Khużistān to Lālamūs (9) and Fīrūzān. He was buried in the madrasa of Ruknādād.

His successor was his son (according to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa his brother) (9) Muṣṭafā al-Dīn Afrāṣiyāb II (Aḥmaḏ). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa travelling via Mājdīl-Rūmūn-Tustar, visited the capital Ḫādī or Malāmūr. He found the prince given to wine. The Arab traveller describes the peculiar customs of the Lurs which he witnessed at the burial of the son of the ‘sultān’. The latter’s possessions included ‘Tustar (Shīštar) and extended to Garwīκ al-Rūkh (the modern Kāhvarūkh in Carmāshāl west of Fīrūzān). During the ten days the Arab traveller took to cover this distance he found shelter every night in a madrasa. At the same time (740) Ḥamдалlah Mustawfī mentions the foundation by the Emirs of the Great Lur Dījaḵāt (apparently the district N.E. of Luristan and west of Gulpāyagān).

Next follows an obscure period. According to the anonymous historian of Muzāṣ İskandar, the successor of Afrāṣiyāb was his son (10) Nāwī al-Ward (‘rose-bud’), who ruled from 736 (*7) to 756 and dissipated the treasures of his ancestors. According to the Dījan-ārā, Muhammad Māpurār of Fārs (713–760) learning of his dealings with Abū ʿĪsāḵ İndūţ had him blinded at Sūd in 750. His cousin (the Dījaḵān-ārā’s nephew) (11) Shams al-Dīn Pashaḵāb b. Yūṣūf Shah II (*7) succeeded him and ruled from 756 to 780. At this time Luristan became involved in the civil wars of the Muzāṣ İskandars. When Shāh Ṣāmūr, making Shīštar his headquarters began a series of raids on the lands of Pashaḵāb, Shīş Shūtl (elder brother and rival of Man-ūr, d. 780 or 784) came to the help of Pashaḵāb. We have coins of 762 and 764 struck at Ḫādī and in the name of Shīš Shūtl (S. Lane-Poole, Cat. of Oriental Coins in the Brit. Mus., vol. vi. [London 1881], p. 235, 237). After the death of Pashaḵāb a struggle began between his two sons (12) Malīk Pīr Aḥmaḏ and his younger brother (13) Malīk Ḥūṣāng in which the latter was killed. (According to the anonymous historian of İskandar, if he has been rightly understood by Ḥomwūr, Aḥmaḏ and Ḥūṣāng were bastard sons of Khwāzī Shams and Iṣḥāq Shīktūf respectively, who shared their father’s fief. During the reign of Aḥmaḏ they quarreled and the elder Malīk Pīr Aḥmaḏ fled to Tūsar where he was granted a fief by the Ilkhāns. When Iṣḥāq was exiled to Tabźn, Aḥmaḏ could not persuade his brother to return, and his relations then broke off.)
LUR-I KÜÇIK, a dynasty of Atabegs which ruled in Northern and Western Luristan between 580 (1184) and 1006 (1597) with Khurramšāh as their capital. The Atabegs were descended from the Lur tribe of Djangrā (Jangra). The dynasty is also known by the patronym of Khurramšāh from the name of the first Atabeg. (It remains to be seen if this name is connected with that of Muhammad Khurramšāh, vicer of the former rulers of Luristan before the rise of the Atabegs of Lur-I Buzurg). After 730 the power passed to another line which later claimed to be of ʿAlid descent; at this time also the title malik succeeded that of atabeg. The ancestors of the Khurramšāhs had entered the service of Hisām al-Dīn (of the Turk tribe of Shahī or Shudja) who ruled Luristan and Khusūsī about the end of the Sālūq period (c. 550—580).

(1) Shuṣ̄dā al-Dīn Khurramšāh b. Abī Bakr b. Muhammad b. Khurramšāh was at first Shīhāna of a part of Luristan on behalf of Hisām al-Dīn but after the death of the latter (in 570 or 580) became independent lord of the whole of Lur-I Küçik. He waged war on the Djangrāvi (the tribe in which he had originated, but which was then being ruled by his rival Surkhāb b. ʿAlīyar) and besieged their stronghold Dī-i-Siyāh (in the district of Mānīrūd and in the ʿwilayet of Samhārā). The inhabitants handed over Mānīrūd over to him but the caliph ordered Shuṣ̄dā al-Dīn to deliver up to himself the stronghold of Māngarrā (Māngarāh north of Khūlāh). In compensation Shuṣ̄dā received the district of Tarāzak in Khusūsī. Shuṣ̄dā al-Dīn drove back the Bayāt Turks who were ravaging Luristan. He led a nomadic life and spent the summer at Kīrīt (in Bālā-Gīrīt) and the winter at Dūlur (Dīhi Lurān in Pūsh-i Kōh?) and at Mālāḥ (?). He died a centurion in 621 and his tomb was venerated by the Lurs. His son Badr was killed by his nephew (2) Saʿīf al-Dīn Rūstam b. Nūr al-Dīn who became Atabeg and was a capable ruler. Rūstam ruled over Khurramshāh, his father first (3) Shāraf al-Dīn Abū Bakr and next (4) ʿĪz al-Dīn Gāvāhp. The latter married the widow of Abū Bakr, Malik Khātūn, who was the sister of Sulaimān Shīh Aiwa, later commander-in-chief of the caliph al-Mustaʿṣim (Abū should be altered to ʿAlī) the chief of a tribe or in the district of the last Sālūqūs; cf. Rāhāt al-Sādūr, G. M. S., p. 436; ʿĪz al-Dīn, G. M. S., p. 475; Fīrōz, Ṣafī, G. M. S., p. 477; Defrémery, Récits sur quatre princes d’Hami- dou, T. A., 1847, p. 177; When (5) Hisām al-Dīn Khālīl b. Badr b. Shuṣ̄dā died, a struggle ensued between him and Sulaimān-šāh (Shīhān al-Dīn). The Lurs took Bahār (near Hamādān) but finally Khālīl was defeated and killed near Shāpur-ḵwaist in 640 (1242).

His brother (6) Badr al-Dīn Masʿūd went to the court of Mangī and returned in the train of Hūfāgī. This devout man, an authority on ʿAskī law, ruled till 658. He showed great kindness to the family of Sulaimān-šāh, when the latter was executed at the taking of Baghādād. The sons of Masʿūd were executed by Abaḵā, who appointed Atabeg (7) Tādā al-Dīn b. Ḥīsām al-Dīn Khālīl (also executed by Abaḵā in 657).

He had two immediate successors, the two sons of Masʿūd of whom (8) Falak al-Dīn Ḥasan ruled a part of Luristan (dīfāʾ, wilāyat) and (8b) ʿĪz al-Dīn Ḥusain ruled the crown domains (indijā). The number of their troops was 17,000. They chastised the Bayāt and reunited under their control all the lands between Hamādān and Shīhūšt and between Jafābād and the Arab lands. Both died in 659.

Kalḵāšt appointed as their successor (9) Dja- ma al-Dīn Khādīr b. Tādā al-Dīn, who was killed in 693 near Khurramshāh by (10) Ḥīsām

(12) Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Izz al-Dīn (Ṣābi) was a minor and his cousin Badr al-Dīn Masʿūd (son of 8) obtained from Uldjaitū the title Āṭābeg and ruled over a part of Luristan (dīfār) but later Izz al-Dīn fully established his authority. After his death (716 or 720) his widow (13) Dava-lṭ Khuṭṭān retained a semblance of authority while the real power was in the hands of the Mongols. Such was the state of affairs when Hamdallāb was writing his Taʾrikh-i Gisrida (c. 730). Later the maḏka (who according to the anonymous historian of Iskandar became the wife of Yūsuf b. Saḥaf (the Great Lur) found herself forced to surrender to the throne to Izz al-Dīn Husain who received investiture from Abī Saʿīd and ruled for 14 years. His son and successor (15) Shuǧāʾ al-Dīn Māḥmūd was killed by his subjects in 750.

(16) The Malik ‘Izz al-Dīn b. Shudjā al-Dīn was only 12 when his father died. The vicissitudes of his life are known from the record of them in the Zafar-nāma. In 785 (1383) the Muḥammad Shuǧāʾ with his army visited Khurramābād and married the daughter of Izz al-Dīn. Another of his daughters was married to Abī Ḥamād b. Uvār. The death of Izz al-Dīn was announced in 793. In 798 he was told of the depredations of the Lurs of ‘Izz al-Dīn. Setting out from Firūz-Kūh, Tumīr by forced marches reached Luristan. Burūḏjīrīd was laid waste, and the fortress of Khurramābād razed to the ground. The ringleaders were thrown down from the tops of cliffs. The fate of ‘Izz al-Dīn is unknown and we do not know if he was one of the Āṭābegs of Luristan in whom 789 Tumīr granted an audience at Shīrāz, to whom according to the anonymous historian of Iskandar, ‘Izz al-Dīn was captured in 790. He passed through Fārs (Armīyān, Wāmīyān, situated near Burūḏjīrīd) and deposed with his son to Turkestan. At the end of three years both father and son were released. In 793, ‘Izz al-Dīn played a part in the aggrandizement of the Muṣaffarīd Zain al-‘Abīdīn, son of his old suzerain Shāh-Shudjā. When in 795, Tumīr returned to Persia, he went from Burūḏjīrīd to Shīhstār. Luristan was overrun piece by piece and laid waste by the troops of Mirzā ‘Omar but ‘Izz al-Dīn escaped his pursuers. In 798 prince Muḥammad Sulṭān, governor of Fārs, extended his authority over all Luristan and Khurramābād. In 805 we find a mention of the restoration of the fortress of Armīyān (1) near Burūḏjīrīd ordered by Tumīr and under 806 the Zafar-nāma mentions the arrival in Bālakān from Nīhawand of a courier, bearing the head of ‘Izz al-Dīn, whose skin had been stuffed with straw and publicly exposed. His son (17) ʿAlī Māḥmūd, whose irregularity in the payment of tribute seems to have provoked the punishment of his father, regained his possessions, after the death of Timūr in 810 and was ruled till 815 (or 825). (18) Shāh Ḥusayn (“Abdās,” i.e. descendant of ‘Abbās b. Abī Abī Ṭalib, an-

other son of ‘Izz al-Dīn), took advantage of the decline of the Timūids to extend his territory. He plundered Hamdān, Gulpāyag, Isfahān and even undertook an expedition to Shahrāzūr where the Bahārūl Turks slew him in 871 (or 872). His son (19) ‘Abī Rūstam supported Ismāʿīl I; at this period the lords of the Little Lur had already adopted the theory that they were of ‘Alīid descent. The son of Rūstam (20) Oghur (or Oghuz) accompanied Shāh Taḥmāsp on his campaign of 940 against Ubaḏ Allāh Khān and during his absence his brother (21) Džaḥaṅgīr seized the power. He was executed in 949. The governor (lala) of his son (22) Rūstam Shāh handed over the latter to Taḥmāsp Shāh who imprisoned him in Alamūt while Muḥammadī, another son of Džaḥaṅgīr, was hidden by the Lurs at Čagula. An impostor in Luristan gave himself out to be Shāh Rūstam Taḥmāsp, then released the true Rūstam who recovered his fief but had to hand over a third of it (do dang) to his brother (22b) Muḥammadī. At the instigation of the wife of Shāh Rūstam, the governor of Hamdān sent Muḥammadī who was slain in Aḥānum. The sons of Muḥammadī plunged Luristan and the adjoining provinces into great disorder. Ten years later Muḥammadī escaped, and conquered Luristan while Shāh Rūstam took refuge at the court of the Shāh. Muḥammadī established good relations with Taḥmāsp and Ismāʿīl II but after their death submitted to Sultān Murād III (1582–1603), which earned him an extension of his territory by the cahots west of Pūsh-i Kūh: Mandlā, Džesān, Badrātī and Tursāk. But relations with the Ottoman Turks soon became strained and Muḥammadī became reconciled with the Safawīs.

(24) Shāhwardī b. Muḥammadī, who had escaped from Baghdād where he was living as a hostage, received investiture from Shāh Khudūsbanda after his father's death. At the time of the occupation of Nīhawand by the Turks Shāhwardī showed some signs of independence. In 1000 good relations with Shāh 'Abbās were re-established with whom Shāhwardī made the most of his alleged descent from 'Abbās b. Abī and his Shīʿī (tayybiyya, as 'Abbāsī). Shāh 'Abbās married his sister and gave him a Sufī princess in marriage. In 1002 Shāhwardī in a pitched battle killed the governor of Hamdān Oghurlu Sultān Bayāt who was trying to levy taxes in Burūḏjīrīd. Shāh 'Abbās, filled with wrath, left the Khorāsān front and hastened to Khurramābād. Shāhwardī crossed the Saimara (Karkhā) and escaped to Baghdād. Luristan was given to Sultān Ḥusayn b. Shāh Rūstam. In 1003 Shāhwardī was pardoned and restored but he was not long in relapsing. In 1006 Shāh 'Abbās took the field against him a second time. Shāhwardī was besieged and slain in the fortress of Čagula (in Pūsh-i Kūh). Ḥusayn Khān b.Muṣār beg Saẕwīnī (1) was given Luristan, except Saimara, Hindmas (1) and Pūshī-Kūh which were given to Taḥmāsp Kūl Iānu. This may be regarded as the end of the dynasty of the Āṭābegs of the Little Lur, although the dynasty of "wāls" of Luristan (later of Pūsh-i Kūh [q. v.]) continues to be ruled by the descendants of Shāhwardī.

(V. MIRSKY)

**LURISTAN**, "land of the Lurs," a region in the S.W. of Persia. In the Mongol period the terms "Great Lur" and "Little Lur" roughly covered all the lands inhabited by Lur tribes. Since the Safavid period, the lands of the Great Lur have been distinguished by the names of Kūh-Gilli and Bakhtiyari. At the beginning of the xviiith century the Mamassani confederation occupied the old Shīštān [q. v.] and thus created a third Lur territory between Kūh-Gilli and Shīštān.

It is however only since the xvith century that Lur-i Kūk [q. v.] has been known as Luristan (for greater precision it was called Luristan-i-Feilī). In the xivth century Luristan was divided into two parts: 1. *Pīš Kūh*, "country on the side of the mountains" (i.e. east of Kabīr-Kūh) and 2. *Pusht-i Kūh* (country beyond the mountains) i.e. west of Kabīr-Kūh. At the present day the term Luristan usually means Pīš-kūh while Pusht-i kūh means the Feilī country.

The Mamassani territory and the Kūh-Gilli form part of the province of Fārs. The capital of the Mamassani is at Bahliyān (cf. *ṣūr*). Kūh-Gilli (Kūh-ṣūr-i Bahli, Kūh-Gilli) stretches from *Bāgh* (west of Bahliyān) to Bahlihā; this last town is the main centre for the tribes of Kūh-Gilli. To the south the Kūh-Gilli tribes descend as far as the Persian Gulf. The mountains of Kūh-Gilli and the frontier between its tribes and the Bakhtiyari are not yet well known. The chief rivers of Kūh-Gilli are the Ab-i Shīštān which is formed by the junction of the Kairāštālā and the Zohrā and in its lower course runs via Zāhdūl and Hindiyān, and the Ab-i Kurdistān or Džurjāl, one branch of which later runs into the Karun [q. v.] and the other towards Jawrāk. On Kūh-Gilli see the valuable *Fārs-nawā-yi Gāhr* of Ḥasan Pārdī (Tūhān 1313), the itineraries of Scoqueler, Hausknacht (*Routen im Orient*, Map iv.), Wells and Herzfeld and the general account in *de Bode*, i. 251–289; ii. 327–398; *Ritter, Z. Asian*, ix. 132–144 is now very much out of date.

The Bakhtiyārī lands stretch from Čahāmāhīl (west of I-fahān) to Shīštār; to the south the Bakhtiyārī march with the Kūh-Gilli and to the north they go beyond the northern barrier of Luristan (Shūtur-kūh etc.). They are found around Farākān, Burūndū, Ḟajrudnāg, and in the Canons around Burārdnū (even before 1840 many villages had been purchased here by Muhammad Taḵī Khan Čāhr-Lang). Roughly speaking the Bakhtiyārī occupy the upper basin of the Zandārūd and of the Kūsān [q. v.] above Shīštār. The works of Layard, Sawyier, Mrs. Bishop, Cursōn etc. give a very accurate picture of this mountains country, in the centre of which rises the Kūh-Rang (12,500 feet high) which forms the watershed between the Persian Gulf and the central Persian plateau. (It may be asked if the name Kūh-i Rang is not the Mongol kūren, "encampment, larger", found in Luristan). The frontier between the Bakhtiyārī and the Lurs proper follows the western branch of the Abī Diz, an important tributary of the Kūrān. Luristan (Pīš-kūh) is bounded on the east and west by the convergent streams of the Abī Diz and the Kākhā, while in the north the range of the Čihār-bālghān, Gareh etc. separates Luristan from Nīshwand and Sīlāghor (district of Burārdnū). To the west of Kākhā Pusht-i Kūh begins. In the northwest the frontier of Luristan runs to the southwest of the districts of Ḥalīlān and Ḥarsīn which belongs to the province of Kermānāshāh.

The chief left bank tributary of the Kākhā is the Kāshgān (Rawlinson: Kāshghān) which is formed by two arms. The northern arms with its tributaries drains the beautiful plains of Hūr-rūd, Alīshāt and Khwāna. The southern arm, separated from the northern one by the Yāftā-Kūh range, takes the name of the town of Khurramābād [q. v.] near which it passes. After the confluence of the two arms, the Kāshgān, running S.W., receives on the left bank the combined waters of the Kāwgbān and Tāyīn, which flow from Kūh-i Haftād Pāhū (south of Khurramābād) and the northern slopes of the Kūh-i Gird. These two ranges are at right angles to the mountain which follows the right bank of the Abī Diz, which they separate from the valley of the Kākhā. On the right bank the Kāshgān receives the Mādīyān-rūd, "river of the mare". Above Kāshgān the Kākhā receives on its left bank several tributaries of less importance still little known (Rūlār etc.). Below Kāshgān and also on the left bank, the Kārkā receives the Fānā, Leilm (Lehum) and Ab-i Zāl. This last river with its tributaries Anārāk etc. rises in the southern slopes of the Kūh-i Gird. The topography of the right bank of the Abī Diz is not well known. The sources of the Balārdūd and its right bank tributary the Kūrāb lie a considerable distance to the north. The Balārdūd flows into the Abī Diz between Dīsfūl and Susa. The Kūrāb receives on its right bank the waters of the Kūh-i-āb which come down from the high valley of Māngarā, which with the peaks that surround it form a kind of natural bastion and separate the basin of the Balārdūd from that of the Abī Zāl. The Šahrā-yi Lur plain formerly well irrigated lies north of Dīsfūl and south of Kūrāb ("pitch-water") whose naphtha spring has been known since ancient times. It was probably here that Dārus settled a colony of Greeks (*Ritter*, ix. 201).

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

**Ancient history.** The lands now occupied by the Lur tribes have been inhabited since the period before the arrival of Iranians in them. This region, being at a considerable distance from Assyria, was mainly under the influence of Elam; Susa where there have been found traces of occupation going back to the third millennium B.C., lies just at the entrance to the mountains of the Little Lur. The purest traces of the local culture and of this alone are found more to the south-east. Just as the Atabegs of the Great Lur had for their capital Iškābid (=Malamer) so in very early times. the lords of this district, the kings of Aṣāpīr (Hapīrito), whatever were their relations with the rulers of Susa had control at least of
the Kārān valley. The site of Mālamīr (cf. de Bode, Layard, Jéquier in de Morgan, Dilig. en Pers., 1902, iii. 133—143 and Hüsing, Der Zagros u. seine Völker, Leipzig 1909, p. 49—59) with its purely indigenous (Elamite, non-Semitic) inscriptions and bas-reliefs is an important point. The recent discovery by Herzfeld (Reisbericht, Z.D.M.G., 1926, p. 259) in the Māmasān region of a bas-relief and bricks bearing Elamite characters (1500—1000 B.C.) is valuable as indicating the extent of Elamite penetration into the Lar mountains. Kūh-Gūlīn lying between Susiana and Persis may correspond to the still unknown region of Anšān (Amān) out of which came the ancestors of Cyrus the Great. On the survival of this name near Shāhītar, cf. Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., ii. 418 (according to Rawlinson: Assān).

The antiquities of the valley of the Upper Kārān (the two Sūsān, Lurdāgān, the mounds of Salm, Tūr and Frād) are insufficiently known (Layard, Sawyer). According to Sawyer, the higher Bākhītyārī lands are “singularly devoid of any ancient landmarks”.

For the west part of Luristān in the strict sense of the word see the articles MĀSĀRĀN, and PAMPIH-π KÜH. No monuments of very great antiquity have been discovered except the caves (Median?) of Se-daṛān between Māngarā and Khorramābād, Čīrīkow, p. 129. The early inhabitants of Luristān were the Kāshgiu = Keshūti who imposed their rule on Babylon between 1760 and 1650 B.C. The Achaemenids paid the Keshūti the right of passage for the Babylon-Ecbatane route. These highlanders were temporarily subdued by Alexander the Great. Antiquity, pursued by Eumenes, traversed the heart of the Kassanian country, according to Rawlinson on the route Pul-i-tang—Keīlūn pass—Khorramābād (Ritter, Erdkunde, ix., p. 335). The Kassanans (who should perhaps be distinguished from the KēšŪt = Kešūt = Kēshūtī) who spoke a language different from that of their neighbours, but in it we already find proper nouns borrowed from Indo-European. Cf. E. Meyer, Gesch. d. Altert., 1/2, Berlin 1913, § 455; Hüsing, Der Zagros, p. 24 and Aurān in Les langues du monde, Paris 1925, p. 283. [The name Kāshgiu has perhaps survived in that of the river Kūshgān.] It is also probable that northern Luristān was more or less dependent on the land of Ellīpī, often mentioned by the Assyrians. This region, which was considerably influenced by Media is now located in the province of Kirmānšāh. Cf. Andreas, Alinī in Encyl-Wiss., 2, Strauβ, Z. A., xv., 379; Cambridge Ancient History, 1921, ii., cf. map.

We know very little about the Mawtūnī people who (Herodotus, v. 49) were bound on one side by the Armenians and on the other by the Susians (Reinach, Un peuple oublié: Les Maitunie, Revue des Études Grecques, 1894, vii., p. 313—315).

Here we can only call attention to these various ethnical elements buried in the later strata of Iranian invasions. In the name of Parādān, a canyon in the northeast of Bākhītyārī, we have a reminiscence of the Median tribe of Paratākistān (Herodotus, i. 110) and of the province of Paratākistān (Strabo, i., p. 80) which lay between Media and Persia (in Assyrian: Partakka, Partakka; cf. Streak, Z. A., xv., p. 363). The iranisation must have been accelerated by the formation of the great empires, Achaeemnid, Macedonian, Parthian and lastly Sassānī. There are many Sassānian towns in the valley of the Kārkūh. Many Sassānian buildings are attributed by the natives to the Atabegs of Luristān, who were certainly nothing more than the restorers. The complicated system of bridges is very remarkable (cf. the photographs in de Morgan, Études Geogr., ii. and Études Archéol., Paris 1893—1897, p. 360—374) and the roads which may still be traced on the upper courses of the rivers of Susiana. The remains of roads, paved or hewn out of the rock, may be seen at Tang-i Sāndā (between Bīhābān and Mālamīr) near the Sassānian bas-reliefs (de Bode, i. 353, 364), to the east and west of Mālamīr (de Bode, i. 350, ii. 820: gjeadd-ī atšābān, between Difūs and Kīrūh (Rawlinson, A march from Zohāb, p. 93), to the south of Kūhāwā (Gjeadd-ī Khorvar, Čīrīkow, p. 216—221). All these works are evidence of a systematic and continuous penetration. But since at the end of the fourth (tenth) century the inhabitants of the plain of Kūhrisman had not yet forgotten the Old Iranian language (Mukaddasī, p. 418) colonies of the ancient stocks may have survived in isolated corners of the mountains. The Lar highlands only assumed the present extent under the Atabegs.

The knowledge of the Arab geographers about the Lur country is very summary although they describe the routes between Kūrīstan and Fās (cf. Schwarz, Persien, i. 173—180; Aṣlādān-Širāz, p. 190: Aṣāladān-Sumānān), between Kūhrīstan and Ifāšān (the road started from Iījād; ibn Khurāddābīh, p. 57; Mukaddasī, p. 401) and lastly between Kūhrīstan and Dīfūs. As to these last routes, Iṣṭakhrī, p. 196, reckons from al-Lur to Shāpūr-Khwās 30 farsāks, from there to Lāštār (= Alīšār) 12 farsāks, from there to Nikwānd 10 farsāks (the road must be that which follows the upper waters of the Balad-rūd). A few details of this route are cleared up by Mukaddasī, p. 401, who gives the following eight stages: Karādji (cf. the article SULĀN-Kād)—Wafrawand—Irbān—Kurūchī (certainly = Hūrūd, Hūrūd, north of Khorramābād)—Sābur—Khudās (= Shāpūr-Khwās = Khorramābād)—Kākīṣh (=) al-Kūn—Razmānān—al-Lur. Mukaddasī, p. 418 also makes one suspect the existence of a road along the Al-i Dīz: from al-Lur to al-Dīz, two stages, from there to Kāgān one stage, from there to Ghilīpāgān 40 farsāks through uninhabited country (mofūnān).

Among the inhabited places in modern Luristān may be noted the following: the town of al-Lūr, a farsāk north of Difūs (Kantarat Andāmī) the site of which should be sought in the plain of Shāhī-yi Lur near Sālībābād; the town of Lāštār, now disappeared, was certainly in the plain of Alīšār and the town of Shāpūr-Khwās. The exact location of the latter is important for the comprehension of certain events in the fifth (eleventh) century (ibn al-Alīfī, ix. 89, 146, 211; x. 166; Turāk-i Guzida, p. 557). Rawlinson had identified Khorramābād with Shāpūr-Khwās (cf. Le Strange, The Land, etc. p. 202, 668). The combined evidence of Iṣṭakhrī, p. 196 and 201, of the Aṣāladān al-Kulūk, p. 79, 176 and particularly the itinerary of Mukaddasī, p. 401 fully justify Rawlinson’s identification (against Le Strange). The change of name, or moving of the site (cf. Schwarz) must have taken
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place in the ninth century. The Nāshat al-Kušūb (740 = 1340) which does not include Shapur-Kaust in its enumeration of the towns of the Little Lur in the Indian source, to mention Khurram-ābād (a town in ruins). It is on the other hand not at all probable that the wilāyat of Mān-rūd, the alleged ancestral home of the Lurs, is near Khurramābād. It should be sought to the north of the town of al-Lur near Mān-garra (= Māngarra). Samtah, mentioned in the Tu’rīqu-i Gāzīa, p. 549, was in Mān-rūd; its fortress Diz-i Siyāh must correspond to the fort of Diz which defends the entrance to Māngarra and was destroyed by the wāli of Pishth-i Kāh in 1895 (Mann, Die Mandarten der Luristan, p. 117). Finally the stronghold of Gīrīn (Tu’rīqu-i Gāzīa, p. 549, 552) is mentioned by Cirkow, p. 133, among the encampments of the tribe of Pāpī (to the south of Khurramābād).

Economic conditions. Apart from the Bakhtiyāri districts near Isfahān where there are flourishing villages, the Lur territories inhabited by nomads or semi-nomads only export the products of their cattle-rearing. But the future of the mountainous country which lies like an amphitheatre around the plain of Khwāz est is very promising. The Lur lands are rich in minerals and especially in petroleum. The famous wells of Masjūdī Sulaimān (Maldūn-Nafīn), belonging to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company are in the middle of Bakhtiyāri territory (between Shūghtar and Mālamīr). The same Company whose concession includes all the petroleum-bearing lands in the whole of southern Persia is putting into operation its claims in the Kūh-Gilīl region (to the north of the port of Gānāwa) etc. (cf. Schwer, Der turkisch-pers. Erdeinverkehr, Hamburg 1919).

On the other hand the territories now occupied by the Lurs was played a considerable part in ancient times, as they lay on the route between the great centres of the Persian empire. Their southern part (Kūh-Gilīl) may become of great importance for air and railway communication between Neshapota and India. The Bakhtiyāri country is now traversed by aconnecting Khwāz est with Isfahān and controlled by Lyon Brothers. Finally Luristan proper seems destined to be crossed by the main line connecting the Persian Gulf (Mohammara or Khormāw) with Teherān, and perhaps the Caspian Sea. Before the war of 1914 surveys had already been begun for making the Mohammara–Dizūl–Khurramābād railway by the Persian Railways’ Syndicate (cf. Litten, Persien, Berlin 1920, 65, 85). Since the change of dynasty in Persia, the Persian government proposes to carry through this task itself (cf. Millspaugh, Amrī, 1912 in Pers. Mitt., 1916, p. 272).


Lût, the Biblical Lot has in Muslim legend, even as early as in the Kur'an, an importance which he does not have in the Bible or the Hadâda. As his story is related, with the downfall of the sinful Sádûm (not however mentioned in the Kur'an) he appears to Muhammad as a prophet of punishment along with Hud, Seth, Nûh and Shu'âib as predecessors of Muhammad. When Muhammad is accused of being a liar he can converse himself with the reflection that before him the people of Nûh, 2Ahd, Thamûd, the people of Ibrahim and the people of Lût also called their prophets liars (Sûra, xxii. 43). Lût's people (called 2baum Lût, l. 13: 2vwân Lût) are usually located between Thamûd and Madyan. Lût in the Kur'an becomes a mu'âlî, messenger of Allah (xxvii. 160; xxxvi. 123), a rasûl amin, a reliable prophet (xxvi. 162), a participant in wisdom and knowledge (xxi. 74). When Ibrahim warns his people, Lût believes him (xxxi. 25). Lût is sent to sinners who forbid hospitality (xx. 70), waylay strangers and practice sodomy and cruelty such as no other people had before them. They threaten him that they will banish those who lead such a moral life saying: "If thou preachest right, bring God's punishment upon us" (xxix. 28). God therefore sends his angels of punishment; Ibrahim's intercession is vain (xi. 77-79). The angels come to Lût. His people demand the visitors for sinful purposes. In vain Lût offers his daughters instead. He feels himself helpless. The angels calm him, saying: "We shall save thee, only no one must turn round; thy wife will do it". The city was turned completely upside down (xi. 84; xv. 74); sidjîl stones, marked by God, rained upon it.

The Kur'an mentions no other name in the history of Lût. The destroyed city is called al-mu'tahîb (Sura, lv. 54) of which the plural is almü'tâbihât (ix. 7; lxix. 9) corresponding to the Hebrew mahpehâ, which is used in the Bible of Sodom.

The Kur'an commentators also know the Biblical story quite accurately (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 346, 347). They are able to fill all the gaps and give all names. The sins of Sodom are fully described. Sadûm has a king of the line of Nimrod. The habitants worship idols. Lût admonishes them for 40 years (al-Kisâ'). Then God sends three angels, Gabriel, Michael and Israîlíl (al-Kisâ' and the soul-taker Asérîl) (Minonski): "In Lût's time there was a Man who destroy a people among whom there are 300 believers". No. — 300, 200, 100...? — No. — 14 believers. No. — This number is assued, Ibrahim comforts himself, in the belief that Lût's wife is one of the believers. The angels must not destroy Sâdûm until Lût testifies four times to its sinfulness. They at once meet Lût who testifies. After meeting others they encounter Lût's daughter. She invites them into her father's house. Lût orders his people to be silent, especially his wife who has disobeyed him for 40 years (al-Kisâ'). But Lût's wife deliberately makes it known that they have visitors or she ostentatiously procures salt (this is why she becomes a pillar of salt) or she actually says: "Young men have come to stay with us, with more beautiful cheeks and sweeter fragrance than I have ever seen".

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

The Muslim legend gives names to everything and explains them all. Lût takes his name from látâ, "to attach oneself", because Ibrahim's heart was affectionately attached to Lût (Thâlabî). Lût's wife is called Hálsaka' or Wa'lî', his older daughter Kith (2), the younger Râriya (3) (Tabari), Zaghâr (Yâsût), or Rawaya (2) (al-Kisâ'). Not only is Sâdûm mentioned, but also other four towns, in whose names may be recognised the Biblical
Amrā, Adhām, Sāḥib’ān and Sā’ār. Of Sā’ār, Thālibā’ī says it was saved (Gen. xix. 20–22) "because it believed in Liṭi." The Muslim legend has a little in common with the old Haggada (Gen. Rabba, xlix, 1; Sinhedrin, 1909), e.g. the fact that Abraham thinks he is sure of a certain number of devout people. When Torke R. Elster (xxv) describes the daughters of Liṭi favourably, when Mīhrāgh Ḥagādah (ed. Schechter, p. 257) calls the angels sent to Sodom, Gabriel and Raphael, Muslim legend may have had some influence on the later Mīhrāgh.


LUTFI YAHYA. [See ARF MIKHSAK.]

LUTFI ‘ALI BEG Adhar, a Persian poet and biographer of the xivth century. He was born in Isfahān on the 20th Rab‘I 1123 (June 7, 1711) and spent his youth at Kūm and later at Shīrāz, where his father lived while governor of Luristan and the coast of Fars under Nadīr Shāh. After the death of his father, he made the pilgrimage to Mecca and travelled in Persia, finally settling in Isfahān in the service of Nadīr’s successors. He latterly adopted a life of seclusion and put himself under the spiritual direction of Muḥammad ʿAlī Mushtaghī. He died in 1381.

Lutfi ‘Ali Beg is best known for the collection of biographies of Persian poets which he compiled between 1760 and 1779 under the title of Māṭīkhīdā; in it he gives biographies of poets in Persian in alphabetical order according to towns and districts. The last part deals with contemporary authors and is followed by an autobiography, the Aṣa Ṣālihī which was lithographed at Qazvin in 1249 A.H. and at Bombay in 1277 A.H. There is a Turkish translation printed at Constantinople in 1250 A.H. Among his poems was a mathnawī, Tawāf al-Dawlah, from which the author quotes many verses at the end of his book. Lutfi ‘Ali Beg was held in considerable esteem by his literary contemporaries; he was particularly intimate with the poet Ḥūf of Isfahān.


LUTFI ‘ALI KHAN was the last member of the Zand dynasty in Persia. He was the son of Qājār Khan Zand (q.v.), who had reigned from 1756 to 1785, and had continued the struggle against the Kūmil Agha Muhammad, who had forced him to retire to Shīrāz, where he died on Jan. 23, 1789 from poisoning. During the short period of the reign of his father, Lutfi ‘Ali Khan had been entrusted with the conquest of Luristan and Kīrmān, which he had successfully carried through. But after the death of Dji‘far he was forced to flee from his own army to Kīrmān to seek refuge with the Arab lord Būshīr. With the latter’s help, he was able to make himself master of his capital Shīrāz where a certain Saiyid Murād had proclaimed himself king. It was chiefly through the efforts of his father’s minister Ḥājjī Shāh of the town that Lutfi ‘Ali succeeded in getting himself again recognised as sovereign. After his accession the character of the young man, whose nobility and generosity had hitherto been as much praised as his personality seems to have changed. His acts of tyranny and cruelty decided Ḥājjī Shāh to abandon the cause of the Zands and betray it to the enemy. This he did in 1791 when Lutfi ‘Ali Khan had set out against Agha Muhammad Khan. Ḥājjī Shāh seized Shīrāz and stirred up Lutfi ‘Ali’s own troops to mutiny against him. The latter fled to the coast and succeeded in collecting a small armed force with which he tried in vain to retake Shīrāz. Then followed several years of guerilla warfare waged with incredible vigour by Lutfi ‘Ali against the Kūmilān. He went up and down the whole of southern Persia, being for some time supported by the lord of Tabān and even by the British ambassador in Yazd. In 1794 being assisted by the chiefs of the district of Garmāsi, he even took Kīrmān. Here Agha Muhammad besieged him with a large force. After four months the town capitulated; Lutfi ‘Ali Khan succeeded in once more escaping and reaching Bām but here he was treacherously delivered over to his enemy who had him taken to Tībān where he was blinded and mutilated and finally put to death. Then came the terrible vengeance wreaked by the Kūmilān on the people of the town of Kīrmān [q.v.]

Lutfi ‘Ali Khan, the “last chivalrous figure amongst the kings of Persia” (Brown), probably had the sympathy of most of his contemporaries and it is recalled that even Agha Muhammad Khan openly recognised his bravery. But as his history was written under the new dynasty of the Kūmilān in Persia, the Persian sources could not show much sympathy for him. European sources give a more faithful picture of the course of events. The more modern Persian historians like Mirza Muhammad ‘Alī Khan (Dororo-i Makhzan-gar-i Tārīḥi Jām, Isfahān 1328, reproduced in Beek, Neuerutsche Kirchengeschichte, Heidelberg 1914, p. 259–260) do not hesitate to describe the action of Ḥājjī Shāh as treason. Lutfi ‘Ali Khan who soon afterwards became minister tried to justify his conduct to Sir John Malcolm.


LUTFI PASHA, properly Ḥājjī LUTFI PASHA, was an important Turkish statesman, scholar and historian, grand vizier in the time of Sultan Sulaiman i-al-Kāntār. He was of Albanian descent. The date and place of his birth are unknown. He was brought up in the imperial service, which he had
apparently entered through the *devshirim* for the Jauissaries. Much may be learned of his career from his own biographical references in the "History" and in the Hâşâni. Even in the world he devoted himself to theological studies, a fondness for which he retained throughout his whole life.

At the accession of Sultan Selim (1512—1520) he passed from the ranks of the pages as a peşni and filled in succession the following offices at the court: teyânâr (taster), kâşâş-bâshî, mir-i ʿAlâm (bearer of the imperial standard). He then became sanâdîk beş of Kastamonu, beglerbeg of Karaman, of Anatolia and in 941 (*tevâriş*). He spent a quarter of a century in the foreign service of the Sultan; according to his own account, he was through all the wars and battles in the reign of Sultan Selim who was very favourably disposed to him, usually in his train: in Rumelia and Anatolia, in Arabia, Syria and Egypt; similarly in the reign of Sultan Sulayman he took part in the campaigns against Belgrade, Rhodes, Hungary, Viena the Tâhâş, Baghdad, etc. In 945 (1538) he took part in the campaign to Kara Boghdad as second vizier. In 946 (1539) he succeeded as grand vizier Ayâş Paşa, who had died of the plague, also an Albanian, at a period when the Ottoman empire was straining its strength to the utmost. (The year 944, which was suggested by Kâtib Celebi’s *Târîh-i al-Târîhât*, Constantinople 1146, p. 176 adopted by all later historians and so handed down, is incorrect as is proved not only by Lütfî Paşa’s own statement but also by an analysis of events). He proved his ability in high army commands, in the fleet and in administrative offices.

He sought to carry through with a strong hand the reforms in internal administration which he had long recognised to be necessary, especially economies in the financial system, the abolition of oppressive institutions (*ağa*, privileges of couriers), the development and independence of the navy, the importance of which for Turkey his foresight recognised. Earlier than anyone else he saw the beginning of the collapse of the externally so brilliant political system. At the same time he conducted negotiations with Venice, Austria and France with great skill and firmness. It is very worthy that he was the first to recognise the surpassing genius of Müşir Sinâh, whom he appointed state architect. He was a highly gifted statesman, an energetic inflexible personality, incorruptible and above all intrigue with high ideals and strong religious and scientific leanings. In spite of his violent temper he was regarded as a “good natured Vizier”.

He was a brother-in-law of Sultan Sulayman, whose sister Şâh Sulayh he had married. Nevertheless he was summarily dismissed in 948 (1551) when in his rage he used threats to his wife when she reproached him with his inhuman treatment of a Muslim slave-girl. His eagerness for reform had naturally gained him few friends, at court. It is said that only his rank as a dansad saved him from execution. Whether the deeper reason for the matrimonial dissensions lay in his love for boys is not clear.

Lütfî Paşa was banished with a pension to Dimotika where he had a *siftik*. Here he gave himself entirely up to his studies, for which he was well qualified by his constant intercourse with theologians and scholars during his whole political career. After his return from Mecca to Dimotika — his successor Rustam Paşa was successful in preventing a complete reconciliation with the Sultan — he used his enforced leisure to compose numerous works in Arabic and Turkish. He died in all probability after 979 (1562) (so also Momentum-bashî), in any case after 961, in Dimotika. The date 959 (1544) usually given is impossible as he continued his history down to Ramazân 15, 961 (Aug. 14, 1554) and there is no reason to suppose that any other continued the history; on the contrary there are references in the text to events of the year 961. He only left one foundation, a *mâşâm* in Constantinople, after which the quarter and the Lütfî Paşa mosque take their names; its builder was a dessertdâr Ahmed Celebi.

Lütfî Paşa is the author of 21 works, a list of which he himself gives in his "History", p. 1—4 (cf. also the list in Flume, Geschichte des osman. Reiches, ii. 703; Flügel, *Abhandlungen der Wiener Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, vii. 247; Berlin, *Türkische Bibliothek*, vol. xii., p. xv.—xvii.). It includes 15 Arabic and 8 Turkish works, to which perhaps may be added the Kâmi-i mâniş ascribed to him which he perhaps does not mention as his own because it was the result of his official activities.

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

As a poet he is praised by Şehi, who completed his *Hedîc-i hediye* in 945 in the time of his grand vizierate. But the numerous verses scattered throughout his history are not by him. Verses certainly by him are very mediocre. Besides, he does not show much sympathy with poets as the contemptuous attitude to ʿAli Celebi, author of the *Humâyûn-nâmi*, shows, to whom he makes the reproach that he had spent 20 years trying to be the first to recognise the surpassing genius of Müşir Sinâh, whom he appointed state architect. He was a highly gifted statesman, an energetic inflexible personality, incorruptible and above all intrigue with high ideals and strong religious and scientific leanings. In spite of his violent temper he was regarded as a “good natured Vizier”.

He was a brother-in-law of Sultan Sulayman, whose sister Şâh Sulayh he had married. Nevertheless he was summarily dismissed in 948 (1551) when in his rage he used threats to his wife when she reproached him with his inhuman treatment of a Muslim slave-girl. His eagerness for reform had naturally gained him few friends, at court. It is said that only his rank as a dansad saved him from execution. Whether the deeper reason for the matrimonial dissensions lay in his love for boys is not clear.

Lütfî Paşa was banished with a pension to Dimotika where he had a *siftik*. Here he gave himself entirely up to his studies, for which he was well qualified by his constant intercourse with theologians and scholars during his whole
M Ä’ AL-A’AINAIN AL-SHINGIT, the name by which the famous agitator in Mauritania [q.v.] at the end of the sixteenth century and beginning of the seventeenth is best known (several explanations of his sobriquet are given; the literal meaning is “the water of the eyes” but the most satisfactory seems to be that which sees in it simply a euphemism, like that in the expression ʿmurrat al-dīm). 

Mūhammad Muṣṭaṣṣ Mā’ al-A’ainain was the twelfth son of a chief and marabout of great fame in his own country, Mūhammad Fāṭīm b. Mā’mūn, born at Walā’at in the latter part of the sixteenth century and chief of the Moorish tribe of Gālāgīma in the district of al-Ḥawd in the southeast of Shingit group. After breaking off from the Bakṣayya whose religious head was the chief al-Muḥtār al-Kuntī [q.v.], he founded a new brotherhood affiliated to that of al-Ḵādirīya [q.v.], to which he gave the name of Futluṭa derived from his own. On the death of Muhammad Fāṭīm in 1689, Mā’ al-A’ainain left the district of al-Ḥawd to complete his Islamic studies in Shingit (on this flourishing Moorish centre, see the long and interesting monograph by a native of the place resident in Cairo, Ahmad b. al-ʿAlīn b. al-Shingiti. *al-Waṣiṭ fi Tarāṣīm Līlāh Shingit.* Cairo 1329 [1911]). Mā’ al-A’ainain then settled for several years in al-Adrīr [q.v.] but afterwards went further north to the al-Sākhyat al-Ḥamrā‘ country, which was his usual residence from 1824. All this region, which now forms the northern part of Spanish Rio de Oro, was being desolated by murder and brigandage. He succeeded in establishing security there, restored the land to cultivation, planted numerous palmgroves and encouraged trade by caravan to Senegal and Shingit in one direction and to Morocco on the other. He chose Smāra as his permanent abode and later built a ṣaḥba for himself there in the Moroccan style on the Wādī Tarāṣī. Like the majority of religious leaders of the Saharan countries of North Africa, he practiced commerce, politics and the proselytising activities of a marabout and was not long in gathering round him a considerable number of followers who became widely known throughout Morocco by their nickname of “blue men.” In an account of their costume, consisting of a jallaba of khunut (a cotton stuff from Guinea), a turban and a burnous, all blue in colour. They were also called Ānīya, from the name of their master, and al-Šingiti (Shawāṭī), “the men of Shingit.”

Mā’ al-A’ainain very soon entered into regular relations with the Sulṭāns of Morocco. He had already made a sojourn in the country on his journey to the holy places of Islam, in the reign of Mawlāy ʿAbd al-Raʾyām b. Ḥishām [q.v.] (1238-1276 = 1822-1859). Later and especially in the reign of Mawlāy al-Ḥasan [q.v.] (1290-1311 = 1873-1894) he traveled regularly to Marrāḵūsh and to Fās and was welcomed by the Sulṭān, whom he supplied with slaves (in which he also dealt). When the young Mawlāy ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz [q.v.] ascended the throne in 1311 (1894), he sent him his homage and went to visit him in 1896 in Marrāḵūsh. The Sulṭān gave him a gift in his southern capital of a site for a zāvitā of his order and he hired him a steamer to take him with his suite from the Moroccan port of Mogador to that of Tarāṣī, the natural harbour of the Rio de Oro for his capital Smāra. This little port henceforth became of some importance: German ships, Greek and Spanish sailing-vessels disembarked there merchandise from Morocco and considerable cargoes of arms and ammunition, all consigned to the agitator to enable him to supply.
his followers and arm the Moorish tribes to enable them to fight French expansion beyond the frontiers of Senegal. For several years Māʿ al-ʿAinain was able to maintain in all the vast area under his influence an atmosphere hostile to French penetration into Mauritania. He was largely the instigator of the anti-French outbursts, which after the assassination on May 12, 1905, near Tidjikjda, of the explorer Xavier Coppolani decided France to occupy Tagant in 1906.

After these happenings, Māʿ al-ʿAinain, having assembled the chiefs of the great Moorish tribes who were in alliance with him, took them to Fas to demand the alliance and assistance of Morocco against France in Mauritania. He was favourably received by Mawlay ʿAbd al-ʿAziz and succeeded in getting a cousin of the Sultan, Mawlay Idris, sent to al-Adrār as representative of the magāzīn. At the same time Māʿ al-ʿAinain was authorised to install himself in the Moroccan ṭūbā of Tinżit, to summon to the holy war and to rally around him all the warriors of the Sahara from al-Sūs to the region of Sākiyat al-Ḥamrāʾ. The hopes that Mawlay ʿAbd al-ʿAziz had based on the plans of Māʿ al-ʿAinain were soon disappointed. After the occupation of Ujda and the destruction of Shāwiyah by the French he had to disown Māʿ al-ʿAinain. The latter had no longer a chance even in his own country, where a fatal blow was struck at his power as a result of the al-Adrār expedition in the course of which French troops led by Colonel Gouraud completely scattered his forces. Māʿ al-ʿAinain had however not lost all hope of regaining his former influence in his old territory. He aimed even higher, when in May 1910 he did not hesitate to proclaim himself Sultan and to attempt the conquest of Morocco, which he thought had been sold to the infidels by the ʿAlawī sovereigns.

Having united around him all the tribes of the Anti-Atlas and of al-Sūs as well as his own followers, he reached Marrākṣūs and from this town tried to take Fas by surprise, taking the road through the Central Atlas. But he was checked in his advance near Tādīs [q.v.] by a column under General Moinier which routed him completely on June 23, 1910. He just managed to escape and reach al-Sūs where he was abandoned by all his followers and had to sell his slaves and flocks in order to live. He retired to the ḏāra of Tinzn, where he died on 17th Shawwāl 1328 (Oct. 28, 1910).

Two years later, the son of Māʿ al-ʿAinain, Ahmad al-Ḥibat, in his turn attempted to proclaim himself Sultan. Proclaiming himself the Mahdi, he set out from Tinzn and entered Marrākṣūs on Aug. 18, 1912, where he had himself proclaimed, while his troops put the city to fire and sword. But on Aug. 29, al-Ḥibat was defeated at Benguerir by Colonel Mangin, who after a second encounter at Sidi Bu ʿTāhān entered Marrākṣūs on Sept. 7 following.

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


A short monograph was devoted to Māʿ al-ʿAinain by his son Muhammad Taḥy al-ʿĀmil entitled: Mafʿūdāt al-muṣākāt bi-ṣalātun Māʿ al-ʿAinain, printed al-fawārid, Fas 1316. A notice of him is also given in the Wāṣirat of Ahmad al-Shingīti, p. 360–362.
MA’ADD, a collective name for certain Arab tribes, in the traditional usage for those of North Arabian origin (Mudar and Rab’i) in contrast to the Yemeni tribes. This contrast said to be inherent in the name Ma’add seems already to be found frequently in the early poets, always presuming the genuineness of the passages in question. Thus in a verse of Idris b. ‘Kais (Alwardī, No. 41, l. 5) the term Ma’add is used apparently in the sense of excluding the Ḥabd, Ṭayi and Kinda, and in Nashiha (Alwardī, No. 18, l. 1, 2), the Ghassān. Tradition also records fighting between Ma’add and Yemen in the pre-Muhammadan period (cf. ‘Yākūt, ii. 434; Ibn Badrān, p. 144). At a later period the genealogical term Ma’add is even more sharply contrasted with South Arabia, when the term Mu’rid and South Arabs had become the dividing political element in the fighting of the Ommiyad and ‘Abbasid period (passages quoted in Goldziher, see below Bifl).

The fact that the name Banū is not found combined with Ma’add as well as the form of the word itself suggests that Ma’add may originally have been of similar foundation and meaning to Ma’bar, a general name for “people”, body of people. Ibn Daurād (Iṣṭifāṣ, p. 20) long ago suggested the derivation from the root ṣad. “To count, number” not however without adding other very different attempts to interpret it. The usual genealogical scheme of Arab tradition has inserted it the name Ma’add as the name of an ancestor of an eponymous series, namely a son of the traditional founder ‘Anas. Ma’add is brought into connection with the history of Mecca by the legend that he married ‘Ummā, a daughter of the Ḥafīrūmīts. From this marriage were born ‘Nai’ū, father of the tribal eponym Mu’ād, Rab’ū and ‘Ayyād. According to Abu ʿAlī Fābū, Hist, Ante-Islāmica, ed. Fleischer, p. 72 Ma’add is even said to have been a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar.

Bibliography: Tabāri, i. 671 sqq.; Maḥdī (Pseudo-Balakī), ed. Huart, iv. 101 ff. On the origin and history of the feuds between the North and South Arabs cf. Golzheher, Muḥammadanische Studien, i 78 sqq.; on the genealogy, ibid., p. 179. (11 H. BRAT)

MA’ARRAT MASRIN or MISRIN, capital of a nāḥiyā of Ḥalab. The name is also written Ma’arrat Naṣrān which has been wrongly taken as an abbreviation of Ma’arrat Kinnarīn (Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 497). In Syriac manuscripts of the eighth century, the town is called Ma’arrat Mesqīn (Wright, Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the Fort. Mus., p. 454); dated 745 with Agnāni. Lewis & Hazzard, in Gesta Pontificum Orientis, London 1910: a palimpsest under a collection of biographies of holy women, written by a monk of Mar Mattai Monastery of Bēth Mārī Kānān, a monastery of the town of Ma’arrat-Mesqīn in the Kūra of Antioch-a.

In the year 16, Abu ʿUbayd defeated a large Greek army which had assembled between Ḥalab and Ma’arrat Masrīn and then took this town, which capitulated under conditions similar to Ḥalab (al-Baladhurī, Futuḥ, ed. de Goeje, p. 149). In the reign of the Caliph Mutawakkil, ‘Amr b. Hāwbar, a native of Ma’arrat al-Buraydā (cf. Ṣafw, Musārīṭ, p. 400) near Ma’arrat al-Nū’mān, was governor of the town; Kamāl al-Din (Freytag, Selecta ex Historia Halābī, Paris 1859, text p. 24; transl. p. 18) quotes the beginning of a lampoon composed by him on the town, and how it was taken by ‘Ubayd b. Djiyād (d. 231). Nicephorus Phocas took the town in 537 (568) and deported its 1,200 inhabitants to Bilād al-Rūm (Kamāl al-Din in Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 228). After the truce of Sāfār 359 (966–970) between the Greeks and Kāhrīya, the town passed to the territory of the latter (op. cit., p. 232). In 415 (1024) the Kilābi leader ʿAlī b. Mīrād on his march against Ḥalab sent his follower Abū Ṣafwūr Sulaymān b. Ṣaww against Ma’arrat Masrīn; the latter took the town and made it a governor prison (J. J. Müller, Historia Monodiaramum, Bonn 1829, p. 14; Rosen, Zapiski Akad. Nauk., xlv. 578). Shortly before the death of Ẓāhiḥ (545), the Byzantines took the town. The town passed between Nāṣir and South Arabs had become the dividing political element in the fighting of the Ommiyad and ‘Abbasid period (passages quoted in Goldziher, see below Bifl).

The fact that the name Banū is not found combined with Ma’add as well as the form of the word itself suggests that Ma’add may originally have been of similar foundation and meaning to Ma’bar, a general name for “people”, body of people. Ibn Daurād (Iṣṭifāṣ, p. 20) long ago suggested the derivation from the root ṣad. “To count, number” not however without adding other very different attempts to interpret it. The usual genealogical scheme of Arab tradition has inserted it the name Ma’add as the name of an ancestor of an eponymous series, namely a son of the traditional founder ‘Anas. Ma’add is brought into connection with the history of Mecca by the legend that he married ‘Ummā, a daughter of the Ḥafīrūmīts. From this marriage were born ‘Nai’ū, father of the tribal eponym Mu’ād, Rab’ū and ‘Ayyād. According to Abu ʿAlī Fābū, Hist, Ante-Islāmica, ed. Fleischer, p. 72 Ma’add is even said to have been a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar.

Bibliography: Tabāri, i. 671 sqq.; Maḥdī (Pseudo-Balakī), ed. Huart, iv. 101 ff. On the origin and history of the feuds between the North and South Arabs cf. Golzheher, Muḥammadanische Studien, i 78 sqq.; on the genealogy, ibid., p. 179. (11 H. BRAT)

The town has not been much visited by modern travellers. Jullien describes Ma'arrat Maṣfīn as a large village, lying among sesame fields and olive trees in a rich plain. Garrett is enthusiastic about the fertility of the region and criticises the field systems: he considers the olive trees of the community generally as unhealthy, fig trees are numerous and roses growing by the roadside*. In modern times the name of the town is often written Ma'arrat al-Muṣfīn (with the article) e.g. by J. B. L. J. Rousseau (*Description du Fuḥailik de Halah*, in Fundgruben des Orientes, Vienna 1814, iv. p. 11), Ritter (*Erkundungen*, xvi., p. 1576), Garrett (*Publications of an American Archæal. Expedition to Syria*, New York 1914, part i., p. 119) etc.

Not to be confused with our town is Ma'arrat al-Khawān (also called Ma'arrat al-Akhwān) east of it, sometimes called simply Maṣfīn, e.g. by Seiff (Zeitschr. f. Erdk., 1873, viii., p. 24; Maarrat, al-Dīn, ed. 1909, p. 193), and it is accepted to give this name to Ma'arrat Maṣfīn*. The site of a castle still bears the name Kal'at al-Muṣfīn (see below). We have much earlier evidence from another older name, Ma'arrat al-Yūnis (al-Kalālīh, ed. de Goeje, p. 149; Abu ʿl-Fidāʾ, *Annales Musulmānici*, ed. Reiske, i., Copenhagen 1789, p. 226 etc.). The district of this town originally formed an iliūm (ilīmus) of the jdūd of Ḥim, (whence Hīm, al-Khurāshī, B. G. A., vii. 75; cf. also — but this is an anachronism, — al-Kalḵšāndī, ṣāhib al-ṣafī, iv. 142, transl. Gaudefoy-Demounyès, *La Syrie*, p. 109) the Hīm gate (see below), probably also a memory of this. It was only from the time of Ḥīnān al-Rūdī that the town belonged to the jdūd of Kinnariān, the capital of which at a later date was Ḥalāh (Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, p. 36, 39).

As early as 276 (891—92) we find Yaḵūṭī giving the Banū Tanbīḥ as the inhabitants of the town. The district around it was one of the parts of Syria most strongly settled by Maronites (al-Maṣfīn, Khalīf, *al-Tanbīḥ*, ed. de Goeje, p. 133). As there was no running water near the town, its inhabitants had to collect rain-water in cisterns. But the country around was rich in olive, fig, pistachio and almond trees; wine was also made here as in the ancient Ḥaram. According to Ibn Ḥuṣayn the orchards stretched for nearly two days' journey (in the town and formed one of the richest and most fertile areas in the world. South of Ma'arrat al-Maṣfīn, just beside the town wall was, according to local tradition, the tomb of ʿosmān son of Ṣūḥ; but Yaḵūṭī says his grave was really at Nahābū (cf. Goldziher, *Muhammadiene Traditionen über den Grabeigentum der Joum*, in *Z. D. I.*, i., 13—17). The Dājam Nāla Yaḵūṭī in Ma'arrat al-Maṣfīn still bears the name of ʿosmān and has an inscription dated 604 (1207—1208) (Von der Hellen, *Voyage en Syrie*, p. 202, note 4).

When Abu ʿl-ʿUṣair came to Ma'arrat Ḥim, in the year 16 (637), the people came out to welcome him and promised to pay his demands and built al-Kalālīh, ed. de Goeje, p. 131; Caetani, *Annales dell'Islam*, iii., p. 794 § 284). The Caliph ʿUmar II was buried in 101 in the monastery of Simeon (*Dair Sīmān*) at al-Nāṣr (al-Maṣfīn) not far from Ma'arrat al-Maṣfīn (Hömgärm, Z.S., i., 1922, p. 17; Dussaud, *Topographie historique de

---

**MA'ARRAT AL-NU'MĀN**

Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, in northern Syria, often called simply al-Maʿarrā. It is celebrated as the birthplace of the poet Abu ʿl-ʿAlāʾ Ahmad al-Maʿarrā, [q.v.]. According to al-Samʿānī (Kitāb al-Anbāʾ), reproduced by D. S. Margoliouth, *G. M. S.*, xx., 1912, fol. 536, i., the name from the place-name was Maʿarrāni to distinguish it from that of Ma'arrat Naṣīr, Maṣfīn. The town probably lay on the site of the ancient Arra which is called Ḫāyya ʿAbī Ḫāyya in an inscription. Yaḵūṭī says that Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was an old town in ruins. Naṣīr-i Khusraw in 438 (1047) found in the town wall a stone column with an inscription in some language not Arabic and Ibn al-Shihna also talks of old pillars being dug up in the town. Van Berchem notes the remains of a Greek inscription in the Madrasa (*Yayaz*, p. 203, note 1).

The town received its new epithet, to distinguish it from the numerous other Syrian towns of the same name, from the Companion of the Prophet, al-Nu'mān b. Basḥi, who was governor of this district under Maʿārṣiya and whose son died there. According to another tradition it is called after al-Nu'mān b. ʿAbd al-Sāliḥ of the tribe of Tanbīḥ. An earlier name of the town according to Ibn Battūta and Khalīf al-Zahiri (ed. Ravalesi, p. 49) was Dīkīt al-Kuṭbīr, according to al-Dimashqī Dīkīt al-Kurāshī; al-Ḥubrīn and Ibn al-Shihna (see below). But ʿAbd al-Sāliḥ, the owner of the land, to whom the town belonged, was not given as a birthplace of Tanbīḥ.
la Syrie, Paris 1927, p. 184), 'Abdallah b. Tahir, appointed by the Caliph al-Ma'mūn in 207 as successor of his father in the governorship of Syria, destroyed the fortifications of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, while fighting against Naṣr b. Shabīth and many small towns like Ḥisn al-Kafr and Ḥisn Hunāk (Kamāl al-Dīn in Freytag, Selecta ex historia Helvī, Paris 1819, p. 20). In 290 the Karmania were subjected by ʿAbd al-Karīm, ravaged the country round Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Ḥisn, Ḥumā, and Salamīyya, slew many inhabitants of these towns and carried off the women and children into captivity. The Banū Kilāb in 325 (936–937) entered Syria from al-Najdī and advanced on Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. The commander there, Mu'ād b. Sa'd, went out to al-Burāghūlī (site unknown) to meet them but was captured there with the greater part of his army, and only later released by the Kilābī Abu ʿl-Abbās ʿAbdallāh b. Sa'd, governor of Ḥalab. The latter and the Kilābī Yānis in 332 were driven from Ḥalab by al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbī Ḥamīda, Saif al-Dawla's uncle and pursued beyond Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān as far as Ḥisn al-Kufr, whereupon Governor the Franks, who were victorious against Saif al-Dawla as far as Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, which he took. Mu'ād b. Sa'd whom Kībhī had already installed there as governor was slain in battle at Kinnārīn by Saif al-Dawla. In 357 (968) the emperor Nicephoros Phocas took the town and destroyed its chief mosque and most of the walls. When Karghūyya seized ʿAleppo, Zuhair the governor of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān joined the Ḥamdūddī Sa'd al-Dawla (355) and set out with him from Manbāq against ʿAleppo; it was only when the Greek Turbasi brought help to Karghūyya that the pair retired to al-Khunṣūr and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. In the treaty between Nicephoros and Karghūyya (Safr 359) Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was promised to the latter. Sa'd al-Dawla held out in it for three years. Bakdūr had depo-ed and imprisoned Karghūyya in ʿAleppo and made himself sole ruler (364 = 975). Sa'd al-Dawla set out from Ḥisn against him and with the Banū Kilāb whom he had won over to his side by promising them lands at Ḥisn be-seged Zuhair, who was an ally of Bakdūr, in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. He forced his way with his followers into the town through the Ḥunāk gate; when they were repulsed, they burned the Ḥisn gate. Zuhair thereupon surrendered and was executed in the citadel of Ḥamā; the citadel of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was plundered by the conqueror. When Rammūsā, a Mamluk of Saif al-Dawla ("al-Safr") rebelled in 396 in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān against Sa'd al-Dawla, the latter with Luʿlu' went to besiege the town but retired to Ḥalab on the approach of Bandjutakin (Freytag, Locomotivrail, p. 45, l. 6); Luʿlu' who had seized the power in Ḥalab in 392, next year had Kafr Ṭūna in the district of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and the fortress in the ʿArāḍ (the two districts of al-Rūḏj, cf. Rosen, Zap. Imp. Akad. Nauk, xlv., p. 237, note 200) destroyed to prevent them falling into the hands of his enemies. When the Ḥamādīyya and al-Dawla al-ʿAbbāsī were in 434 (1045) again against the Mamlūk Muʿizz al-Dawla Thīmāl, he occupied Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. In 452 on his campaign against his nephew Maḥmūd, Thīmāl spent eight days in the town; the inhabitants suffered severely as the Arabs on account of the severe winter were billeted in the houses and did much damage there. Maḥmūd after occupying Ḥalab in 457 allotted Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān to the Turk chief Ḥarīn; on Shāwāl 17, 458, the latter entered the town with Turks, Dailmīs, Kurds, and men of the tribe of al-ʿAwādī, about 1000 fighting men besides camp-followers. They pitched their camp before the gate at which public prayers were said. Although excellent discipline prevailed among them and no one injured the olive-trees and vineyards or even took water for it, the inhabitants breathed more freely when they left the town again to assist Maḥmūd on his campaign against the Kilābīs. In 462 Turks in large numbers came out of Byzantine territory against Ḥalab, went via Ṭūrūk to al-Dijar, Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Kafarṭab, Ḥamā, Ḥisn and Rakanīyya, and laid Syria waste in dreadful fashion. The Turk Tutuş in 472 undertook a campaign from Damascus against the north of Syria; he burned the region of Ḥaḍāl al-Summāk and Ḥaḍāl ʿAbdallāh ʿUmar. Extorted enormous sums from the people of Sarmin and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and plundered the country east of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān; he laid siege to Djabal al-ʿAbbāsī, burned Ma'arrat Ratarīya (the ancient Maṣrāzīgūn) in the district of Kafarṭab. His son Rūmān in 488 gave the town of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān with its lands to Suṭḥān b. Ṭūrūk. Soon after the taking of Anṭākiyya (491) the Franks advanced on our town, supported by the people of Tall Mannas, and all the Christians in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān itself but they were defeated between these two towns. In the beginning of 492 they again besieged the town with a large army (then an urbis munitissima, Will of Tyre, vii. 9) and took it, killing almost the whole population, 20,000 men, women and children (Hist. or. des. Croisades, iii. 482 sq.). Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was, like Jerusalem in the same year, completely sacked and the walls and mosque destroyed. During the siege the Franks had destroyed all the gardens round the town and the Kilābīs, who had come to the help of Rūmān consumed all the supplies of the district so that the country was completely starved. In 496 Rūmān reconquered the lost fortresses. At the end of 514, he concluded a treaty with the Franks by which the latter were allotted Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Kafarṭab, al-Ṭāra and and a part of Ḥaḍāl al-Summāk etc. In 531 (1137) the Atābeg Zangi regained Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. When the inhabitants asked to have restored to them the estates of which the Franks had deprived them, he demanded the original charters of ownership from them but they had been destroyed. He therefore had search made in the books of the office of the financial department of Ḥalab (Dafātir Dirāsān Ḥalab) and found from the old payments of khurādīyāt what families had owned property and restored them (Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, xi. 34 = Hist. or. des. Crois., i. 423; Abu ʿl-Fida', Annales Moslem, ed. Reiske, iii. 470; v. 274). Zangi razed the walls. While King Folco of Jerusalem was putting down a rising in Antākiyya, Turkoman tribes entered the district of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and Kafarṭab but were driven out again by the Franks who thereupon conquered Kībhī b. Muʿizz al-Dawla Thīmāl, Hist. Or. des. Crois., i. 667, where our town is meant by al-Maʿarr, not Maʿarrat Maṣrīn as Robricht, Gesch. d. Konigs. Jerusalem, p. 107 assumes). The Byzantine emperor John II Comnenos in 532 (1138) invaded the district of Maʿarrat al-

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 584 (1188) went from Halab to Maʿarrat al-Numān from which he made pilgrimage to the Shāiḫ Abū Zakariyāʾ al-Makhrūbi who lived at the tomb of the Caliph ʿUmar. Towards the end of the reign of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (c. 1191) the town formed part of the Syrian possessions of Taḥk al-Dīn (Hist. Or. d. Crois., v. 14). Maʿarrat al-Numān is several times mentioned in the wars between Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's sons. About 589 it belonged to al-Malik al-Muṣaffār b. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ʿUmar. Later we find its possession alternating between Ḥamā and Halab. An old Shāfīʾ madrasa was built, according to the inscription on its gateway, in the reign of the Ayyūbīd Sūluṭ of Ḥamā, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Muḥammad ʿI (plan in Creswell, R. I. F. A. O., xxi. 13); it is by the same architect as the lovely square minaret of the great mosque. Ibn al-Muʿṣaddam in 596 (1159) owned the towns of Fāmīyā, Kafrāṭāb and 25 estates in the district of Maʿarrat al-Numān. In 597 the town was sacked by Sūluṭ al-Malik al-Zāhīr Ghāzī al-Halab and seems to have belonged to him for a period. An inscription dated 604 (1207–1208) still bears his name. Al-Malik al-ʿĀṭil in 598 went from Damascus via Ḥamā to Tall Ṣafīrūn where al-Malik al-Manṣūr of Ḥamā joined him. His opponent al-Malik al-Zāhīr of Halab concluded a treaty with him by which he was to cede Kaʿb al-ʿAlāʾid to Afdāl and the part of Maʿarrat al-Numān which he held to al-Malik al-Manṣūr. About 619 and 620 the town belonged to the lord of Ḥamā, al-Malik al-Naṣīr; it then passed temporarily to al-Malik al-Manṣūr ʿĪsā of Damascus who placed a governor in it. (Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Blochet, R. O. L., v. 65; Maḳrizī and Ibn ʿAwīlī, R. O. L., ix. 497 sqq.; Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī, Annāl. Mālīk, ed. Reiske, iv. 312). During this fighting the lands of Maʿarrat al-Numān and Ḥamā were ravaged by a horde of Arabs under Mānī (R. O. L., v. 68). On the advice of Saʿīd al-Dīn b. ʿAbd al-Qodūr, the Kopānī of Halab, Shāh al-Manṣūr (the same man) of Ḥamā in 611 (1213–1214) had the citadel of Maʿarrat al-Numān rebuilt, but by 615 al-Malik al-Naṣīr of Halab seized the town again and after a brief siege the citadel also. The news of its fall was brought to Halab by a carrier-pigeon (R. O. L., v. 100, 105; Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī, op. cit., v. 404, 452, 596). The Khwārizmīs, routed by ʿCingī Kān, entered Syria over the Furāṭ and advanced via al-Dābībūl, Tall Aʿzār and Sarmin to Maʿarrat al-Numān which then belonged to Halab. The geographer al-Dimāshḳī also reckons the town to Halab. After the victory of Balbars over the Tatars at Aʿīn Dīlūt where the Mongol general Khtobūga Ṣūluṭ had been left behind in Syria by Hilāḡū fell, Khosrawshāh the Tatar lord of Ḥamā left Syria. Ṣūluṭ Ḥusayn thereupon restored this town along with Bārin and Maʿarrat al-Numān, which had belonged for 23 years to Halab in 658 (1259) again to its original owner al-Malik al-Manṣūr of Ḥamā.

Henceforth with slight interruptions Maʿarrat al-Numān was in the possession of the lords of Ḥamā. In the years 710 (1310) the Sūluṭ granted Bārin and our town to Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī as a fief but he had to return them to Halab by 713 (1313) as the conditions of ownership had become ex-

 extraordinarily obscure on account of the frequent changes in the land-books and repeated grants by the Sūluṭ (Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī, Annāl. Mālīk, v. 274). A journey by the prince to Egypt in 716 resulted in the restoration of the town and citadel to him and a charter of presentation was prepared (op. cit., v. 302, 304). Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī quotes a portion of a poem which the Almohad secretary (faith of ʿīnād) Shāhīd al-Dīn Mahīmūn composed on the event (op. cit., v. 306). But by the end of the same year he had again to cede the town to Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā (op. cit., v. 310).

The district of Ḥamā was confiscated in 742 and placed under the Egyptian governor as a separate province (Qamīṣ); henceforth Maʿarrat al-Numān formed a wilayet of this province (al-Kākhashandi in Gaudefoy-Demombynes, La Sirène à l'époque des Mamelouks, p. 233). In the Mamlık period the town had seven gates (according to the al-Rawd al-Maṣʾūr fi aḥādīth al-Maṣʾūr, quoted in al-Kākhashandi, Cairo, iv. 142): the Halab gate, the great gate, that of Shīḥ, called after the adjoining tomb of Seth, the garden gate, the Ḥim Gate and the like gate (kaftāh probably a double gate of Ḥimnā). Maʿarrat al-Numān was a station of the Egyptian pigeon-post (al-ʾumarāʾ Tāʾifī, transl. R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., lxx. 501; al-Kākhashandi, iv. 393).

After the battle of Marj Dīlīk in 922 (1516) the town passed to the Ottomans. De la Vallé a century later found here (1616) a native chief under Turkish vassalry and the Agha who lived there in Poecoeke's time while paying tribute to the Porte retained complete independence. Troilo found in the town "zwey schone Wirthes-Hausen, das eine war ziemlich bauvollig, das andere aber noch wohl zugerecht, umb und umb mit breiten langen bleyern Taffeln bedeckt". Seetzen describes Maʿarrat al-Numān as the most northerly place in the Pašhalik of Damaskus (Sōrya). Walpole was a guest of the muttaṣarīf of the town. The district of the town later became a każī of the Ḥirā of Halab. When Saḥau passed through it in 1879, a kānīmaḵām was living there. Along the frontier with Ḥamā Maʿarrat al-Numān was the most northern town in the territory under French mandate. According to Saḥau it has about 40 well built houses and with its well cared for gardens and fields looks a peaceful and prosperous country town, while van Berchem calls it a "large village of rather dismal appearance"; it lies in a monotonous but well tilled plain at the foot of the eastern edge of the plateau of the Djebel Ḥiḥā. In the north-west it is commanded by the high hill on which stand the ruins of the mediaeval citadel (on the map by R. Gazezt and F. A. North, in Smirni, Archæol. Exp. to Syria, i. 50 and Princeton Exp., Div. ii., Sect. B. part 3, Kaʿb al-Numān is wrongly placed north-east of the town, cf. however also van Berchem, Voyage, p. 202 and Eli Smith in Riter, Erit. xvii. 1067 and Sachau, Reise, p. 94). Among the architectural features of Maʿarrat al-Numān the most notable, next to the great mosque, is the already mentioned Shīḥī Madrasa (built in 595). A notable building of the Ottoman period is a large square caravanserai on the south side of which is a fine gateway with an inscription of 974 (1566–1567). Sykes was shown by the Kākhashandi as one of the sights of the place (the alleged) tomb of the poet Abu ʿl-ʿĀlāʾ.
MACASSAR, an important seaport on the island of Celebes, on the Bay of Macassar; it is the capital of the administrative district of "Celebes en Onderhoorigheden" and also of the division of it of the same name administered by an assistant-resident. By the native population the town has made very great

MACASSAR


MAC'BAD, Abū ʿAbbard Maḥād f. Wāhī, was one of the great singers and composers of the early Umayyad period. He belonged to Malūn and was a client of ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Kāṭān (cf. Aghbānī, i. 19) of the house of Wāḥid b. the Bāb Makkāhī. He was a half-caste, his father being a negro. In his youth he was an accountant, but having taken music lessons from Śīh Kháthīr, Naṣḥī al-Farīsī and Qādimaî (q. v.) he adopted music as a profession and soon made a name for himself. During the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik (65–86 = 685–705) he carried off the prize at a tournament of song organised by Ibn Saftān at Makka. He sang at the courts of al-Walīd I (80–96 = 705–713), Yazīd II (101–105 = 720–724), and al-Walīd II (105–126 = 734–744), the second of these treating him with unheard of favour. On the death of Ibn Suraídī [q. v.] about the year 107 (726), Maḥād became the leading singer, and when al-Walīd II was called to the throne, Maḥād, although an old man, was invited to his court at Damascus. Here he was honourably treated and received a gift of 12,000 pieces of gold. Shortly afterwards he was again commanded to appear at court, but he was very ill when he arrived. Paralysis intervened, and although he was lodged in the palace itself, it had every possible attention, he died (125 = 743). At his funeral, the caliph and his brother al-Chams, walked in front of the bier, whilst the renowned songstress Sallāmā al-Kass, one of Maḥād's pupils, chanting one of his elegies.

Maḥād must undoubtedly be counted among the "four great singers" (Aghbānī, i. 98, 151; ii. 127) whatever opinions may be held as to the others. A poet of Malūn said: "Tuwais, and after him Ibn Suraídī, zelled my renown; the eminence belongs to Maḥād." ʿIsāk al-Mawsīlī (cf. ii. 439) said: "Maḥād was a consummate singer, and his compositions reveal a talent superior to all his rivals." Poets like al-Buhūtī [q. v.] and ʿAbd Tāmmān [q. v.] have shown the work of Maḥād in Arabiā musical history. Among the compositions of Maḥād his most famous were the seven known as the "Cities" (Mādīn) or "Fortresses" (Ḫubāfī), whilst five others were celebrated as the Maḥādīt. His fame was made by his adoption of a grandiose (ḵāmil ṭamm) style of composition in the rhythms (ḫābīl) called Ḫubīl or Ḫabhīl. Among his pupils were Ibn ʿĪsāhāk, Malik al-Taṭī [q. v.], Yūnūs al-Kāthīr [q. v.], Siyyāt, Sallāmā al-Kass and Habbābā.


AL-MARĪRĪ, ZAIN AL-DĪN ARabi, writes about the year 985 (1577) for Sulṭān ʿAli ʿAbbāsī of Bidjāpur (d. 987 = 1579) a brief history of the spread of Islam in Malabar, the coming of the Portuguese and their campaigns against the Muslims from 908 to 985 (1498–1578). The work is preserved in Brit. Mus. MS., No. 94, India Office No. 714 and 1044. 5 and in Morley, Catalogue of Historical MSS., No. 13 and is entitled Tāfăfīt al-Mughālibīn; extracts were given by John Briggs in Persica, History of the rise of the Mughal power in India, London 1829, in. 52 and 1829; it was translated by M. I. Rowlandson, Tāfīsīt al-Mughālibīn, an historical work in the Arabic language, London, Or. Transl. Fund 1833 and ed. by D. Lopez, Historia dos Portugueses no Malabar, por Zunzimun, manuscrito arabo do século XVI publicado e traduzido, Lisbon 1898. (C. Brockelmann)
progress in the last few years, is still often called by its original name of Ujung-pandang (Djum-pandang). The Dutch gave it the name Macassar from the kingdom of the same name. The heart of the Macassar country is the former principality of Tello, which was put under the direct rule of the Dutch East India government in 1811 and is a remnant of the once very powerful kingdom of Macassar. The area inhabited by the Macassars in the wider sense stretches over the whole southern part of the south-western peninsula of Celebes, as well as over the island of Saleic and several groups of island in the neighbourhood. The remainder of southern Celebes is inhabited by Buginese who are closely related to the Macassars and whose language, manners and customs are very similar.

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

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

No particulars are known of the earlier history of Macassar and of the regions inhabited by the Macassars in general. In the middle of the sixteenth century they were under the rule of the Hindu-Javanese kingdom of Madjapahit. According to the native chronicles of the royal houses of Gowa and Tello, which, at least so far as the earliest period is concerned, were more or less originally consisted of an alliance of nine small districts each under a noble; after the government had passed into the hands of one man and the kingdom had expanded, to include for example the lands of what was later Tello, Gowa is said, after the death of the sixth king (at the same time the first whom the chronicles represent to us as an ordinary mortal), to have been divided between his two sons; the one became ruler of Gowa and the other of Tello. It is certain that, so far as our knowledge goes, there were always close relations between these two kingdoms and that there was a certain degree of unity about them; they were known together to Europeans as the "kingdom of the Macassars". About the year 1512 Malays from Sumatra were given permission to settle in Macassar and it was perhaps they who first brought Muslim ideas to South Celebes. When the Portuguese appeared there in the middle of the century, they found only a few foreigners there, who were Muslims; it was not till the beginning of the sixteenth century that the Macassars in general adopted this new religion. During the reign of Tunjilalu (1565-90), Bubulluh, king of Ternate, came to Macassar, concluded a treaty and at the same time attempted to introduce the Muslim religion into South Celebes. In 1603 Sultan 'Aliuddin and one of his brothers became converts to Islam, which thereupon spread rapidly over Gowa and Tello, chiefly through the influence of Kareang Motawaya, administrator of Gowa and prince of Tello. We find traditions about the first preaching of Islam in South Celebes, similar to those of other parts of the archipelago. They are particularly associated with a certain Dato-ri-Bandang, a Minangkabau peasant from Kottaengah, who is said to have landed about 1606 in Tello and to have preached the Muslim faith, at the same time attempting to introduce the Muslim religion into South Celebes. In 1603 Sultan 'Aliuddin and one of his brothers are said to have been his contemporaries Dato-ri-Tiro and Dato-Patimang. Their tombs are still much visited.

In the first half of the sixteenth century the kingdom of Macassar extended very much, so that it brought under its suzerainty almost the whole of Celebes, Buton, Flores, Sumbawa, Lombok and the east coast of Borneo. The Dutch East India Company, which had a good deal of trouble with the Macassars, did not succeed till 1627 in concluding a treaty with them which permitted freedom of trade but allowed them no permanent settlement. But as Macassar caused the Company further difficulties in the Moluccas, a war resulted in which the town was burned. By the peace concluded in 1660, the king lost a portion of his territory; the Portuguese were forbidden to remain in the kingdom while the Company were allowed to settle and trade freely in Macassar. Peace was again broken in 1665; the Admiral of the Dutch East India Company, Speedman, sailed with a large fleet to Celebes, destroyed the Macassar fleet and forced the king to sign a treaty of peace ("Bongaars Verdrag", 1667; confirmed in 1669), whereby
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the suzerainty of Macassar over Celebes was finally destroyed. Even after this, the relations of the Company and the kingdom were not good. Telle was incor-
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The island was called al-Komr by the Arabs, Bakini (lit.: where there are (ni) Buki) by the Bantus of the neighbouring East African coast and by certain Malagasy tribes. The Portuguese called it "Island of St. Laurence" because they discovered it on that saint's day, August 10, 1506, and finally it became known as Madagascar from Marco Polo's name for it. The orthography جبل القمر جبل al-Qamar, in which the Nile was

MACASSAR. With its area of 228,340 sq. m., Madagascar is the third largest island in the world after New Guinea (244,770 sq. m.) and Borneo (284,630 sq. m.). Its area is a little greater than that of France (207,000 sq. m.). Belgium (11,373) and Holland (12,740) combined. It is

The island called of "Kom" or "of the moon" is mentioned by all the Muslim geographers who deal with eastern Africa. We shall see below how and to what degree the name of this mountain is connected with that of Komar = Madagascar.

In my memoire entitled Le Kwa-Kum en les anciennes navigations interocéaniennes dans les Mers du Sud (J. A., 1919, vol. 13 and 14), I have endeavoured to trace the origin of the name Komar; the documents there utilised enable it to be con

The Chinese sources take us also to East Africa in which the Cu fan is of Cao Ju-ku (1252) reproducing word for word two passages of the Li shi tai tais of Cu-yu (178) locating a land of K'un-lun on the "land of the Zangs of K'un-lun", which is close to a large island (M=Madagascar) which is the regular home of the f'ei or rack of the Arabs, whose feathers are so large that they can be used for holding a half-mud of water. The old name of Madagascar has survived in modern geography in the name of the Comoro Islands, the little archipelago lying to the N.W. of the island. In his Exploración portuguesa de Madagascar en 1813 (Bol. Soc. Geogr. of Lisbon, 7th series, 1857, p. 331-356). Father Luis Mariano refers to the Malagasy's as Bikè (more correctly: Bikô), which is also found in later travellers. It is the name given by the Eastern Bantu to the large African island: Bikô, or with the addition of the locative suffix -ni: Bakini. Bikô is to be con

1. J. de Bogaerde, Geographie der Celebes, in Nederlandsch, 1902, p. 428; J. Tideman, De nolking k de Makassaren, in Tweekijt van h. Binnenlandse Reisuit, 1897, xxvii., p. 555; do. De Batara Gowa of Zuid-
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dom subjects phonetically vahvah, which is a plural Bantu form wafiki malagacised wa < Bantu plural form, waw euphonic intervocalic Malagasy k waka. This radical is identical with the reduplicated form used by the Arab geographers, tvahvak or tvhvak q v and phonetically equivalent to the fiki of the early travellers and the Eastern Bantu wa fiki, the Malagasies and Buki, Madagascar. This explanation seems preferable to that which I had proposed in 1904 in F. A., vol. ii., p. 496 sqq. I think we must agree that the Malag. vahlaka comes from wa fiki and recognise a Bantu substratum in the Malag. word.

The present name of Madagascar is given by Marco Polo in the form Madagasacar (cf. The Book of See Marco Polo, ed. Sir Henry Yule and Cordier, p. 411 sqq.). Yule long ago pointed out that Marco Polo had not visited Madagascar and only knew it by hearsay, and that the information he gave about it really related to the adjoining east coast of Africa. The origin of this name is as follows: As I think has already pointed out in studying once more this chapter of Marco Polo, Madagascar is undoubtably a slightly erroneous formation of the form Zangbar and should be corrected to Madagasbar, land of the Malagasies, just as Zangbar means land of Zang or of the Zangs (see citations from the Se Majestueux. Soc de Ling. de Paris, vol. xiii., 1905-1906: Trois etymologies malagacises, p. 418-422), where *zangbar should be corrected to *zangbar.

This correction is justified by the following facts: In the Travels already quoted, Father Luis Mariano mentions a kingdom of the S. E. of Madagascar which he calls Matarasi, Matarasi, Matarasi (or Matarasi). Three years later in 1616, Father D’Almeida, travelling in the same country also mentions a kingdom of Matarasi. Cauche in his Relation published in 1657 by Morikot (Relations et curiosités de l’ile de Madagascar et du Brésil, p. 10, 49, 99, 124, 127, 134), mentions a province called Madagascare by some and by others Malagasie, the inhabitants of which he calls Malagassie and Malagassies. He also uses the term Madagascaro, but with the wider sense of the whole island and its inhabitants. Placourt (Histoire de la grande ile de Madagasar, 1661, p. 1) says: ‘The island of Saint Lauren is called Madagascar by the Malagasy by the geographers, by the inhabitants Madrass, by Ptolemy Menuthias, by Thunny, Corsini... but its real name is Malagasie.’ Later writers are all more or less inspired by the work of Placourt and need not be discussed here. All these different readings go back to two forms: Malagasy and Malagasi which correspond exactly to two main categories of dialects those with dental d and those with liquid l. It is the latter form that came to prevail over the whole island, sometimes with the sibilant: Malagáisi. and sometimes with the palatal: Malagáii. Both are paroxynous. The modern vernacular frequently uses the abbreviated form gáii and even l. These facts seem to justify the explanation suggested over by the same Madagascar which we owe to Marco Polo.

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

In the Arab geographers the first detailed account of the island of Komr Madagascar is found in the Kitab Nuzhat al-Maghribi fi Khitair al-Zanj (1154) of al-Idrisi who included the large African island in the country of the Zangs. ‘The people of the island of Zalag = Sumatra’, he says, ‘in the seventh section of the first clime come to the country of the Zangs in large and small ships and use it as a centre for trading in their merchandise as they understand one another’s language’ (MS. 2221 of the Bibl. Nat. Paris, p. 206, l. 15). This passage is very important as it shows that in the xiii century, Madagascar, wrongly located in the country of the Zangs, had been long before colonised by immigrants from Sumatra who had introduced their language into the island and Malagasy was derived from it. In the eighth section of the same clime the island of Komr Madagascar is situated seven days’ sail from the Maldives. Its king lives in the town of Malay. This is an island four months’ journey in length. It begins near the Maldives and ends in the north opposite the islands of China. The geographer of Roger of Sicily, in whose map shows, has combined into one huge island Madagascar, Ceylon and a part of Sumatra. In the ninth section, we are told that the people of Komr and the merchants of the land of the Maharrada (= Sumatra) come to the inhabitants of the east coast of Africa and are welcomed by them and trade with them (cf. my Relations de Voyages, Index, s.v. Komr and Komor).

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

Alu l-Hasan b. Sa’d b. Al-Maghribi, best known as Ibn Sa’d, was born in 1208 or 1214 near Granada and died at Damascus in 1274 or in Tunis in 1286. The Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris has a copy catalogued as Ms. n°. 2234, a treatise on general geography which runs from f. 1 to 117 and is entitled: ‘The book collected and epitomised by Ali b. Sa’d b. Al-Maghribi the Spaniard of the Book of the Geography of Ptolemy in seven climes; and he has added to it longitudes and latitudes from the book of Ibn Fathun’. This copy of the original manuscript is dated 714 (1314-1315) and belonged to the celebrated geographer Abu l-Fida. The text contains in a few lines information of the highest importance to the following effect: ‘The Komr who have given their name to the mountain of this name situated in eastern Africa are brothers of the Chinese. They originally lived with the Chinese in the eastern regions of the earth, i.e.
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in the interior of the Asiatic continent. Discord having broken out between them, the latter drove the Komr to these islands. After a certain period of time, dissensions broke out among the Komr who had migrated into these islands, the king and his family migrated once more and went to the large island of Komr = Madagascar and the king settled in a town of the island, called Kominya. These Komr immigrants to the large island increased in numbers and spread through the different centres of the island; but new dissensions broke out and provoked a new exodus, and many of them went to settle in the south at the beginning of inhabited land along the mountain which bears their name" (cf. Relation des Voyages, n. 316 sq.). If we translate these successive migrations into terms of modern geography, we get the following: The Komr, related to the Chinese, originally inhabited Central Asia, migrated from the interior of the continent where they were neighbours of the Chinese to the adjoining lands = Indo-China, Malay Peninsula and Indonesia. In the 13th century (cf. Ibn Majid in his Kitab al-Fawaid) they migrated from Indo-China to the coast of Malaya-Lancipot India. There followed several centuries in which the Komr were neighbors of the Chinese in the Malay Peninsula and Indonesia and from there to the land of the mountain of Komr, the famous mountain in which the Nile was thought to rise = East Africa.

The Komr from Central Asia to the sea-coasts of India-Lancipot India certainly took place long before our era. Several centuries must have passed between the departure of the emigrants from the plateau of Eastern Tibet, their expansion in the region of the coast, from Burma to Indo-China and their crossing to Indonesia. Ibn Sa'd lived in the 8th century. How then could he have known of events that took place several millennia before his time and are not recorded elsewhere? Neither the history nor legends of the Komr show anything of such happenings. The Indians, Sumatrans, and Indonesiologists whom I have consulted cannot think of any text or inscription directly or indirectly referring to them. I am surprised at such a question being raised by a comparatively late Arabic text and I know no satisfactory answer. I was prepared by my studies on Madagascar to accept Ibn Sa'd's statement that the large African island was colonised by Sumatrans whose ancestors had come from the Asiatic continent; this is exactly what Ibn Sa'd tells us. The agreement between the Arabic text and historical events is striking; but this undeniable agreement is unexpected for we do not know as well as we ought how and when such information could have been obtained in the 8th century. I put forward the hypothesis (Körte & von Garath, 1920) that Ibn Sa'd might have got the information at the court of Bulgar where he spent some time in the 9th century. But we know from his biographers that the Arab traveller lived in Bagdad, studying astronomy at the 36 latitudes of that city and making extracts from the scripts. He may have found in these works the statements he has fortunately preserved for us.

A contemporary of Ibn Sa'd, Lamin or Nadjin al-Din Abu 'l-Fath Yusuf b. Ya'qub b. Muhammad, better known as Ibn al-Mu'tadmir al-Shahabi of Damascus, prepared his Tarikh al-Mustawfiir (Cod. al-Mustawfiir) in 1250 (MS. 6021 of the Bibl. Nat. in Paris). In the 25 folios devoted to the history of 'Aden, 72 a. 3 deals with the voyages of the Komr from their original home to 'Aden and notably in 626 (1228) from Madagascar to the African coast and to 'Aden (cf. J. A., vol. 13, 1919, p. 469-485).

The following geographers: Shams al-Din Abu 'Abdallah Sufi al-Damashki (d. 1325), Abu 'l-Abbas Ahmad al-Nawai (d. 1325), Abu 'l-Fidr (1273-1313), Ibn Khalidin (d. 1375), Malrizi (1365-1442) tell us nothing particular about the island of Komr. The towns, which some of them locate in the great African island, are really in Ceylon or farther east or cannot be identified (cf. Relations des Voyages, index, s. v. Komor and Komur).

In the 8th century Ibn Majid (cf. Shihab Al-Din Ahmad b. Majid) in his Kitab al-Fawaid (cf. my Instructions nautiques et routières arabes et portugais, fol. 68b) mentions the island of Komr among the ten large islands of the world and mentions it after the Arabian peninsula: "The island which is the second in size", he says, "is the island of Komr. It is now an island (sic). The information I have collected orally does not agree about its length or breadth for it is quite apart from the world and the inhabited climates of the earth. This is why there is doubt on the subject. In the large books on geography it is said to be the largest of the inhabited islands. Between it and the land of Sofala and the islands dependent on it (= the Mozambique Channel) there are islands and reefs. In spite of this sailors are able to pass among the islands and reefs. The island of Komr takes its name from that of Kerman, son of 'Amar son of Shem son of Noah. To the south it has the sea which the Greeks called Oliviandos, this is the ocean surrounding the world (al-Masir in Arabic). It is the beginning of the southern darkness, which is to the south of this island of Komr". Ibn Majid frequently mentions the island of Komr in his other Nautical Instructions and it undoubtedly is Madagascar.

With Salaiman al-Mahrni (cf. below) our information becomes more definite. In his al-Umdat al-mahritija in Chap. iv, dealing with the islands and sailing routes along their coasts (cf. Instructions nautiques et routières arabes et portugais, vol. II, p. 229), he says: "Let us begin with the island of Komr because it is a large island which stretches along the coast of Zang and Sofala. Its northern extremity is called Ras al-Mih = Amhur Cape); it lies in 1 16' of Nas = (21° 37' South; the true latitude is 17° 57'). Its southern extremity which is called Isfah (= Cape Sainte Marie) is in 3 16' of Nas = (21° 37' south; the true latitude is nearly 25° 38' according to some, in 1 16' of Nas = (24° 51' south) according to others. This latter latitude is the more accurate. There is a difference of opinion about the direction of the sea-routes along it coast because this island is remote from the inhabited earth. There are two opinions regarding the direction of the route along its east coast: according to some one should sail S.W. 4 W. according to others S.W. There is a third opinion that one should go W.S.W. from one end to the other of the island. This last view is that of the older sailing
masters. In my opinion, adds Sulaimān al-Mahri, it is possible that the route should be W.S.W., then S.W. ¼ W., then S.W., and in another direction still for two reasons: the first that it is a large island, that its coast is long and the route is also long. The second reason is that the directions given have not been verified on account of the fewness of the voyages made to this island and the insufficient nautical knowledge of those who have been there. Sailing-masters (mukallim) of Zang have told me that the route on the east coast from Rās al-Milha to the place where Naš is 8 ibha (\(= 13^\circ 30\)‘) south is to the south and from this place to the south end of the island is S.-\(\frac{1}{2}\)S.W. I have recorded that the route on its west coast from Rās al-Milha to the place where Naš is 8 ibha (\(= 13^\circ 30\)‘ S.) is to the south; and from this place to the south end of the island S.-\(\frac{1}{2}\)S.-W. On the west coast from Rās al-Milha to the place where Naš is 6 ibha (\(= 16^\circ 44\)‘), the coast is perfectly safe; from 6 ibha to its south end there is a rīkk ("bank" or "shallow") about 2 zūm (= 6 hours) sail or more in length to the neighbourhood of the coast. Between the island of Kūm and the coast (east coast of Africa) there are four large inhabited islands, near one another, to which the people of Zang go. The first of these islands is Anjouan (\(=\) Great Comoro). It is in 11 ibha \(\frac{1}{2}\) of Naš (\(= 9^\circ\) S. approx.); Monri, the capital of Anjouan, is in exactly 11° 40‘ South. Between it and the African coast it is 16 zūm (\(= 48\) hours) sailing. The second, Mũalũ (our Mohali), is in 11 ibha of Naš (\(= 8^\circ 37\)‘ S. true Lat. about 12° 20‘); the third Dumānī (capital of Anjouan) which is in 11 ibha of Naš (\(= 8^\circ 37\)‘ S. true Lat. 12° 15‘) is to the east of Mũalũ; the fourth Mawūṭ (our Mayotte) is in 10 ibha \(\frac{1}{2}\) of Naš (\(= 9^\circ 25\)‘ S., true Lat. 12° 46‘ 55‘). To the east of these islands lies a great reef of rocks, about 4 zūm (= 12 hours) sail, usually called Aīn al-Baḥr ("eye" or "source of the sea"). The harbours of the west coast of Kūm are Langānī (15° 17‘ S.), Saḥā (true Lat. approx. 13° 54‘) and Munsafīt (\(=\) the bay of Mahdazamba, whose whole west point is in approx. 15° 12‘ Lat.). Those of the west coast are Bendar Šiṃapī (in the same latitude as Langānī on the west coast), and Bimārīth (\(=\) Vohemar in 15° 21‘ 15‘). All these ports are dangerous (for ships) except Langānī. Known that between Rās al-Milha and the coast of Zang, there are 50 zūm (= 150 hours) sail; and 20 zūm (= 60 hours) to the east of Rās al-Milha there is an inhabited island called Munawwarā (one of the southern Maldives). To the southeast of the island of Kūm lie numerous islands called Tīrakahā (the Mascarene Islands); they are 12 zūm (= 36 hours) sail from the island of Kūm. In his Kitāb al-Minādāj al-fajhrī (f. 73b of the same MS.), Sulaimān al-Mahri gives another description of the island of Kūm which does not differ from that given above. Four pages earlier (f. 71) he mentions several other harbours of the island of Kūm with their latitude calculated from the altitude of the Great Bank: Island of Munawwarā by 11 ibha; Bendar Is- mānīl or Bendar Is- mānīl on the east coast and Lūn- langānī or Langānī on the west by 10 ibha; Bimārīth on the west coast, Anāmīl on the west by 9 ibha; the island of Amber (Djīsārat al-ʿAmar) on the east coast and Bender al-Nḥōb on the west by 8 ibha; Noğhim (?) on the east coast and Malawīn (?) on the west by 7 ibha; Manākīr on the east coast (true Lat. 23° 08‘ 30‘) and Bender (al-)Shūṭān, “port of the banks,” by 6 ibha; Bender Hadūda on the east coast and Bender Kūrī on the west by 4 ibha; Wabaya (according to the Turkish text of Sidi ʿAlī; the name is illegible in MS. 2559) on the east coast and Bender Hit (or Hīt) on the west coast by 3 ibha; Bender Hadūda (ṣīn) on the east coast; no name known on the west coast and Bender Kūrī in this latitude by 2 ibha; Bender Kīs (or Kauz) on the east coast and the bay of Kūrī on the west coast by 1 ibha; the majority of the names of harbours, which are sometimes found on both coasts recall nothing known elsewhere.

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

1. The borrowings of relatively recent date from Swahili, which in turn got them from Arabic, of the type: Malag. bahari, "sea" < Swahili bahari < Arabic bahār; Malag. kamba "coconut fibre rope" < Swahili kamba < Arabic khobār, khubj; Malag. sukani, "rudder" < Swahili nusuki < Arabic shukūn. These loanwords are practically only found in the maritime dialects of the N. W. and W. coasts.

2. The borrowings from Swahili of the type: Malag. blvu, "baabab" < Swahili bluveyu; Malag. baada, "master,"" sir" < Swahili baada; Malag. kibbika, "measure for rice" < Swahili kibbika, "measure of about a quart", etc. Like the preceding, these loanwords are found almost solely in the maritime dialects of the west coast; it may therefore be assumed that they also are of recent introduction.

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

- Malag. ambāha "dog" < Bantu mbaa;
- Malag. akča "guinea-fowl" < Bantu kanga;
- Malag. amphndua "ass" < Bantu pan;
- Malag. akūn, akīnw, akīn. ox < Bantu ngombe;
- Malag. angndua "tale, fable" < Bantu ngana;
- Malag. akunedī, aknndrī akndri "sheep" < Bantu kūndi;
- Malag. fnndn, fnndn, "green pigeon" < Bantu ninga;
- Malag. gdru "kind of lemur" < Bantu ngdore "little black monkey";
- Malag. kizī "kind of lemur" < Bantu kizā "woman, wife";
THE NAM-KRIT SUB-RATRUM CONTAINS MANY WORDS OF VARIOUS CLASSES;

1. NAMES OF GODS, SPIRITS AND OF CASTE;
   Old Malag. Tz.ozan, "god of evil", tan dea < Sanskrit devata, "deity" (for the inverse semantic progression of Sanskrit deva, "god") > Zend dieu, Pahl. die, "evil spirit".
   Old Malag. Ram, "in the expressions hanin-ramu, lit. "by Rahu the moon" = eclipse of the moon; also in the noun ramina, lit. "obscured by Rahu the sun" = eclipse of the sun.
   Malag. enda, andina, "noble", "of royal or noble caste" < Kawi sūra < Sanskr sthā, etc.

2. NAMES OF THE MONTHS:
   The names of the months in the Indian calendar are found in the dialects of all the tribes of Madagascar. They have not however been preserved in the original order and a month that is placed at the beginning of the year by one tribe is put at the middle or end by another. On the other hand, some and zimba are not found in the Malag. lists; they are replaced by two artificial (large and small) and two natural (large and small) and a month called raha (ße):
   - Skr. ṛahā > Malag. fahia, féza, féha, fiaa;
   - Skr. ṛahā > Malag. malia;
   - Skr. cau > Malag. ali, amia, aimia;
   - Skr. ṛahā > Malag. ahe, aha, aha;
   - Skr. ṛahā > Malag. sara, saha;
   - Skr. ṛahā > Malag. aha, aha;
   - Skr. ṛahā > Malag. aha, aha;
   - Skr. ṛahā > Malag. aha, aha;
   - Skr. sari > Malag. saha, saha;
   - Skr. sari > Malag. saha, saha;

   "the month or moon of shira";
   cf. also Skr. raha "season of the tame" > Malag. sara, sarana, sarana, sarana, sarana; sarana "season of hurricanes".

A. COMMON WORDS:
   - Skr. ṛahā "10 months" > Malag. 100 miles;
   - Old Malag. 1 = modern Malag. 4 = 100 miles;
surmounted by a vertical tashdīd, then by ُ.

Contrary to Malay each letter is vocalised, which renders the reading of Malagasy-Arabic texts easy in spite of the variations in orthography, which are too numerous to be given here.

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

Malagasy manuscripts in the Arabic character bear the generic name of shura-de “great writing”, i.e. “sacred writing”. They used to be difficult to obtain; the owners gave them an esoteric character which did not allow their contents to be communicated to a stranger. I was able to get some copied and to acquire a few others between 1890 and 1894. The Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris has ten, of which eight are undoubtedly old. MSS. 2, 3, 4 and 5 came from the old Abbey of St. Germanes des Prés; N°. 6 is also old, although it was only acquired in 1820. Thanks to an inter-linear transcription and Latin translation by a European, which can be dated on palaeographical grounds between 1595 and 1620, it may be presumed that N°. 7 reached Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century and must therefore have been written before that date. According to an MS. note by Langlès, “MS. 8 seems to have been brought to France in 1742”; the MS. 5132 wrongly classed with the Arabic manuscripts is also an old Malagasy manuscript. MS. N°. 1 given by the Duc de Coislin to the Abbey of St. Germanes des Prés has coloured drawings, coarsely executed of men, animals, trees, and cabalistic figures but not a single line of text. MS. N°. 13 is a copy of four short modern manuscripts. With the except of 1 and 13, all the manuscripts are on native paper, written with the kalâm with native ink. Flacourt gives a detailed description of them in his Histoire de la grande île Madagascar (p. 194 sqq. of the edition 1661). The subject matter of the manuscript is very varied. There does not seem to have been a shura-de prototype out of which all the others proceeded. In an apparent disorder, the result of the fancy of the author or the copyist, we find collected sūras of the Kurān, interlinear lists of the names of Allāh, and of names of angels, Arabic religious texts with interlinear Malagasy translations (cf. the facsimile publ. in N. E., vol. xxxviii., 1904, p. 457); Arabic-Malagasy glossaries, magic texts, and invocations in large numbers, magic squares and formulae, texts showing the magic influence, good or bad of the planets, signs of the zodiac, lunar mansions, months, and days of the week, of the male and female character of the twelve Muhāmmadan months (Muharram is male, Sa'āf is female, and so on, in MS. N°. 2 sqq., 269), of patterns for amulets (kīriz < Arabic ژز). The sūras of the Kurān are not reproduced in the order which was settled at the revision ordered by the Caliph ʿOthman. MS. 6 gives them in the following order: fāṭha, cxv., cxlix., clixii. and so on to cxvii. (f. 2a etc.). Then come verses 1-4 of Sūra cxiv., verse 256 of li., verse 16 and beginning of verse 17 of iii. The same MS. also contains Sūra xxxi. (f. 130b) and f. 130b-134b, verses 158-159, 137, 256-259, 284-286 of Sūra ii. and verses 25-26 of Sūra iii.

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

MS. 5 contains from f. 85a to 88a an Arabic poem with Malagasy translation in honour of a certain Laiā (I have not yet been able to ascertain if this is the lover of Madjān, or of some Laila in Arabic literature). The piece begins “The poets said...” and ends “…the girl who possesses beauty and kindness”. The Arabic verses are of an unusual inaccuracy and show that whoever reproduced them had a very superficial knowledge of the language and poetry.

MS. 8 (f. 52b to 56b) preserves a khūṭba in Arabic entitled al-dīn allāh al-Muṣtaṣim bi'llāh (the text has bi-l-rād Allāh) Amr al-Mu'minin. Further on there is a reference to Sūltān ʿAbd al-Ḥānī, son of Sūltān ʿOthmān.

The mention of the last of the ʿAbbāsids caliphs seems to indicate that the Malagasy converts to Islam, among whom this khūṭba was in use, had been converted by Arabs who had left Baghdād or a country under al-Muṣtaṣim in this caliph's reign, i.e. between 640 and 656 (1242-1258). We cannot explain otherwise how this happen without the title “Commander of the Faithful” in a khūṭba used in Madagascar. As to the Sūltān ʿAbd al-Ḥānī (perhaps we should read ʿAbd al-Ḥānī) who is here”, the khāṭīf then indicating the Sūltān in question), I have not been able to identify him. As it is written, the name is neither Arabic nor Malagasy. MSS. 7 and 8 contain two identical versions of a religious text which I published in N. E. (xxxviii. 449 sqq.). In a passage devoted to the glorification of the month of Ramdān, the anonymous author succes-
sively invokes the prophets of the Old Testament, Jesus and Mary, the Prophet Muhammad, the first four caliphs, Ḥasan and Ḥusain, and finally Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān, the great Sunni Imām, and Muhammad b. Idrīs al-Shafiʿī, the founder of the Sunni school which bears his name. The mention of these two learned men and the ḥadīth already mentioned are evidence of the orthodox character of certain Muslims of Madagascar and, perhaps one may say of the generality of Muslims on the southeast coast. But the same manuscript No. 8 contains a Persian text which prevents us putting forward this conjecture. This latter text which is still unique is found on f. 255–27b. The last lines invoke the "abūra mubākhārah, then, the first eight iāmin's of the Shīa sect of the "Twelvers" (cf. 11J[XN ʿAṣākirya) to whom the author has added "All Akbar ("All the elder") of Ḥusain and half-brother of Ḥusrām b. Ṣāhel. The mention of these iāmin's of whom the last named, "All b. Ṣāhel, reigned from 135 (800) to 202 (815) is valuable, for it implies that the writer of this text belonged neither to the shiʿiatic sect of the Zakariyya founded in 695, nor to the shiʿiatic Shīa sect of the Imāmas which dates from 765, nor to the orthodox Shīa sect of the "Twelvers" which is important, for the Persians whom historical tradition makes come from Shībān and colonise Kilwa on the east coast of Africa and the island of Anjouan in the Comoro Archipelago were Zaḍīyas (cf. G. Ferrand. Les Salésiens de Kilwa, in Mémoires Henri Foutte, in the present case. The Imāmīya, whose presence in Madagascar is evident from MS. No. S thus form a separate group different from that of the Persians who had immigrated to the adjoining coast of Africa.

The Arabic–Malay manuscripts which I possess, those of the University Library of the Faculty of Letters in Algiers and the others which I have been able to see are, as a rule, much inferior to those of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with the exception of the "Ṭaḥta and the Persian text, which so far as I know are found nowhere else. Quite a considerable number of manuscripts like MS 13 contain genealogies of kings of the Southeast, from which all the documents come, and local histories One of them gives details of La Casse's campaign in the summer of 1659–1663 (cf. N. F., 1907, xxvii).

The majority of the religious texts which are found in the Arabo-Malagasy MSS. of the Royal Nat. are translated into Malay. The Arabic part is very incorrect and the Malay translation shows that the exegesis of Malagasy understand very little of it. The illustrations and bilingual Goldiner, to whom nothing Islam was foreign, was interested in the texts which I publish. Comparing three translations of the Malay text with the Arabic text he concluded that "the meaning of the fundamental ideas was most gravely misunderstood" (Les Diverses langues de l’île Maurice et de Malabo et de l’Archipel d’Azur au XIVe Siècle, in its Origines, in R.H.E., 1905)

The borrowings of the Malagasy from the Arabs who converted them to Islam are many and are found through all the tribes of the island without exception. The most notable are the names of the days of the week, in particular, "sikhi, sikhi (<"six", "figure") is the art of divination, its object is to find out what is not known and the method of discovering a remedy against it. Used throughout the island with slight variations from one tribe to another, sikhi, to take the form generally used, is a direct derivative from the Twelvers', lit. the science of sand or Arab geomancy (cf. the Kitāb al-Farṣ fi ʿIltīm al-Kaṣīlī of Sīnérah Muhammad al-Zanjū, Bth. Cairo, n. d.). Shāhī al-Zanjū's table from which is derived all these in use in Madagascar comprises the following 16 figures.
Each figure of the table bears a name of its own and is composed of a certain number of dots, maximum eight (IV) and minimum four (XII). Four figures have five dots (V, VII, VI and XV); six have six dots (II, III, VI, X, XI, XIV) and four have seven dots (I, VII, VIII, IV). Each figure governs a certain number of things or beings; according to the question put to the diviner, the latter considers very carefully the figure relating to the question asked. The influence of each of the figures comes from the sign of the zodiac, planet, day, Arab month and from one of the four elements to which it corresponds. It is also lucky or unlucky, male or female, ħālip (applying to the person consulting the fates) or maylāb (applying to the question asked); it is more or less strong and powerful in such and such conditions, and it also shows in what state the thing asked shall be realised. The 16 figures of the table are divided into different groups each bearing a particular name:

the ḏawāqid, “those who enter” which number three (XI, I, XV). If they are present in a large number in the sīlikī effected by the diviner, it is a very auspicious sign and the questioner will certainly obtain what he seeks. If one of the ḏawāqid proves to be the first figure, the object sought enters, i.e. is obtained;

the Ḳhawārid, “those who go out” are three in number (III, I, XII). If they are several times represented in the sīlikī effected by the diviner, it is an unlucky omen and the object sought will be unattainable. If one of the Ḳhawārid proves to be the first figure, the object “goes out”, i.e. is lost to the seeker;

the munkālīb, “those who return” (IV, V, VI, IX, XIV, XVI) are sometimes lucky, sometimes unlucky, according to circumstances. If one of the munkālīb is the first figure, the operation will remain without a definite result;

the Ṭāwaṣṣiḥ, “those who are fixed, who do not vary” are the figures I, II, X, XI, XIII, XV. They are lucky and assure that the seeker will gain his end;

the munkēlīb, “the dismal” are figures III, VII, VIII, XII. If the first figure is one of the munkēlīb the questioner will not obtain what he asks, or will not escape the misfortune he fears.

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

Figures II, V, VIII, XI are called mīkāli al-awtād, “what concerns the pious”. If the four figures found in it are similar the desire expressed, will be realised.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure III (Qabdat al-khârîj, Malag. aAda) is that of the family, especially brothers and sisters. Its sign of the Zodiac is Râs Ljâwazhr («the head of the Dragon»); its planet Saturn; its day, Saturday. The corresponding figure is the tenth. It is unlucky, male and fâlib. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval necessary for the accomplishment of the desire formulated is 150 days. It reaches the maximum size in the ninth place and strength in the third. Its metal is gold.

Figure IV (al-qaDma > Malag. dama, damu) is that of the country, gardens and barriers of the dead. Its sign of the Zodiac is Virgo; its planet Mercury; its day, Wednesday. The corresponding figure is the fourteenth, its element black earth. It is good or bad according to circumstances and mafîth. Its month is Ǧumādā al-Ākhir. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before the rediation of the desire expressed is 20, 55 or 130 days. It is large in the sixth place and strong in the fifth and tenth. Its metal is silver. Figure V (al-l hacker < Pers. khurâk or al-farâb) Malag. diskada) is that of children and bearers of news. Its sign of the Zodiac is Libra, its planet Venus, and its day, Friday. The corresponding figure is the twelfth. The south wind is its element. It is neither good nor bad: it is fâlib and female. Its month is Râjab. If it occupies the fourteenth place the desire expressed is satisfied the day following. It is large in the twelfth place and strong in the fourth, eighth and eleventh. Its metal is gold.

Figure VI (al-idhâf, Malag. aida, idha) is that of the sick, of cries of war, of slaves, of less of property, of remigration and of ships sailing ships of the Western Indian ocean. Its sign of the Zodiac is Aquarius; its planet Mercury; its day, Saturday. The corresponding figure is the seventh. Its element is the west wind. It is good or bad according to circumstances. tâlib or mafîth. Its month is Ǧub âl-Kaʿaḍa; it is female. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before accomplishment of the desire expressed will be fifteen days. It is large in the ninth place and strong in the eighth, eleventh and twelfth. Its metal is silver.

Figure VII (unâ > Malag. al-am) is that of husbands and wives, of women and of sexual relations. Its sign of the Zodiac is Capricorn; its planet Saturn; its day, Saturday and its element earth. The corresponding figure is the sixth. It is unlucky, tâlib or mafîth, and male or female according to circumstances. Its month is Shawwâl. If it is in the fourteenth place, it indicates an interval of 30 days before an answer to the question asked the diviner is obtained. It is large and strong in the second, ninth and eleventh. Its metal is silver.

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

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

Figure X (nasrat al-khârîj, Malag. asurwalah) is that of strength and of rulers. Its Zodiacal sign is Leo, its planet is the sun; its day, Sunday; its element fire. It is male, fâlib and very lucky. Its month is Ǧub âl-Kaʿaḍa. In the fourteenth place the interval before the accomplishment of the desire is 32 days. It is large in the tenth and strong in the thirteenth. Its metal is gold.

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

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

Figure XIII (furik > Malag. tarabik) is that of the road which leads to the house of death, to the cemetery. Its sign of the Zodiac is Cancer; its planet, the Moon; its day, Monday. The corresponding figure is the ninth, its element is water. It is lucky, mafîth and female. Its month is Ǧub âl-Kaʿaḍa. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before the accomplishment of the desire will be 50 days. It is large in the fourteenth and strong in the fifteenth. Its metal is copper.

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

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

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

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

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

When requested to consult the fates by the sīkīdī, the diviner first of all pronounces the invocation: “Awake, O God, to awaken the Sun! Awake, O Sun, to awaken the Cock! Awake, O Cock, to awaken Man (ulambelina)!” Awake, O Man, to awaken the sīkīdī; not that it may lie, not that it may lead us to error, not that it may make a laughing stock, not that it may say foolish things, not that it may deal with any matter of no importance, but that it may search out secrets, that it may see what is beyond the mountains and the other side of the forest that it may see what no human eye can see. Arise! For thy skill which comes from the Muslims with long hair (sic! silamū be vula), from the high mountains, from Rabaruba, from Templaketsiketsika, from Zaftisimaui (eponym of a tribe of the south-east converted to Islam), from Andriambavitualahi, from Rakelihuranana, from Ianakara (eponym of another south-eastern tribe, converts to Islam), from Andrinoni-Sulamatra, from Vazimba (a dwarf tribe, of African origin as the name shows; the old owners of the soil), from Anakandriananaha, from Rakelihavavula (lit. the little man with long hair)! Arise! For we do not have thee for nothing, for thou are dear and cause expense! We have taken thee in exchange for a fat zebu cow with a large hump. And for money on which there was no dust (i.e. coins which are still circulating). Awake! For thou hast the confidence of the ruler and thou expressest the judgment of the people. If thou art a sīkīdī that can speak, a sīkīdī that can see and that does not repeat (only) the gossip of people, the hen killed by its owner, the ox killed in the market, the dust which clings to the feet (i.e. a sīkīdī who does not repeat what everyone knows); awake, on the mat which is on this very spot!” (cf. Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine, 1886, p. 221). If the diviner operates with seeds, he takes up a few at random and counts them two by two until the end he has one or two which are placed at the top of the figure. The operation is repeated four times which gives the four rows of dots of the first figure.

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

```
  I
  II
  III
  IV
```

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

```
  a
  b
  c
  d
```

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

```
  V
  VI
  VII
  VIII
```

Figure IX is formed by adding horizontally the dots of I and II (in the addition + + = =, + + = =, + + = = = =). All the other figures are similarly formed: III and IV give X; V and VI give XI; VII and VIII give XII; IX and X give XIII; XI and XII give XIV;
XIII and XIV give XV; and XV and I give XVI.

The eight last figures are called banât al-banât "the daughters of the daughters":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
<th>XII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sixteen figures contain the fate of the inquirer and the diviner has to give him the meaning of each of them by interpreting them from the table of Shāhīkh al-Zanātī, which was given above (p. 714). We may therefore imagine what a high place the ahdīkī occupies in Madagascar life, and the very numerous circumstances in which recourse is had to it. The diviner was and undoubtedly still is the true manager of it. In practice it is consulted for every act of private and public life whether of the individual, family, clan or tribe. I have not been able to learn how one becomes a miṣb[i]lī. It is the speciality of certain individuals without distinction of sex or birth.

A diviner or a sorcerer may be man or woman (I have never known a woman sorcerer but have heard that there are such) The sorcerer may be of royal birth, noble or freeman (I have never heard of a sorcerer or diviner who was a slave, although slaves have been executed on charges of sorcery) The diviner or the sorcerer is very often the son or daughter of a diviner or a divineress, which assures him an extensive clientèle, for he or she is supposed to inherit the paternal (or maternal) crest. The sorcerer or diviner may be either native or foreigner I was taken for a diviner during a stay of forty mouth at Mananjary (S E coast) by the Muslim miṣb[i]līs of the district, who treated me as a colleague after I had shown them my knowledge of Islam. It was in this way that I was enabled to be initiated gradually into the practice of ṣin ib and appeal was sometimes made to it.

The area of dissemination of the ʿilm al-ḥawāl in Africa is considerable. It is found in Dārfūr and the Tafsir of Hafsa in Pesamney reveal the existence of practices closely allied to it among a West African people who are however not Muslim (cf. Ferrand, Miroirs, M. 1955, p. 128) The great annual festival of the ʿilm al-ḥawāl is only a survival under another form of the old iṣṭīʿu[t]a (p. 1) On this identification of G. Ferrand, Miroirs, M. 1955, p. 128, see below

According to the Portuguese discoverers and especially of Hecquet, the Malagasy-Malay of the S E. of the xvth century arrived during Ramėmā, erected the oblong prayer- nātī the Kūrān, but drank fermented liquors and ate pork. There were ṣin ib in the S E. which assembled of the faithful took place; but there is no mention of the existence of mosques in the early travellers and Hecquet says definitely in his preface that "the nation of which he is going to speak...has no ṣin ib nor temples". As in ʿilm [p v] the success of Islam was only mediocre in Madagascar. Malagasy does not readily assimilate foreign beliefs and customs and the latter do not profoundly modify native beliefs and customs. His whole philosophy is contained in the proverb māni ni aina, "life is sweet"; he thinks it good to be always the strict observation of the Kūrān prescriptions would have upset too much his usual life and customs. Allah proscribes fermented liquors, standing stones, games of chance and consulting the fates as abominations invented by Satan. But these abominations are particularly dear to the Malagasies; they are particularly devoted to alcoholic liquors and to gambling, believe firmly in soothsaying and standing stones (tangambatu) held in honour throughout the whole island. No doubt they venerate Allah, the Kūrān, the Prophet and saints of Islam but it is a purely verbal reverence and they are not really islamised to the degree, that for example are the negroes of the adjoining east coast of Africa.

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

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

I. Many legends give the old Vazimba, now disappeared, as tanguan-tant or ancient masters of the soil i.e. the autochthons. The name which is found in East Africa is clearly Bantu and represents an older vazimba Malag. vazimba. They are said to have been of small stature. They were perhaps nigrillo.

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

III. There was next an important immigration of Hindooedans from Sumatra (cf. G. Ferrand, L'Empire Sumatran de Cirebon) in the second-fourth centuries a.d. A word like the Malag. keti < old Malag. kiti = 100,000 < Malay ketu 100,000 < Sanskrit katu 10,000,000 is over many others testifying to this fact. These Indonesians modified the onomatological, cultural and linguistic type of the nigrillo Bantu who peopled Madagascar.

IV. Arrival of Arabs in the sixth-ninth centuries and conversion of the Malagasies to Islam. These Arabs probably came from the Persian Gulf and belonged to the Sunna.

V. Another immigration of Sumatrans at the end of the tenth century. I consider the Wākṭā to be western Islanders, as I shall explain in the article wākṭā. The book of the Wonders of the World (Adīgī al-Hind, ed. by van der Lath, and trans by M. Devé) mentions a piratical campaign by these Wākṭā in 334 (945) in the Western India Ocean. It is probable that we have here a reference to the migration led by Ramūni the
“Sumatran” or Raminia “the Sumatran” (fem.). His elder son Ra-Hadzi was the ancestor of the tribe of Zafni-d-Raminia, “the descendants of Raminii”, of the S.E. coast of Madagascar. The younger son, Ra-Kuka, went into the interior of the island, reached the plateau of Imerina where he married a Vazimba woman. Ra-Kuka was the ancestor of Hova who bear his name.

VI. Coming of Persians of the sect of the “Twelvers” later than the reign of ‘Alī al-Riḍā (185-190 = 800-815).

VII. Tenous of other Arabs in the reign of the ‘Albāṣid caliph al-Mustāṣim, in the middle of the thirteenth century of our era.


Al-Madā’in: a mediaeval Arab town or rather a group of towns in al-’Irāk (Ibbânlânia) about 20 miles S.E. of Baghdađ lying on either side of the Tigris in two almost equal portions. The name al-Madā’in (plur. of al-Madīna) “the towns” is explained from the fact that the two capitals situated opposite one another, Seleucia on the west and Ctesiphon on the east, was built between 312 and 301 B.C., and Ctesiphon on the east (the first reference to which is in 221 B.C.), the winter residence of the Parthian and Sasanian kings, with several other places close at hand were regarded as forming a whole. The Semitic Aramaeans who formed the bulk of the population under the Arsakids and Sasanians comprised the whole group under the name Maḥbūs or Mūnibhūs “the towns”, which latter word the Arabs adopted in the plural form al-Madā’in peculiar to their language. Following the Sasanians, the Arabs reckoned seven towns in al-Madā’in, the official names of which they partly arabisised.

On the west bank lay Bah-rasir, corrupted by the Arabs to Behrāsir (often wrongly read Baharāsir and Nahr Shir or Sir; cf. Streck, Babylonien, p. 262, note 3). The name does not mean “good (is) Ardeşîr” as it is often explained but “house (i.e. foundation) of Ardeşîr” (cf. thereon, Noldeke, W. Z. K. M., xvi., 1902, p. 7: Weh = Aram. Bē). In Syria the Talmudic literature Behrāsir is usually called Rēbāsir (= Kohele of the late classical writers) and Maḥbūs = (= the town”). It occupied the lower southern half of the former Greek town. A parasang (c. 3 miles) north of it was the village of Darzadhān (also Darzādān), arabisised to Darzādān. On the east bank stood Ctesiphon. The Arab historians and geographers usually reproduce this name, which is not Greek but very probably indigenous (Iranian?) by Twaināfūn; but we also find Tusfūn and Tusāfin corresponding exactly to the presumed Palhāvi form (Tosfūn, Tosbūn). On these place-names cf. the very full discussion by Streck in Pauly-Wissowa, l.c., Suppl. vol. iv. 1102 ff. Not uncommonly the town on the east bank, much more important for the Muslims, is called al-Madâ’in (e.g. in al-Ṭisakhī, B. G. A., i. 87.?). About an hour’s journey away, south of Ctesiphon stood Weh Antoşi-kī Khosraw (= Antioch, house of Khosrow). The Arabs, who founded it in 1921, by Ehsâwar I Anushawrin, which settled with the deported inhabitants of Antioch ad Onontem destroyed in 540 and is said to have been planned on the model of the Syrian capital,
Rūmīyā = Rome or (New) Rome or Byzantium. The Syriac sources distinguish this new foundation from the older towns by the name Ṣa'da'ī bīt-hāštā = "New town".

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

As far as the Parthian period there was a stone bridge to convey the traffic between the two thickly populated banks of the Tigris, which the historian Ḫamaṣa al-Iṣfahānī (cf. his Taʾrikh, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 31, 16) describes as a marvel; but already in his day (beginning of the fourth = tenth century) there was no longer any trace of it. Under the Sāšānians a second bridge (of boats?) was erected. In the Muslim period however there was still only a bridge of boats.

In Yarsāfīn-Tesiphon two main quarters are distinguished, the northern "old town", Arab al-Madā'in al-ʿuttāba and the southern, ʿAblānāb (ʿAblānāb, ʿAbūlānāb, and other variants of the name).

The "old town" probably represents the oldest settlement on the east bank, the foundation of the Parthian period. In it was a royal palace which the Arabs called al-Kāṣr al-ʿabīyāf = "the white palace" (there were other palaces of the same name elsewhere; cf. the article Kāʾṣar, s. v.), probably the residence originally of the Sasanian kings built by one of the last Arsakids or first Sasanians. The southern quarter ʿAblānāb also included a royal residence, the Ṣawīn (= pillared hall, palace), usually described more definitely by the Arab authors of the middle ages as Ṣawīn al-ʿāṣir (= Pers.-Khosrow, Chosroes, the general title of the Sasanian kings among the Arabs; cf. Streck, Seleucia u. Kleisphōn, p. 37, note 1) Its builder is known with certainty to have been Sapor (Sāpor) I (243-272 A.D.). It may be noted that later Arab historians often confuse the "white palace" and the Ṣawīn.

It can hardly be supposed that the site of al-Madā'in, so favoured by nature, at the point where the Euphrates and Tigris most nearly approach each other, was without any considerable settlement until the time of Seleucus I. There is on the contrary every indication that the town of Ḥudayrī (written ideographically Ḥūdayrī, dating back to remote antiquity like its -sceen-on ʿIp) the OPT of the cities, cannot well be located anywhere else than on the site of the older towns of Seleucia and Ctesiphon or in the immediate neighbourhood. What the Arab writers say about the founder of al-Madā'in is worthless. They ascribe the foundation to mythical kings of the old Iranian epic like Ḍa信访 and Tāmārā and other celebrated rulers of the east like Nūrūd-dīn or ʿAbd al-Rahōmī, Alexander; for Nūrūd-dīn see Abl-Fadlī-Bāqhaib, Taʾrikh, p. 203, ed. p. 50, 2.)

For the pre-Muhammadan history of al-Madā'in which does not fall within the scope of this work cf. Streck, Seleucia u. Kleisphōn, and the references to articles in Pauli-Wischnius. The Arabic sources contain much valuable information for the Sasanian period; the most valuable is Tabari's history (cf. Noldeke, Gesch. der Pers. u. Aras. im A. v. Zeit der Sasan. , Leyden 1879). We may here mention that under the later Sāšānians, Ctesiphon, to some extent, lost its popularity as the winter capital, for they, especially Khosrow II Parvēz (599-628), preferred Dastgerd to it, three days journey to the north on the very old "royal road" (cf. Dastagīrī).

We have fairly full information about the conquest of al-Madā'in by the Arabs, especially the great chronicles of Tabari (1. 2426-2456) and Ibn al-ʿAṣir (ed. Tornberg, ii. 396-403; cf. also Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, iii. 732 sq; Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, vi. 68 sqy, and Streck, Seleucia u. Kleisphōn, p. 38-41). After the glorious battle of al-Kaldisiya, which made the Arabs masters of ʿIrāk west of the Tigris (cf. above, ii, p. 612 b), the Caliph ʿ Omar ordered Saʿd b. Abī Waḳāṣ, who was then in command of the Muslim troops operating in the ʿIrāk, to march on the Persian capital. Saʿd advanced, fighting several battles on the Tigris and appeared before Behrāsīr in the first half of January 637 (= end of 16 A.H.). The strongly fortified town which was bravely defended was besieged and stormed in vain for two months. In the end the Persians whose supplies were exhausted fled by night unnoticed over the river so that when the Arabs stormed the town soon afterwards they found it quite deserted. A few days later the invaders were able by using a convenient ford to cross the Tigris, much swollen by the spring floods. This almost miraculous crossing effected without any loss is a much celebrated event in Muslim history; it is one of the famous "days" of the period of the conquest. The Persians had not expected that the Arabs would win their way across. The king had taken refuge with his family and court in Ḥulwān (q.v.); the army had retired to Ṣīr Nahravān (about 24 miles north of Ctesiphon). Only a few regiments remained at the palace in the capital. At the end of March 637 Saʿd made his triumphal entrance through the deserted streets. The progress of the Arab operations had not given the Persians sufficient time to carry off the vast treasures accumulated in Ctesiphon. These all fell into the hands of the victors. The Arabic sources give many interesting details of the very valuable objects which were captured not only in Ctesiphon but in the pursuit of the Persian army. The total value of the booty taken in Ctesiphon was estimated at 900 million dirhems (of a nominal value of nine pence but it varied a great deal).

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

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

In the history of the Umayyad and 'Abbasid periods al-Madâ'in was as a rule no longer of any prominence. It only played a part of some importance in the civil wars of the first two centuries of Islam, those provoked by the Khâridjîs as well as those provoked by the 'Alida. The Muslim inhabitants of al-Madâ'in were, it seems, always strong supporters of the Shi'a. They were also hostile to the Khâridjî movement. As early as 458 there was fighting around al-Madâ'in between 'Alî and the Khâridjîs. An attempt by the latter (in 664) to seize Ctesiphon from Bahrasîr was thwarted by the commander there who had Shi'a sympathies, by destroying the bridge of boats. The Khâridjîs however later succeeded in twice gaining temporary possession of al-Madâ'in, e.g. in 688 when the Khâridjî group of the Azârkiya [q. v.] wrought great slaughter among the Muslims who did not belong to their party. The second occupation of al-Madâ'in in 696 was achieved by the Khâridjî leader Shâbib b. Yazid. On these events cf. J. Wellhausen, Die religions-polit. Oppositions-partien im alten Islam (v. Abb. G. W. G., N. F., vol. v., N. 2 [1901], p. 21, 36, 43, 45; R. Brunnow, Der historische Charakter des alten Ommajîn, Leyden 1884, p. 22, 92. With the death of Shâbib b. Yazid, the power of the Khâridjîs was broken, but as late as 751 'Abbasid troops had to be sent to suppress a leader of these rebels; cf. A. Muller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande, t. 440.

As regards the 'Alid wars in the 1stâk the most important campaign was that of Hasân to al-Madâ'in in the year 691. Hasân lived there in the "white palace". Cf. on this expedition, the Arabic accounts of which differ not inconceivably: Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, i. 244; Flügel, Gesch. der Araber, Leipzig 1867, p. 158—159; A. Müller, op. cit., i. 336 and especially J. Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz, Berlin 1902, p. 146. In the latter Shi'a troubles of al-Madâ'in appears in 684—686 and 714 as supporting the 'Alids; cf. Wellhausen, Die religions-polit. Oppositionspart., p. 72, 73, 80, 98. The importance of al-Madâ'in as an objective in these civil wars is evident from the fact that in those days the military road from Baṣra to Kufr did not go through the desert along the Arabian bank of the Tigris but went across the canals to the Tigris at al-Madâ'in and from thence over further canals to the Euphrates; cf. Wellhausen, Die religions-polit. Opp., p. 85, note 3.

The Caliph al-Ma'mûn was repeatedly forced to lead an army against al-Madâ'in; in 817, when in the troubles arose over the succession on the death of Hârûn al-Rashîd the Banû Quraysh b. Musâdefended the town against Ma'mûn (cf. i., p. 6058) and in 815 when an 'Alid rebel Abu 'I-Sâyâyâ (al-Sarî b. Masûr, cf. iv., p. 170) who had seized the town was besieged in it. For the rest we do not hear much more of al-Madâ'in in the 'Abbasid period; its two main components, Tâsafûn and Bahrasîr, continued for several centuries more to enjoy the modest existence of small country towns. As regards Rûmîya which was included in the system of towns forming al-Madâ'in, the Caliph al-Masûr had temporarily held his court there in 754 and had caused Abî Muslim [q. v.] to be treacherously murdered there (Yâkût, ii. 867; 2; Strock, Babylonien, ii. 268). But about the middle of the tenth century this place according to al- Masûrî (Murâdî al-Nakbâb, ed. Paris, ii. 200) was already completely deserted: the wall round it built of thick bricks was the sole relic of it left. When Yâkût wrote in the early decades of the xiiiith century (cf. his Ma’qûm, i. 768; v. 447, 7) the whole of the east side of al-Madâ'in, i.e. Tâsafûn in particular was already completely deserted; on the west bank still stood Behrasîr, a small town, practically a village, inhabited by peasants who practised only agriculture. It was now known as al-Madâ'in.

When Jalâl with his Mongol hordes was advancing to conquer the Caliph's capital in 1257, he pitched his camp in the ruins of the Iwan and in the following year, after he had been joined by the troops of the Mongol princes, he marched on Baghdâd; cf. Rashid al-Dîn, Hist. des Mongols de la Persé, ed. Quatremère, Paris 1836, p. 266. The author of the Ma’rûdî al-Itlîdî (ed. Juyboli, iii. 62) who wrote an epitome of Yâkût and died in 1328 is also acquainted with Bahrasîr as a little town inhabited exclusively by Shi’is, as is also Bâkûwi who about 1403 prepared a synopsis of the geography of al-Kazwîn [q. v.]; cf. the French translation of the latter Talâtîb al-Alâbîr by de Guignes in N. e., ii., 1789, p. 424. When Behrasîr became deserted is unknown. Presumably the disastrous invasion of the Mongols under Timûr at the beginning of the xvîth century which was so fatal to so many once flourishing towns of the lands of the Euphrates and Tigris also caused the collapse of this last settlement in the territory of al-Madâ'in.

It was not till the xiiiith century that a modest village arose on the site of Ctesiphon, a little north of the ruins of the Iwan of the in sight of the highly venerated sanctuary of Sâlûm Pâh and called after him. This consisted on my visit in 1927 of a single street of mud-houses and hânîs where the numerous Shi’i pilgrims who pass through here and put up. The brilliance of the place was mainly supplied by the ruins of the Iwan especially of the north wing of its great hall which collapsed in 1888; cf. Herfeld, op. cit., ii. 63.

In the Great War the site of al-Madâ’in was the scene of desperate fighting, momentous in its results. This is usually called the Battle of Ctesiphon. When the Anglo-Indian army under General Townshend in the late autumn of 1915 began an advance from the fortress of Kût al-‘Amîn along the Tigris to the north to try to take Baghdâd, it was defeated on the 22nd and 23rd November 1915 in the district of the ruins of al-Madâ’in by the Turks. The fighting over the east bank; the British line of battle ran on the east of the ruins of the Iwan and the little village near it. This reverse forced Townshend to retire to Kût al-‘Amîn, which was soon afterwards surrounded by the Turks and capitulated after a five months' siege on April 29th 1916. For further particulars of this battle, the greatest on the Mesopotamian front in the world war, see the works on this subject; cf. especially General Townshend's My Campaign in Mesopotamia (London 1919), p. 193 sq., 171—154, with plan of the battle (map 7).

In connection with this brief sketch of the history of al-Madâ’in it may be mentioned that one of the most distinguished scholars in the
field of Arabic history was born here, namely 'Ali b. M. al-Maḍā'īn [cf. the next article], born 753, d. between 830 and 845. His work itself has not survived but may be partly reconstructed from the numerous extracts in Baladhuri, Tabari, Yahyā, the Kitāb al-Thadhhib, etc., so that we have an idea of its contents; cf. Brockelmann, G. A. E., i. 140—

As to the mint history of al-Maḍā'īn, neither the name al-Maḍā'īn, nor as we might perhaps expect, Taibāf or Behraiz is found on the coins of the Muslim period; on the other hand we have a considerable number of pieces with the inscription al-bāb "the gate" which undoubtedly belong to our city. The Arabs adopted the custom of the Sassanians who gave their coins struck in Ctesiphon the mint name Bābīz (= the gate), which is to be interpreted like "Sublime Porte" as the official epithet of their royal capital (cf. the official designation of Constantinople as Δυτικόν Σταύλον "Gate of Bliss"). We have not only a series of Arabic coins with the mint name al-bāb down to the end of the Umayyad period but also a few pieces of Sassanian type with the legend Bābāz, on the latter (specimens of the year 67—68 cf. Nauck, Kalālig. des orient. Münzen in den kgl. Mus. zu Kiel, i (1898) p. 102. Coins are also found occasionally with the mint al-Maḍā'īn d'Assis, the name of the northern quarter of Ctesiphon (with the Sassanian royal palace: cf. above). For the Arab coins of the ninth century cf. articles of various writers in Z. P. M. G., iix. 504—505, xxx. 148 sq.; xxxii. 691; xxxiv. 25, 58; xlil. 592; cf. also Streck, Scl. und Ktes., p. 37—88 and the references there given.

Here we can only refer briefly to the important part which al-Maḍā'īn played in the church history of the east independent of Rome, especially Nestorian Christianity. The see of Seleucia, said to have been first erected in the time of the apostles, was the premier diocese in the east. As supreme head of all the Nestorian bishops, in the Sassanian period as well as in that of the Caliphs as patriarch of the east the occupant of the see of Seleucia bore the title Kāthīk. A number of important churches were held at his official residence in the course of centuries. The episcopal cathedrals were in Behraiz (New Seleucia) which the Syriac sources usually called Kökhe (cf. above): hence the official title of the patriarchate, "Church of Kökhe". Besides, the official church of the bishop there were in al-Maḍā'īn in the quarters on either bank a whole series of other Christian churches, the names of which are occasionally found in Syriac and Arabic texts. From Seleucia

the Nestorian church developed considerable missionary activity, extending even to the Far East and reaching its zenith in the period from the sixth to the ninth century. Under the Abbāsids 25 metropolises — the first in rank after the Katholikos was the bishop of Kaskat [q.v.] — each of whom in turn had 6—12 suffragans under him, acknowledged the authority of the see of Seleucia. All the metropolises received their investiture in the cathedral of Kökhe. Soon after the foundation of Baghdād (762) the Katholikos also moved from Behraiz (Kökhe), now declining politically and commercially, to the new capital of the empire in order, as religious and political head of the Christian community, the more effectively to champion their interests there at the court of the Caliph, where he usually enjoyed considerable prestige. But each new patriarch continued to be ceremonially installed in the mother church at Kökhe (probably down to the end of Abbāsid rule). For further information on the organization of al-Maḍā'īn in oriental church history cf. Streek, Babylonien, ii. 274—275: do., Sel. und Ktesiph., p. 42—7. 64 (sources in Syriac literature); J. Labour, Le christianisme dans l'emprise perse, Paris 1904.

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

Finally it may be briefly recalled that al-Maḍā'īn possesses considerable interest for the history of Judaism, especially for the Talmudic period of it. As in the Hellenistic period, the Jews under Sassanian and Arab rule had also their main settlement on the west bank in Behraiz which in Jewish sources is usually called Mahzā, "the town". There, as in the Greek Seleucia (cf. Streek, Sel. und Ktes., p. 10, 21), they formed an exceedingly high percentage of the inhabitants, indeed at times they seem to have been in the majority. That they are described as very rich is not surprising in view of the great importance of al-Maḍā'īn as a trading centre down to the time of the rise of Baghdād. At the same time their character is unfavourably described by the Mahzanēs; it differed from that of the other Jews of Babylonia which is perhaps mainly to be explained by the fact that there were many proselytes among them. They also had a famous college, which was however only the intellectual centre of Babylonian Judaism under Rabah bar Joseph (b. 229 A.D.), a native of Mahzā, and at other times was inferior to the other Jewish centres of learning in Babylonia. Nehardea, Sura and Pumbeditha. For further Jewish accounts of al-Maḍā'īn, cf. A. Berliner, Vater, zur Geogr. nach Ethnogr. Babylonien im Talmud und Midrash, Berlin 1883, p. 19, 23—24, 39—43: 61—62; see also Streek, Sel. und Ktesiph., 47, 63 and 64 (bibliography). Apart from the wretchedly modern village of Salmān Pāk the whole of the area of the town of al-Maḍā'īn measuring about 60 square miles is quite uninhabited. It is only from the middle of the xvith century that we have more or less full accounts of it by European travellers: cf. Streek, Sel. und Ktesiph., p. 47—8. The first systematic topographical and archaeological examination of the extensive ruined site was made by E. Herzfeld, who visited it five times between 1903 and
1911. He dealt fully with the results of his examination in 1914 in the second volume (not published till 1920) of his and Sarre's *Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigristeben*; cf. ii., p. 46—76 and the pictures on Plates xxxix—xliv (Vol. iii.) and cxxii—cxxxvii (Vol. iv.). Herzfeld gives (ii. 51) the first plan of the whole area prepared by him in 1911; cf. this reduced to 1/4 of the original also in Streck, *Sel. u. Babyt.* p. 50 and in Pauly-Wissowa, *op. cit.* iv., Vol. iv., 1106.

Of the towns on the west bank, notably Seleucia, there has survived from the Hellenistic period only remnants of the old city wall (al-sīr), a double wall of gigantic dimensions, on the north and (less considerable) south side. The whole west side of the old city is now sunk in a permanent swamp (harā) formed since 1900 of the annual inundations. Within the south half of the ancient city walls, there now rise from the otherwise flat plain two mounts of rubble about 15 feet high (djara'a), which in the 'Irak is practically synonymous with tell), namely the Djara'at al-Bārida and the Djara'at al-Buṭt al-Kādī. The former which takes its name (powder-millhill) from a powder-mill which used to stand there to supply the Turkish troops, may, from the finds of pottery, conceal an important part of the Sasanian foundation of Behistun. The second hill with the legendary name Djara'at (or Djara') al-Buṭt 'al-Ḳadī's daughter' may very well mark the site of the several times mentioned citadel of Seleucia-Kōkhā. Beyond the above mentioned permanent swamp, further hills and walls may be seen: — Tell ʿUmair (or Djara'at ʿUmair), Khusūf or Abū Hulayṣifya, al-Ṣuṣifya, al-Khāyāmīyat and Tell al-Dhahab. They perhaps all fell within the area of Seleucia, and probably come from suburbs of it.

The ruins on the east bank, that of the village of Salamān Fāk. After isolated wall-like ruins of walls and canals, the first considerable unit we reach is a large quarter of the town running for a mile along the Tigresi, one of the Hellenistic Seleucia covering 1,400 yards in breadth enclosed by a notable mediaeval destroyed wall of clay: — hence the name al-Tawalābi, the little clay-wall. Within this area lie a few farmplaces with palm-groves, mulberry trees and fields. Al-Tawaliba with its immediate vicinity must mark the site of Madina al-ʿAtiqa, the northern quarter of Ctesiphon. A second area filled with ruins is found around the village of Salamān Fāk and around the Iwān.

The village street of Salamān Fāk leads in a straight line to the much venerated tomb of Salamān al-Fārisī (Salamān the Persian) or, as it is usually called locally, of Salamān Fāk, *S. the Pure*. He is said to have been born in the town, to have adopted Islam and as Apostle to the Persians' is one of the most popular Shi'a saints. According to Muslim tradition he died at an advanced age in 656 or 657 in al-Madain, where the Caliph ʿOmar appointed him governor; it should be noted however that the Arab stories of Salamān's share in the conquest of the 'Irāq and in the government of al-Madain are little credible. Cf. on Salamān vol. iv., p. 116 and Streck, *Sel. und Ktes.* p. 53—54. The mausoleum with the alleged grave of Salamān which is crowned by a dome (it used to be shown in the vicinity of Isfahān) stands on the south side of a court enclosed by a high white turreted wall and in its present form may date from the first half of the xviith century, when it was renovated by Sultan Murad IV (1623—1640). In 1907—1908 the building was restored. A description of the interior by Kāsim al-Duḍqūlī is given in Herzfeld, *op. cit.* ii., p. 262, note 1.

South-west of Salamān Fāk about 1,000 yards from it close to the bank of the Tigris is a second Muslim tomb with a dome, that of Huḍhafa b. al-Yāmān, one of the "councillors" of Muhammad. The latter, an ardent champion of the 'Abid cause, obtained, we are told, great merit by building the first mosque in al-Madain and died in 657 in Kūfā: on him see Baldhārī, p. 289; Tabari, i. 2452; Streck, *BABYLONIA*, ii. 262; Herzfeld, *op. cit.* ii. 59.

The tradition that these two companions of the Prophet are buried here is old and goes back to the third (ninth) century — the earliest reference is in Yaʿqūbi, *B. G. A.*, vii. 320. Of the thousands of Persian pilgrims who annually visit the great Shi'a shrines of the 'Irāq (Kerbilā), Nādirā, Kāṣīmān and Sāmārā) many chose to visit Salamān Fāk as one of the stages on the way out or home.

K. Niebuhr (cf. his *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien*, Copenhagen 1778, ii. 306) heard of a tomb of a third companion of the Prophet in al-Madain, namely that of ʿAbd Allāh b. Salām, [p. 2.] a Jew of al-Madina. The latter was a strenuous opponent of ʿAlī — never to come to the 'Irāq so far as we know. The Salāhndī Buḥdādī of 1317 (1906), p. 256 (according to Herzfeld, *op. cit.* mentions in addition to Ḥudhafa a certain ʿAbd Allāh al-Anṣari, buried in al-Madain, but I think his statement like that of Niebuhr (or rather his informants) is not to be relied upon. There is possibly some confusion with ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabī, who is said to have been of Jewish origin and accompanied the Caliph ʿAlī to the 'Irāq, but was there banished by him, as his extravagant enthusiasm for him made him a nuisance, to al-Madain, where he may have died. Details of his end are not known. Herzfeld suggests that ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥulaybī, who according to Yaʿqūbi (p. 410) was murdered by the Khārdoj in 36 (658) while acting as ʿAlī's representative in al-Madain. As the interior of Salamān's sanctuary is said to contain two graves, the second may be claimed as that of this uncertain ʿAbd Allāh and not as that of the last Caliph Musta'ṣim executed by Ḥulaybī, as Mignard, *Travels in Chaldea*, London 1829, p. 78 says: he is followed by W. Alusworth, *Narrative of the Euphrates Expedition*, London 1855, ii. 276. For the existence of a tomb of a Caliph at al-Madain there is no literary authority. As to the second area of ruins, which begins south of Salamān Fāk, it is generally agreed that the great hall of Tahk Ikhār ("arch of Kish") and of the celebrated Iwan which will be dealt with briefly below. In the immediate vicinity of the Tahk, four groups of ruins may be distinguished in which the most notable is an oblong mound 20 feet high in the south, called locally ʿHusāni-i ʿKaisa, "the harem of Kish", the hyena hill. It certainly conceals a single building. All these groups of ruins which fringe the Tahk on the four sides undoubtedly belong to the palace of the Iwan, which must have covered an area about 400 yards long and 500 broad. Some 500 yards S. E. of the ruins of al-Tahk, behind an irrigation canal the surface shows fewer but continuous remains
of buildings, which stretch to a corner of the wall, called Bistān-i Kisrā, "the garden of Kisrā"; which perhaps enclosed a park for animals. A thousand yards S.W. of Bistān-i Kisrā rises another mound, 20—25 feet high, almost square at the base, Tell al-Dhahab = "Gold-hill" or Khusraut Kisrā = "Treasury of Kisrā". It is apparently one large building, perhaps the treasure-house built by Khosrau II (cf. Tabari, i. 1042).

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

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

For the place of Iwan in the history of art and the date of its origin, the reader may be referred to Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 74 sq. According to him the building shows a mixture of Oriental and Hellenistic styles. Sapor (Sabur) 1 (241—272) is the only possible builder; Khosrau I (531—579) seems to have undertaken a considerable restoration of the whole. The most characteristic part of Iwan, which clearly shows it was mainly intended for a palace of audience, is the great hall, in the Māsānian period the scene of ceremonial public audiences and receptions by the sovereigns. Nothing has survived of the architectural details of the Iwan, and the stucco or mortar coating in which these found expression has fallen off. The Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum in Berlin possesses stucco rosettes, which Herzfeld (Z. f. d. M. G. Ixxv., 1927, p. 226) identified as ornaments from the Iwan. In the interior, the palace, as we know from the accounts of the Arabs, was adorned with pictures and images in gilt relief. When the Muslims, pending the building of a mosque of their own, used the great hall of the Iwan provisionally after the capture of Ctesiphon, the paintings remained there intact and were still to be seen two centuries later. For example in the ninth century we find the poet Abū 'Uṣāda al-Buḥurī (cf. i., p. 773), who wrote a very fond of describing palaces, describing the Iwan in a famous poem from his own observation; see this poem in the edition of his Diwān printed at Stambul in 1300 (1882) (Vol. i., 108 sq). Almost the whole text is also given in Yākūt, i., 427—429; pieces of it in al-Khitat Khāshānī (Salman, p. 90—91) and in Kayrūnī, ed. Wustenfeld, ii., 304.

The majesty remains of Ctesiphon, which from early times have always made a deep impression on the Oriental mind, very soon inspired the imagination of the poets. The Persian poet Afšāl al-Din b. 'Ali Khākānī (d. 595 = 1200 [q.v.]) wrote an elegy on al-Madā'in, one of his best works; cf. Streck, in Grundriss d. iran. Phil., ii. 264. This was printed in Stambul in 1330 (1912) and in Berlin 1543 (1924). This latter edition entitled Aweyn-i Modā'in, a poème de Khākānī, adapted et augmenté par quelques poètes contemporains (pahl. No. 5 of the Iranşahr press) has a critical historical introduction by Dr. Riđā Tewfik and a commentary by the modern Persian writer Ḥusain Dāndī; on it, cf. E. G. Browne, The Persian Poetry of Modern Persia (Cambridge, 1914), p. 307.

Muslims regard the abandoned and ruined remains of the Persian royal city as monuments of the victory of their religion (on the alleged omen of the collapse of 14 pinnacles of the Iwan in the night of Muḥammad's birth, see Streck, Sel. una Babylon., p. 6) and as impressive symbols of fallen greatness. Like the pyramids, we find them in Arabic poetry as the regular symbol of the transitoriness of worldly power: cf. for example the verses of al-Tifūšī in Maḥfzī, al-Kāfītī; the chapter on the pyramids, ed. by E. Graefe (Leipzig, 1911), p. 47 and 58 (and 94). The Būyid Sulṭān Ḥabīl al-Dawla (1025—1045) recorded his visit there by incising on the wall of the Iwan two verses proclaiming the transitoriness of worldly things (see Yākūt, i., 429, s.): cf. also Streck, op. cit., p. 61. The Arabs reckoned the Iwan, like the pyramids, among the wonders of the world (cf. e.g. Ibn al-Fakhr, B. C. A. A., v. 255); indeed it was held to be the work of man but of the demons, the Dīnān [q.v.]. Quite early many legends became associated with the Iwan, most of which centre round the figure of Khosrau Anūshgarwān, still proverbial in the east for his generosity: e.g. the story of the old woman's hut which the king, undertook to guard within the precincts of the palace (see Streck, Babylonien, ii., 256—258; Streck, Sel. and Kītāb, p. 50 and J. A., 1851, Vol. 15, p. 489) which Herzfeld (op. cit., p. 68) traces to the lack of symmetry in the façade; also the story of the "chain of justice" to which petitions were attached (initiated by Ikhrān in Tabriz: cf. j. v. Hammer, Geschichte der Iskāhān, Darmstadt 1843, ii. 339) which according to Bormont still seem to be known among the people around al-Madā'in; cf. the legend published by him in Le Liban, La Revue du Domain, May 1926, p. 10—11: La Légende du Mena d'eau taken down from the lips of a Bedouin there.

Down to the accession of the 'Abbāsid the Iwan seems to have been practically intact; then they began to use it as a quarry but this was abandoned as too costly, the yield being far below the cost of obtaining it. As to the Caliph who ordered it to be taken down, authorities differ. Al-Mānsūr is usually given (754—775) but very often Harūn al-Rašīd also (786—809). In any case the partial destruction of the Iwan under the early 'Abbāsid is an assured fact; cf. Streck, Babylonien, ii., 255—256, 259; do, Sel. and Kītāb, p. 61—62; Herzfeld, ii. 63. The Iwan with the exception of the great hall and two wings of the façade had been destroyed by this time; for the part that was spared, the name Tāk-i Kissrā—now popularly pronounced Tāk-i Késrā as a rule—
came into use, first, I believe, in Rashid al-Din (Hist. des Mongols de la Perse, ed. Quatremère, p. 266), Yakut (i. 425), as well as Bākūwī (c. 1400) after him, know only the arched hall flanked by two wings as remains of the Iwān. The building remained in this state practically unaltered till 1888 when on April 5th on the occasion of a high flood the northern front wing collapsed, probably undermined by the ruthless robbery of bricks. An attempt was made a few years ago to save the threatened south wing by securing its foundations. Pictures of the Tāq-i Kisrā before and after 1888 may be found in Fr. Langenegger, Die Baukunst des Irān (Dresden 1911, p. 16.

The Kašr-āb-Adyəd, the “White Palace”, has been cleared of the stones of the capture of Ctesiphon it was spared by the Arabs like the Iwān. The Muslim general Sa’ad took up his quarters in it. It met its fate in the reign of the Caliph al-Muktafi (902–908) who had it destroyed to provide building material to complete the al-Tādi palace on the east side of Bagdad; cf. Streek, Babylonien, ii. 122; ii. 259; Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 63.

Systematic excavations have never been conducted on the site of al-Madā’in. The antiquities found here come from isolated chance finds; for a list of these see Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. iv., p. 1166–1167. The Deutsche Orientgesellschaft has just (autumn of 1927) begun work at al-Madā’in; and it is to be hoped that this enterprise, which on a considerable scale, will yield valuable results for the archaeology, history and topography of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, especially on disputed points which can only be decided by the spade.


The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
"l-Akrād of the Fihrist, 103, 14. There still exist only parts 1 and 2 of the K. al-Żawīs (Fihrist, 104), in the Zāhiriyah of Damascus (e.g. 'Abd al-Zayyāt, Khārisīn al-Kutub fi Dimashq wa-Damāsку, p. 28, N°. 1, 3). Of his historical works his K. Ḥabūr al-Ḫalīfa 'al-Kabīr seems to have been the most comprehensive. It came down to the reign of al-Mu'tasim. Tabari's account of the end of the reign of the caliph Hīṣām in 125 and the beginning of the reign of al-Walīd seems to be based on it, although for 'Umayyad history he generally prefers Abū Mīkha'il. The K. al-Dawla al-'Abbāsiyya, according to Yākūt, Irshād, v. 315, 8, consisted of several books, some of which were still available to him in Sukkāri's manuscript. He is wrong however in thinking that this work was unknown to Ibn al-Nadīm, for it is evidently the K. al-Dawla of the Fihrist, 103, 19, but it was omitted in the copy used by him. Of his historical monographs, the one used most copiously by Tabari was his history of Khurāṣān, the title of which K. Futūh Khurāṣān already given in the Fihrist, 103, 19, made its subject plain; it is a most important source for the history of Central Asia in the period of the Muslim conquest. His history of Başra (Fihrist, p. 103, 9) seems also to have been Tabari's main source for his account of this town. As his authority Tabari gives 'Umar b. Shabba; in one passage he definitely mentions the latter's K. Ḥabūr Aḥl al-Baṣra (i. 168, 10); perhaps he knew Madżīn's work through the intermediary of 'Umar b. Shabba. Lastly Madżīn's work on the Khāridjīs was used not only by Tabari but also by Bābāhīr in the K. al-Ḫalīfa (Ahwardi's Anonymous), by Mubarrad in the Kāmil and Abu 'l-Farādj al-Ḫīṣānī in the K. al-Ḫīṣānī. His separate work on the battle of Nahrawān has been used by Tabari for the year 38. From his history of Madīna (Fihrist, p. 103, 23) al-Bābāhīr seems to have taken his statements in the K. al-Futūh, p. 11, 2; 13, 6; 47, 17 and he seems to have been acquainted with Madżīn's numerous other monographs on the history of the conquest. Among al-Maḳdisī's pupils, al-Zabārī b. Bakkār, is the best known conserver of his work, which was however rendered obsolete in the next generation by the systematic works of Bābāhīr and Tabari.


MADĀR. [See Ghāzi Miyan.]

MADDA (α.), a philosophical term = hayyūla, Gr. φῶς, like its correlative Īsara, Gr. ἵππος, a word of varied significance. In general it means that which can possibly exist (δυνατός) but which really is not (has no form) but may become something through the adoption of opposed determinatives (forms). As the realisation of the possible is conceived as advancing by stages, a lower stage of form may again be conceived as material for a higher form of development. The question is further complicated even in Aristotle by the distinction between a physical and a logical material (this consists in the conception of species, which is formed by the specific differentia) and by the division of the physical into a heavenly and an earthly material. In addition there were further different, especially neo-Platonic, influences among the Arab philosophers.

The fourfold division of matter is very common, e.g. in the Ikhwān al-Safā': 1. prime matter, either directly or indirectly an emanation from the divine being, i.e. an intelligible matter conceived, according to Pseudo-Empedocles, as the first emanation but usually explained as in neo-Platonism as the last in the series (spirit, soul, nature), often defined as the efflux of light from the light of God; 2. the matter of the universe as a whole, especially and permanently, of the heavenly spheres, which first of all adopts the indefinite form of corporeality (extent) or at once the three definite dimensions; 3. the matter of the four earthly elements, fire, air, water and earth; 4. energy, which is already formed in some way, but can be used for definite purposes, e.g. wood, stone etc.

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

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

(TJ. DE BOER)

MADHANA. [See Manāra.]

MADHAB. [See Fiqī.]

MADHHIDJ, an Arab tribe of Yemen origin, treated by the genealogists to Mālik b. Udād, who is said to be descended in the fourth generation from Khaṭān and to have received his name Madhhidj from a hill of this name on which he and his brother Taiy were born. His sons are said to have been: Sa'd al-'Abbāsha, Djaal, Yahbābir called Murād, and Zaiz called an Az. The Madhhidj whose tribal lands are said to have lain near Tardj "on the road to Yemen" (Yākūt, s.v.) and whose brother tribes were Khaṭhām and Murād, were, according to tradition, at war with the 'Amir b. Sa'āda about the time of the appearance of Muhammad; in the course of this war was fought the battle of Faif al-Rīf. In the Muslim period, families of the tribe of Madhhidj were predominant in Kūfa along with those of Kinda and Hamdān.


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

First row: fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun.

Second row: fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun.

Third row: fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun, fā’ilātun.

fā’ilātun may become fā’ilātun; it only changes into fā’ilātu (without n) if fā’ilām which follows it retains its long vowel. Fā’ilātun, except in the second ‘arād with its third darb, only changes into fā’ilām when fā’ilātun preserves its n.

(NAH. AL-NAGQUI)

AL-MADİNA, a town in Arabia, the residence of Muhammad after the Hijāra, and capital of the Arab empire under the first caliphs. The real Arabic name of the town was Yathrib, Jathirppa (this is the correct reading) in Ptolemy and Stephan Byzantisus, Jihrib in Minaean inscriptions (M. Hartmann, Die arabisccc Frage, p. 253 sq.). Al-Madina on the other hand is a descriptive word “the town” and is taken from the Aramaic, in which Madinina means strictly, “area of jurisdiction” and hence town (of some size). In the Meccan sections of the Kūfān it is found as an appellative with the plural al-Madīnān, while in the Madina Sūras al-Madina is used as a proper name for the residence of the Prophet (ix. 102, 121; xxxii. 60; ixiii. 8). The old name Yathrib on the other hand is found only once (xxxiii. 13). It is evident from these references that the usual explanation of the name as “the town” (of the Prophet) is a later one. It is rather to be supposed that it was a result of the existence of a strong Jewish element in Yathrib that the Aramaic loan-word became the regular name of the town. It is analogous to the originally South Arabian Hadjar [q. v.] “town”, which is applied to the capital in Bahrain. Of the Madinese poets, Kās b. al-Khāṭim uses the name Yathrib exclusively while Hāsa b. Thālūt and Ka‘b b. Mālik use both names, which is also the case with Muḥammad’s ordinance of the community (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 341 sqq.).

Madina is situated in the Hijāra on a plain sloping very gently towards the north, the boundaries of which are marked in the north-and-northwest by the hills of Ubd [q. v.] and ‘Air about four miles from the town, two outer spurs of the range which forms the boundary between the Arabian highlands and the low lying coastslands (Thāma). West and east the plain is bounded by the Ḥarras or Lābas, barren areas covered with black basalt but the eastern Ḥarras lie at a greater distance and leave between them and the town room for more fertile patches so that the eastern frontier of the plain is really formed by a row of low black hills. In the south the plain stretches away farther than the eye can reach. Its noteworthy feature is a richness in water unusual in Arabia. All the water-courses come from the south or from the Ḥarras and flow to the north, where they combine at Zaghāba and then take a westerly course to the coast in the wādī Idam. As a rule they only contain water after rain but they keep the level of the subterranean water fairly high so that there are a considerable number of wells and springs. After heavy rains the open square of al-Manākhā (see below) forms a lake and considerable inundations are not rare and may even be dangerous to the buildings in the eastern part of the town. One such flood was particularly threatening in the reign of the Caliph ‘Uthmān so that he had a dam built as a protection against it (Balādhurī, p. 11) and even worse were those of the years 660 and 734 A.H., when the wall created by the great volcanic outburst was broken through by the water (Samhūdī-Wāstensfeld, p. 23).

The water is in places salt and unpalatable, and different governors of the town have made aqueducts to bring to the town good water from wells of sweet water farther to the south. The water courses have different names: in the west al-‘Aṭīq with W. Būthān and Rantān, in the east W. Kānāt with Mabīrūr and Mūdīr. The soil is of salty sand, lime and loamy clay and is everywhere very fertile, particularly in the south. Date palms flourish exceedingly, also oranges, lemons, pomegranates, bananas, peaches, apricots, figs and grapes. The winters are cool and wet, the summers hot rarely sultry. Modern travellers say the air is pleasant but not very healthy and fevers are and always have been a plague, especially for newcomers as Muḥammad’s followers had frequently to learn (Balādhurī, p. 11; Farazdāk, ed. Boucher, p. 9, 13; Burchardt, Reisen in Arabien, p. 482 sqq. 605; Burton, A Pilgrimage, p. 176 sqq.; Wensinck, Mohammed en de Bedj-, p. 31; A. Lammens, Dāima, p. 54; Goldziher, Muḥammadische Studien, ii. 241). The Umayyads called the Town “the filthy” in contrast to the honorific al-‘ayyūba which the Prophet is said to have given it (Goldziher, ḥ. cit., ii. 37).

The way in which Madina is favoured by nature forms a striking contrast to Mecca which lies in a rocky valley where corn does not grow (Sūra xiv, 40). From the very beginning it was not a regular town but a collection of houses and cottages which were surrounded by gardens and cultivated fields, the inhabitants of which were devoted to agriculture and therefore contemptuously called “Naḥa-means” by the Bedouins. These scattered settlements only gradually became consolidated to a townlike agglomeration, which however lay farther north than the later town, as the name Yathrib according
to Samtūf (Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Madīna, p. 37) was especially associated with a place west of the tomb of Ḥamza where the Banū Ḥārītah settled. The town which arose in this way was not surrounded by a wall so that its defences were the thick groves of palms and the orchards which surrounded the houses. As they were less thick on the north and west sides, these were most exposed to hostile attacks. The little forts (ṣūnum, plur. ʿādām or ʿudām, plur. ʿādām) which were built in considerable numbers formed a substitute for a wall and the inhabitants could retire into them in times of trouble.

There were in later times no reliable traditions regarding the origin and earliest history of Madīna and the historians endeavoured to fill the gap themselves and as elsewhere made the Dārūhum (q.v. and also Krauss, in Z. D. M. G., 1x, 352) and the quite unhistorical 'Amalakites play a part in (cf. also Hassan b. Thabit, ed. Hirschfeld, N9, 9, verse 6). It is only with the coming of Jews to Madīna that we are on surer ground, but the historians know so little of the exact period of these settlements that they connect them sometimes with Moses, sometimes with the deportation of the Jews under Nebuchadnezzar, and sometimes with the conquest of Palestine by the Greeks or by the Romans. According to various references in the Talmud there were Jews in Arabia in the early centuries of the Christian era and this certainly means North Arabia in the main (see Hirschfeld, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Koran, p. 49 sq.), and that they were numerous is evident from the existence of Jewish communities in Ẓāimā, Ḥijrār (Jaussens and Savignac, Mission, p. 150, 242), Khaibar, Wādī 'l-Kura, Fadak and Maḵnā, to which may be added that in Madīna. Everywhere in these cases they took over and developed the cultivation of the soil, and it was probably due to them, that these scattered settlements each developed into a kind of town; evidence of this is found in the Aramaic name Madīna for Fāqirūb. According to the definite statement of Hassan b. Thabit (N9, 9, verse 8) in Hirschfeld) they built a number of small forts in this town. But that they were not the first to do this may probably be concluded from the fact that the earliest inhabitants were not pure Beduins (according to Lammens, Ṭabīf, p. 72, these forts were built after the model of those of the Yemen). The Jewish tribe of Kainuḵā played a prominent part in the immigration, as at a later period one of the principal markets in the western part of the town was called after it. But gradually the tribes of Kuraizah and Naḏīr came to be the leading ones. In Madīna Jewry. The former dwelled with the Bahdal on the W. Mahzir, the Naḏīr on the W. Buṭḥān (Kīlāb al-Aṣghārī, xix, 95, where the Jewish tribes and the jāzaed Arab tribes are detailed). While in this passage, as usual, the Kurāizah and the Naḏīr are numbered among the pure Jews, according to a notable statement in the historian Yaḵtūbi (ed. Houtsma, ii, 49, 52) they were not pure Jews but jāzaed clans of the Arabic tribe of Dārūhum, which Noldeke has repeatedly emphasized as a genuine tradition. Now it is historically certain that at that time there were many Jewish proselytes (cf. Ibn ʿUtayba, Kīlāb al-Maḏārīf, p. 299) but in spite of this there are decisive reasons for believing that the Jewish element in Madīna did not arise in this way. It is of special significance that the Kurāizah and Naḏīr are frequently called the Kākhāni, the 'two tribes of priests', which shows that the Jews knew their genealogy and laid stress upon their descent (cf. e.g. Ibn Ḥāṣim, p. 660, 18: 'how reviled the pure of the two tribes of priests'). The same thing is seen from the fact that Naḏīr Ṣafyā was married by Muhammad as described as belonging to the family of Aaron (Ibn Saʿd, viii, 86, ). But the decisive fact is the way in which the Prophet speaks in the Madīna sūras to the Jews there. He apostrophises them as sons of Israel and reminds them that God has raised them above all men (ii, 44, 116); he brackets them with the ancient Israelites as if they had taken part in the Exodus from Egypt (ii, 46 sq.); Allah gave Moses the scriptures so that they might be rightly guided (ii, 50); they break the laws which bound them to observe at the treaty of alliance (ii, 77 sqq.) etc. Such passages suggest as clearly as possible that he regarded them as true descendants of the ancient Israelites. There must therefore have been in addition to the jāzaed Arabs a stock of true Jews, and indeed it is obvious that without such there could have been no proselytes. Wellhausen moreover has aptly pointed out that the Arabian Jews by their language, their knowledge of the scriptures, their manner of life, their fondness for malicious mockery, secret arts, poison, magic, and cursing, and their fear of death, make an unusual impression which cannot be explained simply by the jāzaeding of pure Arabs. But on the other hand it must not be forgotten that the Jews in Arabia were very much influenced by their surroundings and had assumed a character of their own. For example we find among them the division into tribes and families, characteristic of the Arabs, with the obligations associated with this. The names of these tribes cannot be traced to old Jewish names but are thoroughly Arabic in appearance, which is also true of their personal names among which true Jewish names like Samawal and Sīrā are rare. The arabisation of the Jews is particularly notable in the poems which are ascribed to Jewish poet of which might have been equally well written by Beduins (see Noldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber, p. 59 sqq.).

While the Jews were supreme in other places like Khaibar, al-Fadak etc., the position was changed in Madīna as a result of a new immigration which the Arabs associate with the bursting of the dam at Maḏīrīq [q.v.] and the migrations of South Arabian tribes produced by it. In this way the two so-called Kaila tribes, Awa and Ḥaṣarrāj [q.v.], came to Madīna. No particulars of their coming are recorded, but from an interesting verse in Ibn Khurdabdīhī (B.G.A., vi, 128) and Yākūt, iv, 466, it is evident that they were for a long time subject and tributary to the Jews and that this part of Northern Arabia was at this time under Persian rule, in keeping with the usual Jewish policy of maintaining friendly relations with Persia. Later the Kaila Arabs however succeeded in casting off the Jewish yoke and bringing the Jews under their rule. According to tradition the occasion of this was that a powerful Jewish king named Ṣittyaw, who exercised the just primae nocis, was murdered by a Ḥaṣarrāj Mālīk b. ʿAbd Allāh to save his threatened sister — a widely disseminated motif (cf. K.
Schmidt, *Fus primae notitii*, 1882, and also *R. E. F.,* 1883, p. 156 sqq.) on which too much stress should not be laid. As to later events there are two different traditions: some make Malik after his deed seek the help of a Ghassânî ruler, Abu Djihaila (cf. the name Djiabela among the Ghassânîs), others of a South Arabian Tubba', As'ad Abïkârib (c. 430; M. Hartmann, *Die arabischen Fragm.* p. 482, 497). In this second story, Wellhausen finds some support in some old verses and assumes that Tubba's is here an erroneous popular name for a later Abyssinian viceroy. There is however nothing in these verses about an attack of the South Arabs on the Jews of Madina alone but on the inhabitants of the town together, so that Wellhausen further supposes this attack may have so weakened the Jews hitherto predominant that the Arab inhabitants succeeded in breaking their supremacy; but this is of course no more than an attractive hypothesis. In any case the name Abrahā in Kāis h. al-Khaṭjīm, N°. 14, verse 15, cannot be used as a basis for further hypotheses for it is certainly not the celebrated Ahrahā [q.v.] who is meant. Besides, these stories contain legendary allusions to Muḥammad's future appearance in Madīna, which betrays at least a later recasting by Muslims.

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

The Kāila tribes at the time of their immigration to Ṭaḥrīr had been heathens like the great majority of the Arabs. The principal deity they worshipped was Manāt [q.v.], after whom the Awtallāh were originally named hut they also reverenced among others al-Lāt (cf. the name Ta'm al-Lāt already mentioned). Through living alongside of Jews they became influenced by their religious and moral ideas, but unfortunately we know very little of their spiritual outlook before the coming of the Prophet. The poet Kās deals in the Beduin style mainly with the quarrels between the tribes and families and rarely refers to religious matters. He nowhere mentions the local deities but refers to Allāh (No. 6, verse 22) whom he calls the creator (5; 6; cf. Goldziher, *Z. D. M. G.*, 1vii. 398), which is in itself sufficient to prove Jewish or Christian influence. Of him he says in N°. 11, verse 8: "Allāh will only what he will"; verse 13, 12: "Praise be to Allāh, the lord, the lord of the building" refers to the Ka'ba in Mecca, the masjid covered with carpets (5, 14). The three days in Minā are mentioned in 4, 4, which shows that they then as later in the Muslim poets gave the young men an opportunity for love-affairs with women of other tribes. In rejecting a life after death, 6, 22, he is quite on a level with the pagan Mekkans. Alongside of such representatives of a mixed religion there were others whose conceptions had developed farther through contact with Jews or Christians, so that they were reckoned hānis [q.v.] as they definitely rejected the popular deities and had assumed a tendency to asceticism. Abu 'l-Haïtham and As'ad h. Zūrān for example professed monotheism before they became acquainted with Muḥammad (Ibn Sa'd, iii/ii. 22, 139). A Khazradjī, Abu Kāis Sīrma b. Abī Anas, wore sackcloth and laid stress on levitical purity; he actually thought of becoming a Christian hut gave up the idea and adopted Islam when an old man (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 347 sq.). A man of the Awt tribe,
Abū 'Amir 'Abd 'Amr b. Ṣaifīt was known as "the monk" from his ascetic mode of life; he later became an enemy of the Prophet, left Madīna and fought against him on the side of the Meccans; he is also said to have supported those who built a rival mosque at the time of the Tabūk campaign (Ibn Ḥišām, p. 411; Ibn Sa'd, ii/ii. 90, 7; Willki-Wellhausen, p. 310). In evidence of such influence of Christians in Madīna one might quote a verse of Ḥassān b. Thāḥit (ed. Hirschfeld, p. 133, 7), but this probably refers to a later period and opportunities of mixing with them were to be found in many places in Arabia. One result of living alongside of Jews in Madīna was that the art of writing was quite well known there (cf. Ibn Kūtaibah, Ktāb al-Maṭrīf, p. 132 sqq.; Ballādhūnī, p. 473 sqq.; Ibn Sa'd, ii/ii., passim).

The spiritual influence of the Jews on the Arab inhabitants of Madīna became an important factor in the relations between them and Muhammad, for it made them receptive to his religious ideas with which they became acquainted by visits to Mecca and in other ways. How finally a treaty was concluded between him and several representatives of the Madīnees, by which the latter pledged themselves to take him into their community and to defend him as if he were one of themselves and how he and those of his followers who were still faithful to him thereupon migrated to Madīna is related in the article MUHAMMAD. After a brief stay in the southern suburb of Kūhī he entered the town and took up his abode with a Ḫadhrajī, Abū Ayūb al-Ṯālīb b. Ṣa'id, with whom he lived till a dwelling was arranged for him. He is said to have left the choice of the site to the movements of his camel — if the story is true, a very clever move not only from the religious but also from the political point of view. In any case it is certain that hardly anything ever showed so clearly his gift, based on his unshakeable belief in his prophetic call, of leading men to follow his will, as the fact that he succeeded in a very short time in bringing some kind of order into Madīna, hopelessly split up by feuds, and making a kind of unity out of the heterogeneous elements in the town, the earlier Arab inhabitants of Yathrib, the later immigrants, now predominant Kaila tribes, the Muhādhīrīn from Mecca and the Jews or judaized Arabs. We get a glimpse of the first step towards this goal from the ordinance of the community preserved in Ibn Ḥišām, p. 341 sqq. ("Book of the fines"); cf. Ṣahāri, Glossary s. v. 'ākūf, which Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, iv. 67 sqq., and following him Caetani, Annali dell' Istituto, i. 393 sqq. and Wensinck, Mohammed de Joden te Medina, p. 78 sqq. have discussed. It is most interesting for its omissions and it lacks to a marked degree clear and logical fundamental ideas, because Muhammad was content temporarily with what could be attained and avoided everything that might cause strife. In it he calls himself the messenger of Allāh, but there is no reference to his divine inspiration. His object is to form a unified umma out of the inhabitants of Madīna and this is defined from the religious side as the community of believers from Mecca and Yathrib. But the non-believers are not excluded, and the umma coincides rather with the town of Madīna which included also Jews and heathens, of whom it is not demanded that they should adopt Islām. The tribes retain their autonomy as regards blood-vengeance and ransom of prisoners, but against the rest of the world generally the affording of protection was obligatory on every member of the community without exception and no one could conclude peace separately with the enemies of the community (particularly the Kurāshī). All important matters, out of which misfortune might befall the community, were to be brought before Allāh and Muhammad. The valley of Yathrib was to be haram (or haram) for all who were bound by this ordinance. The whole document thus alternates continually between religious and purely political clauses in a very opportunist fashion. It never became of great importance and it soon fell into oblivion as it was rendered obsolete by the rapid progress of events, certainly not against the wish of Muhammad whose plans went far beyond what was laid down in it. The main cause of its loss of importance was the breach which soon occurred between Muhammad and the Jews, which the latter provoked by their scornful criticism of Muhammad's revelations, especially of the weak points revealed in his reproduction of stories from the Old Testament. This meant a serious threat to his authority and in addition the Jews endeavoured to destroy the agreement reached in Madīna by endeavouring to revive the old hostility between the two Kaila tribes (Ibn Ḥišām, p. 385 sqq.; cf. Sīra, iii. 114 sqq.). To meet these difficulties, which of course were very welcome to his enemies in the town, Muhammad worked hard to unite his followers for a common object, the war with the Meccans, by which he could at the same time avenge the resistance offered him there. It was at first difficult for him to arouse enthusiasm for this war among the Muhādhīrīn and even more the Ṭanīr but finally, when a fortunate accident occurred to help him, he succeeded in bringing about a war with the Meccans which led to the momentous victory at Badr. On the further fighting of this campaign, the battle of Uhoud and the name of the ditch, cf. the article MUHAMMAD. The latter campaign gets its name from the ditch (Khanḍāk q.v.) which Muhammad on the advice of a Persian (Salāmān) had dug around the unprotected parts of the town and which, in spite of its modest dimensions (it is said to have been a fathom broad), formed a serious obstacle to the enemy. Ibn Dujayr in the sixih century still saw traces of it, an arrowshot west of the town. On its further course cf. Wensinck, Mohammed en de Joden, p. 26, 31. The Meccans in this fighting gave him very material assistance by their lack of warlike ability and energy, and the war contributed to consolidate his position in Madīna, aided not a little by the lack of resolution among the Muhādhīrī who never managed to seize opportunities favourable to them. He was thus not only in a position to continue the war against his native city but also to repel the Jews in ruthless fashion for all the annoyance they had caused him. After the battle of Badr, the Kainūkī were driven out of the town and after the battle of Uhoud, which went against the Prophet, the same fate was meted out to a Kāhin tribe, the Nadir. But the worst lot was that of the Kuraiz, whom in spite of the intercession of the Awsis he had massacred. These events however do not show the Jewish tribes in a favourable light as they made no attempt to help one another but left each other
in the lurch in most cowardly fashion. The Kurāja alone at the massacre showed a courage which to some extent atones for their previous attitude. In this way Muhammad succeeded in disposing of the danger that threatened him from the Jews, for the Jews who were left in Madina were of no importance and caused him no serious difficulties. With the treaty of Ḥudaybiya in the year 6 A.H. [cf. MUHAMMAD] the war with the Kurāja was practically finished, for in it his genius for diplomacy succeeded in bringing them to recognise Madina as a power equal in importance to Mecca. The official conclusion of the struggle was the bloodless occupation of his native city in 8 A.H. However great a triumph this was for the Prophet, it produced a new feud which was to prove fateful for Islam after the death of Muhammad. Even before the decisive turn in the struggle with Mecca, in the campaign against the Banū Muṭṣalf, the ill feeling between the emigrants and a section of the people of Madina came to a head in threatening form. Ibn Ḥishām has recorded some of the hoastful speeches and threatened to expel the troublesome intruders (cf. Ṣūra, ixii. 8), which he naturally denied when the Prophet later took him to task. But when Muḥammad had entered Mecca, his faithful followers in Madina became anxious, as they feared he would now abandon their town and return to his native place. He calmed them however and declared that he would live and die with them (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 824). But when he began to treat the Meccans with great clemency and after the battle of Ḥunain was striving to win them over to his religion by rich gifts, the Anṣār with justice felt themselves slighted and once again feared that he would abandon them. But he delivered them a speech in which he reminded them how he had united them when they were living in hostility to one another and declared his gratitude for all that they had done for him, and when he concluded by asking them to he satisfied if others went home with captured herds but they with the messenger of Allah, they burst into tears and withdrew satisfied (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 885 sq.). While in such stories there may be an echo of the later antagonism between the Anṣār and the Kurāja, they undoubtedly give a not inaccurate idea of the feelings which found expression and this time. It is all the more remarkable that according to various indications there must have been an opposition to Muhammad at the time of the Tabiīt campaign in Madina. His orations against the Munāfikūn in the ninth Sūra sound unusually excited and recall those of the Meccan period with their threats of punishment. There is also the notable, but unfortunately not quite clear story of the Masjd al-Dirār (cf. also Lammens) which some men had built south of the town in the land of the 'Amr b. ʿAwf and which he sanctioned until he saw that its object was to provoke discussion among the believers for the benefit of his former enemies (Ṣūrā, ix. 108 sqq.), wherefore he had it demolished. According to another story, the already mentioned Ḥanif Aḥū 'Amir was the moving spirit in it, (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 906 sq.; Wajūdī-Welhausen, p. 410 sq.; Tabari, i. 1704 sq.; Ibn Saʿd, II/ii. 36, 8, 96, 13). In any case Muhammad succeeded in again restoring peace, probably assisted by the fact that the leader of the Munāfikūn died soon afterwards.

Faithful to his promise, the Prophet remained in Madina till his death on June 8, 632. According to a reliable tradition (Ṭabarī, i. 1817; Ibn Saʿd, ii/I. 57, 58, 59, 71, 6), his corpse lay unburied for a whole day, so that its putrefaction was far advanced when it was finally buried under ʿAṣīla's house, apparently a result of the great confusion into which the Prophet had plunged the town. The nity created by his strong hand at once fell to pieces; the Anṣār assembled and chose the Khazzājī Saʿd b. ʿUbdā as their chief, while others proposed that the government should be shared between the Anṣār and the Muhāǧirūn. ʿUmar's rapid and vigorous intervention however succeeded in thwarting these plans so threatening to Islam and carrying through the election of Aḥī Bakr as Caliph. He and his two successors resided in Madina which thus became the capital of the rapidly growing empire. Aḥī Bakr and ʿUmar, like the Prophet, were buried under the house of ʿAṣīla, while ʿUḥman's body was brought in the darkness on a door to the Jews to thwart any such obsequies and stone-throwing. In this period no one thought of strengthening the defences of the capital, not even during the ridda after the Prophet's death and still less later when the holy wars were waged exclusively in foreign lands. ʿUḥman had the forts taken down, but remains of them could be seen as late as the tenth century (Masʿūdī, K. al-Tanbih, B. G. A., viii. 206).

ʿAll's reign brought a complete change for Madina. When the great civil war broke out between him and his rivals and the decisive battles were fought in the provinces, the Caliph recognised that the vast empire could not be governed from the remote corner of the world in which Madina lay. While the earlier caliphs had remained in the capital and sent out armies of conquest from it, ʿAll placed himself at the head of his troops and set out from Madina in Oct. 656, never again to see it. He made Kufa his capital and after Muʿawiyah's victory Damascus took its place. Madina now sank, like its old rival Mecca, to the rank of a provincial town, unaffected by the current of the world's events. What plous old folks thought of this change is reflected in a characteristic tradition (Dinawari, p. 152 sq.) according to which several prominent Anṣār tried to induce ʿAll to abandon his plan of leaving Madina: "What thou dost lose in the form of prayers in the mosque of the Prophet and the course between his tomb and his pulpit is of more value than what thou expectest to find in the ʿIrāq; reflect how ʿUmar used to send his generals to war; there are still just as capable men amongst us as then!" But the Caliph replied: "The wealth of the state and the armies are in the ʿIrāq and attacks threaten from the Syrians, and I must be near them".

Madina with its venerable associations and the tomb of the Prophet could not of course become quite unimportant; on the contrary, its sanctity increased in the eyes of Muslims, as the more the faith of Muḥammad became imprinted in their conceptions; but the life of the town became more and more remote from the real world in which actual history was being unfolded. Aḥī retired all who wished to keep aloof from the turmoil of political happenings, like ʿAlī's son Ḥasan, after he had abandoned all his claims (Ṭabarī, ii. 9; Dinawari, p. 232). ʿUṣayn also went there from Kufa, but left it again to make his desperate attempt to gain his rights, and it is significant that none of the Madina Anṣār
went with him (Wellhausen, *Die Oppositionspar-
teiien*, p. 69). When he was slain, his wives and son were brought to Madina, where they lived in peace and took no further part in the fighting. 'Ali's son, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya, lived in Madina (Dinwari, p. 308). It was not however only relatives and ardent followers of the Prophet, who preferred to live here in his city, but several of his former enemies, the Umayyads, also felt attracted thither by the quiet and easy life and would not go to Damascus (Lammens, *Études sur le califat de Moawia*, p. 35). In this way Madina gradually became the home of a new population, consisting of people who wished to enjoy undisturbed the great wealth which the wars of conquest had brought them. Life there became more and more luxurious until finally the holy city became so notorious (Khitâb al-Asghâni, xxi. 197, 19), that during a rising in the year 127 (745) the last Umayyad Caliph Marwan II could ask one of the participants in it how it was that the wines and singing-girls of Madina had not held him back from taking part in it (Tabari, ii. 1910). Such was the side of his career of the present inhabitants of Madina (Travels in Arabia, 3rd ed., p. 151: "carding, playing, tipping in arak, brutish hemp smoking, ribald living"). This was the golden period of Madina about the glories of which the poets sang. Flourishing, well-watered gardens and meadows surrounded the town, and there were a number of splendid palaces built by wealthy Qurâsh, especially in the Wâdi 'l-Ajkâf of which traces can still be found (cf. Batantûn, Rihâ, p. 261 sq.; Lammens, *Moawia*, p. 228).

Another section of the people of Madina was attracted thither by the quiet life, although for other reasons. Their object was not worldly enjoyments but they devoted themselves to the memories in the town of its sacred past, by collecting and studying the legal and ritual enactments dating from the Prophet, in so far as they were based on the *sunna* of Madina and the *ijma* there. The most distinguished representative of this group was Malik b. Anas (d. 179 = 795), the author of the *Mawaqif*, who as founder of the MalikÂ' school gathered many pupils around him (Colziâ, *Muhaddisemischen Studien*, ii. 213 sqq.). One of them, Ibn Zabâla, composed the first history of the town of Madina (199 = 814) but it has not survived.

Madina was now ruled by governors appointed by the Caliph, lists of whom are given by Tabari and Ibn al-Athîr. The town was however not entirely unaffected by the wars of the first centuries after Muhammad. In the reign of Yazid, feeling in Madina, even among the Umayyads, was more or less hostile to the Caliph and many took sides of his rival 'Abd Allâh b. Zair ibn Zayd in Mecca. The expedition of the governor 'Amr b. Sa'id, which Yazid ordered, was a failure. In 63 (682-3) the Madinense rebelled openly, appointing 'Abd Allâh b. Hanâla as their leader and building a wall with a ditch to defend the town on the north. The Caliph sent an army under the leadership of Muslim b. 'Ukba which took up its quarters on the Harra N.E. of the town and fought the battle of the Harra, which ended in the defeat of the Madinense — according to the usual story, a result of the treachery of the Banû Hâritha. That the inhabitants were abandoned to the ill-treatment of the Syrian troops is probably a malicious libel (Wellhausen, *Das arabisch Reich*, p. 98 sq.). Towards the end of Umâyad rule, in the year 130 (747/8), the Khârijis under Abû Hâmaîz resisted the Madinense at Kubbâd; but he was surprised by Marwân's troops and slain (Tabari, ii. 200 sqq.; B. G. A., vi. 327). When the 'Abbâsides became supreme, two Alid brothers, Muhammad and Ibrâhîm, sons of 'Abd Allâh, made an attempt to fight for their rights. Muhammad himself, the son of al-Mahdi, appeared in Madina in 145 (763/4) where he found not a few adherents, among them Malik b. Anas and Abû Hânifa. He endeavoured in various ways to imitate the example of the Prophet, used his sword, had the ditch dug by him round the town restored (see above) etc. The Caliph sent his relative 'Isâ b. Mûsâ with 4,000 men against him and when he bridged the ditch by throwing a couple of doors over it and entered the town, most of al-Mahdi's followers lost heart, as was usual with the supporters of the Alids, and when he renewed the hopeless struggle, he was mortally wounded. About 20 years later (169 = 786) another Alid arose, Husain b. 'Abî, against the Alids, and his followers were driven out and slain at Fakkîh near Mecca. In spite of the harm he did to the town of the Prophet, he was celebrated by the Alids as a martyr (Tabari, iii. 551 sqq.; Ibn al-Athîr, vi. 60 sqq.). In the caliphate of Wâliq, Madina suffered severely from the attacks of the Sulaim and the Banû Hilal. Boghâ the elder [q.v.] came to their assistance in 230 (844/5) and imprisoned the Beduins. When he left the town again, the latter succeeded in breaking out of prison; the Madinense however discovered their escape and put them to death (Ibn al-Athîr, vii. 124). Their love for Wâliq was shown by their lamenting him every night after his death (ibid., vii. 21).

In the centuries that followed, Madina is only rarely mentioned by the historians, and what they tell us about it is of little interest as a rule. When the Fatimids became lords of Egypt and were threatening the holy cities in the Hijâz, a wall was at last built round Madina. This was erected in 364 (974/975) by the Bayyâd 'Abud al-Dawla but enclosed only the central part of the town. It was restored in 540 (1145/46) by a vizier of the sons of Zangi. But as a considerable proportion of the inhabitants lived outside the wall without protection from the attacks of the Beduins, the Atâbêg of Syria, Nûr al-Din Mahmûd b. Zangi, in 557 (1162) built a second wall of greater extent with towers and gateways. The present wall, 35-40 feet high, was built by the Ottoman Sultan Sulîman but Salîm the Magnificent (1520—1566) of basalt and granite (Samhâji-Wustenfeld, p. 126). A trench was dug around it. The same Sulîman brought a covered aqueduct from the south into the town. Finally the wall was raised to a height of 80 feet by Sultan 'Abd al-Azîz, which height it has retained.

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

In 654 (1256) Madina was threatened by a volcanic eruption, known as the fire of Hijâz. It began on the last day of Dhu' al-âdah I with a
sight earthquake which increased in vigour each succeeding day. Then a glowing stream of lava burst forth which, as the chroniclers tell us, devoured rocks and stones but fortunately flowed to the east of the town and then continued its way northward. The inhabitants sought protection in the Mosque of the Tomb, praying and confessing their sins. The belief in the latter's inviolability, which was thus strengthened, was soon to be shattered by the conflagration described below.

Under the rule of the Turks Madina continued to lead a quiet life, little heeded by the outside world, and it is rarely mentioned, a circumstance much facilitated by the fact that the holy city could not be entered by non-Muslims. Radical changes only came about in the sixteenth century. In 1804, the Wahhabis took the town, plundered its treasures and prevented pilgrimages to the Tomb of Muhammad. An attempt to destroy the dome over the tomb failed, but the great treasures in pearls, jewels etc., presented by pious visitors to the mosque were carried off. It was not till 1813 that Muhammad Ali's son Yusuf succeeded in retaking the town. In 1818 he took Dar'iya and razed it to the ground, whereupon he returned to Madina. The sacred cities once more belonged to the Turks and the Grand Sharif of Mecca even forbade pilgrims from Ibn Sa'ud's territory to enter Mecca. This restoration of Turkish rule brought at least one important innovation: the building of the Hijaz railway from Damascus to Madina in 1908. It was primarily intended for pilgrims but was also of military importance and therefore suffered severely in the world war. Through the intervention of the Grand Sharif Husain b. Ali b. 'Abd al-Mu'tin, the fighting and the intrigues in North Arabia became more and more involved. He first posed as a faithful servant of the Turkish Sultan but later he rebelled and on Nov. 6, 1916 had himself proclaimed king of the Hijaz and joined the English. After the peace which ended the world war the Turkish troops evacuated Madina in 1918. In the meanwhile a stronger opponent to Husain had arisen in 'Abd al-Arīz b. Sa'ūd, who had once more raised the Wahhabis to a position of supremacy. Husain's bold move in assuming the title of caliph found no support among the Arab chiefs, and the people of the Hijaz forced him to abdicate. Ibn Sa'ūd seized this opportunity, entered Mecca in October 1924 and forced Husain's son 'Ali to leave the town. The two holy cities are therefore now both in the hands of the Wahhabis, who are however now more tolerant and permit visits to the Mosque of the Tomb and other holy places and only forbid actual worship there.

In spite of the inaccessibility of Madina to all non-Muslims the reports of various modern travellers enable us to form a fairly clear picture of it, which can only be briefly outlined here. In keeping with the configuration of the ground the plain on which Madina lies is divided into an upper southern part, a middle part, al-Ṣāliya and al-Ṣālīq, names found even in the earliest writers. Al-Ṣāliya is reckoned to run to the above mentioned village of Kuṭāba, 3 miles away, al-Shafila to the hill of Ḫūd. The older wall encloses the town proper; the already mentioned later wall which is now partly in ruins encloses the western rather large suburb of al-Anbariya and "camp of the camels," barr al-munākhā, 400 yards broad lying between it and the town. Here is pointed out the traditional site of the muqalla, the Prophet's place of prayer, a tradition probably worthy of credence, as otherwise it would have been natural to locate it in the great mosque mentioned below. Along the south side of the wall runs the road of the funeral processions, Darb al-Djarnās, which leads to the old general burial-place, Bab al-Qarbād (so called after the plant nitārīn retsu) in the east of the town. Among the thousands who are buried here are the little son of the Prophet, Ibrāhīm, his wives (whether also his daughter Fātimah is disputed: see below), many of his companions, al-Abābās, Muhammad al-Ṣākir, Dja'far al-Ṣādīk, the already mentioned jurist, Mālik b. Anas, and many others.

At the north-west corner of the town stands the castle built on to the town wall. There are several gates in the walls, including the Bab al-Ṣāhilī in the east, the Bab al-Majdī in the east and the Bab al-Anbariya in the west. From a spring of fresh water in the village of Kuṭāba an aqueduct runs into the town, first laid by Marwān when governor of Madina. It frequently fell into disrepair and was restored for example by several Ottoman sułāns, on the last occasion by 'Abd al-Ḥamid after the Wahhabis had destroyed it. The damage not infrequently done by floods has already been mentioned. In 754 the Madinese were prevented for six months by an inundation from visiting the grave of Ḥamza. The streets of Madina are clean but narrow and only the main streets are paved. The houses are well built of stone and a number have two stories. Several of them are surrounded by gardens, but the houses with gardens are mainly found outside the north and south wall, especially towards the south where vegetable gardens and orchards alternate with palm groves and cornfields. The dates of which there are 70 varieties are, as in ancient times, one of the principal products. The pilgrim traffic is however the most important source of revenue for the inhabitants, who let their dwellings to the strangers and guide them to the sacred places and instruct them about ritual duties. The muṣawwarīn here play the same role as the mušawwarīn in Mecca. Burton (ii. 189) gives the number of inhabitants as 16,000–18,000, in addition to 400 men in the garrison. Wavell (p. 63) in 1908 put it at 30,000, excluding soldiers and pilgrims, while Batangib made 60,000 including many foreign visitors. The results of the world war have of course altered these conditions in many ways. The population used to increase gradually by visitors settling often permanently in the sacred city. Of descendants of the old Anṣār there are very few left in Madina; according to Burchard there were only ten families in his time. There are a number of Shī'a in the suburbs.

Madina possesses no sanctuary venerated from remote times like the Ka'ba; on the other hand it possesses compensation for this of inestimable value in the mosque which encloses Muhammad's grave and is the goal of countless pilgrims. Some teachers even put this sanctuary higher than the Meccan one, but this view is not general, and the visiting of this mosque is not obligatory like the pilgrimage to Mecca.
and also may be undertaken at any time. According to unanimous tradition the Prophet was buried under 'Aīsha's house, where also the two first caliphs found their last resting-place. Further, all the earlier stories agree that Muhammad soon after his arrival in Madina had a mosque built, which he enlarged after the taking of Khaibar, and they are also agreed that the dwellings of his wives were close by so that 'Aīsha's house with the grave could easily have been taken into the mosque. That there is nothing improbable in itself in a mosque having been built in the time of the Prophet is shown by the mention of a rival mosque, Sūra ix. 108 sqq.; cf. xxiv. 36. But Caetani, Anmāli, i. 432 sqq., has disputed with important arguments the correctness of the tradition and from various statements drawn the conclusion that originally on the site of the later mosque there was more probably only the dār of Muḥammad with a courtyard and various dwellings. If this is right, it is not known who built the mosque; but probably it was erected not long after Muhammad's death, for the rapidly increasing reverence for the Prophet must very soon have aroused the desire to bring his resting-place into touch with his religion. To this mosque, early built, can then be referred what tradition tells us of Muhammad's mosque: — a simple building of brick with pillars of palm stems and a roof of palm leaves. Accorded to the tradition, 'Umar had it enlarged and after him 'Uthmān who replaced it by a building of stone and mortar with a roof of teak. When Marwān was governor of Madina, he had a makṣura of coloured stones erected; but no important advance was made till the reign of Walīd, who commissioned the then governor, afterwards caliph, 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, in 87 (706) to adorn the building in greater splendour. For this 'Umar used Greek and Coptic builders, and the Byzantine emperor is said to have contributed ḥaṣābā'ī of gold and a large quantity of mosaic stones towards it. On this occasion five minarets were placed at the corners of the sanctuary and the roofs covered with plates of lead. The mosque remained unaltered till the reign of al-Mahdī. After this Caliph had visited Madīna, it was rebuilt and extended in 162 (778—779) and its length was now 300 and its breadth 200 ells. In the following century another restoration was necessary and was carried through by al-Mutawakkil in the year 243 (856—862).

Of the mosque which thus came into existence there are very full descriptions by Ibn 'Abd Rabbighi (d. 328 = 940), Muqaddasi (375 = 985), Ibn Dūbair who travelled in the east in the years 578—581 (1182/83—1186/87), and also Yaḥyā. Of the many details given by these authors only a few can be quoted here. As is quite evident from several of these descriptions, the mosque had the form, always retained later, of an open court-yard covered with sand or gravel, jāhr, which was surrounded on all four sides by rows of pillars. In the eastern part of the southern pillared hall was the holy of holies, the tomb of the Prophet, with the tombs of Abū Bakr and of 'Umar. It is described by Yaḥyā (iv. 458) as a high building, separated at the top only by a space from the roof of the pillared hall. Regarding the relative positions of the three graves there were in his time different views. North of them, according to some traditions, was the tomb of Fāṭima while according to others this was in the general burying ground. The part of the pillared hall lying west of the graves bore the name al-Rawḍa, the garden, from an alleged utterance of the Prophet. The total number of pillars is said to have been 290; those in the southern part were stuccoed, with gilded capitals, the others were of marble. The walls were adorned with marble, gold, and mosaic. Along the southern border of the Rawḍa ran a barrier, with which several highly venerated relics were associated: — the remains of the trunk of a tree, on which Muḥammad used to lean, and especially his minbar or pulpit. According to tradition Muʿāwiya wished to remove this; but immediately a vigorous earthquake began and he abandoned the idea and instead raised it by an upper structure five steps higher. Al-Mahdī later wished to remove this addition, but he was dissuaded from doing this as the nails had been driven into the old minbar (Yaʿkūb, ed. Honstma, ii. 283; Ṭabarī, iii. 483; Muḥaddad, ed. de Goeje, p. 82). According to the descriptions it had 8 steps and there was a slab of ebony over the seat which visitors might touch. The remnants of the tree-trunk were kissed and stroked with the hands, an interesting imitation of ancient Arabian religious customs. Among the various treasures of the mosque was the Madīna standard manuscript of the canonical text of the Karān prepared by 'Uthmān. The mosque had 19 doors of which only 4 steps higher. Al-Mahdī later wished to remove this addition, but he was dissuaded from doing this as the nails had been driven into the old minbar (Yaʿkūb, ed. Honstma, ii. 283; Ṭabarī, iii. 483; Muḥaddad, ed. de Goeje, p. 82). According to the descriptions it had 8 steps and there was a slab of ebony over the seat which visitors might touch. The remnants of the tree-trunk were kissed and stroked with the hands, an interesting imitation of ancient Arabian religious customs. Among the various treasures of the mosque was the Madīna standard manuscript of the canonical text of the Karān prepared by 'Uthmān. The mosque had 19 doors of which only

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

In modern times we have descriptions by Burckhardt (unfortunately incomplete, as he was ill during his stay), by Burton (1853), a brief one by Wavell in 1908—1909 and a good one by al-Batanūnī (1910). In their main outlines they give much the same picture as the older ones. The mosque stands in the centre of the town proper, a little to the east. Al-Batanūnī gives the length from north to south as 385 feet, the breadth on the north side as 285 feet and on the south side as 220 feet. The court (al-ṣuḥa‘ or al-ḥaswa) is covered with sand or gravel and enclosed on all four sides by a wall of which the largest part on the south side encloses the actual masjid. The pillars in this part are covered with marble with gilt ornamentations. All the pillars in the mosque, 327 in number, support arches on which rest little domes like divided oranges. Of the pillars 22 are in the eastern part of the southern hall (the maqṣūra), the sanctuary proper with the tomb of the Prophet. “The Garden”, i.e. the area between the tomb and the minbar, is 70 feet long and 50 broad. The maqṣūra is enclosed on the south, where the mosque is extended by a row of pillars, by a brass grille with the relics already mentioned and the beautiful mihrāb of the Prophet with an indication of the direction of prayer. The present minbar is of marble with gilding, a gift of Marādī III in 1590 (1688). The maqṣūra, the holy of holies of the mosque, a quadrangle 50 feet long from north to south and 47 feet broad, is surrounded by a green polished brass railing through which a door, Bāb al-Raḥma or Bāb al-Wusūf, leads to al-Rawḍa. It encloses an area which is called al-hudrā, in allusion to ‘A’isha’s house. It cannot be accurately described as it is covered with green silk and is not seen by visitors. The covering, which recalls the covering of the Ka‘ba, is said to have been first presented by the mother of Hārin al-Rashīd. Nūr al-Dīn Zangī is said to have cleared a new area around the older hudrā to protect the tomb. In the hudrā are the tombs of the Prophet and of the first two caliphs, according to the usual belief in the following order: the most southern is the tomb of Muhammad with the head to the west, next him Abū Bakr with his head beside Muhammad’s feet and on the north ‘Umar with his head beside Abū Bakr’s shoulders. A fourth, empty grave is said to be intended for Jesus after his parousia. On the north side of the large maqṣūra, another smaller one adjoins it, which, according to an assumption still disputed by many, contains the tomb of Fath. Two doors on the east and west side connect it with the minbar. To the west hanging lamps are placed in this, the most sacred part of the mosque, and in addition in the Rawḍa there are candelabra of crystal. In the court of the mosque, approximately east, is a quadrangular area shut off by an iron grille, which is called Fāṭima’s garden. Of the 15 palms which grew there in the time of Ibn Džubair, Burton saw only 12; al-Batanūnī mentions several small palms planted round a high one. Behind the boundary is the so-called “Prophet’s well”. The mosque has four minarets at the four corners and according to Burton a fifth in the centre of the west side, but this is not mentioned by al-Batanūnī. Five doors give admittance to the sanctuary: on the west the Bāb al-Salām and Bāb al-Raḥma, on the north the Bāb al-Majidī, on the east the Bāb Džubīr’ al-Bakr) and Bāb al-Nakš. They are all closed at night. From the descriptions already quoted, the mosque was not impressive when seen from the outside, as the houses were built so thickly round it that an open view of it could not be obtained. Even the richly ornamented Bāb al-Salām only looked like the termination of a street running from the west. But this seems now to have been altered, as according to Musil, Zur Zeitgeschichte von Arabien, p. 34, all the houses in the immediate vicinity of the mosque were removed in 1916. The immediate vicinity of the city of the Prophet is of course very rich in places with which are associated anecdotes and traditions of him. The most important of these is the hill of Uḥūd [q.v.] with the graves of those who fell for the faith there. It is rivalled by the village of Kubā’ where Muhammad on his arrival in his new home stayed from Monday till Thursday (Ibn Ḥithān, p. 335). The village, which was at that time occupied by the ‘Amr b. ‘Awf, is according to the Arab geographers 2 miles, according to Burckhardt, 3—4 hours from Madīna; to be accurate it is about 3 miles. The surrounding gardens which are exceedingly rich in all kinds of fruit and vegetables extend for 4 or 5 miles (Burckhardt). Burton describes how the village appeared to him as he approached it: “a confused heap of huts and dwelling-houses, chapels and towers, with trees, between foul lanes, heaps of rubbish and yelping dogs”. Tradition marks the spot where the Prophet’s camel knelt (al-mabrak) and here also was the mosque mentioned in Sūra, ix. 109 built out of piety, as well as its counterpart, the Maqṣūdī al-Dīrār, destroyed by Muhammad’s orders (cf. Wālīd—Weihhausen, p. 417; Ibn Sa‘d, iii. 32, 6; and above). The mosque of Kubā’ with its simple minaret was in ruins in Burckhardt’s time, but has since been replaced by a stone structure.

History of the Medina Caliphate

The Medina Caliphate, the ancient capital of the Umayyad Caliphs of Cordova, the ruins of which are still in existence about 5 miles to the west of this latter town, at the place called Cordova la Vieja, on one of the last spurs of the Sierra Morena overlooking the valley of Guadalquivir [q.v.]. The western Arab historians give us a great deal of information on the foundation of this royal town, upon the period which marked its prosperity and upon the causes which led to its fall. It was the great Caliph 'Abd al-Rahman III al-Nasir [q.v.], who decided upon building it, and its construction was begun during the reign of this sovereign at the end of the year 925 (936). The chronicles say that one of his sons, leaving him a large sum of money, al-Nasir wished to utilize this sum for the payment of the ransom of the Spanish Muhammadians prisoners of war in the kingdoms of Leon and of Navarre. As the envoys who had been sent for this purpose failed to find any prisoners whom they could ransom, the Caliph's favourite al-Zahrâ' is said to have advised him to employ the legacy to build a town to which she would give her name. This anecdote is without doubt legendary, at least in several points. The work of building the town was carried on for many years (from 15 to 40 years according to the sources), and the site selected was the site of the palace of the Caliph. Six thousand hewn stones were used every day, not to mention other materials; the necessary marble was chiefly imported from Ifrikiya, and no less than 4,313 columns were required, if we may believe Ibn Ijarhâr. According to the same author it was the crown prince al-Hakam himself who directed operations. The name of the chief architect, Maslama b. 'Abd Allâh, has also been preserved.

The building of Madinat al-Zahrâ' engaged not less than 10,000 workmen. Account was taken in the planning of the town of the very steep slope of the site and al-Idrisi gives a clear account of how this slope was utilized. The town was built on three terraces; the upper part was set aside for the palace and its appendances; the middle one was devoted to gardens; the lower one contained private dwelling-houses and the Great Mosque. 'Abd al-Rahman removed with all his court to Madinat al-Zahrâ', as he felt the Caliph's palace of Cordova which faced the cathedral mosque and overlooked Guadalquivir too small, and this became his favourite residence. His successors al-Hakim II and Hisâsh II lived there for the most part during their reigns, and further embellished the town of al-Nasir. It appears, however, to have very soon fallen into decay, especially from the time when it had as rival the residence of the 'Amirid Hâdhib, al-Madina al-Zahrâ' [q.v.]. It was pillaged on several occasions by the Berber mercenaries who had rebelled against Cordova. The year 1010 (1090) marked its final fall. A century and a half afterwards in the time of Idrisí, the walls alone remained and vestiges only of the palace. A few inhabitants still lingered in it.

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


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

The Name. It is probably taken in the first place from the Greek *κακήσσης*: *al-dā'ira al-labānīya* or *al-dār dh al-labān*, the circle or path which looks like milk. Other names are *fārīb al-halīb*, the road of milk; *fārīb al-tub*, the road of the place where there is milk, and hence metaphorically *umn al-samāw*, mother of heaven, who feeds the heavens as with milk; *fārīb al-tīb*, path of straw and *darb al-tabābāna*, path of the place where there is straw. Similarly the Milky Way is called in Persian *kakhēsšān*, straw-puller, or *kakhēssān* or *rāhī kakhēssan*, path of the strawpuller; in Turkish *saman ughrī* or *saman Kapara*, straw or fodder-thief. Whether names connected with straw go back to Greek or Oriental ideas is uncertain. Gundel (op. cit.) holds the latter view. In the East the Milky Way is the hay, straw and meal, which Peter or Saint Virgin lost and blessed by God flew to heaven. Another Turkish name is *hâijdjîter*, path of the pilgrims.

Other Arabic names are *hāb al-samāw*, gate of heaven, and *al-tharīf or al-tharīf*, gap, probably from the idea that the Milky Way corresponds to a gap or split through which one can see the shining heaven. Another name is *umm al-nuḍūm*, mother of the stars, because no part of the heavens is so rich in stars. The stars are also to have leprosy (*djarbat al-nuḍūm*). Among the Kazan Tatars the Milky Way is called *Path of the Wild Goats* and by Altai Tatars (*Path of Hear-Frost* (frosted way).

The name *nahr al-madjarra*, River of the Madjarra, is noteworthy. The Milky Way is regarded as a river; this is evident from the passages in *Abd al-Rahmān al-Sūfī* in his work on the constellations, in *al-Birūnī* in his *Kitāb al-Tajhib* towards the end and in the *Chronology* (text, p. 345), transl., p. 348), in al-Karwain in the *Cosmography* (text, i., p. 37; transl., p. 18) and in many others. In these passages the constellation of Sagittarius or the eight stars forming the 20th station of the moon which are called the Ostriches *al-nuḍūm* are described. Four of the stars which lie on the Milky Way are called *al-nuḍūm al-wārid*, the ostrich going to drink; the four others lie at the side of the river of the Milky Way and are called *al-nuḍūm al-sūdir*, the ostrich returning from drinking (cf. e.g. L. Ideler, *op. cit.*, p. 184 and Hyde, *Ulugh Beg's Tabular*, Oxford, p. 23).

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

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

An independent description of the whole Milky Way as full as that in Ptolemy, I have not been able to find in Arabic works. A brief description is given by Abū Ḥanifa al-Dinawarī (in al-Marzūqī, *Kitāb al-Asma wa'l-Akhbār*, Haidarābād 1332, ii. 9-12). The description of al-Dinawarī leaves much to be desired and the text is not quite correct. The former is in keeping with *Abd al-Rahmān al-Sūfī* s verdict, according to which al-Dinawarī was very well acquainted with the verses on the Milky Way but his astronomical knowledge was insufficient (it may be noted that *Abd al-Rahmān mentions an Ibn Kunawa, while there is a Muhammad b. Kunawa in al-Marzūqī*).

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

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

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

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

Al-Karâfi (d. 1285–1286) who wrote a work on Optics ("Noteworthy consideration of what the eyes grasp in 50 questions or problems"), says in the 49th question: "Why do we see a black haze on the moon? Is this an illusion or reality?" and continues:

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

Of these four views the second is nearest the truth.

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

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

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

"Some learned men are agreed that the Milky Way, al-Madjarra, has its origin in the fact that small stars have become combined in this figure (\(\text{qādār}\)) and offer themselves jointly to the view. On account of their smallness they do not look like shining stars as they are joined together and give their light together (the light of the single stars forming one whole). This is the origin of the shining and the figure which we see. This view is one which is intelligible and men adopt it." 3

"We say that the Milky Way is a limbus of the sphere of the fixed stars. As it is a thick limbus, which is thicker than the other limbs, it completely absorbs the light of the sun, corresponding to what the other limbs take up, i.e. as the stars do. This corresponds to the view of him who says that the latter are thick limbs of their sphere. Each limb takes up light in proportion to its density. But this density is the cause of light being reflected to us 4."

"Many learned men attack the Aristotelian view — as was done even in ancient times — and regard the latter view (5.) as the most probable."

The anonymous writer therefore lays it down quite generally that the Milky Way cannot be in the ether; it has always one and the same form quite independently of the position from which it is seen and does not alter its position.

Ahū 'l-Faradj (Bar Hebraeus) in his work ("Elevation of the spirits; on the shape of heaven and of the earth"; transl. by F. Nau, Paris 1899, 92 sq.) has a section on the vapour-stars 2 (kawkāb ṣāḥbī) and the Milky Way. He says: "In the heavens there are some white patches, vapour-stars. Some think these are a part of the Milky Way as it like they resemble clouds. They also think that they consist of a very large number of very small stars lying very close to one another, like the mane below the lion which is in the shape of an ivy leaf. Those who believe this also say that the whole Milky Way consists of very small stars joined together. The Milky Way is obviously neither smoke nor vapour in the air, as the Peripatetics say, since the moon and the planets experience no change in their light as they pass through the Milky Way (it must therefore lie outside the sphere of Saturn) but on the contrary rather affect the Milky Way 3.

The following note may he added on patches of nebulae:

Among the nebulae known to the Muslims are the Magellanic clouds which were observed by merchants in Makdāšīh. They saw there a white patch of cloud which never came down and never changed its position (al-Kazwīnī, 'Adīṭīh al-Makhdūṣīr, vol. ii., p. 40).

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

---

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

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


(MADJD) AL-DAWLA, Abu 'Abd Allah Rustom b. Fakhir al-Dawla, a Buid. After the death of his father Fakhir al-Dawla [q.v.], Madjd al-Dawla, who, according to the usual statement, was then four years of age, according to another eleven (while Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamal, ix. 48 says he was born in 379 [989/990] which does not agree with either of these statements) was proclaimed as successor under the regency of his mother Saiyida. In 388 (998) Khus b. Washmgir [q. v.] seized the two provinces of Dirdqan and Tabarsi, to which was added by the treaty of peace Mzdanda-ran also, and later he brought Gilan also under his rule. In 397 (1006—1007) Madjd al-Dawla with the help of the vizier al-Khaqani Abu Ali b. Ali b. al-Kasim attempted to overbow his mother but he was taken prisoner by his brother Shams al-Dawla [q.v.] and the Kurdchief Badr b. Hasana Wah, whereupon Shams al-Dawla took control of the government. His rule did not last long, however; after a year Madjd al-Dawla was released and again recognised as ruler, while his brother retired to his governorship of Hamadhan. In 405 (1015) the latter succeeded in seizing the town of al-Ra;i; Saiyida and Madjd al-Dawla had to flight, but were soon able to return because Shams al-Dawla was prevented from following them by a mutiny in the army and had to leave the city. Saiyida held the reins of government till her death (410, 1020—1024), while Madjd al-Dawla, who although extremely interested in learning, otherwise cared only for his numerous harem, paid no heed to affairs of state. After Saiyida's death complete chaos reigned. In the beginning of the year 420 (1029) Sultan Mahmut b. Subuktegin [q.v.] undertook a campaign into the Triik. When Madjd al-Dawla wrote to him and complained of the rebellious spirit of his army, the Sultan sent a considerable body of troops against Raiy and ordered the commander to seize Madjd al-Dawla. When the troops appeared the latter went to them and was at once seized along with his son Abul Dalaf. The Sultan himself then set out against Raiy, seized the town and had Madjd al-Dawla sent in chains to Khorsan.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEEN)

MADJD AL-DIN. [See HIRAT ALLAH B. MUHAMMAD.]

MADJD AL-MULK, Abu 'l-Fadl Asaad b. Muhammad al-Barkhistani, finance minister of the Saljuq Sultan Barkiyaruq. As early as 485 (1092—1093) we find Madjd al-Mulk mentioned among the officials of the sultan's court. After his death Barkiyaruq was unable to find a person who became more and more powerful, while Barkiyaruq's weakness and incapacity became more and more obvious. But as a Shii Madjd al-Mulk became suspected of being the real instigator of the murders committed by the Isma'ilis and after the amir Bursuk [q.v.] had fallen a victim to Isma'ilist fanaticism, the troops mutinied (Shawwl 492 = Aug./Sept. 1099) and demanded that Madjd al-Mulk should be handed over to them. He offered to sacrifice his life and proposed that the sultan should have him executed to satisfy the soldiers. But Barkiyaruq, wishing to save him, had him imprisoned. After the soldiers had sworn not to slay Madjd al-Mulk, but only to imprison him, he was handed over. In spite of their oath, the soldiers fell upon him and at once hewed him to pieces. — His nisba is derived from Barawistan, a village near Kuman; cf. Yakut, s. v.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEEN)

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

Bibliography: 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Kalbī, Istīlāḥat al-Sa‘īda, ed. Spranger, p. 17 (N.o 59) and p. 50 (N.o 178); Kasthāf al-Istīlāḥat al-Funūn, i. 686 (art. sūlak); Dāmī, Lavoîth, transl. by E. H. Whinfield, p. 27; D. B. Macdonald, The religious attitude and life in Islam, p. 257—259.

(R. A. Nicholson)

MADJID (A), [See Al-Alī]

MADJNUN. In Arabic, Persian and Turkish literature the epithet al-madjnun, i.e. "the man possessed by a djinn", "the madman", is pre-eminently associated with Ka‘īs b. al-Mu‘alla (according to others, the name of his father is Mu‘ṣīb), the madjīnun of the Banū ‘Amir b. Sa‘āda, the story of whose passion for Laila, daughter of Sa‘d, a woman of the same tribe, is celebrated throughout the Muḥammatan world. Ka‘īs is said to have died about 80 A.H. (Fawāzī, Butūk 1283, ii. 172), but it seems doubtful whether he can be regarded as a historical person, and this view is supported by the statements of early Muslim authorities (Aghānī, i. 167—169; cf. Ibn Khallīkān, ed. Wüstenfeld, N.o 105, p. 159, 8, and Ibn Khaldūn, Muḥaddidin, ed. Quatremere, ii. 196, 4 fr. foot = Aghānī, i. 169, 4 fr. foot, where maghīnun is described as one of three persons who never existed), while Ibn al-Kalbī declared that the story of Madjīnun and the poems attributed to him were fabricated by a man of the Banū ‘Umaiya (ibid., i. 167, 4 fr. foot). Stripped of the picturesque details with which later poets have embellished it, the story is a simple one: Ka‘īs meets Laila amongst a party of women, falls in love at first sight and slaughters his camel to make a feast for her. His love is returned, but her father advises him to give her to his son in marriage; and soon afterwards she becomes the wife of Ward b. Muhammad al-‘Uqailī. Ka‘īs, crazed with despair, passes the rest of his days in solitude, wandering half-naked in the hills and valleys of Nājd, making verses on the subject of his unhappy love, and only seeing Laila at rare intervals until his death. The development of this love-tale of the Arabian desert into one of the popular themes of Persian romantic and mystical poetry was begun by Niẓāmī of Ganjā, in whose Khamar the Laila al-Madjīnun occupies the third place. Of other poems bearing the same title, the best-known in Persian literature are those by Amīr Khusrāw of Dihlī, Dāmī and Ḥattūf; and in Tur- kish, by Ḥāmō (see the abstract in Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, ii. 175—190) and Fuūdī (ibid., ii. 85—88; 100—104).—Sūfī writers find in Madjīnūn a type of the soul which through tribulation, self-devotion and self-abandonment aspires to be united with God.


(R. A. Nicholson)

MADJIRA or Monoq, a term in prosody, meaning the vowel of the rawi or the consonant which is repeated at the end of each line of a kāṣida (cf. Kāṭiva). (Moh. Ben Cheneh)

AL-MADJIRĪTI, his full name was Abu 'l-Kāsim Maslama b. Ahmad al-Farābī al-Ḥasib (the Astronomer). Of the Cordovan al-Andalusī (the Spaniard). We know little of his life. He was born in Madrid but in what year is not known. Various dates are given for his death, which must lie between 395 (1004) and 398 (1007). In Madrid he studied the science of mensuration under an authority on the subject, 'Abd al-Ghāfir, who was also famous for his geometrical knowledge. Al-Madjariti later moved to Cordova where he lived in the reigns of Ḥakam II (350—366 = 961—976) and Ḥīṣam II (366—399 = 976—1009). He died before the outbreak of the fighting and confusion (fitna) which led to the fall of the Umayyads. From his place of birth and place of long residence he gets the two names al-Madjariti and al-Kurtubi. Like so many other scholars, Al-Madjariti is mentioned in laudatory terms by the biographers. He was the leader (imām) in mathematical knowledge, including mensuration. He surpassed his predecessors in knowledge of the doctrine of the spheres and the movements of the stars. He devoted particular attention to the observation of the heavenly bodies and made a special point of comprehending the Almagest. Whether al-Madjariti also dealt seriously with medicine we do not know but among his pupils were several who did. On the works on occult subjects ascribed to him, cf. below.

We are told of a journey to the east from which he brought back Greek and Arabic manuscripts which he adapted for the requirements of the west. Spanish astronomy was thus given a more independent position; for before the middle of the tenth century, as the survey given by Sanchez Perez shows, the Spanish representatives of astronomy and mathematics were of little importance either in numbers or ability. There were among them no scholars to compare with the Banū Mūsā, Thabit b. Qurra, Ibn al-Hādhām, al-Battāntī etc. But even after the time of al-Madjariti, Djābir b. Aḥfār and al-Zarkālī are really the only two of distinction. Perhaps we should also mention the much used Abu l-Ḥasan al-Marrākūshī, but his works are for the most part compilations.

In Cordova, where al-Madjariti lived for a considerable time, he founded — probably as a result of his journey — a school which numbered a number of distinguished scholars, such as Ibn al-Samh (Suter, N.o 194, also a physician), Ibn al-Saffār (Suter, N.o 195), the Kirmānī (Suter, N.o 205), Ibn Khaldūn (Suter, N.o 207, also a physician), al-Zahrāwī (mathematician and physician), (Suter, N.o 190). These men spread and developed the teachings of al-Madjariti and his methods; al-Zarkālī also based his work upon them. — It is however questionable whether al-Madjariti owes his fame more to the widely circulated occult writings which are probably pseudographic or to his astronomical teaching; for his literary activity in this latter field was not great.

Of his astronomical works, his version of the book of tables (tāb) of Muhammad b. Mūsā al-Khwārizmī, which is one of the earliest books of tables in Islam, is of special importance. He converted the tables which are based on the era of
Yazdādjiird into tables based on the Muḥammadan era. He also to some extent replaced the meridian of Arin by that of Cordova, and he also gave the approximate positions of the planets for the beginning of the Ḥijrā. On the other hand, he did not notice a series of errors in the older book and various other astronomical works of his: a work in which he gives a short method of equating the stars (Ṭabīl al-Kawākib) in the tables of al-Battānī; a work on the astrolobe which survives in Latin; a translation of the planisphere of Ptolemy; the latter was translated into Latin in 1143 by Hermann Secundus of Tolosa. His interest in astronomy led al-Mādjarī to deal with the principle of the transversal, in which he developed the views of Thābit ibn Qurra. His Fi Zamān ʿIlm al-ʿAḍād (On the Perfection of the Doctrine of Numbers) or al-Mulamātāt On Business-calculations) is mathematical. Whether the Kitāb al-ʿAḍād (On stones) and the work on the procreation of animals are genuine, need not be discussed here.

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

Two other works belong together in subject matter, Rutbat al-Ḥakm fi ʿl-ʿIlmīya and Ghīyāt al-Ḥakm fi ʿl-Sīrār, "The Goal of the Learned in Magic", which are ascribed in the manuscripts to al-Mādjarī, although he never mentions himself in them. E. J. Holmyard after a thorough study of the question does not believe they are by al-Mādjarī, the main reason being that al-Mādjarī died before the fīna, while these works were not written till after this period. The earlier biographers do not mention them among the works of al-Mādjarī; and it may well but doubted whether works of this kind were in keeping with his mental attitude. Both the works deal with occult subjects. The Ghīyāt treats of talismans, amulets, etc. Hājjī Khaṭṭāf, iv. 166, in dealing with the science of talismans (ʾilm al-ṭibbānāt), says that in it al-Mādjarī expounded very fully but not always intelligently the principles of the science. The Rutba is of an alchemy nature; Hājjī Khaṭṭāf, v. 250 sq. also quotes al-Mādjarī among the alchemists. Holmyard, op. cit., gives the gist of the book.


(E. Wiedemann)

MADJARĪ. [See YAZĐĐĐĐI WA-MADJARĪ] MĀDJĀRĪ (A.), the Zoroastrians. The Greek word Mādjarī (which itself renders an Iranian word, cf. old-Persian magjārī, new-Persian magja) passed into Arabic through a Persian medium. According to the Arabic lexicographers, Mādjarī is a collective like Vēlādī; in the singular Mādjarī is to be used; the religion of the Mādjarī is called the Mādjarīya. The lexicographers cite from the root Vm-∂-

1. In a poem, cited in the Lisan and the Ṭagī al-ʿĀrīs the phrase nār magjarī is found; if we only could be sure, that this poem is really (as is asserted in the Lisan) a composition of Ḥasan of Ad-Dawr and the Tāwām al-Yaṣṣkūr conjointly, the word would already occur in the oldest Arabic literature extant.

In the lexicon, the word Mādjarī is derived from a proper name, Mndjī Kībā, which name, according to them, is the Persian equivalent for Arabic ṣaḏār al-ʿaṣwīn ("with little ears"). This man, named Mndjī Kībā, they say, is not the same as Zoroaster, but lived before him, and was the first who proclaimed the religion of the Mādjarīs. This is one instance of the many etymological and etiological enormities of Arabic antiquarians (cf. Līsān, viii. 98 sq.; Ṭagī al-ʿĀrīs, iv. 245; Lane, Lexicon, s. v.). Incidentally, it may be noted that in Arabic literature the word Mādjarī is also used to denote the peoples of Northern Europe, viz. the Scandinavians (cf. Deyr, Kitzheimer, ii. 250 etc., Appendice N°. xxxiv., p. lxxv.; Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici ..., collegit et ed. A. Seippel, i, Christiania 1890).

In the Kur'ān the word Mādjarī occurs once (xxii. 17); with this verse, ii. 59 and v. 73 are to be compared. In these three places the Aḥl al-Ḳitāb [q.v.] are mentioned, but it is only in xxii. 17 that the name Mādjarī is also found. In this same verse, however, the Mādjarīs also are mentioned, who, of course, can by no means be included in the term Aḥl al-Ḳitāb. Now, in Muslim law the Zoroastrians are, it will be seen, treated as if they belonged to the Aḥl al-Ḳitāb, but this conception cannot be based on the Kur'ānic verse xxii. 17. Also, the commentators (al-Baidāwī, ed. Fleischer, p. 629; al-Zamakhshāri, Kawkāsh, p. 901; al-Ẓāfīrī, Maḥfīl al-Ṣaḥīb, iv. 554; al-Nāṣībūri in margin. Ṭafṣīr, ed. Cairo, xvii. 74 etc.) give nothing that can point to the fact of the Mādjarī being, theoretically, Aḥl al-Ḳitāb. The words of al-Ẓāfīrī, who states that the Mādjarīs are those who do not follow a real prophet, but only a mannaṭabī, might suggest that they take Mādjarī to be a sect in medias res between the real Aḥl al-Ḳitāb and the maṭḥūt, the heathen.

Al-Nāṣībūri also says that the prophet of the
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Madjus — who, moreover, are dualists — is no real prophet but a mutanabbi; the mushrik's, on the other hand, have no prophet at all, nor a sacred scripture. In Arabic historical literature the Zoroastrian Persians are themselves occasionally called mushrik, e.g. al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 302, 303, 350, 387 (mushrik); p. 407 (kuffar). Finally it must be added that the Kur'an-verse xxii. 17 seems to be a later addition to this Sura (cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Grisch. des Qur'ans, i. 214; the verse must be Madnic).

In the Ḥadīth, which represents the theory of Muslim law, there is not very much to be found otherwise than the Madjūs mentioned in particular (cf. A. J. Wensinck, Handbook of early Muhammadan Tradition, s. v. Madjus). The substance of the Ḥadīth concerning the Magi is, that they are to be treated like the Ahl al-Kitāb, and, in consequence, are bound to pay the diyya. Practically, the rising Muslim state power could not follow any other way. The subjection of Irān would have become impossible, had the Arabs considered the Zoroastrians as mere heathens, who were to be given the choice either of Islam or the sword. And, even before that time, dealing with the Zoroastrians of Bah̄rāin in this rigorous way, would have been a grave political fault. Thus tradition, though it also hands down an account of how the prophet gave the Zoroastrians of Bah̄rāin the choice of either Islam or death, reports, that 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥawf said that the prophet had accepted the diyya from these Madjūs. This tradition was regarded as authoritative afterwards, and the other, stating that the prophet refused to consider Madjūs otherwise than as mushrik, was abandoned (cf. Abū Dāwūd, xix. 29 = vol. ii. 30). 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥawf is said to have delivered his statement on an occasion when the KHāIFA UMAR felt doubtful whether he should accept the diyya from the Iranian, or not (cf. al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 267; the prophet, according to 'Abd al-Raḥmān, said: "sunnā bihim sunnat ahl al-kitāb"). There is a tradition relating that Umar, a year before his death, wrote to DJAŻ b. MA'YA, regarding the Madjūs, instructing him, to put to death every sorcerer (IĀTH), to separate each Madjūs from his wife and children, and to forbid the practice of zama'ah (the muttering of Zoroastrian prayers, new-Persian KADI or IĀTH). DJAŻ began to execute these rigid orders, and UMAR refused to accept the diyya from the Madjūs, until 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥawf said, that the prophet had accepted it from the Madjūs of Bah̄rāin (Abū Dāwūd, loc. cit.; Ibn Hani'al, Mu'amād, ii. 190, 194; al-Bukhārī, Sahīh, Cairo 1304, ii. 144 sqq.). Al-Bukhārī, moreover (i. 115) cites the following answer given to a Persian ambassador: "Our prophet has commanded us to fight you, until you serve God, and Him alone, or until you pay the diyya". So here likewise the Madjūs are put on the same level as the Ahl al-Kitāb. The determination of the position of the Zoroastrians in respect of the Muslim state, is the main point of the Ḥadīth concerning them. Moreover, there is a tradition in al-Jārmi, Fārābī, bāb 42, regulating the hereditary portion of Zoroastrians (not altogether clear. however). Other, not very important traditional matter respecting the Madjūs is cited: LIĀN, viii. 99;Lane, Lexicon, s. v. fītira: the article KADARIYA.

The traditions of the Muslims about Zoroaster are in accordance with their idea of the Zoroastrians being a kind of inferior Ahl al-Kitāb. Al-Ṭabarī relates, that Zarādūṭ b. Isfīmān (Isfīmān is an adaptation of the Awestic Spītāma, the name of the ancestor of the family to which Zoroaster belonged) laid claim to the title of a prophet, after three years of the reign of king Bihāṭb (the Awestic Wīšhāspa) had elapsed (i. 675 sq.); the same historian reports, on the authority of Hīshām b. Muhammad al-Kalbī, that Zarādūṭ, who by the Madjūs is said to be their prophet, was, according to the learned men of the Ahl al-Kitāb an inhabitant of Palestine, and a servant of one of the disciples of the prophet Jeremiah. He committed a fraud against his master, who cursed him, so that he became leprous. Zarādūṭ then went to Adhīrābādīn and began to promulgate the religion called Madjūsya; afterwards he proceeded to Balkā, where Bihāṭb resided. This king became a convert to the religion of Zarādūṭ, and compelled his subjects to embrace that religion also (i. 648; cf. al-Thā'labī, Histoire des rois des Perses, ed. Zoten berg, p. 256).

Another tradition, likewise preserved in al-Ṭabarī's work, brings Zarādūṭ together with a Jewish prophet MĀJU (vocalisation uncertain), who was sent to Bihāṭb, and, at his court, met with Zarādūṭ, and the sage Dā'īmā (Awestic Đā'māspā, the minister of Wīšhāspa and son-in-law of Zoroaster). Zarādūṭ is said to have noted down in Persian the teachings which the Jew delivered in Hebrew. Bihāṭb, and his father Uhrābā (Awestic Uhwārāspā) had been Šābis before and Zarādūṭ proclaimed their religion (Ṭabarī, i. 681, 683). These traditions aim at bringing the Zoroastrian faith into a certain connection with the Jewish religion: in the one, Zoroaster is an apostate Jew, in the other, he acts in agreement with a Hebrew prophet. In the Ḥadīth there is a saying of Ibn 'Abīlās: "when the prophet of the Persians had died, Ibīlās wrote for them the lore of the Madjūs" (inna ahl Fāris lamā màta nashīrūn kutakā islam ibīl al-Madjūsya: Abū Dāwūd, Kharāb, bāb 29 = ii. 30). This isolated tradition might perhaps in some way be connected with the reports about MĀJU.

Some Arabic authors, of course, had a better knowledge of Zoroaster and his religion, e.g. for instance al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 331, where it is stated, that according to the Madjūs, Zarādūṭ came from Urmīya, and, especially, al-Shahristānī, Kītāb al-Mīlād (ed. Cureton, p. 182 etc.), whose scientific treatise, however, contributes nothing to the knowledge of the ideas about Zoroastrianism prevalent among the Pābāī. It is enough to say, that al-Shahristānī whose information goes back to Iranian sources, gives a succinct, but, in general, correct account of Zoroaster and the Madjūs, whom he subdivides into three principal sects: the Kāyūmārthiya, the Zarawīnīya and the Zarādūṭyā, the latter, according to him, properly the followers of Zoroaster. The Madjūs are, he rightly remarks, not Ahl al-Kitāb, but, like the dualists, only possessing something like an inspired scripture (zhuhbatu kitāb, p. 179); before the rise of the Madjūsya, the Persians professed the religion of Ibrāhīm (p. 180).

Respecting the treatment of the Zoroastrians during the Islamic conquest, the following data may be given:
1) al-Yaman. Muḥammad had sent envoys to that country, who, among other things, had to collect the ġizya from those who preferred to remain Christians, Jews or Madžūs (al-Baladhūrī, p. 69). The Zoroastrians of al-Yaman (the so-called Abū') were said to be descendants from the Persians under the army of Wahrīs, who, by order of Khusrāw 1, carried back Saif b. Dhi Yazzan to that country. Muḥammad, when sending an army to al-Yaman against the pseudo-prophet al-Aswād, recommended its general, to try and win over to his side those Zoroastrians, who were treated tyrannically by al-Aswād. One of these Madžūs, Fāriz b. al-Dalālī, had already embraced ʿĪṣān; the most distinguished man among the Abū', Dāḏawāth (Dāḏāya), also became Muslim, and, at his advice, the remaining Abū' followed. They helped energetically to put down al-Aswād. So we see, that in al-Yaman the Madžūs were treated like Akh al-Kībād, after which they followed their spontaneous conversion to Islām.

2) ʿUman. There was a tradition that the prophet commanded Abī Zaid to take the ṣaddaḵa from the Muslims of ʿUman, and the ġizya from the Madžūs of that country (al-Baladhūrī, p. 77).

3) Bahrayn. In the year 8 (629/630) Muḥammad sent out al-ʿAlī b. ʿAbdallāh al-Hāḍramī to Bahrayn; most of the Arabs of that country embraced Islām, and so did ʿĪṣān, the Persian marzābān of Ḥadīj (the capital), and some other Zoroastrians. The greatest part of the Madžūs of the country, however, remained faithful to their religion, and had to pay the ġizya, like the Jews and the Christians, who, in Bahrayn, did not embrace Islām. Some Arabs criticized Muḥammad, because he pretended to accept the ġizya only from the Akh al-Kībād, and now accepted it from the Madžūs of Ḥadīj. On that occasion Sūrā v. 104 was revealed (al-Baladhūrī, p. 78 etc.). Here it can be seen, that in the oldest Islām it was by no means regarded as a matter of fact that the Madžūs were to be reckoned under the Akh al-Kībād. During the Khalifate of Abū Bakr an insurrection took place in Bahrayn, the Madžūs refusing to pay the ġizya. This rebellion was not put down before the Khalifate of ʿUmar (ibid., p. 85).

4) Iran. Before entering upon the particulars of the state of the Madžūs in Iran, it may be remarked that in Armenia the Madžūs were treated like the Jews and the Christians. They were obliged to pay the ġizya, but enjoyed security for their persons and their possessions. In the capitulation of the town of Dābīl (Atvīn) to Ḥabbī b. Maslama, the Christians, Jews and Madžūs are comprised alike under these conditions. The kanā'īris and ġizya are also mentioned as remaining in the possession of their old masters; it may be assumed, that here under these words, which properly design Jewish and Christian sanctuaries, the fire-temples of the Zoroastrians are understood also (al-Baladhūrī, p. 200).

In Iran, the regular treatment of the places which surrender themselves is the imposition of the ġizya and the kharāḏij (which, at this time, in most cases were identical terms for "tribute" in general, cf. ġizya and kharaḵa, but cf. al-Baladhūrī, p. 314, where ġizya = capitation and kharaḵa = ground-tax). Thus, the inhabitants are reduced to the state of dhimmī, as if they really were Akh al-Kībād. This is the case e. g. on the subjection of Mahrūd, Bandanīḏjan (al-Baladhūrī, p. 265), Hulwān, ʿAmmānīn (ibid., p. 301), Nihāwand (ibid., p. 306), Dinawar, Sirwān, Sarmara (ibid., p. 307), Hamadān (ibid., p. 309), ʿĪṣafān (ibid., p. 312 sq.), Ahwāz (ibid., p. 377) here the prisoners of war were released by order of ʿUmar, to cultivate the land, but not to pay kharāḏij, where being not enough Arabs for the purpose), Dūndī Sābūr (ibid., p. 382), Dūrā, Arrehḍān, Shīrāz, Darābādīrj (ibid., p. 388: at Darābādīrj, the chief authority in the town was a Zoroastrian priest, a kirbālī), Tabas and Kurīn (ibid., p. 405: they concluded a treaty with ʿUmar, which later was confirmed by ʿUhammad b. Affān), Nāsābūr, Nāsā (ibid., p. 404), Tūs (ibid., p. 405), Hārāt, Badghīs and Būhsāndīrj (ibid., p. 405), Marv (ibid., p. 405 sq.). The term ʿalāhāhān ʿalā . . . (dirham), often occurring in our source, must be understood as meaning a tribute; this appears from the last mentioned passage, p. 405 sq.

Not always, however, did the subjugation of the Iranian places come to pass without bloodshed. In Rāy a massacre ensued, but there seem to have been no religious motives for it (al-Baladhūrī, p. 317). If a town had offered a strong resistance, it might happen, that only a limited number of persons were included in the amān. This was the case at Sarakhs, where, according to the treaty, only 100 men were spared; the marzābān had not included himself in the number, and was, accordingly, killed, while the women were made captives by the conquerors (ibid., p. 405). At Sīr a similar event occurred; here the number of men, comprised in the amān, was 80, or, as others said, 100 (ibid., p. 378 sq.). At the conquest of Maḥdār all the men were killed, and the rest of the population was taken captive (ibid., p. 379). But another stronghold, though resisting the Muslims vigorously, obtained a capitulation, by which its inhabitants became dhimmī (ibid., p. 317 sq.). A great slaughter was made at the conquest of Isfāhān, where 40,000 Iranians lost their lives; most of the nobles belonging to the akh al-bayyātāt and the aswārīs perished there, as it seems, not in the defense of the town, but after its capture (ibid., p. 389 sq.).

When the Zoroastrians were received as dhimmīs, their religious practices must, of course, be respected. Thus al-Farrūḵīn paid the Muslims, on behalf of the inhabitants of Rāy and Kūnis, 500,000 dirham, while the Muslims promised, among other things, not to destroy any fire-temple (ibid., p. 318). When Āḏharbāḏān was subdued and made tributary, the treaty, which its marzābān concluded with the Arab commander, contained also the stipulation, that no fire-temple should be destroyed, and that the people of Shīlā were not to be hindered in their dancing-festivals and other practices (ibid., p. 346). It goes without saying, that in the countries, inhabited by Zoroastrians, soon after the appearance of the Arabs, mosques also were built, destined in the first place for the religious worship of the conquerors; the masjīd ġaṃtī which Saʿīd b. Abī Waḳās constructed at al-Madāin, was the earliest building of that kind in al-Sawād (ibid., p. 289). Under the Khalifate of ʿUhammad, a masjīd was built at Rāy, which town later on under the Khalifate of al-Mansūr, a masjīd ġaṃtī was erected by order of the future Khalīfa al-Mahdī, in 158 (775) (ibid., p. 309). At Tawwāḏī, its conqueror ʿUhammad b. Abī
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'Arṣ caused mosques to be erected for the Arab population, which he transported to that country (ibid., p. 386); in Arradžan a masjīd was built by the governor al-Ḥakam al-Ḥujjamīn (ibid., p. 392).

Already at the period of the conquest, there occur numerous conversions from Zoroastrianism to Islam. As T. W. Arnold (The Preaching of Islam, p. 177 etc.) observes, there were several reasons, why it was not very difficult for the Persians to exchange their religion for Muslim.

The āṣira, moreover, which the Zoroastrians were bound to pay, could no longer be required from those who had become Muslim. Soon after the battle of ṫalala some dhikhr's embraced Islam, and, consequently, became freed from paying the āṣira (al-Baladhourī, p. 265). The inhabitants of Ṭṣfā, on the other side, being invited by al-Asḥā'ī, to accept Islam, preferred to give the āṣira, but some noblemen from the same town became Muslims, and had, therefore, only to pay the kharād (for their lands: wa-anīfū n min āṣira fa-ṣūrām: ibid., p. 312). The inhabitants of Kāzvin likewise became Muslim out of avarice to the āṣira (ibid., p. 321), and so did those of al-Ḵāzīzān (ibid., p. 343).

A Zoroastrian, who had become Muslim and then apostatised, forfeited, of course, his life; this happened e. g. with the dhikhr of Masān, who was killed by al-Mughiya b. Ṣu'īda (ibid., p. 342). Other instances of the progress of Islam, we find in the case of Ādharbājīdān. When al-Asḥā'ī for the first time governed this country, he ordered the Arab settlers whom he himself had brought into the land, to invite the population to Islam. These efforts were successful; as al-Asḥā'ī, under the kalifate of 'Ali, a second time became governor of Ādharbājīdān, he found, that most of the population had become Muslim (ibid., p. 328 s.).

The conversion to Islam of some individuals seems to have been brought about chiefly by the admiration of the rapid successes of the Muslims (instances to be found in al-Baladhourī, p. 374-381); a case of forced conversion is that of Īlūmarān (q.v.). Converts to Islam, whose original name had a too pronounced Zoroastrian meaning, had to exchange that name for an Arab one: the Khālīfa al-Ḥammān, e. g. appointed a certain Māyārdār (comp. Pahlavi vārdā, the Zoroastrian offering of food; the long ḍ of the Arabic trans-literation causes, however, a difficulty for this explanation) governor of Ṭabarzān, Rīšān and Lūhāvand: this Māyārdār had to change his name into Muḥammad Ṭabarzānī (ibid., p. 339). Also the father of Ḥasan al-Bāṣrī (q.v.) was one of the persecutors, taken after the conquest of Masān, altered his name, Fāhrū, to Yāsār (ibid., p. 344), although this Persian name could scarcely offend a Muslim ear: but, after he became a mawla, a change of name became necessary.

After the conquest, Zoroastrianism, for the time being, continued to exist in many parts of Iran, not only in countries which came relatively late under Muslim sway (e. g. Ṭabarzān, cf. KHRUSHHD), but also in those regions which early had become provinces of the Muslim empire. In almost all the Iranian provinces, according to al-Mawṣūdī, fire-temples were to be found: '...the Mājūs', he says (ed. Darbīr de Meynard, v. 86) 'generate many fire-temples in 'Irāk, Fārā, Kirmān, Sījistān, Khurāsān, Ṭabarzān, al-Dībāl, Ādharbājīdān, Arrān' (he adds also: 'in Hind, Sind and Shīrāz'). This general statement of al-Masūdī is fully supported by the mediaeval geographers, who make mention of fire-temples in most of the Iranian towns. The toleration, then, from the part of the Muslims, must have been greater in mediaeval times than in modern ones. That, however, not all Zoroastrians felt happy under a non-Zoroastrian government, appears from the fact, that a number of Mādījus, the ancestors of the Parsi's of to-day, emigrated to India. Their landing on the coast of Gujrat is said to have taken place in the year 716 of the Christian era.

Conversion to Islam may have been, in many cases, 'peaceful and to some extent, at least, gradual' (Arnold, loc. cit., p. 181). On the other hand, it is evident, that for a Zoroastrian, desirous to attain to some prominent position, conversion to Islam was indispensable. Among the well-known converts from Zoroastrianism may be cited Ibn al-Mukaffa (q.v.), Sāmīn Khudū, the founder of the dynasty of the Šāmānīdās (q.v.), the poet Daftī (q.v.), etc.

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

A history of the relations between the Muslim state and the Persian Zoroastrians (for neither the Indian Zoroastrians, the Pārsīs, nor the internal history of the Zoroastrian community concern us here) can only be written, when the mass of Persian historical literature of the Middle Ages and modern times will be completely accessible. The position of the Zoroastrians has become worse in course of time. Their number seems to have greatly diminished by the disturbances which ensued after the death of Nādir Šāh (1160 = 1747). When the Afghans destroyed the Zoroastrian quarter at Kirmān, and by the war between Aḫa Muḥammad Kān Kāḡar and Lutf 'Alī Kān (see also Kirmān). In modern times the number of Zoroastrians in Persia is estimated by v. Houtum-Schindler (1879) at 8,499 at all; by Browne (1887/1888) at 7,000—8,000 for Kirmān, and Yazd and environs alone [but elsewhere (A year among the Persians, p. 379) he gives for Yazd and its environs alone 7,000—10,000] and for Bahramābād 20—25. The Encyc. Britannica (1911) has the number 9,000 for the whole of Persia.

In 1854, there were in Yazd and its environs 6,658 Zoroastrians, of whom 25 were merchants, and the rest small husbandmen and labourers (Karaka, History of the Parsees, l. 55). The same author gives for Kirmān (in 1854, the date of the book) no more than 450; for 'Irān 50-50 men, and a small number of humbler position, who were employed as gardeners, in the palace of the Šāh. At Shīrāz, some Zoroastrian families were found, who exercised the trade of shop-keepers. Further more, there are Zoroastrians at Kāshān and Busahr (v. Houtum-Schindler). The Gebers of Bīrū are Indian Pārsīs (cf. BKh).

According to Browne, there are in Persia 5
on Oct. 1, 844. It was not till November that they were forced to seek the shelter of their vessels by the Muslim armies sent against them. Other bands at the same time ravaged with fire and sword the whole coast from Lisbon to Trafalgar and one of them reached a point in Africa where the little town Ālā (Arzila, q.v.) was founded soon afterwards, but took to flight on the approach of the Berbers of the region.

After this invasion, the leader of the Norse hordes seems to have sent an ambassador to the Caliph 'Abd al-Rahmān II to propose a peace. The Umayyad sovereign agreed to his request and sent to discuss the terms of the treaty a diplomat of his entourage, Yahya b. al-Hakam al-Bakrī al-Daiyānī, known as al-Ghazāl. The latter reached Silves, where he entered a ship which after various adventures took him to the Norse leader. Al-Ghazāl returned to his master after an absence of 20 months. The account of his embassy has been preserved for us by Ibn Dīnār. In the vizier Tamālm b. 'Alkarnī, a friend of al-Ghazāl.

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

We have fuller details of the invasions which followed. In 255 (969), the Danes, who had come to the assistance of the first Duke of Normandy, made an expedition against Muslim Spain, on the interested advice of Richard I. This lasted three years. The invaders, always called Madjūs by the Arab historiasts, appeared first at Kāfīr Abī Dānis (Alacer do Sal) and landed in the country round Lisbon which they laid waste. The Caliph al-Hakam sent against them a fleet from Seville which met theirs in the estuary of the Tagus. At the same time a battle was fought on land near Lisbon in which the Muslims were defeated. The Danes then extended their efforts to Galicia and in 970 seized St. Iago da Campestello. In the next year, they again attacked Muslim Spain but they were much weakened by the losses they had suffered in the north of the Peninsula and they do not seem to have dared to land anywhere.

It is also to the Madjūs (the name being accompanied by the more precise one of adhālīyūn = Arabdomani) that the Arabs attribute the celebrated taking in the following century of the town of Barbastro (Barbāštar) to the N.W. of Saragossa, on the borders of Aragon. The historian Ibn Haiyān wrote a detailed account of it, which is preserved by Ibn 'Ishārī. A Norman expedition, with French knights, shared, which was evidently led by Guillaume de Monteaur, succeeded in capturing Barbastro in 456 (1064). This success and the barbaric treatment inflicted on the population made a deep impression on Muslim Spain. In the next year the king of Saragossa, Ahmad b. Sulaimān Ibn Hād al-Mu'tābid, with an army reinforced by a contingent of cavalry sent by the Seville ruler, al-Mu'tābid Ibn 'Abbād, recaptured Barbastro, where a weak garrison left.
by the Normans on their return to France could offer only a brief resistance and was almost entirely wiped out.


**MADHU** is 1. in the legal institution of the *damūs* [q.v.], "surety", a term which occurs in the following connection: *madīnān amaḥu* "debtor" *madīnān laka* or "alibi creditor", *madīnān al-īlā* "pawn". For the parties to the agreement and the article in question in a bond, the rules hold which apply to all other contracts.


2. In the chapters of the Fikb books which deal with the law of obligations, *madīnān* is used for the thing for which one is liable or responsible, i.e. is bound to replace. In this way damūn comes to mean in the wider sense, "liability, obligation to restore" in contracts. This liability consists either in the producing of something identical (ṣiṣṭtī) i.e. of a thing of the same quality and quantity (ṣiffat wa-sawā'y), e.g. in edible things (ṣifitūlāt) which are measured by quality, weight, or number (maṣaxāt wa-masālik, wa-ma'dād) or in the value of the thing (ṣīma) e.g. in non-edible things (maṣārikāt) which have a special individuality, and are therefore *āin* species.

**Bibliography:** The chapters on the conditions of legal agreements in the Fikb books. (O. Swers)

**MADRAS** Presidency, the southernmost province in British India, occupies the whole of the southern portion of the Peninsula with an area of 142,260 sq. m.; total population (1921): 42,118,953, of whom 2,840,483 (nearly 7%) are Muhammadans. The majority of these are Tamils, 2,681,945 (93.60 per cent); Shī'a: 54,114. The only Native State with a Muhammadan ruler is Banaganapalle (255 sq. m.); population 36,626, of whom only 10% are Muhammadans. The language spoken by the majority of the Muhammadans of the province is Malayalam (1,108,865 i. e. 37 per 1,000, including almost all the Māppilas [q.v.]; Hindustāni, 335 per 1,000; Tamil 209 per 1,000. History: Southern India began to suffer early in the sixth century from plundering raids—carried out by the Muhammadans established in the north, until the rise of the Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar in 1356 erected an effectual barrier against the southward expansion of Muhammadan power for more than two centuries. When in 1564 the four Sultans of the Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan,—Bidājur, Bidar, Ahmadnagar and Golconda,—joined forces against this powerful Hindu state, in a single decisive battle (Tālīkot, January 1565) they effected the ruin of Vijayanagar and utterly destroyed the capital, and its territories were for the most part incorporated in the kingdoms of Bidājur and Golconda. In 1656 and 1657 Awanrzeh [q.v.] conquered these two kingdoms and made them part of the Moghul empire. After Aṣfār Džah, the first Niğm of Ḥaidarābād, had made himself independent, in 1724, the Nawāb of the Carnatic [q.v.], also styled the Nawāb of Arcot (Arīka) from the name of his capital, became his chief subordinate in the South of India. When in the middle of the xvirith century the English and the French were in conflict with one another in Southern India, each espoused the cause of a different claimant for the office of Nawāb of the Carnatic. The support of British troops under the command of Robert Clive assured the success of Muhammad 'Ali (ob. 1795), but papers seized at Siringapatam after its capture in 1799, having proved that both he and his son and successor, though nominally allies of the British, had been in secret correspondence with Tīpū Sultan [q.v.], Lord Wellesley, then Governor-general of India, declared them to be public enemies of the British Government, and in 1801 concluded a treaty with a grandson of Muhammad 'Ali, named A'aṣam al-Dawla, according to which he resigned the government of the Carnatic into the hands of the East India Company, but retained the titular dignity and received a considerable pension. The present representative of the family bears the title of Prince of Arcot and has the position of the premier nobleman of Madras. The greater part of the existing Presidency of Madras consists of the territories annexed by Lord Wellesley.

MADRAS City, on the shore of the Bay of Bengal, in 10° 4' N. and 80° 15' E., is the capital of the presidency of the same name; population (1921): 526,911, of whom 135 in every 1,000 are Muhammadans.

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

**MADRASA.** [See Masjid.]

**MADRID.** The present capital of Spain has kept the name it had in the Muslim period: *Madīrīt* (ethnic *al-Madīrīt*). Arab geographers describe it as a little town grouped round a strong fortress, with a khubta mosque, at the foot of the Djībal al-Shārat, the Sierra de Guadarrama, and a dependency of the province of Toledo. It was especially known for its potteries. It had only an unimportant history, but gave birth to several famous Muslim scholars, among whom the most important was Abu l-Kāsim al-Maslama b. Ahmad al-Madīrī, who lived in the second half of the fourth century and on whom cf. Brickelmann, G. A. L., i. 243. Madrid was taken in 1476 (1083) by King Alphonso VI. According to a Christian tradition, Ramiro II had previously held possession of it for a short time during his campaign against the Muslims in 937 (993). It was on the site of the old cathedral (*qaṣr*) of Madrid that the king
of Castille had the church dedicated to the Virgin of the Almudena built.


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

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

Islam is the generally prevailing religion. The Madurese have no tendency to fanaticism but as a rule they faithfully perform the principal duties of their religion; the great Muslim feasts are duly observed. All receive the usual elementary religious instruction and many are not content with this only. We have no exact or reliable information as to the period of their conversion and the manner in which it came about; the stories given in the native sources do not agree. But as Madura has politically always been closely connected with Java (in the Hindu period it was subject to the kingdoms of Tumapõl and Madjapahit; at a later date it was under the adhāpit of Surabaya and then under the Sulīm of Mataram) and as it is quite close to the district through which the new religion entered Java, it may well be assumed that between the first dissemination of Muslim ideas on Java and on Madura not a great deal of time passed. The complete conversion of the island to Islam seems to have taken place quickly and without difficulty. Hindu rule had never made a deep impression. According to native tradition Madura belonged to the Muhammadan coalition which overthrew the Hindu Javanese kingdom of Madjapahit. Until 1623 Madura (which was divided into five small states) formed part of the territory of the adhāpit of Surabaya. In this year it was acquired by Mataram and a Madurese prince appointed governor. When in 1678, as a reward of his, Truna Djaya, rebelled against Mataram, endeavoured to make Madura independent and even aimed at rule over Java, the ruler of Mataram sought the intervention of the Dutch East India Company. In 1679 Truna Djaya was taken prisoner; in 1705 Mataram recognized the suzerainty of the Dutch East India Company (which had existed in reality since 1653) over the eastern part of Madura and in 1743 over the whole island. The Company and after them the Dutch government for a considerable time always avoided intervention in the internal affairs of the island; as the rulers of Madura had repeatedly performed important services, they were treated — often to the injury of their subjects — less as servants of the Company than as independent allies. From the middle of the sixteenth century the power of the rulers was gradually limited; since 1885 the whole island has been directly under Dutch rule.

Madura—Madyan Shu'aib

MADYAN SHU'AIB, a town on the east side of the Gulf of Akaba. The name is connected with that of the tribe of Midian, known from the Old Testament (xx: Madian, Madyan; in Josephus, Madyon; & Madyon, Madyon). But it can hardly be used without further consideration to identify the original home of this tribe, as the town might be a later Midianite settlement and besides it is difficult to fix the real home of such wandering tribes. In the Old Testament a town of Midian is not mentioned (not even in 1 Kings, vi. 18 where “Midian” should probably be read). On the other hand Josephus (Ant., xii. 1) knew Madiane as a town on the coast, but the text of his Boecitus (Onomast., ed. Lardner, p. 270), in Ptolemy vii. 1. 2, it is mentioned as a town on the coast and called Mediana or Medumina while in another passage it gives it as an inland town under the name Madima, a difference which is explained by the actual position of the town. In Muhammad's time there is only one reference (in Ibn Ishâk) to the town of Madyan, when the Prophet sent an expedition under Zaid b. Hijrâta thither. There are occasional references in the poet Kuthâyir (in Yâkût, d. 723), who speaks of the monks there and in the record of Muhammad b. al-Hanâfiya's journey to Aila. In the geographers it is mentioned only as a town near the coast, six days' journey from Tabîb; it was the second station on the pilgrims' road from Aila to Madina and was a dependency of Madina. In the sixteenth century Ya'qûbî speaks of its position in a district rich in springs and watercourses, gardens and date groves and of its mixed population. Iṣâkhrî says it is larger than Tabîb and describes from his own observations the spring there, from which Moses watered the flocks of Shu'aib (see below), it was now covered by a house which had been built over it. The town then began to decline gradually. In the xîbî century Idrîsî says it is an unimportant little trading centre with scanty resources; in the xivth century Abu 'l-Fida' says it was in ruins. Only in recent times has it been visited e.g. by Ruppell, Burton and Musil. The extensive ruins, which the Arabs call Maghâr Shu'aib after the cave-tombs, lie about 16 miles east of the port of Ma'di in 29° 28' N. Lat. in the southern part of the valley of al-Badî', which is rich in streams and palms and other trees. According to Burton the whole district between 29° 28' and 27° 40' is called Ar-dh Madyan.

In the Qur'ân following the Old Testament there are repeated references to Madyan as a people: for example in the stories of Moses' stay with them (xx. 42; xxvii. 21 sqq., 45), where his father-in-law (Jethro in the O. T.) is still anonymous, or in one of the stereotyped legends of prophets in which the Madyan are punished because they would not believe their prophet Shu'aib (vii. 85-91; xi. 85-98; xxix. 35 sq.). Abu Shu'aib was later identified with the father-in-law of Moses, for which there is no authority in the Old Testament. But perhaps the real truth is that Shu'aib had originally nothing to do with Madyan. In the older Siras (xx. 78; xxxvii. 176 sq.; xxxviii. 12; I. 13) it is not the Midianites but the Aqâbâh a-Sukâ (the people of the thicket) who are his enemies and it is therefore very possible that Muhammad only later combined an indigenous story of the people of the thicket and their Shu'aib with the Midianites of the Old Testament.


(FR. BULI)
**MAGHNATIS, MAGHNATIS, MAGHNĪTIS, Lodestone and Compass.**

1. The Lodestone and Magnetism

The lodestone is a widely disseminated mineral, and is therefore frequently mentioned by geographers and cosmographers, for example in the pseudopegraphical *Petrology* of Aristotle, by al-Dimishkī, al-Kazwini, al-Taflāhī, Ibn al-Fākih, al-Kalkashandi, etc. Of Amīr and Ḥašāṣūj, it is said, the lodestone is found there as a hard rock. According to Ibn Sinā, the Indian is the best and al-Kazwini makes it come from India. Like the Greeks and Romans, the Arabs also discussed the properties of the lodestone and its effects on iron. They found that the lodestone can hold an iron needle (a ring), this a second, a third and so on, so that a chain is formed.

The power of attraction of the lodestone was defined. Most writers say that a lodestone can lift double its weight in iron, and one from Ḥašāṣūj three times. Dājjār b. Ḥašīyān al-Sūfī possessed a particularly strong one. Dājjār b. Ḥašīyān ascertaind that it could work through bronze. Other information is given by Shams al-Dīn al-Dimishkī, p. 72, or 85, of the work mentioned below (cf. also E. Wiedemann, Beitrag, ii. 3: Uber Magnetismus, S. B. P. M. S. Erlangen, xxxvi, 1904, p. 322).

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

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

The Arabs devoted much attention to the theory of these phenomena — with how little satisfactory results is evident from the remark of Ibn Butlān: — "It is very annoying for us to feel that we do not know this with certainty (the cause of the attraction of iron), although we perceive it with the senses". Dājjār b. Ḥašīyān explains the power as a spiritual one, classing it with scents. Al-Tughā’s includes the lodestone among the stones which contain spirits (see E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xxiv. Zur Abhandlung der Arabern, S. B. P. M. S. Erl., xliii., 1911, p. 82). Al-Kīzī does not seem to have dealt with its attraction through vacant space in a work which has not survived, entitled *Kitāb Iltā ʿUṣfīrād al-Maghnītīs fi l-Madid wa-fikr Kalām al-Maṭā ḫaṣr fī l-ʿUṣfīrād*. Book on the reason why the *Maghnītīs* attracts iron: in it there is much discussion of empty space (see Ibn Abī Uṣfīrād, i. 320). Ibn Sinā used needles views which are very obscure in his *Kitāb al-Šīfā* (Maḥāla 2); Ibn Ḥaṣīn is more lucid in his *Kitāb Tawḥīd al-Ḥamāmī fī l-ʿUṣfīrād wa ʿUṣfīrād, Al-Kazwini traces the attraction to a similarity of natures, through which love and attraction between them arose at the beginning of their existence. The Arabs are very fond in poetry and prose of comparing the effect of the magnet on iron to that of the lover on the beloved.

That there are many fables associated with this power of attraction is to be expected. Idols etc. of iron are said to be kept suspended in the air by lodestones (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xii.: Uber Lampen und Uhr., S. B. P. M. S. Erl., x., 1907, N. viii., p. 297). Nails were drawn out of ships and they were thus caused to sink, as was the case with Sindbad’s. According to al-Kazwini (*Al-ʿAzīb al-Maḥkūṭa*, i. 172) there are submarine mountains at Kuhrum which have this effect. Therefore, he says, the beams of ships in the Red Sea were bound together with ropes.

The lodestone is said to be especially effective if it is kept for a time in goat’s blood, which is of course false. The lodestone is occasionally used in medicine (cf. Ibn Sinā and Ibn al-Bāṭārī, s.v.).

Besides the lodestone, which attracts iron, quite a number of other stones are given, which have the same quality with respect to other bodies, for example, gold is the magnet of quicksilver, etc. Numerous statements about such attracting bodies, which include a number of plants, are given in the *ʿAl-ʿAzīb* of Shams al-Dīn Dimishkī (cf. the Bibliography) in the Arabic text p. 73–77, in the translation p. 85–89. Al-Kazwini also gives a number of such magnets under the word *Lāhī tāqī* ("picking, collecting") among the minerals.

2. The Compass

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

In decinding the direction by means of a magnetic needle, the Muslims used the end which pointed to the south; as Mecca lay to the south of most places in Syria etc. the *Kīlāla* (s.v.) corresponded almost exactly to the south.

The oldest passage in which the word *karam mī* or *karam bī* occurs is given by Dūyū for the year 239 (854) in Supplement, ii. 337 who found it in *al-Ḥayān al-Maqūlī (Histoire de L’Afrique et de L’Espagne)* edited by him. Serious objections have however been raised to interpreting the word as compass in this passage (M. S. O. S. Berlin, x. 1–2, 1900, p. 268) from the fact that in narratives of travels of the ninth century A.D. and that in al-Maṣūdī (923) the directions are given in the same way as on compasses, G. Ferrand concludes that the compass was already in use then. The next oldest absolutely certain reference is in the *Dīnī al-Hikayāt* of *ʿAwfī;* it is in his *Lūṭāb al-ʿĀthāb* (ed. Browne and Mīrā Māḥmūd Ḳawzīnī). A
The compass is described as a device that is used to find the magnetic north and is often depicted as a small, beautifully painted box or vessel. The compass needle is placed inside the box and, when a magnetic needle is moved inside the box, it is claimed to turn freely and indicate the direction of magnetic north. The compass is described as a device that is used to find the true direction of magnetic north, and it is also used to determine the magnetic declination, which is the difference between the true north and the magnetic north.

The compass is used to determine the direction of magnetic north, and it is often depicted as a small, beautifully painted box or vessel. The compass needle is placed inside the box and, when a magnetic needle is moved inside the box, it is claimed to turn freely and indicate the direction of magnetic north. The compass is described as a device that is used to find the true direction of magnetic north, and it is also used to determine the magnetic declination, which is the difference between the true north and the magnetic north.

The compass is described as a device that is used to find the magnetic north and is often depicted as a small, beautifully painted box or vessel. The compass needle is placed inside the box and, when a magnetic needle is moved inside the box, it is claimed to turn freely and indicate the direction of magnetic north. The compass is described as a device that is used to find the true direction of magnetic north, and it is also used to determine the magnetic declination, which is the difference between the true north and the magnetic north.

The compass is described as a device that is used to find the magnetic north and is often depicted as a small, beautifully painted box or vessel. The compass needle is placed inside the box and, when a magnetic needle is moved inside the box, it is claimed to turn freely and indicate the direction of magnetic north. The compass is described as a device that is used to find the true direction of magnetic north, and it is also used to determine the magnetic declination, which is the difference between the true north and the magnetic north.

The compass is described as a device that is used to find the magnetic north and is often depicted as a small, beautifully painted box or vessel. The compass needle is placed inside the box and, when a magnetic needle is moved inside the box, it is claimed to turn freely and indicate the direction of magnetic north. The compass is described as a device that is used to find the true direction of magnetic north, and it is also used to determine the magnetic declination, which is the difference between the true north and the magnetic north.
hammad after the early successes of Idris I in the Maghrib, brought him the submission of the Maghrawa and returned Tlemcen to him, which he had just taken from the Banū Ifran; the Maghrawa thus became one of the principal supports of the Ifrisid dynasty at its beginning.

The grandson of Muhammad b. Kharaz, a contemporary of Idris I, also called Muhammad, resisted the Fatimids [q.v.]. When the general of the Mahdi 'Ubad Allah, Maṣṣaṭa b. Habbūs, had seized the Ifrisid possessions in the Central Maghrib and placed over them the chief of the Mānasā, Mūsā b. Aḥbāy, the chief of the Maghrawa rebelled and brought under his flag a large number of Berber tribes. In 399 (921—922) he routed the army sent against him under Maṣṣaṭa, whom he slew with his own hand.

But the next year, the Maghrawa, faced with a new Fatimid offensive, had to take refuge in the region of Sijilmāsa. But some time afterwards, the 'Umayyad Caliph of Cordova ʿAbd al-Rahmān III al-Nāṣir, wishing to annex the Maghrib to his dominions, summoned the Maghrawa to his assistance and with the help of Muhammad b. Kharaz was able to bring under his sway all the central Maghrib except the region of Tihert. The son of the Maghrawīd amīr al-Khaṭāir b. Muhammad was installed as governor in Oran. The Banū Ifran and Māṣṣaṭa b. ʿAḥbāy also joined the 'Umayyads (first half of the tenth century). But all these submissions to the wishes of the 'Umayyads were only dictated by self-interest and when Muhammad b. Kharaz died at al-Kairāwān in 350 (961) he had become the vassal of the Fatimids sovereign al-Muʿizz.

The successor of ʿAbd al-Rahmān III in the caliphate of Cordova, al-Muṣṭanṣir, was a man of central Maghrib; he was able to bring under his sway the Fatimids to their old allegiance; their chief Muḥammad b. al-Khaṭāir b. Kharaz thereupon threw off Fatimid suzerainty. Knowing the enemies that this defection was going to cause him, al-Muṣṭarīz invited Zirī b. Manṭā, chief of the Sanḥāda, to attack the chief of the Maghrawa. A battle was fought in 360 (970—971) between the Maghrawa and the Sanḥāda commanded by Bologgin b. Zirī: the Maghrawa were completely routed, but a little later they were able to take their revenge, owing to the assistance of ʿAḥṣafar b. ʿAlī b. Ḥamdūn, lord of al-Malik al-Khaṭāir b. al-Muṣṭanṣir, commander of the army. This time Bologgin b. Zirī in the name of the Fatimids led a great expedition against the Zanāṭa and subjected them completely in the Central Maghrib. The Maghrawa had once again to take refuge in Sijilmāsa and, after the return of Bologgin to Ifriqiya, they definitely abandoned central Maghrib and settled in Morocco. It is from this time that two of their families were able to found two short lived kingdoms, that of the Banū Zirī b. ʿAṭīya at Fāṣ and that of the Banū Khazrān at Sijilmāsa and at Tripoli.

The Maghrawa of Fāṣ. After the defeat suffered by the Maghrawa in the central Maghrib, the descendants of Kharaz, Muhammad b. Kharaz, crossed the sea to seek the help of the famous Ṭāsimid Ḥādīb al-Muṣṭarīz b. ʿAbī Ṭāsim [q.v.]. The latter sympathised with him in his troubles and sent an expedition to the Maghrib under Ḥāṣafar b. ʿAlī b. Ḥamdūn. The Spanish army with contingents from the Banū Ifran and the Maghrawa took up a position near Ceuta and in view of its strength Bologgin b. Zirī refrained from attacking it and set out to subdue all Morocco.

In 373 (983—984) the Maghrawa, after the departure of the Spanish governor Ibn ʿAṣkaladgra, were chosen by al-Muṣṭarīz to rule Morocco in his stead. In 377 (987—988) the Ḥādīb appointed as his vassal to rule the western Maghrib, the amīr of the Maghrawa, Zirī b. ʿAṭīya b. ʿAbī Ṭāsim b. ʿAbī ʿAllāh b. Kharaz. The latter made Fāṣ his residence and settled his tribe around the town. By orders of al-Muṣṭarīz he waged war on the Sanḥāda and notably increased his dominions towards the east. In 382 (992) he made a journey to Cordova on the invitation of the Ḥādīb. In spite of the assertions — frequently contradictory — of the historians, it seems that the reign of Zirī b. ʿAṭīya was rather troubled and that changes of fortune placed on the throne of Fāṣ sometimes the Maghrawīd prince and sometimes his Ifrisid rival Yūdūd b. Yaʿlī. On his return to Fāṣ, Zirī found his place occupied by Ibn Yaʿlī and it was only after a murderous struggle that he succeeded in regaining his throne. But, finding Fāṣ not sufficiently central in position, he decided, like his Spanish suzerain, to build a capital for himself and the principal chiefs of his confederation. In 384 (994) he laid the foundations of the town of Wāḍjadiya (Oujda) and came with his court to live there. At the same time he tried to throw off the suzerainty of Cordova and relations were finally broken off between him and al-Muṣṭarīz. Ibn ʿAbī Ṭāsim sent against him an expedition under the freedman Wāḍiyya; a battle was fought on the banks of the Wāḍ Ṭāṣ and the Spanish army defeated. The Ḥādīb then sent another force under the command of his own son ʿAbī al-Malik al-Muṣṭarīz. On this campaign Zirī was twice routed in 387 (997). He sought to negotiate with the inhabitants prevented him entering it and ʿAbī al-Malik soon afterwards entered the capital. Zirī had to go to the Sahara; later he tried to create a principality for himself in the land of the Sanḥāda. He laid siege to their capital Aṣhir [q.v.] but before he could take the town, he died of the consequences of an old wound in 391 (1000—1001).

On the death of Zirī b. ʿAṭīya, the Maghrawa proclaimed his son al-Muṣṭarīz; he began his reign by endeavouring to regain the favour of al-Muṣṭarīz b. ʿAbī Ṭāsim. The latter recognised him, and his successor ʿAbī al-Raḥmān al-Muṣṭarīz appointed him governor of Fāṣ and western Maghrib in 393 (1002—1003). He received from Cordova letters of investiture for all Morocco, except the land of Sijilmāsa, which was kept for the Banū Khazraʾin. Morocco seems to have had peace and a certain degree of prosperity in the reign of al-Muṣṭarīz, who died in 417 (1026) or 422 (1031).

His successor was his cousin on the father's side Ḥanāmā b. al-Muṣṭarīz b. ʿAṭīya. He took advantage of the anarchy then prevailing in Spain to strengthen his position. He surrounded himself with literary men and legal authorities. But in 424 (1032—1033) the commander of a rival dynasty Abu ʿIsmāʿil Tamīm b. Zirī al-Ifrānī marched from Salē on Fāṣ. Ḥanāmā took the field against him with the Maghrawa but they were defeated. Tamīm entered Fāṣ the same year and persecuted the Jewish population. As to Ḥanāmā, he reached Wāḍjadiya (Oujda) and Tenes and gathered there considerable forces, with which he marched on Fāṣ in 429 (1037—1038). Tamīm had to withdraw from Fāṣ and returned to his own capital, Shella [q.v.].
Hamāma then continued to reign till his death, which probably took place in 431 (1003-1004).

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

The successor of Dūnās, Hamāma in Fās was his son al-Futūḥ, but on his accession his right to the throne was disputed by his brother Aḍiša. He made himself master of part of the capital, the "bank" (al-ta'āa) of al-Karāwiyān, while al-Futūḥ established himself on the opposite bank, that of al-Andalus. The two brothers fought in the town itself and the inhabitants were divided into two camps. Morocco was engulfed in anarchy and it was only after three years of fighting that al-Futūḥ was able to reign undisputed in al-Fās, after Aḍiša had been killed. A gate of this city perched in the southwest wall still bears his name; another in the north wall bears the name of his brother in a slightly corrupted form (Dūd Gisr).

Al-Futūḥ was driven from his capital in 454 (1062) by the Hammadīd sovereign Bologbān b. Sulaymān. This was the time when the Almoravids were beginning to invade Morocco. After the departure of al-Futūḥ, the Maghrawa appointed one of his relatives to succeed him, Muʿāṣar (or Muʿārmaṣar) b. Ḥammād b. al-Muʿāzīz b. Aḍiša, who was proclaimed in 455 (1063) and took up the struggle against the Saharan invaders. He succeeded in defeating one of the lieutenants of Yūsuf b. Tashfin and retaking Fās, which he had lost. The Almoravids having laid siege to the city, the amir of the Maghrawa attempted a sortie in the course of which he met his death (460 = 1067-1068). The people of Fās then proclaimed his son Tamīm. But the capital was taken by Yūsuf b. Tashfin two years later and the young ruler put to death along with a large number of Maghrawa and Banū Khazrān. This was the end of the dynasty of the Maghrawa of Fās. This city, which had enjoyed a certain amount of prosperity under the early members of the dynasty and had been extended by them, later suffered a great deal according to western historians, from their tyranny and exactions.

According to Ibn Khaldaš, in the period of the decline of the Maghrawa power in Fās, there was at Agmāh, at one of the entrances to the Great Atlas on the plain of Marrākush, a little dynasty of amirs belonging to the same confederation. The last of these chiefs who flourished about 450-460 (1058-1067) was called Laggūṭ b. Yūsuf b. Alī. He was defeated and slain by the Almoravids when they made their successful thrust to the north of Morocco.

The Maghrawa of Sidjilmasa (Banū Khazrān).—At the instigation of the Ḥajjib of Cordova, al-Mansūr Ibn ʿAbī ʿAmīr, a Maghrawa chief in 366 (976/7), had taken Sidjilmasa [q. v.] which for over two centuries had been governed by amirs of the Saharan branch of the Banū Khazrān. This chief, who was called Khazrān b. Fātūfī b. Khazrān, proclaimed the suzerainty of the Umayyads of Spain in Sidjilmasa and sent to Cordova the head of the last Midrārid ruler al-Muʿtaṣī b. ʿAbī ʾl-'Inā. Khazrān received from al-Mansūr the governorship of the town and kept it till his death. He was succeeded by his son Wādūdī. The latter had to defend himself against the invasion of the Sanhajā in western Maghrib and in the end was confirmed in his governorship by the Umayyads in 390 (999) after a period of disgrace. On the fall of the Spanish caliphate he proclaimed himself independent, seized the region of Dra (Darzā) and in 407 (1016-1017) took Sufrūy (Sefrou [q. v.]) and the valley of the Wādī Mašyā (Moulaya). His son and successor Masʿūdī was defeated, deprived of his lands and slain by the Almoravids in 445 (1053-1054). Ten years later, the last of the Banū Khazrān, who still held out in Sufrūy, were in their turn scattered.

On the Maghrawid dynasty of Tripoli in Barbary cf. TRIPOLI.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

MAGHRIB, the name given by Arab writers to that part of Africa which modern writers on geography call Barbary or Africa Minor and which includes Tripolitania, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The word "Maghrīb" means the West, the setting sun, in opposition to "Maghrib", the East, the rising sun (Levant), but as Ibn Khaldaš remarks, the general denomination was applied to a particular region. The extent of this area, moreover, varies according to different authors. Some Oriental writers include in the Maghrib not only Northern Africa but also Spain; the majority, however, reserve the name Maghrib for the first of these countries. But they are not in agreement upon the boundaries to be assigned to it on the East. On the other hand they are in agreement about the Northern, Western and Southern boundaries. To the North, Maghrib is bordered by the "Roman Sea" (Mediterranean). To the West it extends as
far as the "Surrounding Sea", also called the "Green Sea", the "Sea of Darkness", and by foreigners called, according to Ibn Khaldûn, Okeanos or Atlant (Atlantic Ocean), which stretches from Tangier to the desert of Lemtûn (Abu 'l-Fida') or only, according to Ibn Khaldûn, as far as Asâfi (Saffi) and Deren (Great Atlas). To the South it stretches as far as the barrier of moving sands, separating the country of the Berbers from the land of the Negroes, that is to say the Idrîsî and as far as the rocky region called "hammâda" (Ibn Khaldûn). Some districts situated outside this limit, such as Bûdû, Tamentit, Gharara, Ghadamès, Fezzân, Wâddân, are sometimes considered as belonging to Maghrib although they are in reality countries of the Sahara. As regards the Eastern boundary, certain authors made it extend as far as the sea of Kulsum (the Red Sea) and thus include in the Maghrib, Egypt and the country of Barka [see the article Barka]. Others, whose opinion is adopted by Abu 'l-Fida', maintain that it coincides with the actual frontier of Egypt, from the oases as far as the "Abâkat" which is on the sea between Barka and Alexandâria (Abâkat al-Kebîra). Ibn Khaldûn does not accept this delimitation, because, he says, the inhabitants of the Maghrib do not consider Egypt and Barka as forming part of their country. The latter commences only at the province of Tripoli and encloses the districts of which the country of the Berbers was composed in former times. Ibn Sa'id and the later Maghribi writers such as al-Zînî and Abu Kâ'ba's limit themselves to reproducing with a few variations in detail, the boundaries of Ibn Khaldûn. As to Yâkût he confines the Maghrib to the country stretching from Milliana to Sûs (ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 513).

Confined within the sixth "clime" the Maghrib is divided into several regions. Ibn Hâwâk (Description... transl. de Slane, J. A., 1841) distinguishes two of them: the Eastern Maghrib from the frontier of Egypt as far as Zuwîla in Tripolitania and the Western Maghrib from this point to Sûs al-Akšât; but the division commonly accepted is that into three regions, Irikiya, Central Maghrib and Farther Maghrib (Abu 'l-Fida', Ibn Khaldûn etc.). Ibn Sa'id adopts a slightly different division, Irikiya being here an outer Maghrib, and farther Sûs. Irikiya stretches from Kârîb Ahmed near Misrât (Ibn Sa'id) to Bougie, Central Maghrib from Bougie to Mûliâya (Ibn Khaldûn). Farther Maghrib from Mûliâya to Asâfi and to Dëren, to which must be added al-Sûs which forms as might be said, according to Ibn Khaldûn, an island or country detached from all others and surrounded by seas and mountains.


2. AL-HUSAIN b. 'ALI, Abu 'l-KÂSIM, called "al-nawzîr al-Maghribî", son of the preceding, was born in Egypt on the 13th Dhu al-Hijja 20 (June 19th, 848). In 400 (1010) when his father was executed, al-Husain fled from Egypt to al-Ramla to ʿUthân, b. al-Saffâri, amir of the Banû Tâyi', and induced him to forego his allegiance to the Caliph al-Hâkim and pay homage to the ʿAbîd amir of Mecca, Abu ʿl-Futûh al-Hassan b. Dàfâr. The latter came to al-Ramla and was proclaimed caliph. But when Hasan was bribed by al-Husain Abu ʿl-Futûh had to return to Mecca while al-Husain sought refuge with Fâjkir al-Mulk, vizier of the Buîyûd Bâbâ al-Dawla. Although as an Egyptian he was subject to the ʿAbbasîd Caliph al-Kâdir, he was permitted to accompany Fâjkir al-Dawla to Wâsiti and remained there till his death. He then went to al-Mawâlî where the ʿUkâli ʿArâjî took him into his service as secretary. In 414 (1023) the Buîyûd governor of ʿIrâq ʿUthârîrî of al-Dawla appointed him vizier. But the very next year he quarrelled with the Turkish mercenaries and fled to Karwâsh. But as he quarrelled with the ʿAbbasîd Caliph on some trifling matter, he had to leave al-Mawâlî in the same year. He then went to the court of the ruler of Tîyûr Bâkî, ʿUthâr al-Dawla [cf. MARNAVIDA] who gave him a sanctuary. al-Husain died at Mayyâfîn in 150 (May 418) (Oct. 17, 1027) and was buried in Khâfi.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallîkîn, Wafâyât,
AL-MAGHRIBI — MAHALLA AL-KUBRA


3. Muḥammad b. Ḍi‘far b. Muḥammad b. ‘Ali, Abu ʿl-Faraḍi, grandson of a brother of the preceding. When Abu ʿl-Faraḍi grew up, he left Egypt and went to the ʿIraq where he lived for a time. After various vicissitudes he returned to Egypt and was appointed head of the Divān al-Lirash by the vizier al-Barizī. He held his office till the dismissal of al-Bārizī; the latter’s successor had him arrested. While Abu ʿl-Faraḍi was still in prison, he was himself appointed vizier on 25th Kha‘b II, 450 (June 21, 1058) and given the titles “al-Wāfi‘ al-mudallal al-ḥakīm al-arshad gafī ‘Amīr al-Mu‘āminin wa-khāliṣahum.” After a few years (9th Ramaḍān 452 = Oct. 7, 1060) he was dismissed and given the control of the chancellery (Divān al-Ingā‘). He died in 478 (1085—1086).

Bibliography: al-Makrizi, al-Khitat, ii. 158; Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Fattimiden-Reichsministerei. (K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

MAGÉS. [See Magi.]

MAGNESIA (MAGNÝSIA, MANÝSIA), the ancient Magnesia ad Nysum, the capital of the Sandık (now wilāyat) of Sarıkhan in the wilāyat of Smyrna, on the northern slope of the Magnesia Dağ mountains, mountain, and two miles to the south of the river Gediz and 20 miles N. East of Smyrna. The town, celebrated in Greek and Roman antiquity, was occupied by the Turcoman Amir Sarıkhan in the year 713 (began 28th April 1313) and was the capital of his principality and of that of his son Sulaiman, who was buried there with his father in the tombe of the family.

Yildirim Sultan Bayazid seated it in the year 702 (began 20th Dec. 1389). Tamerlane collected his treasures there in the year 1402; after the restoration of the Ottoman power, the town saw the rebellion of Būrlinky Muhammad, a partisan of the Shāhīr Būreğir, in 1346; Murād III replaced it one of the first towns in his kingdom and built a palace there in 1444 which is now in ruins. Murād III also contributed to beautifying the town with the Murādīya mosque built in 1591. In 1633 the town was sacked during the rebellion of Elīyād Pāsha. In 1890 Cuinet put the population at 35,000.


MAHALLA, on Arabic word which, like mahalla from the same root, originally means a place where one makes a halt. Mahalla thus came to have the special meaning of a quarter of a town, a meaning which has also passed into Turkish (e. g. the YÜRİ Mahalla quarter in Constantinople), into Persian and Hindūstānī (where the popular pronunciation is mahālī); the term formerly applied to a quarter of a town used to be dīr (as in old Baghdad). The mahālīs are often under the administration of a special official called muḥātār. In Egypt the word mahalla is frequently found as the first element in the names of towns and villages. Here the primitive meaning of place, locality has been preserved, while quarters of a town are rather called kaṭa‘ especially in al-Fustāṭ and Alexandria. According to the Musharik al-Buldān, there are about 100 places in Egypt called al-Mahalla; “Ali Pasha Mubārak gives over 30 in al-Khitat al-din‘āda (xv. 21 sq.) in addition to the large town of al-Mahalla al-Kubra [q. v.].” (J. H. KramerS)

MAHALLA AL-KUBRA or MAHALLA KABIR is the modern name of an important town in the Delta of the Nile at some distance to the west of the Damiatta arm, north-east of Tanta. It lies on the Turf al-Muḫīṣ, canal, a branch of the Bahr Shībin.

In view of the large number of Egyptian geographical names compounded with Mahalla, the identification of the town with the names mentioned by earlier Arabic writers is a matter of some difficulty. Maspero and Wiet indentify it with the Coptie Tshairi (Amélineau, La géographie de l’Egypte à l’époque copte, Paris 1893, p. 262), but this identification is rendered doubtful by the fact that al-Mahalla is a purely Arabic name (and it also remains to be proved that it is a rendering of the Coptie name just mentioned), and because the work of Abu ‘l Sāliḥ on the Christian buildings of Egypt makes no mention of this town. The earliest author who knew a town called al-Mahalla or al-Mahalla al-Kubra is al-Makdisi (p. 55, 194, 196, 200); he tells us that it was a town of al-Kif built in two parts, one called Sandaf (or Şandafs), but the statement that the town was situated on the river by Alexandria (p. 200) seems to be an error. Al-Bakri seems to know the same town under the name Mahallat Muḥrūn (Kitāb al-Madā‘ik zan’t Maḥallat, Brit. Mus. MS.). Idrīsī, Description de l’Afrique, p. 158, calls the town simply al-Mahalla and knows a canal called after it. Yakūt’s statements are confused, for he speaks of a town called Mahallat Dākala and of another Mahallat Shārṣiyyūn (iv. 428), both of which seem to refer to the same place. Mahallat Shārṣiyyūn in Yūkūt—which he also calls Mahallat al-Kubra—forms part of the town of Dākala and on the other hand he says that Mahallat Dākala between al-Kubra and Dimāya is the largest of the Mahallas that he knows (cf. also Abu ‘l-Fida‘, ii. 160), while the geographer al-Dimīški (p. 231) knows Mahalla Dākala as the capital of the Kūra of Dākala; Ibn Dūynīš (v. 82) says that the governorship of this town was regarded as “the little vizierate” (al-wuhūla al-saghirūn).

The name Mahallat Shārṣiyyūn is again found in al-Makrizi (ed. Wiet, iii. 207). It is clear from these writers that the town was an important commercial centre from the tenth century onwards. It does not seem however to have played any considerable part in history, although ‘Ali Paša Muḥārak quotes some events that took place there, from al-Makrizi and al-Djabarti, in Egypt in the xvi. century the town had to give way to Tanta, which became the capital of the musṭirīya of al-Gharbiya, while al-Mahalla became the capital of a smaller administrative area; ‘Ali Muḥārak estimates its inhabitants at 50,000, while the 1928 Baedeker only gives it 35,500. It is at present a centre of the cotton trade; raw cotton is there cleaned in the factories. Of the many individuals who bear the nisba al-Mahalli, the most celebrated is Djalāl al-Din al-Mahalli [q. v.] who was born here.

Bibliography: Maspero et Wiet, Ma-

(J. H. Kramer)

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

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

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

The homes of the Makari are built of clay, are fairly large and comparatively comfortable. The walls are about 6 feet high; they have an elliptical door about 5 feet high; the roof is of straw and hemispherical in shape. Inside is a bed of clay, shelves of clay to hold household utensils and the fireplace. Sometimes there is also a bed made of things of hide faced round a framework.

There are few isolated homes in the Makari country; they are commonly grouped in villages of which the most important are Logone, Gana (Little Logone), Karnak Logone or Logone Berni (Great Logone) and Kusseri. They used all to be surrounded by circular ditches and clay walls pierced by several narrow gates. These defences were intended to protect the inhabitants from the frequent attacks of their neighbours.

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


MAHBU'B, the name given in North Africa and Egypt (cf. Dory, Supplement, s. v.) to the Turkish gold sequin, contraction for ZERMAYHUB [q. v.].

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

Bibliography: Sikandar b. Muhammad, Mirâbi Sikandari, p. 136—138, Bombay 1891 (English transl. by Fazullah Lutfullah Faridi, p. 90—91); H. Blochmann, Translation of the A'ivi Abhari, Introduction, p. iv—v, Calcutta 1873; Dja'far Sharaf, Qanoone-Islam, 2nd ed., p. 171—172, Madras 1863; ed. W. Crooke, p. 208—209, Oxford 1921; Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, vol. ix., part ii., p. 62—64, Bombay 1899; Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vi. 189 (Goldziher on Ghair Mahdi); Goldziher, Vorlesungen über den Islam, Heidelberg 1925, p. 364; al-Mahdi (A.), means literally "the guided one", and, as all guidance (husd) is from Allah, it has come to denote the divinely guided one, guided, that is, in a peculiar and individual way. For Allah, in the intense and immediate theism of Islam, is guiding every one and everything in the world, whether by the human reason or by the instincts of the lower animals, to a knowledge of Himself and to what is needed for their existence and continuance (Livin, xx. 228, foot). One of His names is a- khi b, "the Guide" (Kur'an, xxii. 53; xxv. 33), and the idea of His guidance is reiterated in the Kur'an. For a statement of its different kinds see Bajaldawi on Kur'an, i. 5 (Fleischer's ed., i. 8, ii. 21 sqq.); Mutfaradāt
of al-Râghb al-Iṣfahânî, p. 560 of ed. Cairo 1324; al-Maṣâqat al-aṣrâm of al-Sâmahî, p. 80 of ed. Cairo 1324. But it is singular that the word mahdî (the passive participle of the I Stem) never occurs in the Kur'ân and that the passive of that stem occurs only four times. In the usage of the Kur'ân, the VIII stem, یکدٔ, strictly “the accepted guidance for himself”, is used as a quasi or reflexive passive. Thus the man whom Allâh guides is not simply “guided” but reacts himself to the divine guidance.

There seems to be no original authority for the vocalisation al-Mahdî which Edward Pococke gave as Nî, xvi. of the Signs in his Porta Mosis, ii, 263 of ed. 1655, with the meaning “director”; cf. Lane’s note in the Supplement to his lexicon, p. 337a e. Margoliouth (article cited below, p. 337a) suggests that it may mean “the giver” and refers to traditions (see below) of the Mahdî bestowing uncounted wealth; but there does not seem to be any oriental authority for this epithet. Also, the verb used in these traditions is یکدٔ. But one who is mahdî, or al-mahdî, is in a different position; he is absolutely guided. It is used of certain individuals in the past and of an eschatological individual in the future. Thus the یکدٔ (xx. 229, 9 from below) quotes from a tradition “the usage of the khalîfâ who followed the right way and were guided” (sunntu ‘l-khulafa’ یکدٔ al-mahdîyin), meaning the first four khalîfâs, and goes on to state that it is applied especially, as a name, to the Mahdî of whom the Prophet gave good tidings, that he would come in the Fad of Time. There are many other instances of the non-eschatological application of the term mahdî to human personages. Goldziher, (Fecionsen, p. 267, v. note 12, 1) has gathered a number of such cases; thus یکد (NajîÞ, ed. Behn, Nî, 104, v. 29) applies it to al-Abbas and al-Sâmahî b. ‘Uthmân (Divân, ed. Tunis, 24, 1) to Muhammad; see, too, Ibn Sa’d (xi. 94, 2). It is often applied by Sunnites to ‘Ali, in distinc tion even to the other three khalîfâs; thus in یکد al-‘Abbâs (iv. 31, 2) he is یکدٔ al-mahdîy, and Sulaimân b. ‘Iraq calls ‘Uthmân, after his death, “Mahdî son of the Mahdî” (Tahân, Tahân, ed. Leyden, Ser. ii. 546, 11). Farazdâk and یکد apply it as an honorific even to the ’Umayyâd khalîfâs. As applied by the poets to ‘Umar II, the ’Umayyâd (Ibn Sa’d, v. 245, 3), it seems to have been more than an honorific; he was regarded as a real یکد (v. v.) and under peculiar divine guidance. The view of later Islam he was the first of these “renewers” of the Faith and the eighth and last of these would be either the Mahdî, a descendant of the Prophet, or یکد (al-mahdî al-mukaddas), according to the two positions; cf. article ’alîk. See on the whole question of the یکد and his relation to the Mahdî; Goldziher, Zur Charakteristik der یکد, in J. B. Al. Wiss., i.v. p. 10, sqq. It is characteristic of Islam to take a very pseu- dopoe view of human nature: men always fall away from the faith and have to be brought back. This will be so especially towards the end of the world. Men will become thoroughly secular and Allâh will leave them to themselves. The Ka’ba will vanish, and the copies of the Kur’ân will become blank paper, and its words will vanish also, from the memory of men. They will think only of poems and songs. Then the end will come.

In a similar heightened sense the term Mahdî was applied by Ibn al-Ta’awwûh (Divân, ed. Margoliouth, p. 105, 5, 6) to the ‘Abbasid khalîfah al-Nâṣir (A. H. 575—622); he is the Mahdî and no other eschatological Mahdî need be looked for. In a narrower but more true etymological sense it came to be applied to converts to Islam; Allâh had guided these to the right Way. For such, Turks use the more Kur’ânic term mukadd; see above for the distinction. Goldziher (p. 268) gives cases. In a heightened sense, also, the term was applied very early (A. H. 66) to Muhammad b. al-Hâfizy, a son of ‘Ali by another wife than Fâ’tima. After the death of ‘Usâin at Karbala, Mukhâr b. Abî ‘Uthmân put forward this Mahdî as a claimant of the khalîfate and called him “the Mahdî, son of the legatee (al-wâfi),” a term applied to ‘Ali by those who asserted that the Prophet had bequeathed the headship of the people to him (Tabân, Tahân, ii. 534). This was after the deaths of ‘Usâin and Fâ’tima, the two sons of ‘Ali by Fâ’tima, the daughter of the Prophet, and shows a different drift as to the inheritance of the ‘Imâmât from that of the Shi‘îe legitimists. This Muhammad was heir as the son of ‘Ali and not as possessing the blood of the Prophet. He seems himself to have declined the dignity thus thrust upon him but, muhîr ‘îdî, he became the founder of the Kâshîyâ sect which looked for his return from his grave in Mount Kâdr, there he remains undying. This was maintained by the poet Ku‘awâyîr (d. 105 = 723) and by the Sufîyî al-Hâlîmîyî (d. 773 = 793; A. B. X. v. 32; cf. Mas‘ûdi, Paris ed., v. 150 sqq.). Muhammad thus became an “expected Mahdî” or یکد, like the Hidden Imam of the Twelve Shi‘îes. For the position of the Kâshîyâ see Shahraštâni’s Miller wa-Nîhâl, ed. on margin of Ibn Hazîm, i. 196: Mukhâr, disgusted with Muhammad, eventually founded the Mukhârîyâ sect which was strict Shi‘îe and upheld ‘Usâin b. ‘Ali (Shahraštâni, p. 197). The whole episode is interesting as showing the extreme fluidity of the religious-political parties at the time. It also shows very clearly how the term Mahdî gradually hardened from being a general honorific to a special designation, and even a proper name, for a restorer of the Faith in the last days.

The Hidden Imam of the Twelve Shi‘îes, whose return (ru’dâs) is awaited, is also called, by the Shi‘a, al-Mahdî. But his status is entirely different from that of the future restorer looked for by the Sunnites. The very essence of Sunnite Islam is that the Muslim people shall rule itself and can attain truth and certainty by its own exertions. When, at any time, its qualified scholars (muqaddad’s) have applied the three یکد — Kûran, Sunna, ’A’îrîs — to any point of Islam and have come to an agreement (’a’îrîs) on it, that point is assured and the acceptance of it as of faith is binding on all Muslims. The idea of an absolute Mahdî, therefore, as an infallible guide, suggests too much that یکد (v. v.), which the later Sunnites theologians rejected. Sunnite Islam, as Goldziher has taught us, is a recoil against the idea of blind submission to any human teacher. Even ’Isa, as restorer, is called mukadd, which is much less emphatic in its suggestion of infallibility. Yet the masses demanded an absolute restorer and it was among the masses that the belief in a Mahdî was, and is, strong. To return — the
Mahdi, or 'Isa when he comes as a restorer and ruler, will restore and apply that Consensus of Islam which has been reached by the successive generations of muṣṭafahī'd.' Thus the Muslim people not only rules itself but is also the ultimate and infallible interpreter of the revelation through the Prophet. The Shi'ites, on the other hand, admit no such authority either in the Muslim people or in their own muṣṭafahī'd; by Kur'an, Sunna, khitās and idā'ī' it can only be gathered from the guidance (al-dī'am; cf. Goldzihier's Streitschrift des Gazalî gegen die Bâtîniya-Sekte, passim) of the hidden Imam who is divinely protected (māṣīma) against all error and sin and whose function it is to interpret Islam to men. The muṣṭafahī'd of the Shi'a are his intermediaries with men; but they in their intermediation may err. When the Hidden Imam returns he will rule personally by divine right. He is called a Mahdi, but it is in a different sense from any Sunnite use of that term. The idea of protection against error and sin (Suna; see article above, ii., p. 543) seems to have been introduced into Sunnite Islam from the systematic exposition of Farid al-Din al-Razi (d. 606 = 1209; see, further, Goldzihier in Isl., iii. 238—245), but there it has been limited strictly to prophets. No "successor" (khalifa) can enjoy it and the Mahdi, for those Sunnites who expect him, is strictly an ultimate khalifa of the Prophet. For those Sunnites who look to 'Isa to play the part of the Mahdi he will not return as a prophet in his own right. It will not be a return (raf'da) in his case but simply a "descent" (nawāli') and he will rule according to the law (kari'a) of Muhammad; see article 'Isa above, ii., p. 525. As all Shi'ite sects agree on this status of their Imam it is unnecessary to go into further details on them; see in general, article 'Isa.

Another important point of difference between Shi'ites and Sunnites as to the Mahdi is that he is an essential part of the Shi'ite creed but not of the Sunnite. That there will be a final restorer of the faith all Sunnite Islam believes as a part of its eschatology, but not that he will be called Mahdi. There is no mention of the Mahdi in either of the two Sā'îd's, of Muslim or of Bukhârî. Similarly Sunnite systematic theologians do not deal with him. The Mu'awâlid of al-İdî has nothing on him; nor, indeed, on any of the Signs of the Hour (ahkâm al-asâ') of article IWAMA. Nasâ'î in his 'Asâ'î has, of these, only al-Dâjî al-Dâjî (see article above, vol. i., p. 886) and the Descent of 'Isa; Taftânâni, in his commentary, gives ten Signs but not the Mahdi. Even al-Ghazâlî, a popularizing theologian, has nothing on the Signs in the last Book of his İyâ', that on eschatology, and has only a slight allusion in the Book dealing with the Ḥadîd (ed. 1334, i. 218; İhâfî, the commentary of the Sâ'îyîd Mûrtaḍâ, iv. 279) to the coming of al-Dâjî al-Dâjî, the descent of 'Isa and his slaying of al-Dâjî al-Dâjî; there is no mention of the Mahdi either in the text or in the commentary. Al-Ghazâlî's whole point in this passage is to stress the final falling away from the faith of all men to which reference has been made above.

It was, then, in the hearts of the Muslim multitude that the Mahdi would be the resting-place and support. In the midst of growing darkness and uncertainty — political, social, moral, theological — they clung to the idea of a future deliverer and restorer and of a short millennium before the end. This belief is, therefore, expressed in a multitude of later traditions, often expansions and expositions of better authenticated and older traditions, and often linking themselves to old stories of inter-tribal and inter-dynastic conflicts in the civil wars after the murder of 'Uthmân. We, therefore, find among them references to historical movements and sects which had failed in their time but had left remains, if only a name, to add to the confusion. Certain are these are gathered up in later edifying collections, such as the Tuhfâta of Abî 'Abd Allâh al-Kurtubi (d. 671 = 1272; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 415) which have we in a Muḥtâṣar al-Shârâfî (d. 973 = 1565; Brockelmann, ii. 335; ed. Cairo 1324) and the Ma'ârîk al-Anawîr of a modern writer, Hasan al-Iḏwî al-Ḥamâzâwî (d. 1303 = 1886; Brockelmann, ii. 486; many editions).

But the clearest presentation of the alleged basis for this belief is given by Ibn Khaldûn (d. 808 = 1406) in his Muḥâlifah (ed. Quatremère, ii. 142 sqq.; Bâlâqî, folio ed., 1274, p. 151 sqq.; transl. by De Slane, ii. 159 sqq.). "A section on the Mahdi is not a separate doctrine, it is a necessity as to him and on clearing up the obscurity as to that. It has been commonly accepted (mâqâlî) among the masses (al-kifâja) of the people of Islam, as the ages have passed, that there must needs appear in the End of Time a man of the family of Muhammad (mawâlib al-bâhit) who will aid the Faith (din) and make justice triumph; that the Muslims will follow him and that he will reign over the Muslim kingdoms and be called al-Mahdi. The appearance of al-Dâjî al-Dâjî and of the other Signs of the Last Day (ahkâm al-asâ') which are established in sound tradition (al-qâfiz) will come after him. 'Isa will descend after his appearance and will kill al-Dâjî al-Dâjî or will descend along with him and aid him in that killing; and in Worship 'Isa will follow the Mahdi as his Imam. In support of this position traditions are used which some authorities on tradition have alleged and which others have disputed and often opposed with other narrations. The later Shi'is have followed another course and method of proof in the case of this descendant of Fâṭima and often seek support, as to that, in the mystical "unveiling" (kasâfî) which is the basis of their method."

This is a very careful statement of the strictly popular drift in Ibn Khaldûn's time, a drift with which he evidently had no sympathy. He goes on to give formally 24 traditions bearing upon this restorer and adds six variants, criticizing the authenticity of them all. In only 14 of these is this restorer named Mahdi. For references to traditions on the Mahdi in Ḥanbalî's Musnad, Abî Dâ'dî al-Sunna, Tirmidhî's Sâ'îd and Ibn Mâjdî's Sunna, see Wensinck's Handbook of early Muhammadan Traditions under Mahdi; in the Ma'ârîk al-Sunna of al-Bâghwî, see ii. 134 of ed. Cairo 1318 and in the Ma'ârîk al-Mazâhid, see p. 399—401 of ed. Dîlî 1327. All these, however, have only a certain number of the mass of traditions quoted by Ibn Khaldûn. In the Tuhfâta of al-Kurtubi, on the other hand, there is (p. 117—121 of ed. Cairo 1342) a further mass of luxuriant detail which Ibn Khaldûn had evidently disdained to incorporate; cf. his later reference to the town Mâsâ, p. 173, l. 7. In the Tuhfâta the Prophet, for example, foretells the future conquest and re-conquest of Spain by name. Al-
Kurtubi died in 617 (1272) in the first years of the Nasrids of Granada when Granada was the only part of Spain left to the Muslims. He and those around him felt grievously the need of such a restorer and Mahdi, and detailed traditions sprang up as to his coming. The situation called for a mightier and more specific champion of Islam than 'Ibâd whose business strictly was to kill al-Dājjâl. Devotion, also, to the blood of the Prophet, of whom the Mahdi was to come, and which was so strong even in the Sunnite Maghrib, may have helped this. Al-Kurtubi's Mahdi was to come from the Maghrib as opposed to the earlier ones who were to come from Syria or Khurâsân. He will come from a place in the Djabal of the Maghrib, on the shore of the sea, called Mâsa; they will swear allegiance to him there and again, a second time, at Mecca. Here the tradition joins and attempts to explain an earlier one, given by Abd al-Rahîm, and quoted by Ibn Khaldîn (p. 145; see, also, below), telling of an expedition against Kâbl and of the booty of Kâbl, thus linking up with the earliest inter-tribal conflicts. This west-teen Mahdi will also kill al-Sufâni who is supported by Kâbl. This is not the place to enter upon the showing how the Marwânid branch of the Umayyads supplemented their cousins, the Sufyânîs. But from the mystery connected with the voluntary abdication and speedy death of Mu'âwiyâ II, the succession of Marwân b. al-Âkâm and the sudden death or assassination of Walid b. 'Utba b. Abî Sufâni ('ajla'na wânsâqa'maysâ'; Masûdi, Paris, ed. v. 170) at the burial of Mu'âwiyâ II, there seems to have sprung an Imâmate party among the Umayyads (sâlî qâlin Umâwiyâ min al-Imâmât, al-Qâzâlî in Goldžer's Streitschrift, p. 14 of the Arabic text); yet this Walid appears later alive in Tâbarî's narrative. In the account of Khâlid b. Yazid in the Aḏ'âbî (xvi. 83) there is a story that he was the first to start this 'qâsî-yâ bâbâr al-Sufâni wâb-kâhbru wâwârâda ar yâfûna l'tând lfitî tâ'âmûn'), although that is also denied and a more general and earlier origin is asserted. In the civil war at the rise of the 'Abâsîd one of the 'white', i.e. Umayyad, revolts was in support of the claims of the 'Sufyânîd of whom there used to be mention' (zârîket-al-Hâdhâ 'I-Sufyânî lakâ lân yubâhâr, Tâbarî, Tarîqâ, Cairo, ed. iv. 138, anno 132; Ibn al-Âlîmî, Kâmîl, v. 207 of ed. Cairo 1301). Apparently the Sufyânîd continued to assert their claims in the underground Imâmate fashion against the Marwânid and, later, the 'Abâsîd, supporting themselves with traditions, as all the parties did. The details are exceedingly obscure for this was one of the lost causes of Islam and has left on no one a name and that name under the general opprobrium which fell upon the Umayyads in all later Islam, Sunnite and Shi'ite. An earlier stage in this appears in a tradition quoted by Tâbarî (I 224 = 838) in his commentary on Kûrân, xxv. 50 (Part xvi., p. 63 foot). The Prophet mentioned a division (zâma) which would arise between the East and the West. Then there would come forth al-Sufâni from the Dry Wâdî (al-wâdî fîsâ'; otherwise unknown; in Yâqût, iv. 1000, the Wâdî of Yâsîr: from a man: it is said that al-Sufâni will come from it in the End of Time) "in that outburst of his", or "when his time comes" (fi jumâlî dâ'â'). Much is said of the armies he will send out and the destruction he will spread, slaying 300 chiefs of the Banû 'L-'Abbâs until Dâjjâl is sent against him and destroys him. His appearance, thus, for Tâbarî, is not eschatological and there is nothing about the Mahdi and the End of Time. But in an apocalypse incorporated by Muḥyîl-Dîn ibn 'Arabî in his Muṣâdara al-Abîr 'âr in der Krimzznzeit and dated by him about 576 (1180), this tradition is used, expanded and brought into the eschatological pictures, and al-Sufyânî is finally killed by the Mahdi. A hundred years later al-Kurtubi expands it still further and calls al-Sufyânî Muḥammâd b. 'Urwa. For other references on al-Sufyânî see Goldžer, Streitschrift, p. 52, note 1; Snouck Hurgronje, Der Mahdi, in Verstreute Geschichten, i. 155; De Goeje, Frag. hist. ar., ii. 526; Van Vloten, Recherches sur la domin. ar., p. 61; Lamens, Le califat de Yazid, i. 17; Mu'awiyâ II ou le dernier des Sufyânides, p. 43.

It is obviously impossible to give in detail the traditions hearing on this restorer, but their types can be indicated and some recurrent characteristics. The great majority are put directly in the mouth of the Prophet, a very few go back to Allâh. If there remain of the world a single day Allâh will lengthen it until he sends this restorer; the world shall not pass away; the Hour shall not come until then. He will be of the People of my House (min aḥt bâltî); of my kindred (min širt); of my Nation (min ummat); of the offspring of Fâtîma (min sealad Fâtîma); his name will be my name and his father's name my father's name. He will resemble the Prophet in disposition (khâlîk) but not in appearance (khâlî); this is put in the mouth of Allâh. He will be bald of the forehead, hook-nosed, high-nosed. He will find the world full of evil and oppression and ungodliness; if a man says: 'Allâh! Allâh!' he will be killed. He will fill the world with equity and justice; he will beat men until they return to Allâh (al-ḥâkîk). The Muslims will enjoy under him a prosperity the like of which has never been heard of; the earth will bring forth its fruits and the heavens will pour down its rain; money in that day will be like that which is trodden under foot and will be uncounted; a man will stand up and say: 'O Mahdi, give to me', and he will say: 'Take!' and he will pour into his robe as much as he can carry. It is suggested that this is a taqṣîr, legitimate or illegitimate, of a tradition in the Sûqût of Muslim: 'There will come in the end of my nation a khâlîfa who will scatter wealth, not counting it'. See many references for this munificent khâlîfa and the abundance of money in the last days in Wensinck, Handbook of Tradition, p. 106 foot. But in this tradition, as in all Muslim and Bukhâri, there is no mention of the Mahdi. Again: the Mahdi is of us, the People of the House. Allâh will bring him suddenly and unexpectedly (ziyâdhu-l-ḥâkîk fi la'tâ). He will rule seven, nine years. There are frequent allusions to his coming in a time of dissensions (jîna). These will be such that it will take a voice from heaven to still them, saying: 'Your Amir is so-and-so' (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 162). This is very like an ironical comment, but it is cited as a simple foretelling. In these earlier traditions he will come from the East (al-Mârîs; Khurâsân), from beyond the River (Oxus); in later times (e.g. Kurtubi
and Ibn Khaldûn, p. 171—176) he was to come from the wide, unknown, lands of the Maghrib. The original Black Banners (râqât saûd) tradition about the 'Abbâsid, apparently forged to lead them to support the 'Alids, does not mention the Mahdi (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 153), but in an evidently later form there is added, "for he is the Khalifa of Allah, the Mahdi" (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 159). One long tradition (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 148) may be given entire as an illustration of a type and because of the later expansion and use of it by Kurûbi: "There will arise a difference at the death of a Khalifa and a man of the people of al-Madîna will go forth, seeing to Mecca. Then some of the people of Madîna will come against the man and make him go out (apparently rise in insurrection) against his will and they will swear allegiance to him between the Rubû and the Madîm. And an army will be sent against (or, "to", ilil) him from Syria but will be swallowed up in the earth in the desert (al-badîd) between Mecca and al-Madîna. Whenever the people see that, the Abâdî ("Substitutes" or "Nobles") of Syria and the "Aqî bî ("Companions" or "Seculars"; see Lane, p. 2059) of al-Ta'âk will come to him and they will swear allegiance to him. Thereafter there will arise a man of Kurûbî with maternal grandfathers of Isâm. So he will work against the man and make it will overcome them and that will be the expedition (ka'bîth) of Kalb. And oh! the disappointment of those who will not have part in the booty of Kalb! He will divide the wealth and rule over the people according to the suûma of their Prophet and he will subject himself to the support of Isâm. He will remain seven or nine years and then die and the Muslims will pray over him". This is evidently an echo of the early 'Alid conflicts and is not eschatological nor does it mention the Mahdi. But its motifs of the Abâdî and of the earth swallowing up in the desert (al-badîd) re-appear in other traditions which are concerned with the End of Time (p. 156, 161) and which are worked into the tradition of the Mahdi from the Maghrib. Again, in a tradition evidently eirenical between the 'Abbâsid and the 'Alids, the Muslims are exhorted to turn to the youth of the tribe of Tamâm (al-tâmûm bi 'l-fata 'l-tâmîmî) for he will come from the East and will be the standard-bearer of the Mahdi!" (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 162). But it is plain, too, that none of the doctrine of the Mahdi arose late and was not generally received. Thus the doctrine of al-Dâjdjâl is fixed in all Muslim eschatology, official and popular, but a tradition tries to assert that belief in the Mahdi is more of Faith than belief in him: "Whoever denies the Mahdi is an unbeliever but whoever denies al-Dâjdjâl is only a denier" (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 144). On the other hand a tradition asserts that there is no Mahdi but 'Ilâ. The upholders of the Mahdi tried to turn this by saying that it means that no one ever spoke in the cradle (mahdî; Kurân, iii. 41) except 'Ilâ (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 163; Kurûbî, p. 118). For al-Kahtânî, another restorer who is not mentioned in any of the collections of traditions used above, see article Kahtân, above, vol. ii., p. 630a and Snouck Hurgonje's article Der Mahdi, p. 12 (Verspr. Geschr., i. 156).

The later, therefore, we go and the more popular are our sources the more fixed do we find the belief in the eschatological Mahdi. The more, too, the Muslim masses have felt themselves oppressed and humiliated, either by their own rulers or by non-Muslims, the more fervent has been their longing for this ultimate restorer of the true Islam and conqueror of the whole world for Islam. And as the need for a Mahdi has been felt, the Mahdîs have always appeared and Islam has risen, sword in hand, under their banner. It is impossible here to give the history of these risings. See for details upon them the article Mahdî by Margoliouth in Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, viii. 336—340 and Goldziher, Vorlesung, p. 231, 268, 291. For the Sudanese Mahdî, see especially Snouck Hurgonje's article Der Mahdî, reprinted in Verspr. Geschr., i. p. 147—181. This contains also, a fundamental discussion of the origin and history of the idea of a restorer in Islam; see also beneath, s.v. Muhammad Ahmad.

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

(D. B. Macdonald)

AL-MAHDI, Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad, an 'Abbâsid Caliph. His father was the Caliph al-Mansûr, his mother was called 'Umm Mâsâ bint al-Manâsr b. Abû Allah and belonged to the family of Khâlid b. al-Mansûr. With the death of the governor of Khorasan 5Abû al-Dâjdjâl b. Abû al-Khaţâm [q.v.] rebelled, the Caliph sent his son Muhammad al-Mahdi with an army against him; the real commander was Khâzîm b. Khâzîma. After taking 5Abû al-Dâjdjâl prisoner, al-Mahdi by his father's orders undertook an expedition against 'Abîl-Khâdi in which had to submit to him [cf. Dàbûsîyâ]. In 144 (761—762) he returned to the Ta'âk where he married Râ'îa, the daughter of the Caliph Abu 3'Abû b. al-Mansûr. For the next few years he lived in al-Kayî. 3'Isa b. Mâsâ had long been designated as successor to the throne but he was persuaded by al-Manâsr to waive his rights in favour of al-Mahdi, and after the death of al-Manâsr in 158 (776) al-Mahdi was recognised as Caliph. He made himself very popular by his liberality and gentleness, although several cruel deeds are credited to him. For example he had the son of the vizier Abû 4Abî al-Mâsâ Muqta'îya b. 'Ubay'd Allah [q.v.] executed on a mere suspicion and another vizier Yaqûb b. Dâfîdîwî who had fallen into disfavour with him was thrown into a prison so dark that he lost the use of his eyes. In 160 (776—777) a rebellion broke out in the always unruly Khorasân; the leader of the rebels, 'Uyûfî b. ibâhil'am, was however defeated and taken prisoner whereupon the Caliph had him executed in the cruellest fashion. The war against Byzantium was continued under al-Mahdi. In continual raids to plunder and devastate the marches, the two opponents sought to do each other as much harm as possible; there was however never any thought of permanently occupying any territory temporarily conquered. On the whole the advantage lay with the Muslims and in the early stages they advanced as far as Angora. Michael Lachanodrakôn however with a Byzantine army advanced against them, destroyed the fortress of al-Hadâdî [q.v.] which however was soon rebuilt, and had the land waste as far as the Syrian frontier (162 = 778/779). In the following year al-Mahdi equipped a great expedition in which his son Hârîn took part against
the Byzantines and in 165 (782) Hārūn took the field again, accompanied by the Caliph's favourite al-Kabīr b. Yūnus, later vizier. This time the Muslims penetrated to the Bosphorus and the Empress Irene was forced to make a three years' truce and to promise to pay an annual tribute. In Ramaḍān 165 (March/April 782), however, the truce was broken by the Byzantines and hostilities lasted till the death of al-Mahdi, without however any decision being reached. In his reign appeared the sectarian fanatic al-Maʔūkanna, who gave the Caliph's troops much trouble and sustained a long siege in a fortress in the region of Khaḍîj, till finally he poisoned himself in 165 (779/780) in order not to fall alive into the hands of his enemies. In other parts of the empire also, heretics—especially real or alleged Manichaeans (Zānid), were treated with the utmost severity. Al-Mahdi acquired great merit by his work for the peaceful development of his empire; new roads were laid down and the postal system improved; trade and industry reached a prosperity hitherto unknown and scholars were richly rewarded. At the same time there appeared an undeniable tendency to extravagance, which in the end was to prove really fatal, and with al-Mahdi began that expenditure of the revenues on useless luxury, which contributed not a little under his successors to the ruin of the 'Abd-Allāh empire. In time the Caliph fell under the control of his courtiers and in particular allowed himself to be guided by his chamberlain al-Kabīr b. Yūnus and especially by his wife al-Khaizurain, formerly a slave who was the mother of two sons, Māsāb and Hārūn. As early as 160 (776) homage had been paid to the former as successor designate under the name of al-Hāfūz in place of Ta b. Māsāq [q.v.] and six years later al-Mahdi had his younger son Hārūn proclaimed as successor to al-Hāfūz. But as Khaizurain preferred Hārūn and he was also supported by the Banū Mardūq, the Caliph decided to alter the succession in favour of him: al-Hāfūz, who then in Đūrjān refused to agree. Al-Mahdi thereupon set out to discuss the matter with him in person, but died suddenly on the 22nd Muharram 169 (Aug. 4, 785) in al-Madinah at the age of 43.

As a ruler he was undoubtedly one of the best among the 'Abbasids.


(K. V. Zettersten)

**AL-MAHDI.** [See Ibn TCMART.]
and his Christians. In spite of all the efforts of al-Mahdi, the blockade of Cordova became more and more strict. He then tried to put on the throne the caliph Hishām II b. al-Mu'āyyad whom he had himself deposed and then given out that he was dead, but this was in vain. On 16th Rabi'-I, 400 (Nov. 7, 1009) the palace of the caliph was in the hands of the besiegers. Al-Mahdi's only hope was to hide himself. The pretender of the Berbers, Sulaimān, received the oath of allegiance at al-Cordova and assumed the honorific title of al-Mu'tahfiz b. al-Mahdi. In the following month al-Mahdi was able to leave Cordova secretly and seek refuge in Toledo where he was well received by the inhabitants. He then sought and obtained an alliance with the Catalans (Irmandu) who marched with him on Cordova in Shawwāl 400 (May-June 1010). The town was taken and the second reign of al-Mahdi began with a bloody persecution of all the Berbers in Cordova. To avenge the wrongs of their fellow-countrymen in the capital, the Berbers in the army of Sulaimān al-Mustafa' returned to besiege the city. Al-Mahdi, betrayed by his servants, was slain during the siege in the palace in Cordova by the Berbers who drove on the day of Dhu-Hijjah 400 (July 23, 1010). His first reign lasted nine months; the second less than two.


MAHDI KHAÑ, MIRZA MUHAMMAD MAHDI ASTARAKAB B. MUHAMMAD, historian of Nadir Shāh of Persia, whose deeds he recorded in the Tarikh-i Dījānān Gāshā-i Nādīr; this work written in Persian is an excellent complement to those by James Fraser and Jonas Hanway on the conqueror. In it Mahdi Khān details the life of Nadir from his birth to his death while other Persian writers only deal with periods of it (e. g. Muḥsin b. Ḥanif records only the expedition to India in his Duḥtar-i Ṣimārūn; Abd al-Karim Khashmiri in his Birānī, which confines himself to the period from this expedition to 1784). W. Jones in his introduction to the Ta'rikh of Mahdi Khān says that the narrative of these perpetual rebellions is somewhat dry and fatiguing; as to the boundless praise which he bestows on the author's style, especially the descriptions of spring at the beginning of each year, it is exaggerated; in these descriptions all the images used had been employed to satiety for years before. It is true that some works of the period are still more hackneyed. Mahdi Khān himself gives free train to this vexatious tendency in another version of his work which seems enriched with two sources and of the same date 1748 only: Durra-i Nādīr, in a style uniformly artificial and elaborate. Malcolm (History of Persia) reproaches Mahdi Khān with having been too flattering to Nādīr; he recognises however that the historian has spoken frankly of the cruelties which were a blot upon the latter part of the reign. Mahdi Khān was Nādīr's secretary. This is revealed not only in the accuracy of his details but in certain statements also. Mahdi, for example, says that he was with the prince when the latter received news of the birth of a grandson (transl. Jones i. 191); at the end of his reign Nādīr sent him on a diplomatic mission to the Sultan of Turkey (ii. 179). H. Bryges (Abd-er-Kazzak, History of the Kāyart, London 1833, p. clxxxvii, note) also credits him with secretarial duties. Besides his historical works, Mahdi Khān composed his celebrated Eastern Turkish-Persian dictionary entitled Sangīlkh (1173 = 1760) a valuable treasure with examples taken from the Turkish classics (Mr. 'Alī-Shir, Bābū-Nūma etc.); the publication of this work of which there are two abbreviations is highly desirable.


AL-MAHDI AL-DIN ALLAH AHMAD, a title and name of several Zaidī Imāms of the Yaman. About 250 years after al-Hādī Yahyā, the founder of the Zaidīya (q.v.) dynasty of the Yaman, his direct descendant, the Imām al-Mutawakkil ibn līl Classes a. Suľayman b. Sulayman had, between 532 and 566 (1134—1170), restored the kingdom to its extent in al-Hādī's period, with Sa'da, Najdān and for a time also Zubaid and Ṣan'a'. A generation later (593—614 = 1197—1217), the hill country from Sa'da to Ḫumār was again ruled by one man, al-Mansur b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥunayn, not a descendant of al-Hādī but of a Rasid, i.e. one of the family of al-Hādī's grandfather, al-Kā'im b. Tabātābā, the spiritual founder of the Zaidiyas of the Yaman. Al-Mansur was twice able to enter Ṣan'a'; he was also recognised as Imām by the Kasjīl Zaidis, the Ḳuwayṭ; but even before his death his power had become restricted by the last Ayyūbī Sultan of the Yaman, al-Malik al-Muṣād, once more to the land of Ḳawkbun. After his death his son Muhammad b. al-Dīn, then the Imām Ahmad al-Mutawakkil tried their fortune in the south, while one of al-Hādī's descendants and his namesake al-Hādī Yahyā b. al-Mubīn created a petty imamate around Sa'da. An attempt to unite the divided forces of the dynast was made by a. AL-MAHDI AL-DIN ALLAH AHMAD: his full official title, one previously met with among the Zaidis, was al-Mahdi al-Dīn Allāh, Ḥāmid b. al-Ḥusayn b. Ahmad b. al-Kāsim b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Kāsim b. Ahmad b. Ismāʿil Abu 'l-Barakat. The uncertainty about his genealogy, that occurs may be explained from the fact that, as is also found in his signature, to his Ḳallājān al-Kurān (see Bbl.: there is a jumā from Ismāʿil Abu 'l-Barakat to Ismāʿil al-Dīlāḏī, cf. de Zambur, Table B); he himself expressly says that his genealogy meets that of al-Mansūr in al-Kāsim b.
Ibrahim, i.e. that he was a Rassid. His reign of ten years during which the Yaman was harassed by plague and famine does not reveal a great ruler nor even any real and consistent authority, but gives a remarkable picture of conditions in South Arabia, when for want of a definite line of succession, success alone decided how far an ‘Alid pretender was able to hold his own among his kinsmen and with any forces he could gather to make a stand against foreign foes. In 646 (1248) Ahmad had him-self proclaimed Imam in the fortress of Thula in the highlands of Hadjir, north-west of San‘a’, by arrangement with the Banu Hama, i.e. the family of the late Imam al-Manṣūr, and with the benevolent tolerance of Asad al-Din Muḥammad b. al-Hasan, the brother’s son of the first Rasid Sulṭān, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Nūr al-Dīn ʿOmar b. ʿAlī b. Raḍū. But he was defeated by Nūr al-Dīn and besieged in Thula, and in 647 (1250) we find him having to fight with the Banu Ḥamza who had again deserted him. He was saved by the death of Nūr al-Dīn who was killed by his own Mamliks in ‘Azbīd, an event which is probably connected with contemporary Mamluk attempts on the Egyptian Ayyūbīs; Asad al-Dīn who wished to make his government in San‘a’ independent, is also accused of instigating it. The latter continued active under Nūr al-Dīn’s son and successor al-Muṣṭafar Yūsuf, rebelling and suing for peace alternately, sometimes on the side of the Imam and sometimes intriguing against him. Al-Mahdī, who in the meanwhile had found Shams al-Dīn Ahmad, son of the late Imam and chief of the Banu Ḥamza, to joint action with him, took San‘a’ in the beginning of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1248 (July 1250); although harassed by Asad al-Dīn who held the fortress of Birāsh, he was able to extend his rule to the south as far as Dhamrā. But before a year had expired al-Mahdī had to abandon ʿAznī. Asad al-Dīn indeed sold him the fortress of Birāsh but it was just the occasion that the final breach occurred between them. Asad al-Dīn then went over to al-Muṣṭafar who had the governmentship of the Yaman granted him by the Caliph al-Muṣṭafīnā, who is even said to have sent assassins (Sirr, see Rest, fol 237a) against the Imam. In a thoroughly ʿızādī fashion, however, his fate was decided not by foreign foes but by the Zaydīs themselves. He quarrelled with his ablest and most ardent supporter, Shāhīd Ahmad al-Raʿīsī. With the help of the Rasīlīs, Shams al-Dīn made himself Imam of the Yaman in 652 (1254) in the old capital of San‘a’. Al-Mahdī was again confined to his original territory. The very next year a Zaydī ascendancy pronounced his deposition. One of the 10,000 infantry and several hundred horsemen of the earlier fighting, he had still 2,000 infantry and 500 cavalry; but these also left him in the decisive battle of Wāḍī Shuwaqā, which runs from San‘a’ parallel in the northwest to the Wāḍī Khārid. He was slain at the age of 42. His head sent round as a trophy and treated shamefully but finally buried with his body in the little Wāḍī of Ḫū Bin (ropheœcan). His inglorious end did not prevent his tomb from becoming a wonder-working abode of grace; his biographer even claims that he “stayed on the path of Allah and the commander of the faithful” and many miracles are recorded of him even from his lifetime. His assassination at the beginning of 656 (1258) falls in the same year as the execution of his old enemy, the last ʿAbbāsīd Caliph, al-Mustaṣīm. Legend says that the messenger who was to carry the news to Baghdād learned on the way that the caliph had met his fate on the same day.

While in his Daʾwā (see Bihār) al-Mahdī collected the usual Zaydī arguments with the regular sayings from the ʿUkān and Ḥadīṯ in practically the traditional form as a general appeal to support the Zaydī cause and himself, his Khāшīf is a passionate personal protest against his deposition and an attempt to bring back his enemies especially Shams al-Dīn Ahmad, to the loyalty they had sworn to him. This, he reproaches them, was as unrighteous as the recognition of Mūmānīs authority as a Prophet by the Umayyads.

The Shams al-Dīn Ahmad above mentioned, who adopted the official title of al-Mutawakkil and recognized the Rasīlīs as his overlords, was at once challenged by a rival Imam in the person of Abū Muhammad al-Hasan b. al-Wahhāb. The position remained the same for the next 50 years. The Tattimma gives nine men, the last being al-Nasīr ʿAlī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, who succeeded in obtaining some recognition as ʿImāms in the period between al-Mahdī Ahmad b. al-Husāin and .

A. AL-MAHDI LI-DIN ALLAH AHMAD B. YAHYA b. AL-MURTADA b. Ahmad b. al-Murtada b. al-Mufaddal b. Manṣūr b. al-Muṣṭafā b. al-Hadjīdānī b. ʿAli b. Yahyā b. ʿAlī b. Rūṣūf al-Daʿī b. Yahyā b. Manṣūr b. Ahmad b. al-Nasīr. The last named ancestor was the son and second successor of Yahya al-Ḥāfī. After the death of al-Nasīr ʿAlī al-Dīn, a kāšī ʿAbd Allah b. al-Hasan al-Dauwārī worked with a few partisans on behalf of his sons who were still minors. But the Ṣanʿāʾi, anxious to consolidate the power which was gradually breaking up, placed in the mosque of Djamāl al-Dīn Sanʿa’ three claimants: ʿAli b. Abī ʿAl-Fadlī b. al-Nasīr b. Ahmad b. Muḥammad and Ahmad b. Yahyā b. al-Muṭṭaṣīr and these three were to uphold the ʿImāmat. Their choice fell on Ahmad b. Yahyā, the youngest of them. In spite of his objections, he had to give in to their argument that “one who has gone deeply into learning problems with their subtle points, cannot be incapable of conducting worldly affairs”. They at the same time promised him their advice and support (Tattimma, fol. 72n). But on the very night on which he was proclaimed, the kāšī al-Dawārī succeeded in getting homage paid to his candidate (end of 793 = 1391). Ahmad b. Yahyā and his adherents at once left the town in a body and withdrew to the hills to the Banu Shāḥīb, a clan of the Banū Ḥamza, as unworthy of the Imamate. His abode was betrayed by one of the Shāḥībīs. Fighting went on for 13 days in which the enemy lost about 50 men and the Imam 10. The latter then went farther into the mountains and his claims were recognised in Ṣanʿāʾ also. Among his special supporters were al-Ḥāfī b. al-Muṣṭafā, son of a former Imam, and Ibn Abī ʿAl-Fadlī. He was also asked by people in Ṣanʿāʾ to receive their homage. But he was surprised by his enemies and as he would not interrupt his ritual ablutions and prayers to fight, he surrendered under a promise that no harm would befell him. In spite of this, as the Tattimma tells us, which is however much biased in his favour, 80 of his men were massacred, he himself was taken to Ṣanʿāʾ where he was kept a prisoner for 7 years.
and 3 weeks (794—801). Liberated with the help of his warders, he lived a further 40 years, “tossed up and down the country”, devoting himself entirely to learning until he died in Zafar (end of 480 = 1437) of the plague in the Yaman, which had already carried off with many notables including the rival Imam ‘Ali b. Sa‘ād al-Din. According to the Tarā‘imma (fol. 75a) Ibn al-Muqtada was born in 775 (1373) in Dhamār, according to other sources (see Kius, in Brit. Mus. Cat. Suppl., No. 365) in 764 (1363) at Anis. The choice of Ibn al-Muqtada as Imam was a mistake, inasmuch as he lacked the necessary military and administrative ability. On the other hand he had another qualification in perfection. As a result of a careful education and a thirst for learning from his youth upwards, he wrote a great deal, dogmatic, legal and paraenetic; he was also a poet and worked at grammar and logic. The kindness of his warders, who supplied him with ink and paper, enabled him to compose the law book al-Akhār fi Fikr al-Yima al-Athār (Berlin MS. 4910) on which he wrote a commentary. His most valuable work is still his theological and legal encyclopaedia, al-Bahr al-zakkīh (Berlin MS. 4894—4907) on which he likewise wrote a commentary. Although not the work of an original scholar, it is a rich and well arranged compilation, which deserves attention, if only for the part of the introduction which compares the various religions, as the distinctions between them are seen from quite a different point of view to that of Aš‘arī or Shı‘ahraṣtī.

About 50 years after al-Mahdī Aḥmad b. Yahyā, from 922 (1516), the Turks had begun to occupy Yaman to hold it with varying fortunes (see Kuṭb al-Din al-Makki, al-Bayt al-Yamanī fi Tīrāt al-Qaimmi, in S. de Saey, in N.E., iv, 412—504 and A. Rutgers, Geschichte Jemen nach Hassan Pascha, Leyden 1838). In his struggle with them al-Maṣūr b.iIALah al-Kāsim b. Muḥammad, a descendant of al-Hādī in the 17th generation, was able about 1000 A.H. to restore the present imāmat in San‘ā’ (see A. S. Tritton, The Rise of the Imams of San‘aa, Oxford 1925). Of his sons, Muḥammad al-Mu‘ayyad succeeded him. Even in his reign but still more after his death in 1054 (1642), when his successor Isa‘ālī, another son of al-Kāsim, was making his way with difficulty against his many brothers and nephews, one of al-Kāsim’s grandsons began to come to the front, afterwards the Imām C. AL-MAHDI LI-DIN ALLAH AḤMAD B. AL-HASAN B. AL-KĀSIM. His father was not Imām but distinguished himself in the wars against the Turks and was also a scholar. In 1049 Aḥmad appeared in the hills of Wāsāb; in 1051 he besieged Dhamār without success; in 1053 he was in Mecca with many members of his family on the pilgrimage. Just at the accession of Isa‘ālī, he set out with another cousin against San‘ā’. At first he came to terms with the Imām but then fought in different places for his own hand, e.g. at Ḥula and again in the Ḥijāb Wāsāb. In his later years he was particular in the remoter territory in the south towards al-Tihāma in Zabīd. A Zabīd assembly of leading Sā‘arīs and ‘Ulamā’ met, at which Aḥmad was with some difficulty recognised as the legitimate Imām. Although this did not mean that he enjoyed the authority of a sovereign, since his rivals and the other amirs remained as independent as before, yet peace and security reigned in the country. But Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan died soon afterwards in 1092 (1681) in al-Ghīrās near Shībām which had been built by the first Turkish conqueror Ḥasan Pāsha. After the short and weak reign of his son al-Muṭawakkil Muḥammat (to 1097 = 1686), family feuds broke out again. Among the later Imams of this Kāsimid dynasty another Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim (from 1221 = 1806) again bore the official title of al-Mahdī Li-Din Allāh.


AL-MAHDI UBайд ALLAH, first Fātimid Caliph (297—322 = 909—934). His origins are obscure. He is also known as Sa‘īd, and is believed to have been the grandson of the celebrated Persian sectarian ‘Abd Allāh b. Māmūn al-Khādījī (the occultist), the Isma‘ili leader; but he claimed to be a true descendant of the Prophet through his daughter Fātima. By some he was supposed to be the brother of the twelfth Imam; according to others, one of the son of the strange “hidden” Imāms of the Isma‘īlis. His spectacular rise to power was coincident with a sudden outburst of Shi‘ite fervour centred in the vexed question of the legitimacy of the Caliphate, involving the mystical doctrine of the Imām and the appearance of a long-expected Māhdi [q.v.]. It was the culmination of Isma‘ilian propaganda and was in alliance with the Karmātian heresy of Arabia. Throughout the history of these times one can discern how in each such zealots worked to trade their esoteric doctrines and allegorical interpretations to the advancement of their own private political ends.

North Africa witnessed the crucial stages of the Fātimid rising, the prime instigator being apparently a Ḥādi‘, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī [q.v.], who proclaimed himself the precursor of the Mahdī. An ambitious factionist of undeniable ability and or-
organising genius, in the end his own astuteness and love of power brought about his undoing. Nevertheless it was to him that 'Ubayd Allah owed his throne and title. While the former was sowing the seeds of sedition amongst the Berber tribes of North Africa, 'Ubayd Allah was making his way with his family from Salamiya in N. Syria to Kairawan (902 A.D.). In passing through Egypt disguised as a merchant he narrowly escaped imprisonment at the hands of a suspicious governor. Perhaps judicious bribery helped him on his way until he found himself with his son thrown by the Beni Midhr, supporters of the 'Abbâsids, into a dungeon in Sidjilmassa. Meanwhile his general in charge was operating elsewhere in his favour with the help of the ruler Beni Kirtha whose services he had enlisted. A victorious entry into Sidjilmassa marked the release of 'Ubayd Allah — though there are suspicions that the real prisoner was slain before the surrender — and his proclamation as the true spiritual head of Islam, al-Mahdi, Commander of the Faithful. The Aghlabid monarch Ziyâdat Allah III was overthrown and driven into exile in Egypt; while on Jan. 15, 910 A.D. (29th Rabi's 11, 297), the new Mahdi and his son made their triumphal entry into Kâkštân.

Following his elevation to supreme control 'Ubayd Allah entered on a policy of extending the bounds of his dominions. Not only had he enemies on all sides; even within his own camp barked traitorous allies and fickle adherents. Those who had raised him from the dungeon found very soon that he was now their master. The e-trangement between him and his chief supporters is said to have originated in the disappointment felt by the latter that he was incapable of working the miracles expected of such a divine personage. Abd 'Abd Allah was forced to play a subordinate part and becoming embittered thereby, began spreading sedition amongst the unwept Berber tribesmen. But the Mahdi, too, quite capable of dealing with the Aghlabids, A. Sp. of the Kirtha family of Berber race, heading a deputation asking for clear proofs of his spiritual claims, was summarily beheaded. Shortly after this he waylaid Abd 'Abd Allah and his brother Abd al-Mansî and had them assassinated (928 = 918). The other brother Abl Zâkî was sent to Kairawan with a letter ordering his execution. As the Mahdi himself and in ju-judging such acts against quondam supporters: "Satan caused them to slip and I have punished them by the sword." Kios enENDED, but the bold handling of the populace by the Mahdi and his personal courage averted national disaster and firmly established the dynasty. However, it did not demonstrate the spiritual virtues of the Fatimid dynasty.

'Ubayd Allah's foreign policy led him to de-patch Husn b. Kulab of the Beni Kirtha as governor to Sicily in order to further the Fatimid cause. The Huwara and Euwata tribes of Tripoli were vanquished, while the Mahdis forces were also victorious against Muhammad b. Khazar at Tiharet. But following Abd 'A'id Allah's death, the Beni Kirtha, who were menacing against the Mahdi, were attacked in April 912, chiefly by their old enemies, the people of Karawan who never liked that savage manner. The Beni Kirtha received a masterly defeat and appointed a new Mahdi named Kali; but after considerable fighting they were defeated. The Tripolitans were also involved in a struggle with the Berbers (500 A.H.).

But the most important events of this reign were the attacks on Egypt. The Mahdi's son, Abu l-Kasim, was sent in command of the forces; while a fleet operated under Khusbas. Tripoli, Barka, and then Alexandria (302 = 914) were taken, until the victorious army was checked outside Fustat by the eunuch Mânis, the Egyptian commander. A second expeditory force (916–917) repeated the feats of the previous one and devastated the Delta and ravaged the Fâylûm, only to be checked once more at Old Cairo, while the fleet of 80 vessels was destroyed at Rosetta (307 = 920) by the Khâlifa's smaller but more efficient fleet under the Fatimid mariners. Once again the fleet had to withdraw. Nevertheless the dominion of the Mahdi extended from the borders of Egypt to the confines of the Idrisid stronghold in Morocco. His fleets spread terror throughout the Mediterranean. Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, and the Balearic Islands felt his influence; while his secret-service agents were to be found throughout Andalusia. A revolt in Sicily in favour of an Aghlabid prince Ahmad b. Ziyâdat Allah affected his sway in that island, but his administration generally was strong and secure, albeit rigorous and unmerciful. The year 926 found him taking up his residence in the new city he had founded on the Tunisian coast, named al-Mahdiya [3 q.v.] (the "Africa of Fosrattâr). This became his capital instead of Kairawan (16 miles distant). The new town was founded in 603 (916) and was situated on a projecting peninsula called Dâsîrât al-Fâr. It was strongly fortified with high and massive walls, and colossally heavy gates, enclosing the palace and the royal barracks. A natural harbour was improved to shelter 100 vessels of war. On the mainland lay the foboung of Zwafli intended as a place of residence for traders and the general public. After a reign of 25 years 'Ubayd Allah died on the 4th March 934 (14th Rabi's 1, 322) at the age of 65, and was succeeded by his son Abu l-Kasim and then Abd al-Mansî of the Fatimid line. Bibliography: Wilh. Geschichte der al-Israel, i 579 sqq.; O'Leary, Hist. of the Fatimia Khalifs, index; Nicholson, Establishment of the Fatimid Dynasty; C. Huart, Histoire des Arabes, i. 333 sqq.; Lane-Poole, Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 95–97; do., Mohammedan Dynasties, p. 70; C. Schefer, Sfer Namek of Nashir Khairun, p. 105, 120; I. Hamet, Histoire du Magreb, p. 25–34; E. Fagnan, Extrait inédits relatifs au Magreb, p. 77; H. C. Kay, 'Omarâ's History of Fâmân, p. 192 sqq.; Muir, Caliphat, p. 562 sqq.; Dusy and Stokes, Spanish Islam, p. 407 sqq.; Vâlés, Geogr., 400, 456; ii. 798, 961; iv. 694; Abu l-Mahâsîn b. Taghrî Bardi, Annals, ed. W. Popper, p. 114, 115; Geog. of Goeje, F.G.A., viii. 334; 'Abd al-Lathîf, Relation de l'Egypte, transl. de Saçy, p. 523; P. al-Masnââî, Les Pratisses d'or, vi. 194; viii. 246; Ibn Khallîkân, Roger. Dict., transl. de Slane, i. 231 n.; ii. 388; iv. 51; Nakrî, Hist. de l'Egypte, transl. Blochet, p. 72; H. Bunz, Fatimidengeschichte von al-Makrizi, p. 31 sqq.; Ibn al-Athir, Kâmîm, ii. 254; Ibn Khaldûn, Hist. des Berbers, ed. de Slane, i. 441 sqq.; Suyûtî, Hist. of the Câlebi, transl. Jarrett, p. 2, 23, 398 sqq.; Archives moraves, xvi. 453 sqq.; xxx. 155, 246, 265; xxxi. 51, 58; al-Balkhi, Livre de la Creation, ed. and transl. C. Huart, ii. 163; al-Birûnî, Chronology of Ancient Nations, transl.
AL-MAHDIYA, a town on the east coast of Tunisia, is the "town of Africa" of the European historians of the Middle Ages. It is built between Sous and Bou-Smama, which was more than a mile in length and less than 500 yards in breadth, which terminates the cape of Africa and is connected to the mainland by a narrow isthmus "much as the hand is joined to the wrist". The site was without doubt occupied by a Phoenician factory and by a Roman settlement, which it has not been possible to identify. Its name comes from the SS's Mahdi 'Ubayd Allah, who in 300 (912) founded and fortified it, after having consulted the oracles and foreseeing the dangers which would threaten the Fatimid dynasty. A rampart of rubble of which a few towers are in existence ran along the coast towards the south; a thin wall protected the town and the harbour excavated out of the rock, which the ships entered under a large gate flanked by two strong defensive works. A little farther on, towards the point was the naval arsenal. From the side of the isthmus, the rampart, which is very strong and strengthened by round and square towers, had a wall in front of it and was pierced by a gate which still exists. Flanked by two salients with inclined sides entrances is gained under an arch 45 yards in length (al-kifā, al-kaθēl). The highest point of the peninsula is occupied by an old Turkish kâbire, built on the probable site of the palace of Mahdi. In front towards the west, probably lay the palace of the son al-Kasim. The town owes to the Fatimids also a great mosque built near the sea, of which considerable remains still exist, notably an ornamental porch. A custom-house was at hand (dār al-munšabat); beyond the peninsula the suburb of Zawila (ancient Zella?) of which the site is still known and where remains have been found, amongst other things ware.

The Mahdi 'Ubayd Allah after leaving Kakkādā near al-Kairawan, came to live at al-Mahdiya in the year 308 (921) Having become the capital of the empire, the town prospered. It was, according to Tijārī, the richest city in Barbary. The son of 'Ubayd Allah, al-Kaθūbī lived there for over five months (January-September 945) by Abū Yazid, "the man with the ass", a Khārijī agitator, who starting from Tawzer made himself master of the whole of Hūkjā. The failure of the blockade of al-Mahdiya was the first stage in the downfall of the heretics. More than a century after, al-Mahdiya, which had been the refuge of the Fātimids when in danger, served also as an asylum to their unconquered vassals, the Zirîd Amirs, the victims of the Hūkjā invasion. In the year 449 (1057) the Zirîd al-Mu'izz abandoned al-Kaθara for al-Mahdiya. From that place he and his successors set themselves to recover the lands they had formerly ruled. From there they also turned their activities to the sea. Al-Mahdiya, where the corsairs were now equipped, became and was to remain
down to modern times the most active centre of Tunisian piracy. The expeditions of the Muslim corsairs provoked attacks from the Normans of Sicily, Pisa, and Genoan raids on the town along the coast. In 1087, al-Mađīya fell into the hands of the combined Christian forces. The Normans again took it in 1148. Then they were blockaded in it by land and by sea during the conquest of Ifriqiya by the Almohad 'Abd al-Mu'min. Having become once more a Muslim town, it was retaken and pillaged in 1180. Then it concluded with William II, the King of Sicily, a treaty of peace. The Normans were able to trade with it. During the famous campaign of the B. Ghāniyya [q.v.], Almoravid Amur, al-Mađīya was for a short time in the hands of an adventurer 'Abd al-Karim al-Kagragy who took the title of Caliph Thoos troubles led to the installation in Ifriqiya of a governor of the Almohad family of the B. Ḥafs. Al-Mađīya was henceforth one of the principal towns of the kingdom of the Ḥafsids. Its government was generally confined to one of the sons of the sovereign of Tunis.

The persistent activity however of the Corsairs provoked in the year 1390 a new Genoan expedition supported by Charles VI, King of France, who sent his galleys and his knights against "cette malencontreuse ville d'Auffrique" (Froissart). Al-Mađīya resisted but was forced to pay a tribute to the Christians in 1359, after the conquest of Tunis by Charles V, the town received a Spanish garrison. In the following year the corsair Dragut took it by surprise. Taken prisoner by the fleet of Andrea Doria, then released, Dragut came back and installed himself in al-Mađīya. On the 8th September 1550, Doria seized the town from Dragut "prince of Africa", after a memorable siege. Charles V offered the change of it to the Knights of Malta but they refused it, so he ordered it to be dismantled. Al-Mađīya, after falling once more into the hands of the Muslims, arose from its ruins and recommenced under Turkish rule until the 19th century; the nest of corsairs, the terror of Christian merchants that it had been for nearly 3000 years. It is now a quiet little town of about 10,000 inhabitants, who live by fishing and by the product of their olive-woods.


AL-MAHDĪYA, formerly called AL-MAʻMURA, a town of Morocco, on the Atlantic coast at the mouth of the Wādī Sabū (Sebū), built on a rocky promontory which dominates the valley of the river. Situated on the southern extremity of the plain of Gharb and 20 miles to the North East of Salé (Sālā) it enjoys a geographical position of the first importance. A port is shortly to be created here for ships of heavy tonnage, which cannot sail up the Wādī Sabū as far as the river part of Kenitra (Ar. al-Ḳunāṭira, "the little bridge") situated 6 miles as the crow flies from the mouth of the river.

It is generally agreed that the site of al-Mađīya corresponds to that of one of the earliest Phoenician settlements founded by Hanno in the fifth century B.C. on the Atlantic coast of Morocco: — the factory of Thynaniteria. Nothing is known of the later history of this foundation and we have to wait till the fourth century A.H. (tenth A.D.) to get the first mention in Arab writers of the town at the mouth of the Wādī Sabū under the names al-MA’MURA ("the populated, the flourishing"), Ḥalīk ("the mouth") al-Mađīya or Ḥalīk Sabū. According to the chronicler Abu Ḥafs al-Sālimi, the modern town was founded by the short-lived dynasty of the Banū Ifrīn [q.v.] which settled on the Atlantic side of Morocco at the end of the tenth century of our era. In the second half of the XIIIth, the Almohad Sultan 'Abd al-Mu'min built there one of his dockyards for his navy (dār al-Mu'mīd). Later, down to the XVIIth century, al-Mađīya's history is obscure: — it was a small trading centre to which European ships came for the products of the country.

Al-Mađīya, when the Christians of the Iberian peninsula made their offensive against Morocco, was one of their first objectives; on June 24, 1515 a large Portuguese fleet anchored at the mouth of the Wādī Sabū and a landing force of 8,000 men occupied the town without a blow being struck. The Portuguese made themselves a strong base in al-Mađīya, built fortifications there, remains of which still exist, but they were only able to hold it for a short time. The Muslims drove the Christians out of al-Mađīya at the end of the same year, inflicting very heavy losses upon them. Al-Mađīya re-enters history when at the end of the XVIIth century it became a formidable nest of European pirates, who under the leadership of an English captain, Mainwaring, practised piracy along the whole Atlantic coast and became a terror to the seafaring centres of Europe. This state of things was put an end to when Spain, which in 1610 had occupied the port of Larache (al-`Arāsh, q.v.), a little farther north, made a landing at al-Mađīya in August 1614, after negotiations with the Moroccan ruler, the Sa'dīan Mawlay Zālidn. The town was taken and the Spanish fleet withdrew leaving a strong garrison of 1,500 men. The captured town was given the name of San Miguel de Ultramar.

The Spanish occupation of al-Mađīya was to last 67 years, during which it was several times fiercely attacked by the Muslims, particularly the "volunteers of the faith" (Muḥāṣiban), who mobilised to drive the Christians from the various points on the coast where they had established themselves under the active leadership of the chief al-Aysh al-Sālī. The principal attacks on San Miguel de Ultramar were delivered in 1629, 1630.
and 1647. In 1681 (1092 A.H.) the 'Alawid Sultan Mawliy Masmūl placed siege to the town and finally took it by storm. He then gave it the name of al-Mahdiya; the name of al-Ma'mura only survived as that of the great forest of cork-oaks which lies between Salé and the lower valley of the Wādī Sabū. — It may be noted that for a few years at an earlier date the name al-Mahdiya had been borne in Morocco by the little military station founded by the Almoravid king Abd al-Mu'mīn on the site of the future Ribāt al-Fath (Rabat), on the south bank at the mouth of the Wādī Salīm (the modern Wādī Bu-regreg) [cf. the article Rabat]. Al-Mahdiya was occupied by French troops in 1911.

Considerable remains survive at al-Mahdiya, dating from the brief Portuguese occupation, the Spanish occupation or from the date when it was definitely retaken by the Muslims. Around the citadel (ṣaḥba) runs a continuous rampart with a ditch. These defences are entered by two gates; — one very massive, with two Arabic inscriptions, dates from the XVIIth century. The other, a simple postern, dating from the Spanish occupation, opens on the steep slope which runs down to the river. In the houses, which form a little mosque are the ruins of the Muslim governor's palace of the XVIIIth century. Between the foot of the citadel and the bank of the Wādī Sabū for a length of 200 yards and a breadth of about 40 may still be seen buildings consisting of a series of square chambers completely isolated from one another and each protected by a double wall. These were probably granaries, which need not be earlier than the end of the XVIIth century, and are not, as has been suggested, of the Phoenician period.


MAHĪYA (A.), technical term in metaphysics, quiddity; frequently used as equivalent of ḍhawhar, substance. Abī Ḥanīfa, Ḍīrār (and al-Nadżīdī) used it to designate the pure divine essence; cf. 'Abd al-Kaḍir al-Baghdādi, al-Fārī dāl al-Fīrāq, p. 201—22; al-Shaḥrāsīrī, Kitāb al-Mīlaḥ wa-l-ṣināʿāt, II, Nikāh al-Qurʾān, i. 114; Kaylbūn Ḍīrār al-Türkī, ed. and transl. Huart, i. 85. On the question whether the quiddity is identical or not to existence (rūjdūd) cf. Dhū Jarīmī, Sharḥ al-Mawā'il, Cairo, p. 92. (L. Masseroni)

MAHKAMA. [See MEKEMEK.]

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

According to Mākānī the custom of sending a mahmal to Mecca was first introduced in 670 A.H. by the Mamluk Sultan Baḥāt; but others attribute it to the Sharīf Abū Numayy; it is also said that it was a prince going on the pilgrimage in a splendid litter that gave Baḥāt the idea of sending one with the pilgrim caravan. This is however only a story; and it is a much more important question whether the custom did not arise at an earlier date and whether it did not originally have a direct religious significance. It is natural to recall the portable sanctuaries of the Arabs and the mahmal particularly reminds one of the description which Muṣīl (Die Kultur, 1910, p. 8 sq.) gives of the "Abū Zūr al-Markāb" of the Ṭwāh tribe: a framework of thin pieces of wood adorned with ostrich feathers which is fastened on to the saddle of a pack-camel and is the visible centre of the tribe. This would at any rate lead us to the practical significance of the later mahmal, a visible sign of independence and claim to suzerainty of the various Muslim states. It is just this significance which gives the mahmals a certain historical interest as political changes and rivalries are reflected in them in course of time. There have occasionally been rulers who by sending mahmals gave expression to their endeavour to obtain recognition as sovereigns and protectors of the sharīfs, only to be soon driven from power again by others. That the Egyptian mahmal came to obtain a place of honour, that from Syria being the only other at all comparable to it, was a result of the political influence of the Mamluk Sultans. It is noteworthy that the important rule made no allowance in this respect and an attempt to send a mahmal from Constantinople met with no success. In 1807 an interruption was
caused by the conquest of Mecca by the Wahhabi|s who forbade this empty pomp so hateful to them; but this ceased when they were driven out and Muhammad Ali’s rule again gave the Egyptian mahmal pride of place.

After the World War the sending of a mahmal from Syria stopped. Difficulties arose between the Egyptian government and King Hussein (1915–1944) regarding the powers of the heads of a field-hospital which was to accompany the mahmal as well as regarding the ceremony of its reception, which twice resulted in the mahmal not being sent.

When Ibn Sa‘ud had become king of the Hijaz, long negotiations took place over the mahmal. The Wahhabi ruler insisted on the massage which usually accompanied the mahmal being omitted and all sorts of superstitious customs being dropped; he also protested against the armed escort as a denial of his sovereignty. The attempt made in 1926 to harmonize the demands of the two sides, came to nothing: a fight broke out between the Irhwan of Ibn Sa‘ud and the Egyptian soldiers which was only stopped by the personal intervention of Ibn Sa‘ud. Since then the Egyptian government has not sent a mahmal, but neither does it any longer send a new kira for the Kaba to the Hadjdji.

Bibliography: Burchardt, Keim in Arakhen, p. 394, 396, 405 sq.; Burton, A Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, 1856, iii, p. 12, 267; Wavell, A Modern Pilgrimage in Mecca, 1912, p. 152, 155 sq.; Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, 1836, ii, p. 180–186, 245 sqq.; (with a picture of the Egyptian mahmal); Snouck Hurgronje, Melko, i, 29, 83 sq. 152, 157 (with a photography in the Atlas, Pl. V); Juynboll, Handbuch des islamischen Reises, p. 151 sq. (Fr. Buhl.)

MAHMUD I, twenty-fourth Ottoman Sultan, reigned 1143–1168 (1730–1754). He was born on the 5th Mahuraz 1108 (Aug. 2, 1696), the son of Mustafa II — the Süleyman-Ogumâdi gives the date 7th Ramadân 1107 (April 10, 1696) — and had spent his life in seclusion up to his accession. He came to the throne through the mutiny of the Janissaries under Patrona Khalil, a mutiny which cost the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha, the Kapudan Pasha and the Koya Beg their lives and forced Sultan Ahmad III to abdicate in favour of Mahir; these events took place on the 17th Kabi 1, 113 (Oct. 1, 1730). The mutiny, which really had the sympathy of most of the sect and seems to have been in the nature of a social evolution (Jorja), was only suppressed after some time through the efforts of the Kilâr Agha Beshir; before it suppression a certain number of appointments to important offices dictated by the rebels had to be cancelled and the many palaces built in the luxurious reign of Ahmad III were allowed to be pillaged. After the Janissaries had been pacified by considerable largesse on the accession of the Sultan, Beshir Agha succeeded in plotting the death of Patrona Khalil, who was assassinated on Nov. 15, 1730. The Kilâr-agha continued to exercise a preponderating influence on affairs of state; the Sultan, who was by nature more interested in literature and in the erection of more or less useful buildings, did nothing to throw off this influence, which on the whole was for the good of the state. One of the consequences of this system was the very frequent changes of grand viziers — there were no fewer then 16 in Mahmud’s reign — but the state possessed a number of able men who worked for the good of the empire in the offices of grand vizier, reis efendi and koya beg. The state finances were kept in good order, as much by the confiscation of any great fortunes amassed by high officials as by a financial system which made no distinction between the public treasury and the personal revenues of the Sultan. The situation abroad was also favourable, especially after the peace of Belgrade in 1739, which secured to Turkey a fairly long period of peace in Europe.

At the beginning of the reign, Turkey was at war with Persia. The campaign of 1731 was favourable to the Turks, who reconquered Kirmanshah and took Hamadan (battle of Koridjan, Sept. 15). Urmia and Tabriz; however, by a peace signed on Jan. 10, 1732 by the serasker and grand vizier Topal Othman Pasha, Turkey gave up Tabriz and Hamadan. This peace neither pleased the powers in Constantinople, who replaced the grand vizier by Hekim Zade Ali Pasha (q.v.) nor Talmâs Kâbir Khân, who on his return from Herât had dethroned Shah Talmâsp and was making new preparations for war. On Oct. 6, 1732, the Porte issued a formal declaration of war and in December a Persian army invaded Mesopotamia, took Kirkuk and laid siege to Baghîdâd; the great battles of this campaign were those of Duldishik on the Tigre, where the Persians were defeated (July 19, 1733), and that of Kirkük, where a week later the Turks suffered a defeat which involved the death of the serasker Topal Othman Pasha. In the same year, the Persian war produced a conflict with Russia, provoked by the Khân of the Crimea’s march through the Caucasus to reinforce the Turkish troops fighting against Persia. Russia declared she could not allow the passage of the Tatars through the country of the Kumuk and the Kaitak, which she regarded as under her authority; the Khân’s force was therefore held up and several battles were fought in Daghestân between Turks and Russians. The negotiations opened at Constantinople showed more and more that a war with Russia would be inevitable and they were finally broken off by the siege and capture of Azof by the Russians in March 1736. Meanwhile the war with Persia, which had ceased in 1734 on an armistice being concluded by the Pasha of Baghîdâd, had been resumed in 1735 when Ahmad Kopîulu was appointed serasker. The campaign was unfortunate for the Turks. They lost a number of towns in the Caucasus; however the development of affairs in Persia where Talmâsp Kâbir, afterwards Nâdir Shâh, proclaimed himself king on Dec. 1, 1735 in his camp on the Caucasian front, was favourable to the peace negotiations which were begun at this time. These negotiations ended in a peace signed at Constantinople on Oct. 17, 1736; the frontiers of the two countries remained as they had been fixed in the time of Murad IV.

In the same year a Russian army invaded and laid waste the Crimea, although negotiations still went on, first at Constantinople and then in the country. Austria, posing as mediator, took an active part in these negotiations, which were finally broken off at the Congress of Niemirow in Aug. 1637, when it became evident that Austria was really Russia’s ally, so that Turkey had to
deal with two adversaries. The war began badly for the Turks who lost Nish to the Austrians and Oczakow to the Russians. Nish however was won back in Oct. 1737. During the next two years fortune was rather on the side of the Turkish armies under the grand vizier Yegen Muhammed Pasha. The conclusion of the war was marked by the appearance of the forces of the grand vizier Hâş-var Muhammed before Belgrade in July 1739. It was before this town that the famous peace of Belgrade (Sept. 18) was negotiated with the assistance and mediation of the French Ambassador, the Marquis de Villeneuve, by which Turkey again obtained possession of the town. Russia was included in the same treaty and had to promise to demolish the fortifications of Azof.

This ending of the war in a way very advantageous to the Porte was followed by a long period of peace with the states of Europe, which, as a result of the Seven Years’ War, had no time to devote to plans for the partition of Turkey. From 1743 to 1746 there was a new Persian war. It began through the demands of Nâdir Shâh to have the Persian Shi’a recognised as a fifth Madhhab, that is, a sect; the Porte, on the other hand, gave an evasive answer but after they had become convinced that Nâdir Shâh intended to make himself lord of Mesopotamia, the Shâh-i al-Islâm gave a fatâwa against the recognition of the Dâ’ifariyya. In 1743 Nâdir Shâh took Kirkûk and laid siege to al-Mawzûl, only to be forced to raise it after a while. In the following year the scene of hostilities shifted to the Caucasus. The Porte then attempted to support a Persian pretender of the Safawid family, whom it sent off with great pomp to Karâ; in 1746 the Turkish ser-asker, the former grand vizier Yegen Muhammed, fell in the battle of Murâd Tepe in Kurdistan. During all this time, peace negotiations were going on in Constantinople and conducted through the Turkish commander-in-chief. During these negotiations Nâdir Shâh had dropped his demand for the recognition of the Dâ’ifariyya and finally agreement was reached on the basis of the frontiers of Murâd IV (Sept. 4, 1746). In July of the same year the all powerful Beshir Agha died at the age of 96; in spite of the efforts of the grand vizier al-Salîyid Hasan Pasha, his successor Beshir Agha the younger succeeded in procuring the same influence in affairs. This new regime only lasted till 1752 when there was reason to fear a new outbreak of discontent among the Janissaries and the ulama also; the Sultan seems therefore to have decided to sacrifice the Kizlar Agha by having him treacherously assassinated along with the whole of his sketchy empire (July 10, 1752). Two years later, on Friday, Dec. 13, 1754, Mahmûd himself died suddenly on his way from the mosque; he was buried in the Ye’ni Dâ’imî.

The Sultan left a pleasing memory behind him; it is even said of him that he took a personal part in the affairs of state (Sidjilli-i ‘Othmânî, i.e.) although the sources give little evidence of this. He did not continue the splendours of the court of his predecessor, respecting public feeling which had led to the latter’s fall. Mahmûd is especially celebrated for the large number of buildings he had erected; in Constantinople he built no less than four čâmiye and he began the building of the Nâr-i ‘Othmânî mosque. This activity was equally displayed in the provinces. This Sultan also acquired considerable merit by founding four libraries in the capital, those of Aya Sofâ, the Wâlide Dâ’imî mosque, the Fâtih mosque and the Gha’âfa Serayî. The reign of Mahmûd is further marked by the display of a very skilful diplomatic activity by the Porte, conducted by several very able ren’s, for example, the famous French renegade Bonneval, who lived in Constantinople from 1729 till his death in 1747 and introduced several useful reforms into the army. But in spite of appearances, the Ottoman empire was far from being a strong power as the historian Djedwed Pasha (Ta’rikh-i Yawdu’at, 1302 ed., i. 63) has very justly remarked; therefore, in the period of anarchy which followed in Persia the death of Nâdir Shâh, the Porte consistently declined to interfere in Persian affairs. From time to time minor revolts contributed to weaken the strength of the empire; besides the always dangerous Jansâries, there were several risings in Anatolia (e.g. Şarf Beg Oghlu in Aidan in 1739). It was also in the reign of Mahmûd I that the Wahhabis first began to give trouble to the government. In Egypt the Mamlûk bey became successor to the country in practical independence, in spite of the energetic steps taken by Râghib Pasha, when the latter was governor of this province. As to foreign relations, it is interesting to note that it was in this reign that France, which became very influential after the peace of Belgrade, succeeded in 1740 in obtaining the celebrated capitulation which became in time the most important document on the extra-territorial rights of foreigners in Turkey.

**Bibliography:** The principal Turkish sources are the imperial historiographers Ta’rikh Sâmt ve Şâkir ve Şâbî, Constantinople 1198 (years 1143–1156), Ta’rikh-i Şâzî, Constantinople 1199 (year 1157–1165) and the beginning of the Ta’rikh-i Wâ’if, Constantinople 1219 (beginning in 1166); then there are the reports of certain embassies like the Ta’zikh ve Ta’zîfî of Râghib Pasha on the peace negotiations with Nâdir Shâh in 1736, a manuscript which was used by von Hammer. There are also several works still in manuscript on the history of the reign of Mahmûd I, notably by Babinger, G.O.W., Leipzig 1927, p. 332. The same author (op. cit., p. 289) also quotes a series of monographs in Turkish which deal with the wars of Nâdir Shâh. For these wars, a complementary source is the biography of Nâdir Shâh by Mahdî Khân and Hanway, A Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia, 1759. — General sketches of the reign of Mahmûd I are given in von Hammer, G.O.W., Pesh 1836, iv. 466–482; Zinkeisen, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches in Europa, v., Gorha 1857; p. 620–647; Jorga, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, Gorha 1911, iv. 409–462.

**MAHMÛD II**, the twenty-ninth sultan of the Ottoman Empire, reigned from 1808 until 1839. He was the son of ʿAbd al-Hamîd I and was born on the 20th July 1784 (15th Ramadan 1199, cf. Sidjilli-i ‘Othmânî, i. 73). He succeeded to Mustafa IV on July 28, 1808, directly after the tragic events, which had led to the assassination of Salîm III [q. v.]. Mahmûd himself had a narrow escape from the fate of Salîm. Until his coming to the throne he had lived in seclusion and during the preceding year his intercourse with
dethroned sultan had undoubtedly exercised a great influence on Mahmud’s ideas, making him appear afterwards as Sahm’s avenger.

The grand-vizierate of Musafa Bairaakdar Pasha, the consequence of the latter’s victory, lasted only until November 1808; a revolt put an end to his reformatory tyranny and to his life. The next years were taken up by the war against the Russians, who had occupied the Danubian principalities in December 1806. Endeavouring to continue their conquests on the southern side of the Danube, the Russians met with more resistance from the Turks than had been expected; it was, however, due principally to the increasing danger of a Persian invasion by the Turks obtained the peace of Bucarest, signed on May 28, 1812, and negotiated, on the part of the Turks, by Ghahib Efendi. By this peace, Turkey had only to cede Bessarabia to Russia. In the meantime the new sultan had inaugurated a policy of internal consolidation of the empire, a policy which lasted until the Greek revolt in 1820 began to absorb all the strength of the state. He put an end to the almost independent position of the ayas in Rumelia and to that of the numerous dereleys in Anatolia, especially to the families of the Khans Oghlu in Sarukhan and Aulin and of the Capans Oghlu in the region of Karacay [cf.mıyan]. The sultan’s authority was equally re-established in southern Mesopotamia after the death of Sublime Paşa of Baghdad in 1810. The end of Muhammad Ali Paşa of Egypt had to be invoked to repress the Wahhabi power in Arabia; Mecca and Medina were reconquered in 1813 by Tüsma Paşa [cf.ımıx]. In Serbia it was only after years of trouble that an arrangement could be attained, which left Milon as supreme kâez of this principality. The submission of Bosnia only took place after 1821. On the contrary Ali Paşa of Yemen succeeded in keeping his strong position during this period; not till 1829 were the Turkish troops able to lay siege to Yemen. In Constantinople the sultan took severe measures to maintain order, especially against the dangerous element of the Janissaries.

During this time the diplomatic difficulties with Russia, relating to the interpretation and the execution of the peace treaty, continued, especially with regard to the regime in Moldavia and Wallachia. These difficulties were to become a real danger after the Greek insurrection had broken out.

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

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

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

The principal political facts of the nine last years of Mahmūd's reign were the conflict with Muhammad 'Ali of Egypt and the Russian intervention, which was its consequence and put Turkey in a state of independence on Russia. The activity of Muhammad 'Ali [q. v.] began in 1831 with the invasion by Ibrahim Pasha of the territory of the pasha of Akka; this town was besieged and fell in May 1832. Within a short time Damascus, and Aleppo also submitted to Ibrahim. The military measures of the sultan were unable to stop the advance of the Egyptian troops, who marched from Syria into Asia Minor; the Turkish General Rashid Pasha was beaten by them in the battle of Konya (December 21, 1832) and was himself made a prisoner. The Porte then was obliged to accept the aid offered by Russia and the mediation of France, the result of which was an agreement, concluded on April 8, 1833 at Kutahiya, with Ibrahim Pasha; Muhammad 'Ali had to be recognised as pasha of Syria while the province of Adana was given to Ibrahim. In the meantime Russian troops had been landed in the Bosporus. These were only withdrawn after the conclusion of the notorious treaty of Hünkâr Iskele, signed on July 4, 1833 between Turkey and Russia. The treaty was a defensive alliance and contained a secret clause by which Turkey undertook to prevent any eventual enemies of Russia from entering into the Black Sea. Thus Turkey became still more politically linked to Russia, without the other powers being able to hinder this.

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

During the same period the sultan had to suppress dangerous and repeated revolts in Albania and Bosnia; the situation in Serbia had remained quiet after a khatfī sharif of 1830. In 1837, the situation in the interior had become sufficiently stabilised for Mahmūd to undertake a journey in his European provinces, unhindered by breach with the traditional customs of the Ottoman rulers. It was to be one of his last public acts. Mahmūd died on July 1, 1839 at Constantinople in his palace of Canlıดา, above Scutari.

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

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

**Bibliography:** The Turkish historical works deserve more attention than has been paid so far to them. The more accessible ones are: Li̇kawat Fasli̇, Tāvīkhī, Constantinople 1303, vol. v., comprising the period from 1223 to 1241, and its continuation, the Tāvīkhī of Ahmad Lutfī, Constantinople 1290—1306, vol. I—v., comprising the period from 1241 to 1255. Other printed sources are: Allā Bakr, Waf̲a̲-i Ḏedid̲e, Constantinople 1332; Tāvīkhī ʿAffī, Constantinople n.d.; Maḥmūd Aṣ̲ād, Uṣ̲r̲-z̲afār̲, Constantinople 1243, a monograph on the extermination of the Janisaries; Maḥmūd Thuri̇, Naf̲̲ḥat al-Waṣ̲āf̲ī, Constantinople (cf. also Bāhmane, G. O. W., p. 387) European general treatments of this period: Zinkesien, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches in Europa, v. I, Gotha 1884, p. 591 sq. (until 1842); Remarques, Geschichte des Türkischen Reiches, v. I, Gotha 1912, p. 182—307. A valuable contemporary source is II, von Moltke, Beichte wiar Zandat̲e̲ und Regehenheiten in der Türkei. Berlin 1883. (J. II. Kraemer)

**MAḤMŪD I, NĀṢĪR AL-DĪN, was Sultan of Bengal from 1446 to 1460. When the ferocious tyranny of shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Shah, grandson of the usurper, Rādžā Kāns, or Ganeṣ̲h, could no longer be borne, he was put to death, and Nāṣir Khān, one of his amirs, seized the throne, but after a reign of one week, was slain by his amirs, who would not submit to one of their own number. Their choice fell on Maḥmūd, who was a descendant of Ilāy, the founder of the old royal house, and he was raised to the throne. He reigned with justice and clemency for twenty-six years, and restored and beautified the city of Goā. On his death in 1460 he was succeeded by his son Barbak Shāḥ.

**Bibliography:** Ghalīm Hūsain Sālim, Kābul-i Sālim, Nīṣān al-Dīn Aḥmad, Tāvīkhī-i Akbarī, both in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Khānī Fīrūzī, Gūr̲bān-i ʿĀb̲d̲-ʿAl̲l̲āh, Bombay lith. ed. of 1832. (T. W. Hage)

**MAḤMŪD II, NĀṢĪR AL-DĪN was the third of the Ḥabashī, or African Sulṭāns of Bengal. He succeeded his father in 1491, but was a mere puppet in the hands of one minister after another. His first minister, an African entitled Habash Khān, was slain by a rival, another African known as Malik Pādīr the Mahāmān, who afterwards slew Mahmūd, he having occupied the throne for no more than six months, and usurped the throne for himself.

**Bibliography:** See MAḤMŪD I of Bengal. (T. W. Hage)

**MAḤMŪD III, GHIYĀTH AL-DĪN, was one of the eighteen sons of ʿAlī al-Dīn Husain Shāh of Bengal. He remained loyal to his eldest brother, Nāṣir al-Dīn Nūr-ʿAlī Shāh, throughout his reign, but after his death slew his son, ʿAlī al-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh, in 1533, and ascended the throne. During a troubled reign of five years he never ruled the whole of Bengal Shīr Khān Shūr, who ultimately ascended the throne of Dvān, was already powerful in Bihār, and allied himself to Maḥmūd's rebellious brother-in-law, Maḥkūm-ʿAlām, who was governor of Ḥidajāpur. Shīr Khān defeated an army sent against him by Maḥmūd, but Maḥkūm was less fortunate, and was slain in another battle. Shīr Khān then forced the Tāḥyāgārī defile, invaded Bengal, and besieged Maḥmūd in Gawr in 1537. Maḥmūd appealed to Humayūn Shāh of Dvān for aid, and Shīr Khān was recalled to Bihār by a rebellion in that province, but left his son Dvālīr Khān to continue the siege of Gawr. In April, 1538, Maḥmūd was forced to evacuate Gawr, and fled, leaving his capital and his sons in the hands of Dvālīr Khān. Shīr Khān, returning from Bihār, then pursued Maḥmūd, overthrew him, forced him to a battle, and defeated him. Maḥmūd was wounded and fled, and nothing more is known of him.

**Bibliography:** See MAḤMŪD I of Bengal. (T. W. Hage)

**MAḤMŪD, SHIR AL-DĪN, the fourth king of the Bahmani dynasty of the Dvānak, was raised to the throne at the age of twelve on the death of his father, Maḥmūd III, on March 12, 1482, and remained under tutelage throughout his reign of thirty-six years. The ascendency of his first minister, Malik Ḥasan Bahrī, Nīṣān al-Mulk, who had been responsible for the death of Maḥmūd Gāwān [q. v.] was distasteful to the Foreign amirs of the kingdom, at the head of whom was Yūsuf Adīl Khān of Bīdāpār, and the assassination of this minister, ordered by the young king, embittered the relations between him and the Dvānak party, which attempted to dethrone him in 1487. The plot was discovered and frustrated, and was followed by a massacre of the Dvānak ordered by the king. But the youth could not stand alone, and was completely dominated by his next minister, Kasim Barid al-Malāmālī, a Turk. In 1510 Aḥmad Nīṣān al-Mulk, governor of Ḥujnīr and son of Malik Ḥasan Bahrī, proposed to Yūsuf Adīl Khān and Fath Allāh Imād al-Mulk of Bīrār that they should proclaim their independence of the king of the Dvānak, and both accepted the proposal. In the numerous wars of the reign of Maḥmūd was no more than a figurehead, being carried into the field by his minister, who issued orders without any pretence of consulting his master. Maḥmūd more than once attempted to free himself from the control of Kasim Barid al-Malāmālī, and of his son Amir Allāh, who succeeded him in 1504, but each attempt resulted only in the tightening of his bonds. In 1512 Sulṭān Kūl Kūl al-Mulk, who had been appointed governor of Telingānā in 1494, followed the example of the other provincial governors and declared himself independent, and in 1518 Maḥmūd died, worn out with debauchery. Four puppets followed him on the throne of Bīdār, and his line was finally extinguished in 1527, when Amir Allāh Barid al-Malāmālī assumed the royal title in Bīdār.

MAHMUD, NASIR AL-DIN, SULTAN OF DELHI, was the son of Shams al-Din Ittimish by the daughter of Kuch al-Din Aibak [q. v.]. In 1246, when the nobles at Delhi were growing weary of the sloth, incompetence, and tyranny of Nasir, Mahmud; then about 18 years of age, was governor of Bahri, and hastened secretly to the capital when he learned that the throne was likely to become vacant. On June 10, 1246, Nasir was deposed and thrown into prison, where he died shortly afterwards, and Mahmud, his uncle, was elected Sultan by an assembly of nobles and pious prince, with a taste for calligraphy, which he displayed in making copies of the Qur'an, but as a ruler he was a mere cipher. He was well served by Ghiyath al-Din Balban, whose daughter he married, and who ultimately succeeded him on the throne. Balban restored the royal authority in the Pandjabs, the Dehli, Mewat, Multan, Nagaur, and northern Malwa, but his enemies had been busy during his absence from court, and on his return attempted to assassinate him. He frustrated this design, but was banished from court. The nobles soon grew weary of the arrogance of his son; once, in the order of the throne, Balban was himself seized, and Balban and other nobles assembled their troops at Bhattinda. Rachna and the king marched against them, but as most of the nobles in the royal camp were in sympathy with Balban, who hesitated to attack the king, serious hostilities were avoided, and the royal army retreated. The nobles at court now prevailed upon the king to dismiss Rachna, who was banished, first to Budhan, and afterwards to Bahri, a reconciliation between the king and Balban was effected, and they returned together to Delhi in January, 1255. Rachna was soon discovered to be in communication with Kutlug Khan of Bayana, who had secretly married the king's mother, and the eunuch was captured, and put to death. In 1256 Mahmud and Balban marched against Kutlug Khan, who fled, and when he was pursued, in 1257, into Sirmur, again fled and took refuge with Kishla Khan, the rebellious governor of Multan and Ceeth. Balban marched against the rebels, but they evaded him and marched to Delhi. Finding, however, that preparations had been made to receive them, and that Balban was menacing their retreat, they fled, and in 1259 joined an army of Mughuls which was invading the Pandjabs. It was feared that the Mughuls would attack Delhi, but they retired without crossing the Satlaj. Order was then again restored in the Dehli, and in the following year the Meos of Mewat expelled by a terrible punishment a long series of crimes. Their country was ravaged, and 250 of their principal men were brought to Delhi and put to death with torture. In a second expedition 12,000 of them, men, women, and children were put to the sword. Meanwhile negotiations had been in progress with Hulagu Khan at Tabriz, and in 1260 a Mughul envoy reached Delhi and promised, in his master's name, that raids into India should cease. At this point a hiatus of nearly six years occurs in the history of the Muslims in India, and the next fact which is recorded is that Mahmud died on Feb. 18, 1268, and was succeeded by Balban.

Bibliography: Minhaj al-Din Siraj, Tabaqat-i Nasir, text and translation by Major H. G. Raverty; 'Abd al-Kadir Badauni, Manahil al-Tawarikh, text and translation by G. S. A. Ranking; Nizam al-Din Ahmad, Tabakat-i Abhari, text; all in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Kasiim Firethi, Gulshan-i Ibrahimii, Bombay lth. ed. of 1832. (T. W. Hage, MAHMUD II, NASIR AL-DIN, was the grandson of Firuz Shah, of the Tughluq dynasty, and was placed on the throne of Delhi on March 8, 1393, on the death of his elder brother Hauyin (Sikandar Shah) and was never more than a puppet in the hands of intriguing ministers. The eunuch Sarwan Delhi was by an unwise and unwise, which ended in the Hindustan rebellion in Awadh, received the title of Sultan al-Shar, and never returned to Delhi, but established his independence in Dewanpur. Another Amir, Sarang Khan, became virtually independent in the Pandjabs, and the minister Sa'adat Khan, presenting his supersession by Mukarrab Khan, set up Mahmud's cousin Nasrat as a rival king within the narrow limits of the kingdom of Delhi. In 1398 Malik, the brother of Sarang Khan, murdered Mukarrab Khan and assumed complete control of the kingdom, who conferred on him the title of Ikbal Khan. Nasrul Shah was then driven into the Delhi, but the kingdom of Delhi was in a state of utter confusion, when, in October, 1398, news was received that the Amir Timur (q. v.) had crossed the Indus and taken Multan. He reached Panipat on Dec. 2, and meanwhile the capital had been filled with fugitives, fleeing before him. The resources of the kingdom were so restricted that no adequate preparations could be made to resist him, and Mahmud and Malik were filled with terror; but such troops as could be collected were assembled within the walls, and on Dec. 15, the king and his minister marched forth to meet the invader, who had crossed the Jumna from his camp at Lon. They were utterly defeated, and fled by night, Malik to Baran in the Delhi, and Mahmud to Gujrat, and afterwards to Malwa. Timur left Delhi on Jan. 1, 1399 when his work of plunder, devastation, and bloodshed was finished, and Mahmud's rival, Nasrat Shah, occupied the ruins of the capital, but was expelled by Malik, and driven into Mewat, where he shortly afterwards died. Malik returned to Delhi in 1400, and in 1401 was rejoined by Mahmud. In 1402 Malik, carrying Mahmud with him, marched to Kanawaj to attack Ibrahim Shaw of Djawapir, but Mahmud, weary of the domination of Malik, fled and joined Ibrahim, who, however, received him so ill that he again fled, and established himself in Kanawaj. Malik then made a fruitless attempt to recover Gwalayar, and returned to Kanawaj in order to recapture Mahmud, but was baffled by the strength of its defences and returned to Delhi. He attempted to subdue Khidir Khan of Multan, but was defeated and slain by him in November, 1405. After his death Dawlat Khan Lodhi became the virtual ruler of Delhi, and at his invitation Mahmud returned to his capital. The rest of his reign was spent in attempts to re-establish his authority in Sambarda, Sambhal, and Baran, and to punish Ibrahim of Djawapir for his reception of him when he had fled from Malik; but he was obliged to conclude an inglorious peace with Ibrahim, and his success in the other direction was neutralized by the advance of Khidir Khan, who pretended that Timur had appointed him his viceroy in India, and in 1406 stripped Mahmud of all his possessions beyond the walls of Delhi except the Durb, Rohtak, and
Sambhul. In 1409 and 1410 Khizr Khān captured Rohá, Nānawul, three towns to the south of Dhilli, and Fīrāzābād, and besieged Māhmūd in his capital, which was only saved by a famine which compelled the invaders to retire. In 1413 Māhmūd died, the last of his line, at Kaithal, after a nominal reign of twenty years.


MĀHMŪD, SĀIF AL-DĪN, BAGARIA, the greatest of the Sulṭāns of Gudjārāt, was a younger son of Muhammad I. Kārim, and was born in 1444. In 1458 the nobles dethroned his nephew, Hāsūl, a vicious and depraved youth, and placed Māhmūd on the throne. The boy immediately displayed great courage and resource in the suppression of a serious conspiracy and rebellion at the beginning of his reign, and in 1461/1462 he marched to the assistance of the youthful Niẓām Shāh of the Dākhān, whose dominions had been invaded by Māhmūd I of Dhilli. He compelled the invaders to retire and frustrated a second attempt to invade the Dākhān. In 1466/1467 he attacked and defeated the Rājdā of Gīrnār in Kāthīāwār, which had been independent since the capture of the fortress by Mūhammad b. Tughluk of Dhilli in 1438, and reduced him to the position of a vassal. In 1470 he again invaded Gīrnār, and on Dec. 4, captured the Rājdā's stronghold and compelled him to accept Islām, thus putting an end to the Ėdāsāna dynasty, which had reigned in Gīrnār for about 1,000 years. The Rājdā became an amīr of Gīrnār, and received the title of Khān-Djāhān, and Māhmūd founded, near Gīrnār, a new fortress, which he named Mūṣṭafābād. He then invaded Kāçh and suppressed a rebellion in that province, carrying his leaders, who were compelled to accept Islām, to Muṣṭafābād as hostages. In 1472 he crossed the Rajn and marched into Sind, to assist Dām Nānda (Niẓām al-Dīn) who was beset by rebels. He crushed the rebellion, and after his return marched to Dwārkā, to punish the Rājdā, Bhīm, who had plundered a ship belonging to a Muslim merchant. Dwārkā and Bait Shānikhodhar, the robber chief's stronghold, were taken, and a Muslim governor was appointed to manage the small state. Bhīm himself was captured and executed. Māhmūd's next expedition was against some Malābār pirates who had harassed the coast near Khambayat (Cambay), and whose depredations were checked by the capture and execution of some of their number. Rājdā Patī of Cāmpāner had long encouraged a brigandage in the kingdom of Gudjārāt, and Māhmūd now retaliated by raiding some districts of his state. On his return to Al-mārdābī he discovered a plot to depose him, formed by some of his nobles, who were weary of his ceaseless activity, but the malcontents, who were well aware of the dangers which threatened the kingdom, were brought to their senses by his threat to perform the pilgrimage to Makkā, leaving his young son as regent. After restoring order in various districts of his kingdom he marched, in December 1462, to settle accounts with Cāmpāner. The fortress fell, after a siege of two years, at the end of 1484 and the Rājdā and his Minister, having received, after five months imprisonment, to accept Islām, were put to death. In 1491 Māhmūd was disturbed by acts of piracy and aggression committed against his subjects by Bāhūdur Gilānī, a rebel in the Konān, and his protests compelled the nobles of the distracted kingdom of the Dākhān to unite for the purpose of crushing the rebel. In 1507 Māhmūd's fleet, under Malik Aīyās al-Dīn, participated with that of Malik Aḥṣar Kāshānī, of Egypt, in the victory over the Portugese fleet, in which the gallant young Lourenço de Almeda, son of the viceroys to Slain, and later in the same year he invaded Kāndhūl and placed on the throne of that kingdom his daughter's son, Aḥān Kāshānī, whose father was descended from the ruling family of Kāndhūl, and who ascended the throne under the title of Aḥān Kāshānī. In this campaign he was opposed by Niẓām Shāh of Almāndāgar. In 1511 a mission from Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī of Persia arrived in Gudjārāt for the purpose of inviting Māhmūd to accept the Shī'a faith, but he refused to see the heretics. He had now been ailing for some time, and on Nov. 23, 1511, he died, at the age of sixty-nine (lunar) years, after a reign of rather more than fifty-three years. He was a tall, burly man, of commanding appearance, and was, besides being an able administrator, both warlike and chivalrous. His nickname of Begarha has been variously explained, but it undoubtedly had reference to his capture of the two great fortresses (garh) of Gīrnār and Cāmpāner. His elder brother had died of poison, and strange stories are told of his precautions against a like fate. He is said to have gradually absorbed poison into his system until he was so impregnated with them that a fly settling on his hand instantly died. Butler refers to this strange prophylactic treatment in the lines:

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

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


**MAHMûD II of Gujûrât,** was the sixth son of Muṣaffar II, on whose death his eldest son, Ṣikandari, was raised to the throne, but was assassinated on July 12, 1526. The minister then placed on the throne Muḥammad, who was an infant, in order that he might rule in his name, but Baḥādur, the second son of Muṣaffar, who had been absent at Dîhil and Dwânpîr, hastened back to secure his birthright, and on July 11, ascended the throne at Aḥmedâbâd and marched on to Câmpân, where his infant brother was. He entered the fortress without opposition, and Muḥammad was dethroned and secretly murdered within the year.

**Bibliography:** See MAHMûD I of Gujûrât. (T. W. Haig)

**MAHMûD III, Sa’d-al-Dîn, of Gujûrât,** was the son of Laṭiff Khân, third son of Muṣaffar II. On the death of Baḥādur Shâh Muḥammad Shâh Fârûqî of Khándâgâh he was offered the crown of Gujûrât, but died on his way thither. The choice of the nobles then fell on Muḥammad, the heir male, but his cousin, Mûbârâk II of Khándâgâh, in whose custody he was, and who had himself expected an offer of the crown of Gujûrât, refused to surrender him, until an army from Gujûrât compelled him to do so. The prince was escorted back to his country, and on Aug. 8, 1537, was enthroned as Maḥmûd III, being then only eleven years of age. For the first three or four years of his reign he was a puppet in the hands of powerful ministers, and when he escaped from tutelage proved himself to be weak and inefficient. His attempt, in 1546, to recover Dîhil from the Portu­guese, was a miserable failure, brutally avenged by him on the few Portuguese prisoners in his hands. In 1549 he retired to Muḥammedâbâd, where he lived in slothful luxury, ruining his constitution with drugs. On Feb. 15, 1554, he was stabbed, as he lay in a drunken stupor, at the instigation of an attendant named Barhân al-Dîn, who attempted to usurp the throne, but was slain by the nobles. The disposal of an heir was no easy matter, for Maḥmûd, dwelling an heir as a possi­ble competitor, had taken the barbarous precau­tion of procuring an abortion whenever a woman of his harem became pregnant. The choice of the nobles ultimately fell on a young prince entitled Râdî al-Mulk, the great-grandson of Shâkâr Khân, a younger son of Aḥmad I, and he was raised to the throne under the title of Aḥmad II.

**Bibliography:** See MAHMûD I of Gujûrât. (T. W. Haig)

**MAHMûD I, Khalid, of Mâlwa,** was the son of Malik Muḥīrī, sister’s son to Dâlîwar Khân, the first independent Sultan of Mâlwa. On May 12, 1436, Maḥmûd caused his cousin, Muḥammad Ghûrî, a debauched and barbarous prince, to be poisoned, frustrated an attempt to enthron­e his young son, Maṣûd, and offered the crown to his own father, Muḥīrī, who refused it, whereupon Maḥmûd himself ascended the throne. He was beset by difficulties, and after quelling a rebellion raised on behalf of Aḥmad, a Ghûrî prince, repelled an invasion by Aḥmad I of Gujûrât, who attempted to restore Maṣûd to his father’s throne. A pre­tender was set up in Cânderî, and died while Maḥmûd was besieging the fortress, but he was obliged to turn immediately against Dongar Singh of Gâvîrâr, who had taken advantage of the disturbed state of Mâlwa to invade the country. He expelled the Hindûs and returned to Mândâl, whence he was summoned, in 1440, by a faction among the nobles of Dîhil, who offered him the throne. He marched to Tughlûtâbîb, but his parti­sans failed him, and he was met by the army of Muḥammad Shâh the Sâiyûd, under Bahlîl Lodi. After some indecisive fighting he agreed to retire, as­senting the more readily owing to news of a serious rebellion in Mândâl. On his return he found that the rebellion had been suppressed by his father, and in 1442 he invaded Mewâr to punish the Rânâ for the assistance which he had given to the pretenders who had troubled the early years of his reign. He had considerable success in the campaign, but retired without at­tempting to besiege Cîtor. On his return to Mândâl he quarrelled with Maḥmûd Shâh Shârî [q.v.] of Dwânpîr, regarding Naṣîr Khân, the turbulent ruler of Kâlpî, but after an indecisive campaign the two kings made peace on the basis of a com­promise. In October, 1446, he again invaded Mewâr, extorted some tribute from the Rânâ, established his own authority in Ranthambhôr, compelled Awhad Khân of Bîyâna to do homage and pay tribute, and collected tribute from the Râdja of Kota, He left a force to besiege Cîtor, but the siege was not formed. In 1450 he invaded Gujûrât to establish his claim to the allegiance of Kanak Das, Râdja of Câmpân, but gained nothing except an instalment of tribute from the Râdja, and in the following year he suffered a severe defeat during a second invasion of Gujûrât. In 1451 he subdued the turbulent Hâra Râdipûrn on his northern frontier, and later in the year invaded Berîr and besieged Mâhîrî, but retired when the Bahmani king marched to its relief. In 1455 he again invaded Mewâr, recaptured Aджmîr, collected tribute from minor chief­fains, and har­assed and plundered large tracts in Râdipûrâm. In 1461 he was induced to invade the Dakân, where he defeated the army of the boy-king, Niẓâm Shâh, and besieged him in his capital, but was obliged to retire by the news that Maḥmûd I of Gujûrât was marching to the assistance of Niẓâm Shâh, and suffered severely at the hands of the Korkûs of the Melghât during his retreat. He invaded the Dakân in the following year, but before he could effect anything was again obliged to retire by Maḥmûd I of Gujûrât. In the same year Kherlî, a fortress of Berîr held by him, was taken by the officers of the Bahmani king, but he succeeded in recovering it. In 1466 he again invaded Mewâr, but though he defeated Rânâ
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Kumbha in the field he failed to take his capital by surprise, and returned to Mandu. In 1468 he marched to Canderi, and his officers captured and destroyed the fortress of Karaha. On his way back to Mandu he suffered severely from the heat, and on June 1, 1469, he died, at the age of sixty-eight. He was the greatest of the Muslim kings of Malwa, and under his kingdom reached its greatest extent. The "column of victory" at Citer is said to commemorate Kumbha's victories over Mahmud I of Gujjarat, and Mahmud I of Malwa, but if this be so it is more mendacious than most SAPID inscriptions, for the successes of Mewar against Malwa were gained by Sangrama against Mahmud II, not by Kumbha against Mahmud I. Mahmud's fame had reached distant Egypt, for he received an envoy from the phantom Abbاس II Kalbā, who formally recognized him as Suliya of Malwa. He was a zealous Muslim, and restored the use in public offices of the inconvenient lunar calendar of Islam, and, while he gloried in his successes against the "infidels", was careful to excuse himself for his attacks—often unjustifiable—on sovereigns of his own faith.  


MAHMUD II, "Abū" al-Dīn, Kakhtājī, of Malwa, was raised to the throne on May 2, 1511, on the death of his father, Nāsr al-Imām Kakhtājī. The early days of his reign were disturbed by rebellions on behalf of his brothers, and of other pretenders, and he was once driven from his capital, but was enabled to return and expel the rebels by the assistance of Medni Rāy, with a force of Rādpāts. The king soon had reason to repent of having accepted their aid, for Medni Rāy assumed the place of minister, and the dominance of the Hindūs alienated and disgusted all the Muslim nobles of the kingdom. Bihgat Kān, governor of Canderi, openly expressed the cause of a pretender, and Mahmud, while engaged in correspondence with him, was disturbed by news of a revolt in his capital and of the invasion of his kingdom by Muṣaffār II of Gujjarat, but the revolt was suppressed, and the invader was repelled to Gujjarat by domestic disturbances. After protracted negotiations the pretender fled, and Bihgat Kān received Mahmud at Canderi and endeavoured, but in vain, to free him from the influence of the Hindūs. Mahmud returned to Mandu early in 1514 and fell entirely under the control of the Rādpāts, at whose instance he put to death many of the Muslim nobles of the kingdom. The arrogance of the Hindūs at length became intolerable, and in 1517 Mahmud fled to Gujjarat and sought aid of Muṣaffār II, who led an army into Malwa to restore his authority, captured Mandu, and mas-sacrificed the Rādpāts who had held him. The rest of the Rādpāts in the state established themselves on its northern border and transferred their allegiance to Rāna Sangrama of Citer. Muṣaffār retired to Gujjarat leaving 10,000 hor to assist Mahmud, and Mahmud besieged Gādrān, held by Hemkaran for Medni Rāy. The Rāna marched to its relief, and Mahmud, turning aside to meet him, suffered a severe defeat, and was wounded and captured. Sangrama received him courteously, but compelled him to surrender his crown jewels. He might now have annexed Malwa, but, fearing to arouse the hostility of every Muslim ruler in India, made a virtue of necessity, and replaced Mahmud on his throne. A few years later Mahmud harboured and encouraged Čand Kān, brother of Bahādur Shah of Gujjarat, and a pretender to his throne. Bahādur invaded and besieged Medni. Mahmud's sloth and negligence inflected his army, and on March 17, 1531, Bahādur captured the city, and Mahmud appeared before him. Malwa was annexed to Gujjarat, and Mahmud and his family were sent towards Cāmpānēr, to be imprisoned there. On April 12 the camp was attacked by a force of Bilis and Kolis, and Mahmud's guards, fearing a rescue, put him to death. His seven sons were conveyed to Cāmpānēr, and nothing more is known of their fate.  

Bibliography: See MAHMUD I of Malwa.  

MAHMUD II, ISMĀ'IL. [See Ibn KĀN ISMĀ'IL.]  
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that he was an infidel. The two brothers readily made friends again as Mas'u'd was still a mere child; Ayaba escaped, was afterwards pardoned by Mahmūd, but lost to Aṣṣonkor al-Dursuki [q.v.] the governorship of Mūsul which he had previously held. Dubais was preparing the Sultan still to disgrace, from which his brother was saved by Toghril, who with his Atabegs had meanwhile been given the province of Arān as ḫaqīq, could not withstand the Georgians there, who had taken Tīlis in 515 (cf. Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, i. 365; Matthiæs of Edessa, ch. 230—232; Ibn al-Farsi in Ibn al-Kalānī, ed. Amédroz, p. 203), and came to the ḫīṭak to seek help from Mahmūd. The latter himself took the field against the Georgians without doing much and Toghril, who had now returned to his province, soon received a visit there from Dubais, who persuaded him to set out to the ḫīṭak against the caliph al-Mustarshid. As they had no success in this enterprise, they went to Sandjar to confess that Mas'u'd was still alive, and Sandjar thereupon went to al-Ra'y and sent an invitation to Mahmūd to come to answer the charges (522 = 1126). Mahmūd was received with honours and instructed to restore Dubais to his territory in Hīla while Toghril and Mas'u'd who was also with him, went off with Sandjar. Mahmūd however did not find the caliph inclined to tolerate Dubais in his neighbourhood, and the Sultan withdrew his claims for a sum of 100,000 dinārs and went to Hamadān. There had been trouble between Mahfūd and the Caliph before and in 520 (1126) for example there had been open fighting in the streets of Baghād between the Arabs and the Sultan's Turkish troops. In all these circumstances, Mahmūd proved unequal to his task; while he left the business of government to his viziers, among whom al-Sumairamī and al-Dargazīnī (or al-Ansābādī as Ibn al-Athir always has it) were the most prominent, he spent his time with his hawks and hounds, which, according to Mirḳhawīnī, were 400 in number and wore jewelled collars and coverings embroidered with gold. It became worse when he devoted himself to sensual pleasures and as a result of his sexual excesses fell ill and died at Hamadān at the early age of 27 (Shawwāl 15, 525 = Sept. 10, 1121). Nevertheless he was by no means an insignificant figure; he had a good acquaintance with Arabic and was celebrated in a long panegyric by Ḥaṣa-Jaṣa [q.v.]; Ibn al-Athir lauds his gentleness and emphasises that he never, as Sulṭān usually did, laid violent hands on the property of his subjects.

Bibliography: in the article SULṬĀN; cf. also Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, Cairo 1299, ii. 519 sq.

Mahmūd of Ghazna, one of the most famous of Muslim conquerors, was the elder son of Subuktigin and was born in 969 A.H. In 994 Nūḥ II of Bukhārā appointed Subuktigin governor of Khurasan, as a reward for assistance received from him, and Subuktigin appointed as his deputy his son Mahmūd, who took Nishāpūr from the Ismā'īlī heretics and made it his capital. On his death in 997 Subuktigin left his throne to his younger son, Ismā'īl, but Mahmūd marched to Ghazna, deposed his brother and ascended the throne in 999. Begtūrān, an amīr of Manṣūr II of Bukhārā, attempted to deprive Mahmūd of the government of Khurasan, but failed, and the Sūmānī dynasty was shortly afterwards extinguished, its dominions being divided between Mahmūd and Ilīk Khān of Kāshghar. The Khātīf al-Kādir now recognized Mahmūd as king of Ghazna and Khurasan, and conferred on him the title of Amīn al-Millâ, and later that of Vāmīn al-Dawla, from which his successors are sometimes Id ālī, as the Vāmīn dynasty. Mahmūd now made a vow to invade India and chastise the infidels every year of his life, and during the remaining thirty years of his life led no fewer than seventeen raids into India. After an expedition in the year 1000 he defeated and captured Ḋajjalī I of the Pandjâb in 1001, and took the town of Īnd. Ḋajjalī was released on promising to pay tribute, but would not survive his disgrace, and burned himself to death, leaving his kingdom to his son, Anandpâla. Mahmūd received the title of Ghârâ, and in 1003 subdued Sistân, Khalâf b. Ahmad, whom he defeated, saved his life by addressing his conqueror as "Sulṭān," a title which so pleased Mahmūd that he bore it ever after. Mahmūd also said, the first Muslim sovereign to do so. In 1004 he invaded the Multûn state, and besieged its ruler, Dāwīd, who had adopted the Carmathian heresy, for seven months in his capital. Dāwīd saved his kingdom by abjuring his heresy and undertaking to pay tribute, and Mahmūd returned to his dominions in time to meet Ilāk Khān, who had invaded them, near Hâlkh. He defeated the invader and put him to flight, but while he was thus engaged Sukhpâl, a son of Anandpâla, who had accepted Īslām and received the title of Nawâsâ Shâh, recanted and rebelled. Mahmūd marched towards Bhara, Sukhpâl's capital, but before his arrival there his officers had captured Sukhpâl, who was compelled to disgorge 400,000 dirhems, and was imprisoned for life. Mahmūd then invaded the district of Īnhâr, conquered it, and compelled the inhabitants to accept Īslām. Meanwhile the princes of India had formed a confederacy to defend their country and their religion, and when Mahmūd crossed the Indus in 1008 he was met at Īnd by a great army composed of the troops of Anandpâla and those of the Râjâs of Udjetân, Gwâyûrā, Kâllindjar, Kānnwâdž, Dîlî, and Adjarâ. Their combined forces nearly succeeded in defeating Mahmūd, but after a hotly contested battle he won the day, and the Hindūs fled. The Râjâs lost faith in each other, and the confederacy was dissolved. Mahmūd pressed on to the fortress of Bhavan and the temple of Nagarkot or Kiṅgâ, and the gates of which were opened to him after a siege of seven days. The enormous plunder which the temple yielded whetted Mahmūd's appetite for further exploits of the same nature. In 1009 he again invaded the Pandjâb and plundered the country and slaughtered its inhabitants. Anandpâla, who dared not attack him, purchased peace by the payment of an indemnity, a promise of tribute, and an undertaking to allow him unrestricted passage through the Pandjâb in future. Dāwīd of Multûn had by now relapsed into heresy, and in 1010 Mahmūd invaded his kingdom, took his capital, and after slaughtering and mutilating great numbers of his heretical subjects sent him to end his days in Īnhâr. In 1011 Mahmūd marched through the Pandjâb to the plunder of the wealthy temple of Thānâsar. The Râjâ fled, and Mahmūd plundered the temple, the city and the kingdom, and carried off the idol Čakrâvarthi,
with much booty and large numbers of captives, to Ghazna.

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

Amandpāl had now died and had been succeeded by his son, Trilokanpāl, a weak monarch who committed the management of his affairs to his son, Nidar Bhīm, or “Bhim the Fearless.” Bhīm reversed the submissive policy of his grandfather, and in 1013 Mahmūd was obliged to invade the Pandjab in order to keep the road to Hindustān open. In the spring of 1014 he defeated the Hindū prince in the Margālā Pas, captured the fortress of Naudana, and pursued him into Kāshmir, but was unable to come up with him, and was obliged to return. A second invasion of Kāshmir was equally unsuccessful: he failed to take Lōhkot, and in the spring of 1016 he returned, with heavy loss, from his only unsuccessful campaign in India, losing, on his way, many of his men in the flooded Dījilām. In the same year he marched to Kuhūrūm to avenge the death of his sister’s husband, Abū ʿAbdullāh Mūmūn, who had been slain by rebels. He crushed the rebellion and appointed one of his own officers, Attānūṭh, to the government of his new conquest. In the autumn of 1016 he set out on his long meditated expedition into Hindustān, whither Trilokanpāl and Nidar Bhīm had retreated. He crossed the Indus on December 2 and received the submission of the Rājdā of Barān, and 10,000 of whose subjects accepted Islam. He next defeated Rājdā Kulūnd of Māhāhan, who to avoid disgrace stifled his daughter and son, and then himself. He sacked and destroyed the splendid cities of Mathurā and Pindārā and, leaving the greater part of his army there, marched with a picked force, to Kānawād, defended by seven forts on the Ganges. Its ruler, Rājdāyapāla, fled, leaving his capital undefended, the seven forts were plundered in one day, and the city was sacked. As on further down the Ganges, spared its fate, and Mūlijhītān, “the Fort of the Brahmanes,” was plundered after its defenders had been slain to a man. Rājdā Cand of Gharwā fled, but the city was sacked, and he was overtaken and defeated on January 6, 1019. Mahmūd then set out on his return march to Ghazna with a large number of elephants, 5,000,000 dirāms, much other plunder, and captives so numerous that slaves were to be had for two or three dirāms each. On his return he founded at Ghazna his great mosque, the “Bride of Heaven.” Rājdā Nanda of Kālindjār and the Rājdā of Gwalīyār had marched to Kānawād after Mahmūd’s retreat, and had punished Rājdāyapāla for his cowardly desertion of his capital by putting him to death. They were attempting to form a new confederacy of Hindū princes when Mahmūd, in 1019, invaded Hindustān to frustrate their design. He defeated Trilokanpāl on the Kāmān Lār and then turned to confront Rājdā Nanda, who was marching to meet him with a great army, at the sight of which even Mahmūd quailed. Nanda, however, was smitten with a sudden panic and fled in the night, leaving his camp to be plundered by Mahmūd, who obtained, with much other booty, 580 elephants, in addition to 270 already taken from Trilokanpāl. Then, fearing lest his retreat through the Pandjab should be cut off, he returned to Ghazna. In 1021 he resolved to provide himself with a base for future raids, and having invaded Swāṭ and Bājdāw and compelled the inhabitants to accept Islam he attacked, but again failed to capture, the fortress of Lōhkot, and, raising the siege, marched into the Pandjab. Trilokanpāl was dead, and Nidar Bhīm fled and took refuge with the Rājdā of Adjam, where he died in 1026. Mahmūd was thus able to annex the Pandjab, and brought it under his own sway. In 1022 he again invaded Hindustān and attacked the forresses of Gwalīyār and Kālindjār, but left their rulers in possession of them on their promising to pay tribute. On his return to Ghazna he mustered his army, and in 1023 invaded Transoxiana to establish his authority there. The smaller chiefs hastened to pay him homage, the ruler of Samarkand was brought before him in chains and was sent as a prisoner to Kālindjār, as were also the chiefs of the Sālīdā tribe, 4,000 families of which Mahmūd, though he was apprehensive of their power, transported into Khurāsān. In 1025 Mahmūd set out on the most famous of his raids into India, the expedition to Somnāth. The insolent boast of the Brahmanes had annoyed him, but it was the reputed wealth of the temple that prompted the enterprise. He crossed the Indian desert after elaborate preparations, plundered both Adjam and Anhilwāra, and reached Somnāth in the middle of January, 1026. Within two days his troops had stormed the ramparts and entered the city, but the temple was strongly defended, and while he was attacking it he learned that the Hindū princes of Gujārāt, who had fled before his arrival, had rallied to the defence of the idol, and were before the city. Leaving a force to continue the siege of the temple, he marched against them, and, after a battle in which he narrowly escaped defeat, put them to flight. Their defeat sealed the fate of the temple, which was almost immediately captured. Mahmūd plundered it of its vast treasures and broke up its idol, a huge lingam. From Somnāth he marched to punish Rājdās Duāb, Rājdā of Anhilwāra, for the attempt to relieve the temple, but the Rājdā fled, leaving his stronghold and its treasures to the conqueror. It is said that Mahmūd was so intoxicated by the beauty and climate of Gujārāt that he was with difficulty dissuaded by his officers from making Anhilwāra his capital, and leaving Ghazna to his son, Masʿūd. On his return march through the Sind desert his army suffered severely, and after crossing the desert was harassed by the Dāšās, but succeeded in reaching Ghazna with its spoils. In 1027 Mahmūd undertook his last expedition into India, in order to punish these Dāšās. He collected a flotilla of boats at Multān, and, owing partly to their superior construction, defeated the Dāšās in a naval battle on the Indus, and carried off their families, which they had removed for safety to islands in the river.

The remainder of Mahmūd’s life was devoted to the western provinces of his empire. He wrested Ira, Rayī and Isfahān from the Buwayhīds, invested his son Masʿūd with the government of the newly conquered territory, and employed himself in establishing order and security on the caravan routes throughout his wide dominions, and in extinguishing the heretics whom the Shi’a Buwayhīds had tolerated. In 1029 he returned from Rayī to
Balkh, and marched in the spring to Ghazna, where, on April 30, 1350, he died, at the age of sixty, three years, worn out with the labours of forty years.

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


MAHMŪD GĀWĀN, MAHMUD AL-DIN, Khvādža, was born in A.H. 1405, of a family which had long held high office in the small principality of Gāwān, and is said to have taken the name of Gāwān, by which he was afterwards known in India, from Kawān, his birthplace. He received a good education and as a young man made the pilgrimage to Mکa. While he was there his family fell into disgrace, so that he could not safely return home. Refusing offers of employment in other parts of Persia he became a merchant, and in 1555 sailed from the Persian Gulf for India, and landed at the port of Dībhōl. Thence he proceeded to Bīdar, the capital of the Bhāmāni kings, and was well received by ‘Alī al-Dīn Aḥmad II, who was then reigning. He received the command of 1,000 horse and was sent to quell the rebellion of Dājjāl Khān in Telingānā. His conspicuous success secured his position as one of the leading nobles of the kingdom, and after the death of Aḥmad II in 1457 he received from his son and successor, Humāyūn, the title of Malik al-Tudqijār (“Chief of the Merchants”), then highly esteemed. During Humāyūn’s short reign he was employed in suppressing rebellion and restoring order in Telingānā, and on the king’s death, in 1461, was associated by his widow with herself and Khvādža Dżāhān the Turk in a council of regency. The foreign enemies of the kingdom took advantage of the childhood of the new king, Nizām Shāh, and Mahmūd Gāwān bore an honourable part in repelling the invasion of the Rādja of Urūs, who was forced to pay a large indemnity. Mahmūd Khādža I of Mālwa next invaded the Dakan, defeated the army of Nizām Shāh, and menaced the existence of the state. Mahmūd Gāwān succeeded in enlisting the aid of Mahmūd I, Begarha, of Gajārāt, and with his help defeated and expelled the invader. Nizām Shāh died in 1463, and the kingdom was governed for his younger brother, who succeeded as Muhammad III, by the same council of regency, but the arrogance and ambition of Khvādža Dżāhān the Turk so aroused the suspicions of the queen-mother that she ordered her young son to put him to death. She shortly afterwards retired to public life, leaving Mahmūd Gāwān, now entitled Khvādža Dżāhān, sole regent. In 1469 he was sent to subdue the Konkan, and to suppress the pirates of that region, and, in a series of campaigns extending over three years, conquered the country and captured Goñ, then one of the principal ports of Vījñāyanagar. On his return to Bīdar he was received with great honour and his position as first noble of the kingdom was assured. In 1472 he brought the seige of Belgum to a successful conclusion, but the chief service which he rendered to the Bhāmāni kingdom was the reform of its administration. It had originally been divided into four great provinces, Gūlbara, Dowlatābād, and Telingānā, to which the name of taraf was given, and the power of the zahrāf, or provincial governor, was almost absolute. He collected the revenue; raised, paid and commanded the army; and appointed all officials, his responsibility to the king being limited to maintaining order, keeping the people contented, remitting to the capital the quota of revenue due, and joining the king when summoned, with the contingent of troops which he was bound to supply. Even in the early days of the kingdom rebellions raised by provincial governors had not been unknown, but the system had worked well on the whole so long as the limits of the kingdom were comparatively narrow, and the kings were energetic; but the kingdom was invaded, and the districts were unwarly and the defects and dangers of the old system were apparent to all. Mahmūd Gāwān divided each of the original tarafās into two, so that their number became eight. Berār was divided into the two tarafās of Gāwāl and Mūhār; Dowlatābād into Dowlatābād and Dżumār; Gūlbara into Gūlbara and Būdāp; and Telingānā into Warangal and Rādja-mahendrī. The powers of the tarafās were at the same time curtailed. These reforms were resisted by all the old tarafās, and by none more than by Malik Ḥasan Bahārī, Nizām al-Mulk, tarafār of the great province of Telingānā, who was posted to the new tarafā of Kādjmahendrī, and found his power, his influence, and his emoluments reduced by more than half. He was the leader of the Dākani party and Mahmūd, though he had done all in his power to end the strife between the Dākans and the Foreigners, was a foreigner, and was regarded by all as the leader of the Foreign party. In 1481, the royal camp being then in Telingānā, Ḥasan Bahārī took advantage of the absence of Mahmūd’s chief supporter, Yūsuf ‘Adil Khān the Turk, who had been sent on an expedition into the eastern provinces of the kingdom of Vījñāyanagar, to compass the downfall and death of Mahmūd. The minister’s
confidential secretary was induced, by misrepresentation, to affix his master's seal to a folded paper. The paper was blank, and the conspirators wrote, above the seal, a treasonable letter to the Râdiâ of Crisâ, inviting him to invade the kingdom. The letter was shown to the king when he was drunk, and he at once summoned Mahmud, who, though warned by his friends that mischief was afoot, insisted on obeying the order. He was asked by the king what was the punishment of treason and unhesitatingly replied, "Death by the sword." He was then confronted with the letter, and though he declared it to be a forgery the king paid no heed to him, but bade the executioner do his office, and withdraw. Mahmud knelt down and repeated the symbol of his faith, and the executioner, Djavhar by name, struck off his head. An order for the plundering of his camp was then issued, and his followers were dispersed. The king was much disappointed by the examination of his late minister's affairs. He had, throughout his official life continued his mercantile transactions, and lived frugally on his profits. His great official emoluments were expended on the troops of emigrants which he maintained and on public works, and the balance was disbursed in alms, in the king's name as well as in his own. Mahmud III understood, too late, the value of the servant whom he had so summarily put to death, and his remorse was bitter. Mahmud was a great statesman and public benefactor. Learned himself, he was a munificent patron of learning, and built at Bûdâr a magnificent college, the ruins of which are still to be seen. The only private property which he left at his death was a splendid library. He is one of the foremost figures in the political history of India, and his death was the cause of the fall of the dynasty which he had served so well, for it destroyed the confidence of the nobles in the town, and hastened the advent of the day when the provincial governors proclaimed their independence.


MAHMUD PASA. grand vizier in the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Muhammad II, often called Wali Mahmûd Pasha. He was born in Abya (Akhisar) in Asia Minor, of Christian parents; according to Chaldean legend, his father was Greek and his mother Serbian. Taken in his youth to Adrianople, he was brought up at the court of Murad II, and began his public career on the occasion of the accession of Muhammad II in 1451. Soon afterwards he became Beglerbeg of Rûmî; according to the historian Râmînân Zâde Meşmele (Kuçuk Nishâh), he had been also Kôfî aker [q.v.]. As Beglerbeg, he took part in the capture of Constantinople. After this event he was appointed grand vizier in 1453; the office had been empty since the execution of Çendereli Khâdî Pasha. As grand vizier, Mahmûd Pasha frequently accompanied the Sultan on his campaigns but in 1456-1458 he was appointed to conduct the operations against the Serbs, while the Sultan conquered the Morea; in 1459 Muhammad himself advanced against Serbia which was completely subdued; during this war Mahmûd Pasha's brother was the leader of the Turcophil party in Serbia. In 1460 and 1461 the grand vizier took part in the expedition against Sinope and Trebizond as commander of the fleet while Mahummed led the army by land. The capture of Trebizond was mainly due to Mahmûd Pasha; he was related to a high dignitary of the court there so that some Greek authors talk of treachery (Fallmerayer, Geschichte des Kaisersfrage, p. 279). In 1462, Mahmûd accompanied the Sultan against the Wawod of Wallachia, Wlad Dacul and in the following year as commander of the fleet he was sent to conquer Lesbos and forced the Duke of Lesbos to capitulate. In the same year he drove the Venetians out of the ishmut of Corinth. In the Bosnian campaign of 1464, Mahmûd prepared the way for the Sultan's advance by taking the principal towns of the country. In the war that followed with Mathias, king of Hungary, Mahmûd forced the latter to raise the siege of Meidâni and advised the Sultan in the campaign which was to put an end to the power of the Karamanoglu and defeated the Karamanid Ishak Beg near Lâranda. The latter himself escaped and this fact combined with the too humane treatment which the governor wished to apply to the people of Konia and Lâranda and the intrigues of the second vizier Rûm Muhammad Pasha, brought the Sultan to dismiss him on the return march to Constantinople. Mahmûd Pasha then governed the sanjak of Gallipoli for some time. In 1472 he again became grand vizier. The Sultan wished in that year to send him against Uzun Hasan but was persuaded by Mahmûd to send Ishak Pasha in his place; in the following year he accompanied the Sultan against the Akit-Koyunlu, who were finally routed after the Ottomans themselves had suffered the defeat of Bel Bazar. In the same year Mahmûd was again dismissed; the reason alleged was a lack of zeal in the pursuit of the fugitives. He then retired to the village of Khâhûs Key near Adrianople. Next year he came to the capital on the occasion of the funeral of Prince Mûsafir; this opportunity was taken to calumniate him to the Sultan on account of the intimacy which had existed between Mûsafir and Mahmûd Pasha. This was sufficient to get him imprisoned in the castle of Yedi Kule and executed a few days later in Rabî'i 1, 879 (July-Aug. 1474).

Mahmûd Pasha was one of the most popular grand viziers. His name still survives in the mosque which he built at Stamboul in 669 (1469-64) on a site originally occupied by a church; in the mosque is the tuke of the founder. He also erected a madras, a medrese, a mekteb, a well and a hamam. There is a legendary story entitled Memäl-i namâ-i Mahmûd Pasha, in which his unjust execution is specially emphasised (printed in Fr. Dietrici, Christ-nathos Otomânî, Berlin 1854); the historian Șadr al-Din in his Tâdil al-Tâ'ârîch (i. 557) also devotes a chapter to the Wa'lâ-i Mahmûd Pasha. Mahmûd Pasha was the patron of a number of men of letters and scholars, who dedicated their works to him. He was himself a poet but it is uncertain whether he wrote under the pen-name of Ādân or Ādhî. There is a Divân of Ādhî (printed Constantinople 1308) which is generally attributed to Sultan Bayazîd II but Gibb
MAHMUD PASHA — MAHR

(Hist. Ott. Poetry, ii. 25 ff.) thinks it should be attributed to Mahmud Pasha.


(J. H. KRAMERS)

MAHBAKER. [See Kösem.]

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

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

In the pre-Islamic period, the mahr was handed over to the wālī, i.e. the father, or brother or relative in whose guardianship (wālī) the girl was. Here the original character of the marriage by purchase is more apparent. In earlier times the bride received none of the mahr. What was usually given the woman at the betrothal is the ʿadād; the mahr, being the purchase price of the bride, is given to the wālī.

But in the period shortly before Muhammad, the mahr, or at least a part of it, seems already to be given to the woman. According to the Kurān, this is already the prevailing custom. By this amalgamation of mahr and ʿadād the original significance of the mahr as the purchase price was weakened and became quite lost in the natural course of events. There can be no doubt that the mahr was originally the purchase price. But the transaction of purchasing in course of long development had become a mere form. The remains, however, as they survived in the law of marriage in Islam, still bear clear traces of a former marriage by purchase.

2. Muhammad took over the old Arab patriarchal ceremony of marriage as it stood and developed it in several points. The Kūrān no longer contains the conception of the purchase of the wife and the mahr as the price, but the mahr is in a way a reward, a legitimate compensation which the woman has to claim in all cases. The Kurān thus demands a bridal gift for a legal marriage: "And give them whom ye have enjoyed their reward as a wedding-gift" (lit. farīda "allotment of property," Sūra, iv. 28) and again: "And give the women their gifts voluntarily" (Sūra, iv. 3); cf. also Sūra, iv. 29, 38; v. 10.

The bridal gift is the property of the wife; it therefore remains her own if the marriage is dissolved. "And if ye wish to exchange one wife for another and have given one a talent, take nothing of it back". Even if the man divorces with the wife before he has cohabited with her he must leave half the mahr with her (Sūra, ii. 237—238).

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

3. There was an ample store of traditions about the mahr and these pave the way for the theories laid down by the jurists in the fiqh-books.

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

A few hadiths endeavour to show that the mahr must be neither too high nor too low. From the traditions we also learn what mahr was given in particular cases in the Prophet's time; for example, the bridal gift of ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ṭawfik was an ounce of gold, that of Abū Huraira of 10 glass and a dish, that of Shahāb b. Saʿd an iron ring.

In the hadiths we again frequently find the Kurānic regulation that in a divorce after cohabitation the woman has the right to the whole mahr.

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

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

Two kinds of mahr are distinguished:
a. *Mahr musamma*; "definite mahr", the amount of which is exactly laid down in the wedding contract.

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

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

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

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


**MAHRA**, a land on the southeast coast of Arabia on the Indian Ocean between Matthram and the coast of which is inhabited by the *Khalif* (v. 30, 96), and Zafar; the Arabs however and modern geographers include Zafar itself, formerly the town only and now the country, the old frankenconic region [*see ZAFAR*], in Mahra, so that Mahra may be said to be the country between Hajar-Mut and *Oman* (cf. al-Mukaddasi, *Geogr.*, 27: 27; Ibn Hawkal, *Itin.*, ii. 17; al-Mukaddasi, *Itin.*, ii. 53; Nafi', *Mujaddid*, iv. 700; al-Muqaddasi, *Itin.*, ii. 29, 43; Ibn Khallikan, *Tarikh*, i. 48; Ibn Khallikan, *Janayat*, London 1892, p. 132*).

This connotation of Mahra seems to have been already known to the Greeks of the fourth century B.C.; Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant.*, iv. 4, 2, numbers among the lands of Arabia which yield spices, along with Saba', Hajar-Mut and Kataban, a fourth, *Mazkali* (var. *Mada*). A satisfactory identification of this land, which would also explain the name, has not yet been made. Of the various attempts to explain it, given in the article *MAZHAR* in *Pauly-Wissowa*, *Realencycl., der klass. Alterthumswiss.*, col. 1331 sqq. (cf. the article *MAZHAR*, iv. 64), that which suggests *Mazkali* is a corruption of *Mazhara* (*Makha*), which Strabo, xvi. 758 gives with the three South Arabian kingdoms above mentioned, following Eratosthenes — these two authors represent one original source; Eratosthenes and Strabo are two different sources — is certainly wrong. The identification of *Mahr* with Mahra proposed by A. Sprenger, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, Berne 1875, p. 92, 265, 266, without however any attempt at proving it and also adopted by Fr. Hommel, *Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orient*, Munich 1926 (L. v. Muller, *Handbuch der Alterthumswissenschaft*, Sect. iii., Pt. i., vol. 1) p. 137, is worthy of attention. It was naturally to be expected that the botanist Theophrastus, whose duty it was to give as full a list as possible of lands in Arabia producing aromatic plants, should mention the real land of frankenconic, Zafar or in a wider sense Mahra, including Zafar. On the other hand, it is not to be denied that the mention in Theophrastus of a Mamali or Mali, which is quite unknown, after three well-known names, is remarkable, as it must of course be an important country, fit to be compared with Saba', Hadramut and Kataban. Simply for this reason E. Glaser's various attempts to identify it (Schier, *Geschichte und Geogr. der Arabien*, ii., Berlin 1890, p. 3, 25 sqq., 40, 132, 155 sqq., 217), not one of which is tenable (cf. Reischencyk., s.v. *Saba*), col. 1332 and here *Saba*, iv. 58, may be discarded. The passage in Theophrastus has been wrongly interpreted as mentioning Mamali only as the home of the cinnammon plant (see *Saba*), iv. 58 and the literature there given to which may be now added: Hommel, *Ethnologie* (= *Grundzüge*), p. 517, note 2). Although Mahra is not suggested without certain inherent probability, the question still arises how has it come to be called Mamali or Mali, which must remain more or less a puzzle. As the first two letters in Mahra and Mali are the same, it may be supposed that there is a corruption in the third letter of Mali. The name seems to conceal the Greek transcription of Mahra, which in the form *MAP* (from *MAPA*), was corrupted to *MAHL*, because it was of course unintelligible to the Greek copyists, or it might have been altered by a learned editor with gemination of the first syllable to *MAMAL*, especially as this form might seem to him to be superficially supported by the *tukak* *khamh* in Potlemy, iv. 7. 5. A further corroborating factor is that Theophrastus' description of the hilly country, where the *felonius* grows, with the *phrak* *thuk* and *kak* and *wabas*, from which rivers pour down to the plain and which was visible to sailors from the coast, agrees very well with the description of the *phrak* *thuk* *habben* and *kak* *thuk* of the land of *Zafar* [v. 41] in the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* § 29 (cf. the *tukak* *kak* and *wabas* and *kak* *habben*), and also recalls Carter's statement that nowhere else in South Arabia is there so much running water as in the frankenconic country. This undeniable agreement is not affected by the fact that, according to Theophrastus, the frankenconic country mentioned by him was in possession of the Sabaean. The fact that he mentions this land as a fourth with Saba', Hajar-Mut and Kataban and at the same time says that the Sabaean were lords (*kharov*) of this frankenconic country, suggests that the country which was quite a considerable distance from their original home, had passed to Saba' by direct conquest or automatically with the occupation of the
whole territory of some formerly independent power. This may have been either its ancient rival Kata-
ban, which, although still an independent kingdom, no longer exercised sovereign rights over the frankincense country and about two centuries later lost its independence to Saba', or the ancient kingdom of Haframot, which with the frankincense country was in the time of Juba a part of the Sabean kingdom, already ruled by the Himyars (according to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xii. 52 sq; see *Saba*) and to which, certainly in the time of the Peripius, i.e. in the Himyar period of the early centuries A.D., long after the beginning of the dissolution of Sabean rule, the frankincense country belonged but it may be supposed that before Saba' became a great power, Hommel assumes (op. cit., p. 140 and notably p. 653) quite a close ethnic connection between the Haframotis and the Mineans and he definitely says that the Haframotis Mineans were those who took possession of the frankincense land, which geographically also appears most natural. No convincing argument can be brought against the evidence of Theo-
phratus that in his time or in that of his authority, perhaps Andra'shenes (cf. *Realencycl.*, s. v. *Sabara*, col. 1306), the frankincense country was not independent, but belonged to Saba', so that the latter was already a great power which possessed the hinterland of South Arabia and numbered its weaker neighbours among its feudatories. The frankincense land only became independent early in the Christian era. That the campaigns of the Sabaeans extended considerably to the east may be deduced from the *Sirwāt* inscription (Glasen, N°. 1000) (cf. Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 658 sq). On the unjustified alteration in the text (Zap) in Thocopherus, see *Saba*, iv. 6 (to the literature there quoted may now be added: Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 516 sq. and 653 sq. [in addition to 138]). To support the as-
sumption that the Katašabaans occupied the frankin-
cessence land, it is not necessary to presume Gebban as a later name of Katašba (in allusion to the Gebban mountains, see *Lehre*, op. cit., p. 185 sq.); it is more natural to examine the Katašabaans in the *chronological period* of Katašabaan occupation of the frankincense country, see *Zafar*, N°. 4). The expression *Yamanat* in the longer titles of the south Arabian kings of the last epoch means, according to Hommel in *Handbuch der altertumskundlichen Altertumskunde*, ed. by D. Nien-
en. Copenhagen–Paris–Leipzig 1927, p. 96, note 5, "perhaps the frankincense coast as the "south-
land" of Haframot?"; it might well be interpreted as a general name of the southern coastlands, at a later date still included in Yemen, in contrast to the lands of Saba', *Bii* Nāidān and Haframot preceding it in the title. *Safar* (Adler) *Das Leben und die Lehre der Mahommed*, Berlin 1865, iii. 417: "The Mahrites were called Sachalities by the Greeks", is misleading; the land around the Sachalith Gulf is in the conception of the author of the Periplius and of Ptolemy not only Mahra, but also the land lying east of it and especially the part of al-Shijr in the wider sense lying west of it, the land of the Kašita (cf. the article *ibarat* in *Realencycl.*). [The *regio turfosa* in Pliny, xii. 52 (vi. 161) is probably to be understood as *Zafār* in the narrower sense but may include Mahra to which alone Glaser refers it (Dit Abessinien in Arabien und Afrika, Munich 1895, p. 125; see at the beginning).] The *Zafār* used in *Herodotus*, ii. 73, in the story of the phoenix is practically a reference to Mahra (Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 158) although it is not mentioned by name. On the *Abashtūn* in Stephanus, see below.

The inscriptions which, according to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 150, are inscribed on stone pillars on an island off the South Arabian coast (cf. the article *Shenna* in the *Realencycl.*), cannot, as Ritter for example (Erkundige, Vol. viii., Sect. 1, Pt. xii., Berlin 1846, p. 290) thought, be attributed to the Mahri who were settled in the neighbourhood of Cane* but were probably Minean (or Nabataean). The position of the emporium of Kāwī, which according to the *Peripla*, § 27 and Pliny, vi. 154 belonged to the frankincense country and is also mentioned by Ptolemy, vi. 7, 10 cannot be definitely ascertained. Recently several scholars, following Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 175, C. Landberg, *Arabica*, iv., Leyden 1897, p. 75 sq, and *Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabe Mirkindolat*, i. (Haframot), Leyden 1901, p. 196 and earlier writers (see the list in *Realencycl.*, s. v. *Saba*, col. 1330), have again expressed the view that this port is probably to be located at Hīn al-Ghurāb (Nelsen in *Handbuch, op. cit.*, p. 8) while Sprenger, *Geographie*, p. 82 sq, had placed it at Bāl-Ijāf. Since Sprenger, nothing new has been produced in favour of the old view and against his localization. In support of the location at the description in the *Peripla*, § 27 according to which two uninhabited islands, the *Okean* (3 *Okean*) and *Tēsλικα* were 120 stadia distant from Kane, these, according to Sprenger, are the islands of "Hālanu and Ghi, also called as-Siika" (to be written: Hīlanīya and Kānāba also called Siqah; see Landberg, *Arabica*, iv. 66). Their mention makes certain the reference to Bāl-Ijāf as the opposite point on the coast from which they are 110 and 130 stadia distant respectively, but not to Hīn al-Ghurāb which, according to Carter, is only a mile from Hīlanīya. Landberg himself tells us that the island of Kānas seems never to have been inhabited. The distance from Kane ascribed to Kane by Sprenger, which besides varying in the manuscripts, naturally yield nothing really convincing in favour of Hīn al-
Ghurāb (particularly of *Kān* al-ʿAsdīd, the equivalent of Cape Kane, west of Kane), according to Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 216: but this promontory of al-ʿAsdīd is at Bāl-Ijāf!); these measurements can equally well be made to fit Bāl-Ijāf. H. v. Malzahn, *Reise nach Sudarabien*, Brunswick 1873, p. 225 sqq, who could not yet have known of Sprenger's view, had already called attention to the *K-n*, (he transcribes it Cane) occurring in the (third) smaller inscription of Hīn al-Ghurāb (a reproduction in Landberg, *Arabica*, iv., Pl. x., where it is nexted with "Cane the Emporium"; J. H. Mord-
mann, Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. (1858), 233, likewise explained it as Kāwī, the harbour of the cindal of al-Ghurāb. Even if we readily grant that the uncertain word in the text of the inscription, most recently and probably definitively published and translated by B. Makker in *W. Z. K. M.*, xxxiv. (1927), p. 72, really reproduces the name Kāwī, this does not prove, as Sprenger, *op. cit.*, p. 83 has pointed out, that the ancient seaport lay on the present rocky point of Hīn al-Ghurāb. It must also be remembered that the names of many Arabian harbours have in course of time been transferred to other places in the vicinity, e.g. Zafār [q.v., N°. 4] and Mirba. Landberg's
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objection (Arabica, iv. 76) that the Periplus, if Ka'ah had been Bal-Haf, would not have said (§ 29) that after Kene came another gulf running far inland, the Kəxəxər, but would have mentioned the harbour of Bir 'Ali to the east of it, is not a cogent one. The Periplus gives a list of the most important gulfs of South Arabia and the comparatively small bay of Bir 'Ali might easily be overlooked behind the broad Sabaitic gulf which runs far inland, especially as the name of the term Kəxəxər is a fairly elastic one (cf. the article IORARAT in Realencyclo.) and the list of the places on the coast in the Periplus is not as a rule scientifically complete and exact but sometimes even gives wrong names (e.g. Mərətɔ), to say nothing of the fact that in many places on the South Arabian coast, the harbourage conditions have changed since ancient times. Landberg himself (op. cit., p. 65) observes that the promontory of Ḥyra al-Adamūn must have had a different appearance in earlier times. M. Hartmann, also, who had previous to the periplus, The archae. Topogr. Die atlantische Orient, u.a. Berlin 1909, p. 175, 371 declared for the older views, said later in the very same work, p. 418, 614 that he had now adopted Sprenger's opinion. The latter in the inscription is still not sufficient ground for the conclusion that the identification of Ka'ah with Bal-Haf should be rejected in opposition to Sprenger, who himself appreciated the evidence of this evidence. The form of the name used by Sprenger, Bal-Haf (Bal-Haf), is incorrect however (as also is Glaser's Ḥa el-Hafi: cf. Landberg, Ḥafranwād, p. 151, 66 is equivalent to Ibn But Sprenger rightly recognised that in this name there is preserved a memory of a son of al-Haf, the son of Ḥafṣa and ancestor of the Mahra (cf. Wustenfeld, loc. cit., p. 19. Ṭuṣ 32, 15: Ḥafr 32, 15: see below). The Arab geographers had no accurate knowledge of Mahra nor of Ḥadramūt: modern explorers have found out much more about these regions. Al-Hamāmid, Ṣafya Ḥaddat va'īr Arab (ed. D. D. Masse, 1984), p. 45 mentions Al-ʿĀṣ— which Landberg Ḥafranwād, p. 158, wishes to restore to al-ʿĀṣīha from manuscript preferences— as the capital of Mahra, which, according to Glaser, Arabian., p. 83, stretches to the district lying roughly between Ḥamīk and Ḥafr, and also in the centre of the modern coast region of Mahra. On p. 53 he says, as do Ibn al-Maŷdar and others after him, that the Mahra people also inhabit Ṣofotra (on the conversion to Christianity of the mixed population of Ṣofotra, see Yarkût, Muṣjam, ii. 102; al-Maṣūḥ, Muṣ. Ṣof, iii. 36; etc., further particulars in the article Ṣofotra). On p. 51 ff. he talks of the Mahra tribes and their fighting and on p. 86 ff. of the road from Ḥadramūt to Mahra and tells us about the tomb of the Prophet ʿĪsā. This sanctuary on the frontier between Ḥadramūt and Mahra is still held in particular veneration and is much visited by the inhabitants of these two lands (a text from Ḥadramūt showing this is given in Landberg, Ḥafranwād, p. 313 f.).—The Arab geographers include Mahra in the Yemen, e.g. Yaŋa. Maṣawat, p. 394: see the reference to the Muhaf ṣ Mahra in Yaŋa. Muṣjam, iv. 700. who in this, his main reference, also repeats the view that Mahra is the name of a tribe and that the correct form is Mahara. Ḥabīl Mahara in Mahra is mentioned on iv. 607. It is sometimes more accurately defined as "in extreme (furthest) Yemen" e.g. Yaŋa. Muṣjam, i. 280; ii. 510 (= Mahārāt, p. 166); iii. 366; iv. 345, 495; Muṣhariq, p. 415. The Arabs speak of a Naḥd in the land of the Mahra (Yaŋa, Muṣjam, i. 280; iii. 681; iv. 345, 495, 697; Muṣhariq, p. 394. 415; cf. al-Mukaddasi, loc. cit., p. 98; al-Tahāri, ed. of Goeje, i. 1980). This is the Naḥd (or Naḥdii) which Carter also mentions as a district in which the frankincense especially flourishes, the highland country about two days' journey more within the latitude which Carter has also defined, although too narrowly (cf. ʿAvəxix). The Mahra are also said to be inhabitants of the coastalland of al-Shihr (q.v.), for example by al-Maṣūḥ, i. 333 and Yaŋa, Muṣjam, iv. 357 and we find the land of Mahra is called al-Shihr (al-Iṣlahki, loc. cit., p. 25 = Ibn Hawāl, loc. cit., p. 32 sq.; al-Idrisi, i. 48: Ibn Khaldūn, ed. Kay, loc. cit., p. 132; cf. al-Ḥanḍānī, Siṣa, p. 51 and al-Bakrī on ad-Duṣ: the statement in Rommel, Abūfeda Arabes Descritta, Göttingen 1802, p. 32 sq., is obscure). Al-Shihr however in the later and modern use of the name is applied to the coast not only of Mahraland proper but of the land of Zafr also, that is of the frankincense country generally, i.e. the "frankincense region" which is identified by many modern writers with the Mahra country but at the same time includes the part of the Ḥadramūt which adjoins on the west (cf. Ibn Khaldūn, loc. cit., p. 33; in general the name of the shores of the Gulf of the Moon, finally in a still wider sense, the name of the whole coast between Aden and ʿOmān).—Al-Iṣlahki, loc. cit., p. 25, and almost in the same words, Ibn Hawāl, loc. cit., p. 32, also al-Maṣūḥ, i. 333 sq.; al-Idrisi, i. 48, 150; Abu ʿAlī al-Fīdā (see Rommel, loc. cit., p. 33); Ibn Khaldūn (loc. cit.) describes Mahra as a desert in which there are no palms and no agriculture and the inhabitants therefore are not acquainted with bread. Carter, like these Arab writers, also emphasises the contrast between the frankincense region and the dreary desert west and east of it and more recent travellers, like Bent agree with him. The only possessors of the inhabitants, according to these authorities, are goats and very fine camels, particularly renowned for their swiftness, mentioned also by al-Ḥanḍānī, loc. cit., p. 100, 201; Ibn Hishām, Siṣa, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 963 and the poets as well as the Liḥn al-ʿArab, v. 36; Ḳawān, i. 455 and Ṭuṣ 32, 15: al-ʿArab (Mahrika); the Liḥn quote three plural forms: Ḳawān, Ḳawān, Ḳawān; on the first cf. Howland, Grammar, i. 997, 1000). The camel which Muhammad chose for him—of the best—out of the booty after the battle of Badr had been purchased in Mahra; his governor in the Yemen procured Mahra camels for the caliph Sulaimān b. ʿAbī al-Malik (714—717) (al-Kazwini, ʿAlīb, ed. Wustenfeld, u. 41). Ibn Hawāl (ibid.; Ibn Khaldūn, loc. cit.; al-Idrisi, i. 48) adds that the Mahra live on meat, milk and its products, and fish (cf. al-Mukaddasi, loc. cit., p. 100) and that they also feed their camels and goats on fish. Yaŋa, Muṣjam, iv. 700, records a note that the Mahra camels do not take their name from the land but from the ancestor of the Mahra's, Mahra b. Ḥaḍān (cf. al-ʿUjarah, also Līḥn, Kūmūs and Ṭuṣ loc. cit., and Rommel, loc. cit., p. 33). According to Landberg, Ḥafranwād, p. 87, and others the Mahra riding camels have for long had a bad reputation, as they are really not swift; the best of this kind are said to be those of the Bandi
In 1877 he obtained some information about conditions along this coast through his intercourse in Djidda with merchants from Ḥaḍram̄ūt or Mahra (in *Journ. As.*, 3rd Ser., 1838, vol. v. 507 sqq., vol. vi. 529 sqq.); he gave an account of Gūšīn, the capital of Mahra and the Sulṭān whose authority did not extend beyond the walls of the city. His description of the boundaries of the country was incorrect. Much more detailed and accurate were the topographical data collected by Captain S. B. Haines, who was appointed in 1834 to make an astronomical and nautical survey of the South Arabian coast from Bāb al-Mandāb eastwards (as far as Rās al-Ḥaḍūd). In his *Memoir of the South and East Coast of Arabia* (in *J. R. Geog. Soc.*, London 1845, xvi. 104 sqq.), he describes the western boundary of Mahra, the Wādī Masīl, which is rich in water and well tilled by the Mahra and contains many villages lying among palm groves. He then gives his short notes on the town of Sīḥūt east of the Wādī and corroborates Fresnel’s account of Gūšīn about which he is the first to give fuller details. C. Niebuhr, *Beschreibung von Arabien*, Copenhagen 1772, p. 287, had already mentioned “Keschin” and the independent shāikh there, who was also lord of Soḵtūr; he also gives a plan of the harbour from a drawing by an Englishman, whom he had met in Bombay (Pl. xvi.). Haines observes, like later writers, that Gūšīn is only a wretched little village of at most 300—400 inhabitants, which consists mainly of reed-huts and has only a few stone houses and that the trade there is very slight. He also gives some details of the Mahra people and its tribal divisions, its customs and dress, and in confirmation of Fresnel’s observations their attitude to Islam, which only the chiefs profess, while the people are indifferent to the Kūṯān and are not even able to perform the daily salātis. He ends by giving the promontories and villages on the coast east of Sīḥūt as far as the eastern frontier of Mahra towards Zāfār. The English officers cooperating in this survey of the coast visited only a few points on it, which were practically confined to the Gulf of Gūšīn because their duty was really confined to surveying the coast west of Mahra. Valuable information about the Mahra is given in H. J. Carter’s *Notes on the Mahra Tribe of Southern Arabia with a Vocabulary of their Language*, in *J. R. A. S.*, Bombay Branch, July 1847, vol. ii., p. 339 sqq. Maltzan combined ethnological research with his study of the Mahra language (in the introduction of his edition of *Adolph von Wrede’s Reise in Hadramaut*, Brunswick 1873 [the preface is dated 1870], p. 18 sqq., and 28 sqq., and in his article cited below) but regarding the country itself which he never entered, he knows no more than the English naval officers. The extracts in Ritter, *op. cit.*, xii. 625 sqq., and 655 sqq. he says, are sufficiently accurate according to his own information. The coasts east of Wādī Masīl to Rās al-Ḥaḍūd, i.e. Mahra, Zāfār and “Oman he however calls the great “terra incognita of Oceanic Arabia”. “The names Mahra and Gūšā (also “Gūšān” or “Gūšān Gara”) by which the two countries on the coast are distinguished, he described as “not clearly defined” (*op. cit.*. p. 28). We now know that these are the Mahra and Kūṭā (the hill-people of Zafar) and the language of the latter is Kārawī (Grawī) or Shāwārī, in modern times also called Ḥakīlī, or Shērātī (*cf.* Ẓafār). Maltzan recognised

Mahra
that the two peoples are fundamentally different in language, mode of life, and religion from the people of Central Arabia.

Glaser, Sitzung, p. 26, wrongly identifies Mawāla in Strabo, xvi. 768 (quoting Eratosthenes) with Mahra (Rasselan, s. v. Sabat, 1334 sqq.). On p. 20 he gives the land of Ḥajramōt (after the fall of the “Alexanderian-Arab kingdom”) too great an extent (as far as Miḥrāb). On his note that the Ṭaḥfāṣīm of the Ptolemy are the hill-peoples of all Mahra cf. Rasselan, s. v. IOBAPETAL. — As a result of the inquiries made by him on his travels in Arabia, he states Toemeyer, p. 87, that there are three different divisions of the Mahra tribes: the eastern is called Ṣheḥrat or Zair and inhabitants, according to his information, the coast from Rās Nāīs (55° 17' East Long. from Gr.), according to another authority from the island of Ṣayriya, to Rās Darbat ‘All (53° 3' East Long.); the western that to which the name Mahra is generally applied, stretches from Rās Darbat ‘All to Seḥrūt, while the third group inhabits Soqāṭrī (cf. above on Ibn al-Mu‘allāṣwīr). — L. Hirsch gives not a little new and valuable information about the people of the southwestern coast. His account of Mahra is based on his ten days’ stay (1893) in Gishīn (for Gishin, transliterated Kishin or Kishn; Hirsch writes sometimes [cf. cit. p. 48, 50], Gi-chin and sometimes Kischik, like W. Hein and others [p. 2, etc.], he gives “Kischchen” in the Index as the Mahri pronunciation which is also given by Jahn [see below]). Of the wretched little capital of the country, he tells us, practically agreeing with Hames before him and Hein and Bent after him, that it consists almost entirely of ivy-covered mud-houses in a rainy season and a few ragged tents and reed-huts which, being scattered aimlessly over a wide area, leave irregular wide open spaces between them. Even the palace of the Sultan who reigned over Gishīn and Seḥrūt and other places on the coast is quite nominal, as he can do nothing without the approval of his Beduins. A broken down mud building: there is said to be only one building in the town that is kept clean, the house of another Sultan According to Hein, the most imposing of the mud houses, which are not built according to any system, is that occupied by the reigning Sultan’s body-guard. There is nothing like a regular market or regulated trade there. Even the most rudimentary necessities of life are acquired by barter and money is unknown from the government buildings a little mosque may be seen. While Maltrin, corroborating Freidel and Hames, pointed out (H. c., p. 29), that the Mahra have long been distinguished herself from the great majority of the orthodox and indeed hardly be called Musulms at all, Hirsch says that: at least in Gishīn and Seḥrūt the Mahra are no less attached to Islam than any other Arabs; he saw them regularly performing their ṭāalīr. This contradiction may perhaps be explained by the observation already made by Hames on the same question. According to Hirsch the ruling Sultan or Shāhī is pure Arab and not Mahra’s. In any case the attitude to Islam of Beduins living north of the coast territory is quite superficial. The Sultan of Gishīn belongs to the dynasty which has also a kind of suzerainty over Soqāṭrī. The Mahra coast, like Soqāṭrī is under British suzerainty, Hirsch (p. 75) and on his map) gives the names of several places on the coast east of Gishīn. Th. Bent (Southern Arabia, London 1900, p. 280) notes the striking contrast between the sandy plain of Gishīn, which he did not succeed in reaching, and the fertile stretch of the coast of Zafār. Shortly before his arrival in Zafār (in the winter of 1894—1895) the wāls residing in al-Hifān had been fighting with the Mahra tribes. The coast-town of Rakhīyat, west of Raisūt, has a little fort to defend it from the Mahra. Bent gives a more detailed account of the Mahra who live in Soqāṭrī [q. v.].

The statement in A. Jahn (Sudarabische Expedition of the Viennn Academy of Sciences, ii., p. 302, Die Mehrisprache in Sudarabinen), p. i.: “The Mehris the language of the South Arabian coast between Ḥasāwēl and Darbat which is called kibīd mahra by the Arabs” — is misleading. Ḥasāwēl lies roughly in the centre of the Mahra coast in 50° 4’ East Long., N. E. of the capital Gishīn. — W. Hein, who was sent out by the Vienna Academy to continue the work of collecting specimens of the language begun by the South Arabian expedition, arrived in Gishīn with his wife in 1902. During his stay of 66 days during which his work was much impeded as he was interned most of the time, he collected, among other information, statistical and topographical data for the adjacent parts of the coast and also for the interior (see his article, Einbeitrag zur Statistik Sudarabinen, in the M. Geogr. Ges., Vienna 1903, p. 219 sqq.). In D. H. Muller’s preface to vol. ix. of the South Arabian Expedition, introductory remarks to W. Hein’s record of his journey are given (p. viii. sqq.). According to him Gishīn is the name of the whole stretch of country along the coast from Rās Shīrwân to Rās Derdā for a breadth of 5 to 15 miles. About 2 miles to the north of the coast a ridge runs parallel to it. Immediately on the coast lies the dhūr fields of the district of Maghīl, behind it, the centre Gishīn, the district of Kibīb, in which the Sulṭān lives, east of it the most important district of Yentīf, west of Kibīb, Sulṭān, the western boundary of which is the Wādī Ghabyā: Further inland lies Darrāb, where prominent Sulṭāns have their homes. Hein clears up many statements by Hirsch and gives further topographical details about the surroundings of the capital. Gishīn has an area of about 50 square miles. Hein estimated the permanent population at 2,386; Hirsch put that of the capital and its immediate neighbourhood at about 500.

From the results of exploration so far, it appears that the country of Mahra stretches from Wādī Maslīd eastwards to Rās Darbat ‘All i.e. from 55° 15’ to 53° 3’ East Long. and between 16° 30’ and 17° 30’ N. Lat. The Mahra rule the lower course of the main wādī which runs through Ḥajramōt. No European has yet penetrated into the interior of the country; their presumed original home: it was however equally unknown to the Arab geographers.

In the coast district of al-Shīr (Mahra to Omān) old south Arabian dialects are still spoken, which differ essentially from Arabic and indeed from Semitic in general. The Mahra as a rule speak very little Arabic. Al-Ḥajākhī, op. cit., p. 25; Ibn Hawkal. ed. cit. p. 32; Al-Idrīsī, i. 48, 150 who identifies it with the old līmiyante language; Ibn al-Mudwil [cf. Soqāṭrī], Abu ‘l-Fadl (see Rommel, op. cit., p. 33) and others describe it as unintelligible to Arabs. Al-Hamādānī also (Sīf,
calls their language a jargon and al-Maštûdî, i.e. 335, points out differences between it and Arabic. Fresnel was the first, apart from early vague reports of a peculiar language in Hadramôt, to establish the existence of a hypothetical unknown language quite different from Arabic "in the interior of Yemen towards Ḥadramôt". He had become acquainted with it from natives who called it Ejkili. This name however he gave (Note sur la langue Ḥimyarite. J.A., 1838, 3rd Ser., vii. 79 sq.) not only to Mehri or what he considered as such but to other South Arabian dialects and, as Maltzan has already pointed out, to Ḥimyarite also, although we must confess that this (or Sabæan) has several features in common with Mehri. Ritte, op. cit., xii. 46 ff., 254 and others followed Fresnel's error, including Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Muhammed, iii. 457; it is however quite an old mistake; it was made by Ibn Durâdî (see Wustenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, Register, p. 280) whom Sprenger follows (on al-Idrisi see above). Haines (see above) said that the language of the Mahri was strange to the Arabs. With these earlier and recent statements may be compared Landberg's observation given by Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 153, that, "according to the statements of Arabs, Beduin tribes of the great desert of el-Rūba el-khali north of Ḥadramôt and the frankincense coast speak a language which the ordinary Arabs do not understand"; this, according to Hommel, could best be explained if a Kalda dialect was spoken there. M. op. cit. (Von Mittelmeeer zum Persischen Golf, Berlin 1900, ii. 532) was told that in el-Rūba el-khali lived people who spoke a language unintelligible to the Arabs and he supposed that this was Mehri. After Fresnel, Carter (see above) studied Mehri and particularly Maltzan (Über den Dialect von Mahra, Z. D. M. G., xxv. [1871], 196 sqq.; Dialectische Studien über das Mehri, ibid., xxvii. [1873], 225 sqq.; Dialect von Mahra, ibid., p. 252 sqq.). He was the first to give scientific proof of the difference between this language and Arabic in vocabulary and grammar. He also classed Mahri and Kará together as Ejkili and describes it as a modern dialect of old Ḥimyarite, from which he traces the intermediary. He called attention to the similarity with Ethiopic and its modern forms, Ge'ez and Amharic, and presupposed a homogeneous group distinct from Kun'anic Arabic (see also his edition of Wrede's Reise, p. 30 ff.). In Sprenger's belief (Geographie, p. 268), the Semites of Ethiopia are of Mahri origin.

Maltzan's studies in spite of their defects were most valuable preliminary work. Glaser was the first to define more accurately the limits within which Mehri was spoken (Abessinier, p. 87). Fresnel, Maltzan and Glaser had not been in Mahra or Zafar, but they ascertained the existence of the two dialects of Mehri in Djidda. Maltzan and Glaser in 'Aden (Glaser, Abessinier, p. 184). The latter states (Skizze, ii. p. 96) that the Hakil live east of Ḥadramôt and western Mahra (on the form of the word cf. Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 235), and their language is called Shērāt, while the dialect of the territory west of it is "Mehri (certainly not Ejkili!)", similarly on p. 178 sq. In his Abessinier, p. 185, also he identifies the Karā people with the Hakil [as does Hommel, op. cit., p. 153, who says: *šērā (villages) is the Arabic name for the native tribe of Hakil, whose language is called Shērāt]. Hakili is the name given by Glaser (Skizze, ii., p. 95) to the inhabitants of Mahra whose tribal name in the form Ejkili, Fresnel took for the name of the language spoken there and thus introduced it into European philological literature. Landberg's opinion (Arabica, v., Leyden 1898, p. 153) that the name Hakili is "toute à fait just à côté de la vraie forme Hakili", is contradicted by Hirsch's testimony (op. cit., p. 52; cf. Sefig) that the name Ejkili applied by European scholars to Mehri is unknown there and simply means "barbaric, unintelligible". Hommel records (op. cit., p. 153) that Glaser had interesting specimens of the Karā dialect and of Mehri and Soqom; but these have not been published.

Glaser (cf. Skizze, ii., p. 20, 96, 181 sq., 246, 253; Abessinier, p. 84 sqq. and Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 12, 148, 150 sqq.) further developed these ideas of Maltzan on the South Arabian-Ethiopio group of languages. According to the latter, the Ethiopic alphabet came from the Axum inscriptions and that of the later literature in the Ge'ez language from a variety of the alphabet of the South Arabian inscriptions, once common in the Mahra country and the frankincense land in general was the ancestral home of the Semitic Abyssinians and Amhârs. Against the view that the name of the latter is a plural of Mahri, it is sufficient to quote the form Amhâr (Hommel, op. cit., p. 152, N°. 182).

There is no reason to doubt contacts between Mehri and Ethiopic (Hommel, p. 153). That in ancient times members of the people called Ijabashat in the South Arabian inscriptions (cf. Glaser, Skizze, i., p. 25-27 and Abessinier, p. 28) were settled in Arabia is suggested by the mention of the ʿAbsanî in Stephanus Byzantius s.v. from Uranius' Arabia (metâ tos επάλλους Χατάραματι, Ἀβσανοὶ) and the ʿAbsâs pûnûs in Ptolemy, vi. 7, 11 (in Zafar, q.v.). From the first passage, Glaser, Abessinier, p. 58 has concluded that the ʿAbsânî lived east of Ḥadramôt, while in Skizze, i., p. 26 he had previously supposed that by the land of the ʿAbsânî was understood the whole coast from eastern Ḥadramôt to Mahra and islands lying off it: his further identification through an intermediary. He called attention to the similarity with Ethiopic and its modern forms, Ge'ez and Amharic, and presupposed a homogeneous group distinct from Kun'anic Arabic (see also his edition of Wrede's Reise, p. 30 ff.). In Sprenger's belief (Geographie, p. 268), the Semites of Ethiopia are of Mahri origin.

Maltzan's studies in spite of their defects were most valuable preliminary work. Glaser was the first to define more accurately the limits within which Mehri was spoken (Abessinier, p. 87). Fresnel, Maltzan and Glaser had not been in Mahra or Zafar, but they ascertained the existence of the two dialects of Mehri in Djidda. Maltzan and Glaser in 'Aden (Glaser, Abessinier, p. 184). The latter states (Skizze, ii. p. 96) that the Hakil live east of Ḥadramôt and western Mahra (on the form of the word cf. Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 235), and their language is called Shērāt, while the dialect of the territory west of it is "Mehri (certainly not Ejkili!)", similarly on p. 178 sq. In his Abessinier, p. 185, also he identifies the Karā people with the Hakil [as does Hommel, op. cit., p. 153, who says: *šērā (villages) is the Arabic name for the native tribe of Hakil, whose language...
were established in the land of Mahra (Hommel, *Ethnologie*, p. 151).

D. H. Muller and his collaborators were the first to collect and investigate texts in the Mahra language in a systematic and comprehensive fashion. In *Vol. iv. of the Sudarabische Expedition*, Vienna 1902, *Die Mehri- and Sohoti-Sprache* (1) he published Biblical texts, stories, poems and proverbs, which he collected for the most part on the Swedish steamer placed at the disposal of the expedition from the mouths of natives, who had been taken off the coasts in *Abd* and *Soqotra*. For Mehri, in particular, he had a single authority, the same man as John had. In the third volume of the same collection appeared *Die Mehri-Sprache in Sudarabien* by A. Jahn, texts and glossary, Vienna 1902. On these two works cf. the brief review by Glaser, *Zwei Wiener Publikationen über den sabaischen und cushitischen Dialekt in Sudarabien*, *Beilage der Monatlichen Allgemeinen Zeitung*, 1902, No. 186 and 187 of 16th and 18th August, and the very thorough and expert criticism by Landberg, *Die Mehri-Sprache in Sudarabien... von A. Jahn und... D. H. Muller, kritisch besichtigt...* (Siegfried, Vienna 1902) (Vol. iv. ed. by D. H. Muller, *Sohoti-Texte*, Vienna 1903, forms Vol. vi. of the collection).

The already mentioned traveller W. Hein had in 1902 in Ghizina with the assistance of various natives collected Mehri and *Mhdaram* texts. He died in 1903 before he was able to put his material into its final form; D. H. Muller edited and published it in *Vol. ix. of the collection* (Mehri and *Hdarami-Texte...* Vienna 1909) Some of these texts are also included in *Vol. vi. Shauri-Texte (II)* by D. H. Muller, Vienna 1907 and supplied with Shiaway and *Soqu* parallels. M. Bittner's grammatical studies in Mehri are full of matter and excellent in method (see Bibli.). The modern South Arabian dialects in spite of some features in common with Sabaean cannot be explained as daughter-languages and the last surviving relics of the South Arabian language which is found in the Sabaean and Minaean inscriptions (Jahn, op. cit., p. 1; see also *Mohammad*) In them, especially Mehri and *Soqu*, we can at most recognise with Hommel, op. cit., p. 152 "a daughter language of South Arabian dialects formerly spoken there in Mahra-land and on *Soqu*", a pronouncement to which Mahran had already come very near. On the other hand Glaser went too far when he described Mehri and *Soqu* as remnants of the oldest "Punic" Arabic (in *Fur Wiss. u. Kult. u. d. Morgenl. u. Altertum*, Zeitung, 1899, No. 120 and 121 of May 27 and 29) a descendant of the old language of *Hdarami* from which Etroico and Ambresco are also said to come (see Hommel, op. cit., p. 153 note 1 and 4 and in Nielsen's *Handb. b. 91*)

According to Voller (Z. i. xxiii. 223) the South Arabian dialects go back to the time of the settlement from *Hdarami*; the migrant *Ahl* not long before the coming of Islam, had occupied Mahra from the land and influenced its language by their dialect. So early as al-Ma'dani, 1533 we find the Mahra described as a mixed people. Glaser (Stass., u. p. 188 and 96) also speaks of the influence of eastern and north-eastern peoples on the Mahra language, but he wrongly ascribes to Parthian and Indian elements the notorious corruption of the Arabic language in the district of Mahra This*


(J. TAKESCH)

**AL-MĀʾIDA (A.), the Table, title of the fifth Sūra of the Qurʾān.**

**AL-MAIDĀNI AHMAD b. MUḤAMMAD ABU l-FAṬI, Arab philologist born in Ma’dānī Zā‘māl, a quarter of Nishābūr, pupil of the Qurʾān exeget and philologist *Ali b. Ahmad al-Wāhidī, teacher of Samānī among others, died in his native town on 25th Ramadan 518 (Oct. 27, 1124).**


His Arabic-Persian Dictionary *Sāmī fi lʾĀlamī*, is arranged in subjects in the following categories:


The ecliptic (al-Malil al-tuwa’wal) is an arc of the circle which goes through the two poles of the equator and one degree (point) of the ecliptic, namely the arc which lies between this point and the equator. This circle is perpendicular to the equator. The second inclination (al-Malil al-thālīn) is an arc of the circle, which goes through the two poles of the ecliptic and a point of the ecliptic, namely the arc which lies between this point and the equator. This circle is perpendicular to the ecliptic.

In the figure let ab be the ecliptic, ac the equator, bc be perpendicular to ac, bd perpendicular to ab, then bc is the first and bd the second inclination. For the calculation it is important that we should have a right angle in each of the two spherical triangles, abc and abd. The first inclination is also called Malal fālak ma’uddal al-nahār, inclination towards the equator. Of special importance is the obliquity of the ecliptic, i.e., the inclination of the plane of the ecliptic to the equator; it is equal to the first inclination in the solstitial points. It is called Malal fālak al-burūd, inclination of the ecliptic, Malal al-sūm, the greatest inclination, Malal kullahu or Malal al-kulli, the whole inclination. To distinguish it, the inclination of any degree is called al-Malal al-dīqūn, the degree-inclination.

If it is a question not of points on the ecliptic but of some star, the arc corresponding to the first inclination is called tād’i, “interval”, that corresponding to the second ʿard, “width”. We speak in the first case quite generally of declination, in the second of latitude.

The obliquity of the ecliptic is one of the fundamental magnitudes of the solar system. It was therefore continually being calculated anew and almost always so as to obtain the altitudes of culmination α1 and α2 of the sun at the summer and winter solstices. The sun is at these times at the same distance from the equator, north in one case and south in the other. The obliquity of the ecliptic is the $\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2}$. It should be mentioned that Muḥammad b. Ṣaḥḥah (c. 875) claims to ascertain the magnitude from three different points (O. Schirmer, op. cit., p. 52).

The first method was that used by Hipparchus, Polomeny and Eratosthenes, using the most varied instruments, the two rings, the quadrant and the armillary spheres. In the Muḥammadan period these observations were continued with larger and larger instruments and account taken of the fact that the sun does not always enter the solstices in question by day but may do so at night, that the heavens may be obscured at the time etc. From observations made before and after the time in question the value has to be obtained by interpolations. This is how al-Khwājāδ, for example, worked (on the instruments), used, e.g. E. Wiedemann and Th. W. Jünboll, Arzenciaus Schriften über ein von ihm ersonnenes Beobachtungsinstrument, Acta orientalis, v., 1926, p. 81–167. The values ascertained have been calculated by O. Schirmer (O. Schirmer, Studien zur Astronomie der Araber, S. B. P. M. S. Erl., lviii., 1926, p. 30–90).

From the measurements, it was found that the obliquity of the ecliptic decreases in course of time, i.e. that the plain of the ecliptic approaches the plain of the equator. A conspectus of the views of Muslim scholars on this question has been given by O. Schirmer (op. cit.). Further expressions used in this connection are al-fālak al-ma‘ālāf, the inclined horizontal; it means any horizontal, except that of the equator, i.e. the horizontal inclined towards the horizontal of the equator. Kaff ma‘āf ‘an kaff al-iswā‘, i.e. the line which is inclined towards the equator; this is a line (a circle) which lies parallel to the equator on the globe of the earth either north or south. Fālak ma‘āf ‘an fālak ma‘uddal al-nahār has a corresponding meaning on the globe of the heavens; irifa‘ al-adhili fī ma‘lal li-santkihi, third altitude in the first vertical i.e. the vertical which goes through the eastern and western points of the horizontal.

(E. Wiedemann)

Maimana, situated at 36° N. and 64° 45’ E., was formerly known as al-Yahudān, al-Yahudiya (Yakut also calls it Yahudda al-Kubra) but the name was changed to Maimana "the auspicious town", for the sake of good omens. It is at present the capital of the little province of Almār in Afghan Turkistan on the trade route between Herat and Balkh. Afghan Turkistan includes the western Kānates of Sar-i-pul, Shihrangān, Andkhui and Maimana, sometimes classed together as the Čahār Wālīyāt. Dost Muḥammad took this territory from Būkāra in the year 1855; the sovereignty remained in dispute between Kābul and Bākhtārī, till it was settled in favour of Bākhtārī by the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1873.

The low spurs and offshoots of the Bandī Turkistan range subside gently into the Oxus plains and this favoured part of Afghanistan is
rich in agricultural possibilities. Until Maimana was visited by Professor Vambréy in 1863, but one European, Captain Stirling, had set foot within it. According to Vambréy, the place consisted of some fifteen hundred mud huts and a dilapidated brick bazaar. Its inhabitants are Uzbekis with a sprinkling of Padish, Heratis, Jews, Hindus and Afghans. Trade is now considerable and Maimana is renowned for its carpets and other stuffs made partly of wool and partly of camel's hair. It traffics with Persia and Baghdad in raisins, aniseed and pistachio nuts. Horses are good, plentiful and cheap.


(R. L. Whithead)

MAIMANDI, AHMAD, the famous wazir of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna. He was a foster-brother of the Sultan, and had been brought up and educated with him. His father, the father of Ahmad, was the Amir of Bost under Sabuktigin; but on a charge of misappropriation of the revenue, he was put to death in 984 (994), when Amir Nili b. Manṣūr the Samanid overthrew the command of the troops of Khurṣan. Mahmud put Ahmad at the head of his correspondence department. After this, Ahmad rapidly rose in the service of his master, and occupied in succession, the post of Muntazir, Manṣūr (Accountant General), Schībāh Dīwān-e-Taqī (Head of the War Department), and Amīr of the provinces of Bost and Kukhchak. In 404 (1013), Sultan Mahmud appointed Ahmad as his wazir in place of Abu 'l-Abbās al-Fadl b. Ahmad al-Aṣrāfī. For twelve years, Ahmad managed the affairs of the growing empire of Sultan Mahmud with great tact and diplomacy. Ahmad was very strict and exacting, and did not tolerate any evasion of duty or departure from the usual official procedure, with the result that many of the dignitaries of the Empire became his enemies and worked to bring about his ruin. He was disgraced and dismissed in 415 (1024), and sent as a prisoner to the fort of Kalimān in the southern Kāshpar hills. After his accession to the throne, Sultan Māsūd, whose cause Ahmad had always supported, re-appointed him ważir in 422 (1031). Ahmad died in Muharram 424 (December, 1032). Ahmad is considered to be one of the greatest of Oriental ważirs. He was a learned man, encouraged scholars and showed great respect to them, and ordered all official correspondence to be carried on in Arabic instead of Persian.


MAIMŪNĀ, the last wife that Muhammad married. She was the daughter of al-Ḫarīth of the Hawazin tribe of Sa‘āna and a sister-in-law of Abbās. After she had divorced her first husband, a Thāqif, and her second, the Kurashi Abī Kūkūm, had died, she lived as a widow in Mecca where the Prophet would see her, primarily no doubt for political reasons, on the grounds that she allowed him in the year 7. His wish to marry her in Mecca was refused by the Meccans in order not to prolong his stay there; the marriage therefore took place in Sarif.

a village north of Mecca. Her brother-in-law 'Abbās acted as her guardian at the ceremony. The question whether the Prophet on this occasion was still in the īḥām or not is a much disputed and variously answered question. The bridal gift is said to have been 500 dirhams. Maimūnā survived the other wives of the Prophet and died in 61 (681) in Sarif, where she is said to have been buried on the spot where she was married.


MAIMŪNĪ. [See IBN MAIMŪN.]

MAISĀN, the name of a district in southern Iran.

The origin and significance of this name, which fell into disuse in the late middle ages, is unknown. There is no certain trace of it in the cuneiform inscriptions; for the Babylonian Ašāh, which Hommel (Étymogr. und Geogr. des alt. Orientes, Munich 1926, p. 261, 263) identifies with it is as little worthy of serious consideration as the Old Testament Mēṣān (NS, Gen. x. 30) which Biblical exegetes frequently quote. Maisan first appears in the form Maṣān in Strabo in the first century A.D. Ptolemy gives Maṣānitis kōstē as the name for the innermost part of the land of the Persian Gulf. The word is certainly not Greek; the meaning “middle land”, the land between two rivers, may be dismissed as a fanciful etymology. The territory of Mesene is in the cuneiform inscriptions the region of the southern Kaldu states, especially the southern Bit-Yakin; at the same time we find in them the term the sea-land (mēṣānī) as almost identical with Bit-Yakin; the part of Mesene between the Tigris and Khuszān was in the Babylonian period the home of the nomadic Aramaic tribe of Gumbalt.; cf. Steuck, Asirnouqbal, Leipzig 1916, iii. 778, 783, 796—97.

In classical literature Mesene is usually absolutely synonymous with Charakene. Mesene or Charakane appears in the second century B.C. (after ca. 129) as a small independent kingdom founded by a certain Hyspaonics, our knowledge of whom is practically limited to his coinage. After an existence of three and a half centuries Ardashīr I put an end to this kingdom shortly after his accession, between 224 and 227 A.D.: for Arabic sources for this event, see Noldeke, Gesch. d. Araber und Perser zur Zeit der Sassaniden, Leyden 1879, p. 13 (Tabari, i. 185). In the strict sense of the word, Charakene is only the delta of the Euphrates and Tigris before the junction of the two streams, the land on the north was Mesene: we have no information about the eastern and western frontiers of Charakene. Perhaps, as Weesbach suggests (see Bibl), Mesene was only later conquered by the rulers of Charakene and its name transferred to this southern district.

The Talbout knows Mesene as Miszān (and Meṣān). Syriac literature also knows Mašā'ād. Among the Persians we have Mēșān (and the Armenians Mašān): cf. thereon Schaedel, op. cit. p. 11. The Arabs took the word over as Mašān, but we occasionally also find Mašān (e.g. Tabari, iii. 1930 s.). The old name Mesene is perhaps concealed in that of the little town of Masūn, which, according to the Arab sources, was near Basra and was celebrated as the birthplace of the Mašāma.

As in the case of Mesene-Charakene, we have no exact information about the mediaeval Arab Maisān, which would enable us to define exactly the area and boundaries of the district. According to Yāḳūṭ, iv. 714 and Ḥaw[zīn], p. 310, Maisān is "an extensive district with numerous villages and palm groves between Baṣra and Wāṣīṭ, the capital of the district, often called Maisān". This district formed the sixth in the chain of the Arab districts which was taken over by the Arabs (q. v.) and was called Dhuddi Bahman or "the Tigris district"; the name Furât-Baṣra is also found. It was divided into four divisions (ṭasāʾīḍī, q. v.) namely, Bahman Ṭarḏaṣīr, Maisān, Dastmaṣīn and Abāz-Ṭubādāh; according to Kūdāma (B. G. A., vi. 256, 19), these four divisions of the Tigris district later passed into the administrative district of Baṣra. All four ṭasāʾīḍī are to be located on the east side of the Tigris. Bahman Ṭarḏaṣīr, the capital of the district of the same name, lay on the east or north bank of the Tigris, opposite Ubai on the west or south bank (the latter roughly on the site of the modern ʿAḏīlīyā, the port of modern Baṣra). The second division, Maisān in the narrow sense, must have been in that which stood the capital of the whole district of the same name. Al-Madḥār however usually figures as such in the Arabic sources; it may be supposed that this was the successor of an older town called Maisān. The locality of Al-Madḥār cannot be exactly fixed (see below); it lies on the east bank of the Tigris, about thirty miles (as the crow flies) north of Kūrma. Dastmaṣīn also is to be sought east of the Tigris, in the region of al-Madḥār, probably south or south-east of it. As to the fourth district, Abāz-Ṭubādāh, a name, which Marquart, op. cit., p. 41 and Herzfeld, H., xi. 150 would emend to ʿIḍābāb (Kūbādāh), relying on Ḥanūza al-Isfahānī (Ṭurīkī, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 57), this also must be placed east of the Tigris not too far from al-Madḥār.

A reference in Kūdāma (p. 235, 15 sq.) agrees very well with this, according to which the four divisions of the land of Maisān lay east of the Tigris. Even under the Sāsānians there was a separate Neo-Assyrian ecclesiastical province of Maisān which, again divided into four subdivisions, the bishoprics of Perāt de Maisān, Karkhā de Maisān, Bēḥ Rāmān and Nehr Gūl (Gūr); cf. especially Sachau, op. cit., p. 48 sq. Marquart, op. cit., assumed it as certain that these four dioceses must correspond to the four political divisions of the district of Maisān. This view in itself probable and first found by Sachau, p. 49 as worthy of consideration is untenable, as Schaedler, op. cit., p. 29 sq. has shown. Perāt de Maisān is certainly identical with Bāḥmān; but the second bishopric Karkhā de Maisān, does not correspond to the ṭasāʾīḍī of Maisān or Madḥār but is to be located much farther south in the district of the modern Muḥ hannāra. Bēḥ Rāmān very probably lay not on the east but on the west bank of the Tigris at some distance N. E. of Baṣra, so that it does not even come into consideration as the equivalent of one of the four Arab divisions. Nehr Gūl (Gūr) may be equated to Nahr ʿIrāk of the Arab geographers (see Sachau, op. cit., p. 51; Schaedler, op. cit., p. 37). This is to be sought towards Khūṣūstān somewhere in the neighbourhood of Ḥaw[zīn] (see below). Whether the fourth ṭasāʾīḍī Abāz-Kubādāh corresponds to it cannot be settled.

If then the capitals of all four divisions of the Tigris district are to be located on the east bank of the river, the lands on the west bank, also included in the ṭasāʾīḍī must have belonged to the same district as did the whole delta down to the Persian Gulf; for there is no district to which only the doubtful western and southern divisions might be allotted. In the Sāsānian period, according to the Turfan fragments (cf. Schaeder, op. cit., p. 39), that the term Maisān was used for the whole of southern Ḥarāk (or Māshhūn) and this remained the case under the Arabs. But according to the Muslim sources, it does not seem to have been limited to the south proper but to have extended a considerable distance northwards. The quotations above given from Yāḳūṭ and Ḥaw[zīn] show that Maisān was considered to stretch northwards to Wāṣīṭ (q. v. and vol. i., p. 676, il., art. Ṣawṣār); indeed it is most probable that the extreme N. E. frontier of the area known as Maisān lay in the vicinity of the modern Kūt al-Amārā (q. v.; the Ṣawṣār of the Arab geographers; cf. 669 sq.; Scharf, Bayflorum, ii. 310 sq. (q. v.); cf. the map). Maisān also stretched up to here and seems to have included lands east of the Tigris (cf. Kūkār). To avoid misunderstandings it should here be expressly mentioned that for the Arab period, of the present course of the Tigris only the Ṣawṣār and the stretches as far as al-Madḥār come into question; in those days the Tigris bed corresponded with that of the Nahr al-ʿIrāk (Ṣawṣār al-Ḥāyī) which was the western boundary of the district of Kūkār. For further details of the hydrography of Maisān, see below. Maisān is occasionally used as synonymous with Kūkār; cf. Schaedler, op. cit., p. 14, 17 sq. Maisān probably stretched to the east as far as the alluvial land of the swamps, up to the frontier of Khūṣūstān in places beyond the present frontier of Ḥarāk. At least Ḥaw[zīn] (the modern Ḥaw[zīn], q. v.) which is now on Persian soil, is expressly mentioned as a town belonging to Maisān.

The swamp regions, al-Bajārīyā, for the most part came within the area of Maisān. On this cf. al-Ṭaḥīdha and the articles on al-Bajārīyā al-Ḥallīya and al-Dīzārīyā by ʿAli Sharīṣ in the periodical Lughat al-ʿArab, iv. (Baghdad 1927), p. 375-384, 474-477, 526-530 and vi. 277-279; also Ḥādīm al-Ṣadīqī, Lughātīyat al-ʿIrāq, Baghadad 1927, p. 40, where the more important of the swamps (khorās) are given. In modern times the practically synonymous name al-Akṣūr (plur. of khor) is used for al-Bajārīyā (see ʿAli Sharīṣ, op. cit., iv. 376). The two specifically Ḥarāk words khor and khorā, which are very often used indiscriminately in European works, especially on maps (usually the one form khor) (cf. al-Ṭaḥīdha where khor is wrongly given for khor), have to be carefully distinguished. For khor (older alternative name), popularly khor = "permanent swamp, temporary lake, land liable to inundation" (cf. B. G. A., ed. de Goeje, iv. 370; G. le Strange, J. R. S., 1895, p. 298) and al-koher, popularly khor = "arm of a river, creek, lagoon-like gulf", cf. especially the Remarks on Fanastase-Marie, the editor of the Baghdadi periodical Lughat al-ʿArab, in M. Ladsbarski, Das Johannesebuch der Mandaeer (Giessen 1915, p. 145).

One of the divisions of the Tigris district was called, as already mentioned, Dast-i Maisān. The
name is also vocalised Dastu- and Dasta-Ma'insan in our Arabic texts. Ibn Khallikan always writes the Persian form Dasht-i Ma'insan; cf. Marzid al-itilif, ed. Juynboll, v. 466. Dasht, daghht can here only be the Persian dasht = "plain". Schaeder's assumption, cf. cit., p. 344, that Das represents an abbreviation of the Pahlavi Daskert (Arabic Dasht, q. v.) seems to me hardly tenable. Whether this division in particular was distinguished as the "plain of Ma'insan" from Ma'insan proper (especially from the second division of the district), is however not apparent. Could it here have been a more level plain, less filled with swamps? In any case, it is not correct to equate Dast-i Ma'insan with more ado to Ma'insan (as does G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 43). Yakhut (n. 574) thus defines Dast-i Ma'insan:

"It is an important district between Wāsi, Basra and al-`Awyaz [q. v.] (= Khūristān, q.v.) lying near to the last-named. The capital is Basamata; Dast-i Ma'insan is not identical with Ma'insan but is connected with it; it is also said that it is a district with the capital al-Ubulla and Basra belonging to it." Nothing further is known of Basama, here mentioned as the capital of Dast-i Ma'insan: the form in which the name is handed down varies (see the variants in the Marzid al-itilif, ed. Juynboll, v. 468); it is apparently identical with Risamuya, which al-Mu'addas (F. G. A., ii. 114, 2) details among the places of the district of Wāsi (cf. Tabari, iii. 1958, 17; Z. D. M. G., xxix. 660, xxix. 26).

From the rather general remarks in Yakhut the boundaries of the district of Dast-i Ma'insan cannot unfortunately be ascertained. We are brought step forward by a note in Ibn Rosta (F. G. A., vii 94, 1) which expressly states that a place named Ab'dasii, frequently mentioned in Arabic sources, is in Dast-i Ma'insan. When Yakhut in another connection (iv. 275, 2) mentions Ab'dasii alongside of Dast-i Ma'insan (i.e. distinguishing the two), as a division of Kaskar, this probably is an inaccuracy. From the passage of Ibn Rosta quoted it is further evident that Ab'dasii must have been above al-Madhār in the direction of Wāsi. In keeping with this is an itinerary given by Khudama (F. G. A., vi. 126, 3 ca), according to which a road from Wāsi via Zādhib (5 faras) to Ubulla and of. E. of Wāsi; cf. Yakhut, i. 461) to Basra passed successively through Ab'dasii (= Ab'dasii) and al-Madhār. The distance of Zādhib from Ab'dasii is put at 5 stages (rizkā's), and from Ab'dasii to al-Madhār at 8; cf. also Streek, Baby- lonien, ii. 13-14. As a rule, on the average may be put at 4-5 miles (see Streek, cit., cit., p. xv) the distance from Zādhib to Ab'dasii may be estimated at 30-40 miles; from Zādhib to Wāsi it was about 15 miles. To this location of Ab'dasii agrees very a note in Ibn Hawkal (F. G. A., ii. 159, 1), who says that the date-palm grove of the district of Basra stretched without interruption for over 20 parangah = 150 miles. Dast-i Ma'insan can therefore barely be reached from Ab'dasii (then away to the south on the seashore; q. v.) as far as Ab'dasii; the latter must, therefore mark the northern limit of the then district of Basra. From the passages mentioned we have to look for Ab'dasii a far distance to the north of al-Madhār, probably rather near the bank of the eastern arm of the Tigris which was dry in the middle ages. The position given to Ab'dasii by G. Le Strange in his map to Ibn Serapion (J. K. A. S., 1895) and in The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (map ii.) — south of al-Madhār on the left bank of the Tigris (in map ii.) or on the right bank opposite al-Madhār — seems untenable. For further reference to Ab'dasii (with the variants 'Abbās, 'Abdās or 'Abbas; according to Hamza al-Fahdī in Yakhut, xii. 603, 19, a Persian word) see F. G. A., iv. (Inscryp.), p. 94.

The approximate identification of the position of Ab'dasii, which we have obtained, gives us a clue to that of Dast-i Ma'insan. This must have been above Ma'insan proper (with al-Madhār), and have comprised roughly the most northern part of the whole district of Ma'insan in the wider sense. It should be noted that the order in which the four divisions of the Tigris district are officially given (Bahman Ardasīsh, Ma'insan, Dast-i Ma'insan, Abaz-Kubād; see above) is apparently that from south to north or rather north-east. To the east Dast-i Ma'insan extended as far as Khūristān. But it should not be forgotten that the eastern frontier during the caliphate must have undergone changes as a result of political alterations in the organisation of the provincial administration (cf. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 290, 291); this explains the apparent contradictions in our sources, in which one and the same place is sometimes put in the Ḥijāt, sometimes in Ahwāz [q. v.] (Khūristān, q.v., 'Arabistan; see 'AREA KIR).

When we know definitely that Dast-i Ma'insan was separated by the division of Ma'insan from that of Bahman Ardasīsh to which Ubbula belonged, it appears rather remarkable that in Ibn Khordadbeh as well as in Yakhut (cf. Streek, op. cit., p. 16, 19) Dast-i Ma'insan is equivalent to Ubbula. If this is not simply a mistake, it might at least be explained, as Schaeder does (op. cit., p. 55), by saying that under the Abbāsid the headquarter for the collection of taxes for Dast-i Ma'insan was moved to Ubbula. The whole system of division into sawad, originally simply made for convenience in taxation, had lost any practical importance, at least under the later rulers of this dynasty. We are therefore definitely told that the Tigris district later passed under Bahra, where no doubt some of the officials of the old administrative district were moved to towns near Basra like Ubbula.

A part of Dast-i Ma'insan was known as Dījkhā. It must have lain to the west of the modern course of the Tigris roughly from al-Madhār to 'Abdāsi in Rosta (op. cit., p. 95) tells us that in Dījkhā between the two towns just mentioned, a part of the Tigris water used at one time to collect into swamps, before the river altered its bed in the direction of Wāsi. From the accounts of the campaigns of the Khāridjīs in the Umayyad period when the Dījkhā was a favourite place for these rebels to assemble (see vol. ii., p. 905), it is evident that this district must have occupied the position here sketched out for it; cf. Wellhausen, in N. G. W. Götz, N.S., vol. v., no. 2 (1901), p. 22. Whether al-Dījkhā stretched as far as the Nahr al-Tahar (Shatt-āl-Haiy) and even beyond it, we do not know. There is a Tell Dījkhā at some distance from the west bank of the Nahr al-Tahar, to be exact in 45°52' E. Long., and 31°45' N. Lat. It is possible that the mediaeval name of the division Dījkhā has survived in that of this mound, which conceals the ruins of the very ancient, not unimportant town of Umma (ideographically written Ghar-Ukh).
For Umma, which is mentioned in inscriptions as early as 3200 B.C., and disappeared from history even before the time of Hammurabi, see Hommel, op. cit., p. 354—355, 1019, 1102 (Index) and Unger in the Reallexik. der Vorgeschichte, xv. (1928), p. 3—4. Names like Dâkhâ, Dawkhâ, Dawkhanân are found elsewhere in the mediaeval geographical nomenclature of Irâk and Kûtizân; see Yakût, i. 669, 13—16; ii. 143, 144, i. iii. 13; cf. on Dâkhâ (Dawkhâ) also Schaedler, op. cit., p. 23.

The southern Irâk, to which the district of Maîsan of the Arab middle ages roughly corresponds, in course of time far reaching changes have taken place in the appearance of the country. The history of the hydrography of this area is thus a very complicated problem and the solution of topographical questions especially difficult. The first thing to note in this connection is the fact that the Persian Gulf, the Khâlîd-al-Baṣra or al-Fâris, as the modern inhabitants of al-Irâk call it (cf. Häshim al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 20, 41; 'Abd al-Razzaq al-Hasani, op. cit., p. 115; Lughat al-Arâb, iii. 58, and the article Bâkîr al-Fâris), stretched much farther north in ancient times and the present Gulf than it does now. In the Babylonian period it was a lagoon almost as wide as a sea called Nâru Marratu (see Streck, Astur-bonial, Leipzig 1916, ii. 796) and stretched northwards nearly as far as 31° N. Lat. The lagoon must have stretched from Kurna in a westerly direction indicated by the later course of the Euphrates or the modern swamps (korâs) of Abu Kelâm and al-Ḥammar, as far as the region of the mound of ruins of Abu Shahrain (c. 12 miles S.W. of al-Mukâyîr-ūr), Abu Shahrain, the ancient Erîdu, certainly lay on the shore of this lagoon as we know from inscriptions found there; cf. Langdon, Ausgrabungen in Babylonien seit 1918 = A. O., xxvi. (1928), p. 3—4; Weissbach’s objections to the equation Abu Shahrain = Erîdu (in Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., vi. 1205) are now disposed of. From Kurna the lagoon probably sent an arm to the east as far as the Karûn. The land south of Kurna beyond Baṣra on both sides of the broad arm of the sea now marked by the bed of the Shâṭ al-Arâb was probably only partly under water in ancient times (cf. Herzfeld, in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archäolog. Reise im Euphrat und Tigrisgebiet, vol. i. Berlin 1911, p. 251), although it was probably exceedingly swampy. In any case in the Sargonid period, the Euphrates, Tigris, Kerkhâ, and Karûn all entered the sea or rather the lagoon running up from it by separate mouths. Cf. also al-BâṭîÂ ta and ii. p. 777.

If then the question of the extent of the advance of the delta since the beginning of the historical period can be approximately answered, it hardly seems possible to allot accurately the increase in land to each century, as we do not know if the sea always retained at a constant rate. In the middle ages (=Abâdadân (q.v. and below) in 45° 22’ E. Long. Greensw. and 30° 12’ N. Lat. c. 45 miles in a direct line from Baṣra, was still regarded as the most southernly town of the Irâk. According to Ibn BâṭîÂ ta’s Travels (ed. Paris, ii. 18) in the first half of the xvith century, it is already an hour’s journey from the coast. This distance has now increased to over 20 miles. In the last 50 years there has been an average increase of land of at least 2½ miles a century. For further information on the

steady formation of land by alluvial deposits at the north end of the Persian Gulf cf. Shâṭ al-Arâb; S. Genthe, Der Pers. Merkblatt, Marburg 1896, p. 54 sq.; The Persian Gulf (=Handbooks of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office, No. 78, London 1920), p. 133; Häshim al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 51—52. Since the last century the most southerly settlement immediately on the sea has been the telegraph and lighthouse station of Fâo; on this cf. below.

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

The Tigris, probably, was in ancient times forked at the site of the modern Kût al-Amâra (q.v.), the Mâdhârîs the mediaeval Arabic sources (see above), into an eastern and western arm. For four centuries, or more, the Tigris has used the eastern bed running via Amâra to Kurna, while the western arm, a more canal-like channel only navigable at high water, has connected it with the Euphrates. This western arm is in modern European literature known as Shâṭ al-Hâlî; this seems to be a name coined by European travellers, apparently first found in the last decades of the xvith century (in Beauchamp; see Ritter, Erdkunde, xi. 973); Shâṭ al-Hâlî = “river of al-Hâlî” was and still is the name given locally to the northern stretch of the river reaching as far as Hâlî; but its whole course is usually called the ‘Irâk Nahr al-Ghârîf (cf. the quotations noted below from the works of Häshim al-Sâdî and ‘Abd al-Razzaq al-Hasani); Yakût (i. 533, 54; iii. 781, 5) already knows Nahr al-Ghârîf as the name of one of the five arms of the Tigris and of a district belonging to it. The Nahr al-Ghârîf was at one time called al-Muṣârâd; cf. Lughat al-Arâb, i. 51. At the little town of al-Hâlî the Nahr al-Ghârîf divides into five channels of which only the western ‘Îbîn DîyârîrÎ has any water, while the eastern Shâṭ al-Mânî (or ‘Amîr; on the name cf. above ii. 777) is now quite dry; cf. Lughat al-Arâb, i. 51, with note and correction on p. 225 sq. Four miles above Shâṭra the main western arm also divides into two channels: the large Nahr al-Shâṭra in the west, which enters the Tigris at Nîshîrîyê (Nîshîrîyê, see Kût al-Amârâ), the capital of the lîwâ of Mûntashîf — for some years joined by a branch line to the station of al-Muṣârîrî-ūr (L.-junction) on the Baghdad-Baṣra railway —, and the smaller eastern Nahr Badî‘î (Bâdî‘î) said to have been originally dug out by the Mûntashîf which enters the Hûr al-Ḥammar somewhat east of Şîk al-Shiyyâk (q.v.).

On the Nahr al-Ghârîf (Shâṭ al-Hâlî) and the territory through which it flows, of which now as in the Turkish period, the northern part (including al-Hâlî) belongs for agricultural purposes to the lîwâ of Kût (al-Amâra) and the southern part to the lîwâ of al-Mûntashîf, cf. vol. i. p. 676; ii. 513 sq. and Kût al-Amârâ; and Streck, Babylonien, ii. 311 sq.; Lughat al-Arâb, i. 51 sq., 152, 217, 219.
The construction of the Tigris at Māhārāyā (or Kūt al-'Amara) is certainly very old, and may be assumed for the old Babylonian period at least. The ruins of Tellu (the old town of Lagesh), N.E. of al-Shafrāṣ, and of several neighbouring mounds of ruins (like al-Hubba, Sarghal) are at a short distance to the east of the modern Nahr al-Ghārāfr, on an arm (usually) or older bed of it. It is possible that the western bed of the Tigris, Nahr al-Ghārāfr, is of artificial origin (cf. above p. 513 sq.) and was a canal dug at a remote period planned to give a convenient connection with the Euphrates. The western arm of the river was in all probability the regular course of the Tigris in the Babylonian period (cf. also the sketch map in Meisner, Bilder von Babylonien und Assyrien, vol. I); it is only since the last century that the artificial channel of the Tigris for reasons not known to us must have made its way into the eastern modern river bed. Under the later Sāmānīs another change took place, originally connected with the great extension of the swampy area of the Bāṭah. According to a note in Yākūt (i. 660, 1), the Tigris had already ceased in the reign of Al-Rāhmān V Gūr (420–438) to flow in the direction of al-Mādhar and instead of this had chosen the route of the arm that runs towards Kūtār. In any case in the days which took place, especially in the reign of Khālid Pērūz (457–484) and Khwāsaw Il Pērūz (590–610, 636), considerably furthred the development. It is certain that at the beginning of Muslim rule, the Tigris was using the western bed exclusively. The eastern was quite dry as far as al-Mādhar, and only after this town did it contain water again. On the state of the river in the middle ages cf. especially the descriptions in Ibn Rūṣāf, (B. G. A. vi. 106, 1 sq.) and thereon, G. Le Strange, in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 300, 1896, p. 241, 1897, p. 219; also see Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 74 and above i., p. 513 sq., ed. A. ALBADRATH.

The Nahr Abī l-Asad, which runs out of the Bāṭah is often described by the Arab geographers as the eastern section of the (western) Tigris (cf. above and Yākūt, iv. 830, 22) might with a certain amount of justice also be claimed as the last stretch of the Euphrates. It is in this sense that Yākūt (iv. 561, 22) says that al-Mādhar, mentioned above, is "on the bank of the Tigris and of the Euphrates at the junction of the two". On the alterations in the lower course of the Euphrates in the later middle ages down to the xvth century we have very little information (cf. AL-FURAT), but it seems possible that since about the xvth century, at least since the beginning of the xvith century, the whole volume of the Euphrates no longer disappeared in the swamps but a portion ran in a definite channel which roughly coincided with the course of the modern bed, and ultimately used the channel of the Nahr Abī l-Asad and thus effected a direct communication with the Eastern Tigris. From the reports of European travellers (see G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 28 sqq.) it is evident that at the junction of the two rivers there stood since at least the middle of the xvith century a castle named al-Kurrā (now a small
town; see also below, iv. 364). Since the great scheme for regulating the Euphrates was carried out by Willcocks in the first decade of this century (cf. ii., p. 515a and 15—53—506), only a small and insignificant arm of the Euphrates now flows out at Kurna while its main arm cuts through the swamps of al-Hammār in a new channel and enters what is now called the Shāšī-al-'Arab above Karmat 'Ali (c. 10 miles N. of Baṣra). On this modern Euphrates channel called after Karmaṭ 'Ali (popularly Karmaṭ and Gurmat 'Ali) cf. Hāšim al-Sa'dī, op. cit., p. 209, 412, 416, 159, 529; Ibn al-Razzāk al-Ḥasāni, op. cit., p. 69; Lāghūt al-Arāb, i. 365, 8 sq.; iv. 527, 3; Metropolitana (Handbook of the Foreign Office, No. 63), London 1920, p. 6, 52 sq., 55 and cf. ii., p. 515.

The Eastern Tigris from al-Madḥār to its mouth on the Persian Gulf bore in the middle ages the name of Diḏjāt al-‘Arwā (= the "eye-eyed Tigris"; on this cf. above, ii. 777); cf. especially Ibn Rosta (B. G. A., viii.), p. 94 sq. and Ibn Serapion (J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 28, 299—303); Streck, Babylonien, i. 41—42; G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 43; Schefer, op. cit., p. 21—23 and cf. i., p. 676, 699 sq.; ii., p. 52 sq. Yāktūt (iv. 850, 29) however limits the name Diḏjāt al-‘Arwā to the stretch from al-Mattārā on the east bank of the canal to the confluence of the two rivers. At the same time we find other special names for this last section among the Arab geographers of the middle ages like Diḏjāt al-Baṣra (the Tigris of B.), Faṭād al-Baṣra (cf. e.g. Yāktūt, iii. 931, 10), Bāṭināwād (Yāktūt, i. 462, 11). A specifically Persian name is Bahmānhr (= the river of the district of Bahman Ardashir (cf. ii., p. 777; see Yāktūt, i. 770, 20).

Even in the Babylonian period the lower Tigris seems to have had a special name, Surāpu; see Meissner, op. cit., p. 5. For nearly two centuries the combined Euphrates and Tigris has been known as Shāšī-al-‘Arab = "the river of the Arabs," because its basins are almost entirely occupied by the Persian kingdom, are almost exclusively inhabited by Arab tribesmen. (The name Shāš, al-‘Arab is found in the middle of the 16th century in Nāṣir-i Khusraw [Sefername, ed. Schefer, p. 89] but this is the only early occurrence). In its lowest half the Shāš al-‘Arab has since that date formed the often contested frontier between Persia and Turkey or (since the World War) the Kingdom of Iraq; about an hour's journey above (or west of) Muḥammār, the eastern bank becomes Persian. Cf. also the article Shāš al-'Arab and The Persian Gulf (For sign Office Handbook, No. 76), London 1820, p. 54.

The stretch of the Diḏjāt al-‘Arwā corresponding to the modern Shāš al-‘Arab in the middle ages sent out numerous canals on either side; the very complicated canal-system of the country round Baṣra was especially celebrated. The most important canals on the west bank were the Nahr Maṣ'īl (still to-day the name of a small village, an hour above al-‘Ashshārā) and the Nahr Ubaṣla (apparently the modern Nahr al-‘Ashshārā) which united at the town of Baṣra and connected it with the Tigris. The mediaeval Nahr Aḥbār (cf. ii., p. 15 miles south of Baṣra on the west side, may also be mentioned; it still exists to-day and has given its name to a district and its capital (belonging to the sandjak of Baṣra); see Cuinet, op. cit., p. 231; Abd al-Razzāk al-Ḥasānī, op. cit., p. 118. Of the canals on the west bank the most important was the Nahr Bāyān (cf. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, p. 311, 390—391). The Nahr Bāyān formed an artificial channel connecting the Tigris and the Kārūn; we have also mediaeval references to a similar communication between these two rivers. Another canal still in existence on the west side is the Nahr Raiyān (Rayān; modern Rīyān) north of the Nahr Bāyān. The most northern canal on the east side which left the Tigris about the neighbourhood of the modern Kurna, was called Nahr al-Mubārak, not Nahr al-Madhr (cf. thereon to Googe, in J. R. A. S., 1895, 5 p. 749; cf. Streck, Babylonien, i. 41). Generally speaking, there are not now so many canals in the Shāš al-‘Arab as there were in the middle ages. The best account of conditions in the caliphate is that of Ibn Serapion; see the text in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 29—30 (thereon to p. 305—311); cf. also Streck, Babylonien, i. 42 and G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 46—48. Cf. particularly the article al-Baṣra we-Ankhūrhā, which gives a list of old and new names of canals, in Lāghūt al-‘Arāb, iii. (1915), p. 57—68, 128—132 and p. 673—674 (additions) and p. 700—704 (indices); al-Nabhānī, al-Tawīla al-Nabhanīya fī 'Īṭrīq al-Qarātayn (2nd ed. Cairo 1342 [1923], i. 15—52.

After the hydrography of the district of Maṣān, we may now deal briefly with the more important places in it. The mediaeval Arab geographers give as its capital the already frequently mentioned al-Madhrār on the eastern bank of the Tigris, 4 days' journey from Basra. The Shā's inhabitants according to Yāktūt (vi. 468) had a splendid mosque here with the tomb of 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali who fell at Karbalā in the year 680; on this see the references in Wustenfeld, Geographische Tabellen der arabischen Staaten, Register (1855), p. 8 and Yāktūt, vi. 506; cf. also Rawiṣa. This sanctuary still survives and it has not been noticed before (hence for example, the inaccurate locations by G. Le Strange in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 300 and in The Lands etc., p. 42) to define quite exactly the site of al-Madhrār. The name al-Madhrār is no longer known on the spot; as of the old town the highly revered Alīd sanctuary is all that remains, the place is now called simply 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali Keppel, who paused here on his way up the river in 1824, speaks erroneously of "the residence of Sheikh Abdulla bin Ali, an Arab chief"; cf. his Personal Narrative of a Journey from India to England (London 1827), i. 91. According to Chenery's map (see The Exploration for the Survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris, London 1856, Atlas, Pl. x.), 'Uzair and 'Ali (now only 10 miles apart in a direct line, a figure which has however to be doubled when allowing for the many windings of the river if one goes by boat. The traveller Schlaflī, who in 1862 went down the Tigris on a steamer, took two hours to get from 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali to 'Uzair; cf. his Reisen im Orient (Winterthur 1864), p. 137; Rich took six hours to ascend (Kitter, xi. 945). On my own journey in March 1927 I visited 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali; the steamer covered the distance from here to 'Uzair with the river in favour of condition in no quite three hours. 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali lies on a slight eminence ten minutes from the left bank of the Tigris, which describes a curve here. The mosque of the tomb with its dome
visible from a long distance off stands within the south side of an oblong court, to which entrance is given by a door in the slightly built north wall. The *Mašûma*-poet al-Ḥārīm, born in Mashān (near Basra) is said by Yākūt (iv. 468) to have died in al-Madhār. As Ibn Rostā (B. G. A., vii.), p. 95., tells us, the tides came up as far as al-Madhār; this agrees with Schlafli's observation (op. cit.). The tide indeed is sometimes perceptible as far up as the town of Ka'lat Sāliḥ, farther north; cf. Hashim al-Sa'dī, op. cit., p. 39; cf. also *The Persian Gulf Pilot*, London 1898, p. 295. Opposite al-Madhār, on the west bank was the little town of al-Ḥāt (Yākūt, iv. 947, 6). When Yākūt observes in one passage (iv. 714) that the capital of Mašān was also called Masān, he can only be referring to al-Madhār, the centre of the district of Mašān in the narrower sense, not perhaps, Furāt Mašān, for which we also find an abbreviated form Mašān. The name al-Madhār probably first came into existence in the Muslim period, perhaps for a new foundation on the site of the old town of Mašān.

As to Ka'lat Sāliḥ already mentioned on the left bank of the Tigris which like 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali belongs to the ābād of 'Amara, see Hashim al-Sa'dī, p. 151; 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Hāsān, p. 233—234 and *Lughat al-'Arab*, iv. 318—319, 4. 536. This town of modern origin a couple of hours’ journey below 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali has now about 3,000 inhabitants (including many Mandaeans). The site of al-Madhār cannot be marked by Ka'lat Sāliḥ for al-Madhār was certainly of moderate extent and the ābād mosque is to be sought within it and not in its vicinity.

As to 'Uzair already mentioned (now usually pronounced 'Azīr), south of 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali on the west bank of the Tigris, it is especially mentioned that it belonged to the district of Mašān; see Yāqūt, iii. 319, 714; Kazimi, *Al-Sūr al-Bīlān*, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 316. The proper name of this place with the alleged tomb of Ezra ('Uzair) in the middle ages was, according to Arabic and Jewish sources, Nahr Samuna (popularity Sumura); cf. e.g. Yāqūt, iv. 840—849. Cf. on Uzair especially D. S. Sassoon, op. cit. (see Picli: J. R. Ghannam, op. cit. (see Picli), p. 180 sq. and the article 'Uzair.

The town of Abdās (Abbās) etc. to the north of al-Madhār has already been discussed. On the town of Huwara (now Hawwara) also belonging to Mašān see above i. p. 670 and art. Huwara; to the *Kauš* or *Kaš* may now be added-Layard in *J. R. G. S., xvi*. (1846). p. 34 sq. 36. J. de Morgan, *Mission scientifique en Perse*, Éd. géograph., ii. Paris 1893, p. 278 and Schwarz, *Knoten im Mittelalter*, p. 369 sqq. *Lughat al-'Arab*, vi. 277. An extensive swamp (cf. i. p. 676), takes its name from this town, the water from which flows into the Tigris a little south of Kurna; cf. Hashim al-Sa'dī, op. cit., p. 21. sq.

The modern towns of importance on the Nahr al-Gharrāf (Shatt al-Hay), are of recent origin and are still developing. They are from north to south: Huwara, a town with 9,000—10,000 inhabitants (cf. above and i. p. 676; *Lughat al-'Arab*, vi. 152, 224); Ka'lat Sikkar with 1,500 and shrār, with 7,000 inhabitants, on these three places cf. Cuney, op. cit., iii. 290. 310 sq. 312—315; where Ka'lat Sikkar is wrongly given for Ka'lat Sīkkār); Sachau, *Am Euphrat und Tigris*, Leipzig 1900, p. 69 sqq.; 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Hāsān, op. cit., p. 111—113; 130 sqq.; Hashim al-Sa'dī, op. cit., p. 147, 162—165.

At the spot which up till some two centuries ago was regarded as the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris stands the little town of Kurna (Korna, Gurna) with 2,900 inhabitants. It is not known to have existed in the middle ages; on it cf. above and Mignan, *Travels in Chaldæa*, London 1829, p. 284 sq.; Ritter, xi. 1018—1023; Cuinet, op. cit., iii. 211 sqq.; 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Hāsān, op. cit., p. 119; Hashim al-Sa'dī, op. cit., p. 156; *Lughat al-'Arab*, iii. 57. Halfway between Kurna and Basra must have stood al-Maṣūrā where, according to Yāqūt, the two rivers of the Tigris, or the Euphrates and Tigris met in the middle ages; cf. above. About 3 hours' journey above Basra on the right bank of the river is the little village of *Karām* 'Ali, where as already mentioned, the main stream of the Euphrates flows into the Tigris or the Shatt al-'Arab.

In the Muslim period, Basra was the largest and most important town in the old district of Mašān and in practice its capital, although under the 'Abbāsid, al-Madhār may have for a considerable period been regarded as the official capital. On Basra, mediaeval Basra, modern Basra and al-'Ashshār, cf. the article *Basra*.

Al-'Aṣhshār stands approximately on the site of Ubūlla which as a suburb and port on the Tigris for the mediaeval Basra was of some importance. In our sources we are expressly told that Ubūlla lay north of the canal which bore its name, partly on an island, which was formed by the Tigris and the two canals of Nahr al-Maṣūrā and Nahr al-Ubulla which joined one another at Basra. The modern Nahr al-Khurā which leaves the Shatt al-'Arab about an hour south of al-'Ashshār, cannot be the Nahr al-UBulla (in spite of *Lughat al-'Arab*, iii. 63). The modern al-'Ashshār, the principal commercial centre of southern *Irāq*, is only a little inferior to Basra as regards numbers of population. The two together have now a population of 50—60,000. On Ubūlla, the ancient *Axōnāyas kūrāsān* (s. Paulus-Wissowa, *Reallex. der late. Altertumwiss.*, Suppl.-Band, i. 111), cf. G. Le Strange, *J. R. A. S.*, 1895, p. 506 and *The Lands* etc., p. 47; Drouin, a. a. O. (s. Limand), p. 9; Sachau, *Arch. Pr. Ak.*, 1919, xii, 1, p. 20, 31 sq.; *Ibl.,* xi. 151; *Lughat al-'Arab*, v. 471; vi. 200, 1 and the art. *Urbanella*.

Opposite al-'Ashshār, on the east bank of the Shatt al-'Arab stands the little town of al-Tamīna (cf. *Lughat al-'Arab*, iii. 129, p. 239 sqq.; 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Hāsān, op. cit., p. 118; Hashim al-Sa'dī, op. cit., p. 156, 6). On its site or at least somewhere in the neighbourhood, there was already in ancient and mediaeval times an important harbour, known to Pliny as *Forat* (cf. also Drouin, op. cit., p. 8). In the Talmud (see Berliner, op. cit., p. 44) and in Syriac sources it is called *Perat de Mašān*, in the mediaeval Arab authors *Farāt al-Mašān* or *Furāt al-Balār*. In Syriac and Arabic texts we also find *Perat* or *Farat*, without the addition of Mašān; with *Furāt = Euphrates* the name has no connection. When the first Sassanian king Ardashīr I founded the city it received from him the new name of Bahman-Ardashīr, shortened to Bahmanšāh; see Hamza al-Isfahānī, *Tāribikh*, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 37 sqq., 46 and *Ibl.* xi. 149. Cf. the above mentioned
specifically Persian name of the Cidjlat al-Awret and Bamshir (= Bahmanshir) as a name of an arm of the Kūrān (cf. ii., p. 777). That Forūt Māīsān was opposite Ubbul on the left bank is quite clear from the Arabic references: cf. Wellhausen, Groß G. W. Gott, N. F., v., N. 2 (1901), p. 34 and Schaedler, op. cit., p. 31. The identification of Forūt Māīsān with the modern Bāṣra or even with old Bāṣra (Berliner, op. cit.), which has been championed by different scholars (Noldeke in S. B. Ak. Wien, 1893, Abb. ix., p. 18; Marquart, op. cit., p. 41; Sachau, Abh. Pr. A. W., 1919, No. 1, p. 49; only suggested as a possibility by Herzfeld in Spasines, p. 275) is therefore untenable. Perat de Māīsān was the see of the Nestorian metropolitan which was later moved to Bāṣra (first certain reference in 893); cf. Sachau, op. cit., p. 49 and Schaedler, op. cit., p. 31 sq. The old name of the diocese Perat de Māīsān was still frequently used in place of Bāṣra even after the transfer of the episcopal see. If we have on one occasion, e. 900 A. D., a mention of a bishop of Māīsān simply, we should refer it to Perat de Māīsān rather than to Karkh de Māīsān (so Sachau, op. cit., p. 50) because the abbreviation Māīsān for Perat de Māīsān is found elsewhere in Syriac literature (cf. Schaedler, op. cit., p. 32–33). As to the coins of the Omayyad period of the mint of Māīsān, this is probably to be explained also as al-Forūt Māīsān and not as Karkh Māīsān (so Mordtmann, Z. D. M. G., xxxiii. 126) or Māīsān (al-Mādhār) as Schaedler, op. cit., p. 34 thinks. Abu l-Fida, Tuhum al-Buldān (ed. Reinard, p. 296), also is obviously thinking of Forūt Māīsān not Māīsān (al-Mādhār) when he says “Māīsān is a little town in the lower part of the land of Bāṣra”.

- On the east bank of the Shatt al-Arab about where the Eulceus or Djudjil (the modern Kūrān [q. v.]) joins it, Alexander the Great built a new town on the site of an older settlement, which he called Alexandrea after himself. After its restoration by one of the Seleucids, it was known as Antiocheia. When Spasines (Hypsaspines) created a kingdom of his own in Mesene-Charakene, Alexandria-Antiocheia became his capital and was known as Ḥārān Ṣawābū; under this name (Arabic Karakh Āspassinā or simply Karakh) it is mentioned in the Palmyrese inscriptions. Another refoundation of the town is ascribed to Ardashir I, hence its official designation in the Sassanian period as Astaraḵšāb Ardashir (also abbreviated to Astāḵšāb); cf. Noldeke, Gesch. d. Araber und Perser zur Zeit der Sassaniden (Leiden 1879), p. 14; Marquart, op. cit., p. 41; Herzfeld, Ist., xi. 150; Hamza al-Isfahani, op. cit., p. 47, gives the (corrupt?) form of the name Ḥārān Ardashir. The old name Karakh more exactly defined by the addition of “of Māīsān” remained in existence. The Syriac texts always write Karakh de Māīsān. There was a Nestorian bishopric here, which seems soon to have disappeared under Islam; see Sachau, op. cit., p. 49–50 and Schaedler, op. cit., p. 33. The Arabs took over the Syriac name as Karakh [q. v.] Māīsān; cf. e.g. Vāqī, iv. 207, 1. The Persian traveller Naṣīr-i Khushraw who visited the Irāk about 443 (1051) (cf. his Sefername, ed. Schefer, p. 89) mentions, besides Bāṣra, in the district of Māīsān a place called ʿAḵr Māīsān, probably an inaccurate reproduction of Karakh Māīsān. The site of Karakh Māīsān is usually sought on that of the Persian port of Muḥammarah, which has only arisen since about 1812, or at least in its immediate neighbourhood; cf. Andrews in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl., i. 1394 sq.; Drouin, op. cit., p. 7; Herzfeld in Surre-Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise, i. 251; Sachau, op. cit., p. 50; Schaedler, op. cit., p. 33. This identification does not have been absolutely certain: Karkh Māīsān is perhaps to be located farther to the north; cf. e. g. the objections of Mordtmann in S. B. Bayr. Ak., 1875, vol. ii. Suppl. Hefl, iii., p. 14. Cf. also on Alexandria-Charax Spasines-Karkh Māīsān the important article, “Alexandria” by Andreas in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl., i. 1390 sqq. and the article Charax Spasines by Weisbach, ibid., iii. 2122; Drouin, op. cit., p. 7–8; Schaedler, op. cit., p. 31 sq. On coins struck in Karkh Māīsān of the Arsakid and Sassanian periods cf. Mordtmann, Z. D. M. G., xxxiii. 126 sq. and G. F. Hill, Catalogue of Greek Coins of Arabia and Persia in the British Museum (London 1922); cf. also Mūḥammarah and also vol. ii. p. 777.

In the middle ages the most southerly town in the Irāk was ʿAbbābdān, which then lay on the coast — under the later ʿAbbābdān it was already some distant from it — and was an important harbour. Cf. above and the article ʿABBĀBDĀN.

At the beginning of the twentieth century it was still an insignificant little village. It is only since the last twenty years that it has undergone an unexpected development because of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company making it the terminus of their pipes from Shuster and Madīnā-Naftūn (cf. ii., p. 779). The oil is now pumped into tanksteamers at ʿAbbābdān; important factories, warehouses etc. have been built there. In Brém five minutes west of ʿAbbābdān proper, has developed into a flourishing town which bears the name Bīrm ʿAbbābdān or ʿAbbābdān al-Ḥadīthah = New ʿAbbābdān. On the meaning of the word brīm (a particular kind of date) cf. Lukhāt al-Arab, i. 125, 1 sq., 443; i. 502, 2, from below. In Brém are the ruins of a palace or castle said to date from the time of the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd; cf. Lukhāt al-Arab, i. 126, 9 sq. ʿAbbābdān is now next to Bāṣra-ʿAshīrān and Muḥammarah the largest and most important town in the whole of the Shatt al-Arab. On the other places on the island of ʿAbbābdān cf. Lukhāt al-Arab, i. 128, 3 sq. The island, which before the war belonged to the Shaikh of Muḥammarah who was under Persian suzerainty, was leased about 1911 by England for 99 years. On mediaeval ʿAbbābdān cf. Lukhāt al-Arab, i. 121–129; on modern ʿAbbābdān and the works of the Persian Oil Company, ibid., i. 176–184; W. Schweer, Die turk-perische, Erdzivilisations, Hamburg 1919, p. 52, 112–115.

At ʿAbbābdān close to the sea-coast there stood in the middle ages the lighthouses known as al-Khasabīb (q. v.).

As has already been pointed out, ʿAbbābdān is now over 20 miles from the sea. The most southerly place in the Irāk for about a century has been the important lighthouse and telegraph station at Fāo [q. v.], built on the shore of the Persian Gulf; on it and the district, cf. Cuinet, op. cit., iii. 268–270; Abd al-Rasāk al-Ḥasani, op. cit., p. 118; Ḥāṣīm al-Ṣaʿdī, op. cit., p. 21, 155–3 from below; cf. above and art. SHAṬT AL-ʿARAB. The Turks fortified this important strategic point (see Persian Gulf [Handbooks etc.], p. 54; Mezo-
It may be here mentioned that the Zindj, the African negro-slaves, settled in the southern Ḳafr (cf. v. 124) and i., p. 676), during their rebellion in the second half of the ninth century, built several strong places west of the Shaṭṭ al-ʿArab, which they used as bases during their struggle with the armies of the Caliph. Their main bulwark was the town of al-Mukhtara (Yāʾṣib, iv. 831, 3) on the Nahr Abu ʾl-Mashil (see above), south of Basra. Other strongholds were called al-Manṣura and al-Manṣūra. When al-Muwaffak, the brother of the Caliph al-Muʿtaḍid, undertook command of the military operations against the Zindj, he pitched his camp opposite these places on the east bank of the Shaṭṭ al-ʿArab; this camp soon grew into a considerable town, called al-Muwaʃfa ka-ya with mosques, baazars and even a mint. But when in 885 the capture of al-Mukhtara broke the power of the rebels and the dangerous servile war was over, this new foundation of al-Muwaffak seemed to have been soon abandoned again. On al-Muwaʃfa ka-ya and the three strongholds of the Zindj above mentioned cf. Weil, Geschichte des Chalīfāt, ii 456, 462, 464; Lang, Z. D. M. G., vi. 1010; A. Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, i 585; cf. Noldeke, Orientalische Skizzen (1892), p. 174–183; (= Sketches from Eastern History, p. 146 sqq.): de Goeje, Mém. sur les Conventions, Leyden 1886, p. 103.

The population of Masqin in the early centuries of Islam still had a strong admixture of Persian blood; it was therefore regarded as not quite equal to the pure blooded Arabs who were proud of the purity of their stock. We thus see why the poet al-Akhtal thinks he can most effectually insult Arabs by calling them people from the Masqin district of Arūfahd (cf. the verse in Yākūt, i 233. b. n.), i.e., by denying them to be Arabs; cf. Goldziher, Muhammad Studien, i (Halle 1884), p. 118 and cf. idem, p. 119, note 1, the quotation from the Kitāb al-Aḫūn, (xvii. 65, 31).

This naturally produced a reaction among the Masqin Arabs. The celebrated poet and historian Sahib b Ḥasan (v. c.) of Dast-i Masqin, a fanatic believer in the orthodoxy of the equality of all Muslims (Śūrā fig. i 4) on the other hand, extols the blue blood of the people of Masqin (cf. Goldziher, cf. v. 161).

The Muslim inhabitants of Masqin in the middle age as at the present day for the most part Shiʿis. The number of Jews does not seem to have been considerable before the invasion of the Arabs. At the present day there is only a considerable minority of them in Basra. The alleged tomb of Ezra in Ļurp (cf. above), a much-visited place of pilgrimage, also honoured by Christians and Muslims, is in Jewish hands.

Christianity is said, according to legend, to have reached Masqin in the first century A.D. A quite legendary person named Mām. said to be a disciple of Jesus, is regarded as the apostle of the Gospel in Central and Southern Ḳafr (cf. Dabūr, Geschichte des Islam in den Provinzien, Leipzig 1893 (H. Sch.), p. 57–58 and Streck, Islam, ii. 286 sqq. This is much is certain that this early as 410 A.D. there was a separate Nestorian ecclesiastical province with 4 dioceses; cf. Z. D. M. G. xliii. 504: Marquart, cf. cit. p. 41 and Sachau, cf. cit., p. 48–52.

The remarkable sect of the Mandaeans (the Sābīra of the Kurān, q.v.), now called Subbā, had from their early times their headquarters in southern Ṣūrā, in Masqin, especially in the swamp country. On their geographical distribution in the ninth century cf. Chwolson, Die Stadte und der Stadtsystem (St. Petersburg 1850, i. 124–125) and Euting, in Das Ausland (1876), p. 224–225. According to inquiries which I made in 1927 of Mandaeans, the number of Mandaeans in the larger towns of the Ṣūrā may be approximately estimated as follows: in 'Amāra and Ḥawīla 500 each; in Ḳafat al-Shīl and Muḥammara 500 each, in Basra 300 and in Kūna 100. The language of the Mandaeans, who represent a remnant of the original native Aramaic population of BABYLONIA, is probably identical with the Aramaic idiom which was once predominant in southern Ḳafr, the dialect of the old kingdom of Mesene-Charakene, the Mesān dialect as it is called in the Tarqum; cf. Noldeke, Mandische Grammatik (Halle 1875), xxvi and Pogonon, Inscrip. mandae. des coups de Khosraib (Paris 1898–1899), p. 15–14, 224.

On the Indian people of the Dīq (Arab. Ẓṿī) and the Zindj from East Africa, who were settled on the soil of Masqin at the end of the first (seventh) or in the third (ninth) century, see above i., p. 676 and the articles zīdī and zūfti.

As to the industries of the people of Masqin in the middle ages we need only mention the mats made here, which are praised as the best of their kind; cf. S. Frankel, Die aram. Fremdwort in Arabisch. (Leyden 1886), p. 92. The red-heds of the marshes supplied excellent material for them in enormous quantities. Even at the present day the manufacture of red-mats continues to give employment to many hands; for the people of the flat lands in southern Ṣūrā like to use long, taw-shaped huts called ζουςτα, the walls of which are made of red-matting.

The history of Masqin since the introduction of Islam practically coincides with that of the Ṣūrā, especially that of the northern part (the province of Baṣra and the Batīta); the reader may refer to the articles Ṣūrā, Baṣra and Al-A Ṣūrā. Here we will only point out that the administrative district of the Tigris belonging to Masqin was conquered by Dast-i Masqin in the year 14 (625) on this conquest of Baladāb, op. cit., p. 340–346 and Castani, Annali dell' Islam, iii. 252, 301–304 (8 6 and 81–86); vi. 108 (Index s. v. Mayān).

Al-Ma ṣūrā, the capital of Masqin, was the scene of important military happenings at the time of the Arab invasion and frequently later also. In the year 12 (633) al-Khālid and al-Muḥammad fought a great battle with the Persians at this town, the first in their invasion of the Ṣūrā. This battle is sometimes called after an adjacent canal, called al-Thīn (Yākūt, i. 937, 11). The defeated Persians are said to have lost 30,000 men in this encounter; cf. Badhāri, op. cit., i. 242 sqq. Fābarī, op. cit. v. 2026–2029; al-Maṣūdī, op. cit., iv. 209; Müller, Der Islam, i. 228; Castani, op. cita. i. 595–596 (196–200). In the fighting with the Khurjās for whom the district of Dākhṣī in Dast-i Masqin frequently served as a refuge-place, there was a desperate battle in 47 (663) in and around the town of al-Maṣūrā. These rebels were forced to retreat by the Khufans under the leadership of Ma ṣīl b. Kāfis; cf. Wellhausen, Abb.
MAISÂN — MAISIR

MAISARA, a Berber chief of the Maghrib, who rebelled against Arab authority in 122 (739/40). He belonged to the tribe of the Maghbara and the historians give him the surname of al-Hākrit "the low-born" because he was of humble origin and before his rebellion had been a water-seller in the market of al-Kairawān.

After the recall of Mīsāb b. Nuṣārī at the end of the first century A.H., rebellion began to smoulder in North Africa. 'Umar b. Abd Allāh al-Murtādī, governor of Tangier, and a grandson of ʿUkba b. Nāfī, Hābib b. Abī ʿUbaida, governor of Sūs, were inflicting grievous wrongs on the Berbers by treating them, as regards taxation, as a conquered people not converted to Islam, and by taking the fairest of their women to send as slaves to Damascus. The general Hābib having been sent from Sūs with his troops to the conquest of Sicily, his departure was the signal for insurrection. A movement on a large scale broke out; at its head the Berbers put Mażārīs al-Majghāri. With the related tribes of the Mīkhsāna and Baṛaghūwa [q.v.] Mażārīs advanced on Tangier and seized it. The Arabs tried in vain to withstand him; the governor of Spain, ʿUkba b. al-Hādījādī, had no means of the Strait to help Tangier but his efforts were in vain. It was not long before Mażārīs was dismissed and killed by his own followers but his successor Khalīd h. Ḥamīd al-Zanātī was more fortunate: at the beginning of 123 (740) he inflicted on the Arabs on the banks of the Wādī Shalīf (Chēīf) the disastrous defeat known as the "battle of the nobles" (ghawārīf). It was a defeat to be remembered in the east in order to overcome finally this general rebellion, which was not done without considerable losses.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

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

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

The word maiṣār has acquired a wider sense among the commentators and in certain traditions.
Zamakhshari gives it the same sense as kimār (q.v.). According to the tradition of the Prophet, maita, is applied also to:de: "these accursed deer are the maita of Persia (maita at'ādājam"; according to a tradition attributed to Ali it is also to be extended to backgammon and chess (presumably in so far as dice were used in these games) and according to Ibn Sirin to every practice in which there is an element of chance.

Cf. the Dictionaries, the Kanis, Djawhari, Zamakhshari, Kachṣīf, ed. Nasan Lacs, i. 350; al-Kadi, ed. Houtsma, i. 390 sqq.; Huber, Über die Maita genannte Spiel; Freytag, Einleitung, p. 170 sqq.

MAISĀN, daughter of the Kurd chief Rādāl h. Umay, h. Mutawfiq, daughter of the Caliph Yazid I. We do not know if after her marriage with Mu'āwiyah she retained the Christian religion which had been that of her family and of her tribe. A few verses are attributable to her in which she sighs for the desert and shows very slight attachment for her husband. But the attribution to Maisan of this fragment of poetry, which is in any case old, has been rightly disputed. She took a great interest in the education of her son Yazid and accompanied him to the desert of Kalb where the prince passed a part of his youth: this temporary separation from her husband gave rise to the legend of her repudiation by Mu'āwiyah. She must have died before Yazid became Caliph.

Bibliography: This is given in Lammens, L'état et la vogue du calife omeyyad Mawāṣi' (M I, O, F., iii.), p. 286–287, 305, 312–314 (II. LAMMENS).

MAISIR (MIEER) (Stk. mālīshā-Cantūra "buffalo town"). the premier Hindu State in India, is a principality in Southern India under the British protection, having an area of 29,433 square miles, between 11° 36' and 12° 2' N. and 74° 36' and 75° 36' E. Its Hindu rulers preserved their independence until the middle of the nineteenth century when Harār 'Ali [q.v.] took possession of the country. In his and his successor, Khit Sultan's (q.v.), possession until the capture of Seengapattam by the British in 1814 (1790), Maisir was then restored by Lord Wellesley to the old Hindu dynasty. The majority of the Musalmāns are Sunnis, very few being Shi'is. Of Muhammadan builders the most noteworthy are the Gumbār or Musul-din of Hādar 'Ali and Inqulāb at Gāndām and the Dāray Da'wāt, a summer palace at Seengapattam. The population at the census of 1814 was 5,806,193, of whom 3,14,414 are Musalmāns, mostly Sunnis. The capital of the principality bears the same name, Maisir. The language spoken is Canarese-Hindustani, Tamuli and Telugu.


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Bibliography:** Lane, Ar. Engl. Lexicon, s. v.; the books of Ḥanīf and Fikr; Wensinck, Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition, s. v.; Jyunboll, Handleding tot de kennis van de Muhammedanske Wet, p. 165 sq. (J. Schachter)

**MAIYĀFĀRĪKĪN,** a town in the north-east of Diyarbak̄r [s. v.]. The other Muhammadan forms of the name are Mafrākin, Mafrākin, Fārīk (whence the name of origin al-Fārīk) etc. The town is called in Greek Mattyropolis, in Syriac Mpherkeš, in Armenian Nplarkt (later Mharkin, Muphargin). According to Yākūt, iv. 702, the old name of the town was Madur-šāla (read šāla < *matur-khalakk* in Armenian, "town of the martyrs"). On the identification of Tigranocerta with Maiyāfārīkīn see below.
Geography. The town lies to the south of the little range of the Ḥazrū which rises like the first tier of the amphitheatres of the mountains, the higher parts of which consist of the summits (Māshih, Antōk) rising to the south of Mūsā and separating the course of the eastern Esphates (Māshih) from those of the Tigris and the left bank tributaries.

Māyāfārīkīn lies 25 miles north of the Tigris and 12 west of the Bātān-šu. It is watered by a little river (now called the Fārkhān-su) which flows into the Bātān-šu 12 miles to the south-east, an important left bank tributary of the Tigris which drains the wild and mountainous country south of Mūsā (the cantons of Kūlp and Sāṣān). The old names of the Bātān-šu are Nīcyphoros (Roman period), correspondent, Byzantine period, Synnax, ques and Qasdanā, a word of Aramaic origin preserved throughout Persia and explained as “ruler of horses”; Armen. Geogr. of the seventh century, Marquart, Lāntāfīr, p. 161, Armenia Khatut and perhaps Manushel (Faustus of Byzantium). Some of these identifications, as we shall see, are still uncertain.

Māyāfārīkīn was the meeting-place of a number of roads from the north following the different streams which go to form the Bātān-šu: 1. Calshīshīr on the Manas-šu-Bīr Tārānisp-Ludde-Bīshār-Māyāfārīkīn; 2. Māsh-Kūlp-Fāsār-Māyāfārīkīn; 3. Māsh-Khūp-Lunqu (viz., Sāṣān)-Māyāfārīkīn. Routes 3 and 4 passing Sāṣān are still little known. The distance between Dīyarbakr and Māyāfārīkīn is about 15 miles. The old road Dīyarbakr-Brītin, which used to run through Māyāfārīkīn, runs further south and crosses the Bātān-šu south of Bātīn (Dīyarbakr-Mūnān-Zok-Westphān-Brītin).

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

Ancient History. The mountains to the north of Māyāfārīkīn have long sheltered the remains of ancient aboriginal peoples. About 600 D. G. Georgius Zypiris (ed. Fürer, p. 48), mentions the Khordacan and Samsamouta there who gave their names to the districts of Khoit and Šāpān. Marquart (1916) supposes that these are elements of the aboriginal language in names like Māshih-ij and Manushel, which are, he says, formed with the root “sak-sak-i-sač” (sak-sakec) prefixed. According to tradition (Yākū, iv, 703), the founder of Martyropolis, Marthāk b. Layātī, was the son of a woman of the mountains, and Marquart sees in it a mutilated form of the name of the *pāšā* Layātī (Hausd. Interv., 1915, p. 96; 1916, p. 126). The Marwând Abi Naṣr was married to the daughter of Sinkhārī, lord of the Shāmānā, cf. Amnodor, in J.K.A.S., 1905, 234-235; 1905-1906, 1906-

Tigranocerta = Māyāfārīkīn(5). As early as 1838 von Moltke had suggested that Māyāfārīkīn was the ancient Tigranocerta i.e. the new capital funded by Tigran II about 80 B.C., which was taken by Lucullus after the victory won on the banks of the Niphphoros (Oct. 6, 69 B.C.) and again in the reign of Nero by the legate Corbulo (c. 63 A.D.); it is regularly mentioned down to the middle of the fourth century A.D. Other scholars had sought Tigranocerta at świrt (‘Alvanyi), Arzan (H. Kiepert, 1875), near Nej-Jepm (Jepm Kiepert 1875), and Tell-Mashal west of Nisībin (E. Sachau; cf. Duhassar etc. Late Armenian tradition gives the name Tigranocerta to Dīyarbakr. Moltke’s idea was taken up vigorously by Lehmann-Haupt and W. Belecke, after their expedition to Armenia in 1895-99.

On the north wall of Māyāfārīkīn is a mutilated Greek inscription. It was deciphered and published by Lehmann-Haupt, who attributes it to the Armenian King Pap (369-374), which is quite in keeping with the known facts of the reign of this monarch. In spite of his criticism of the details of Lehmann-Haupt’s hypothesis, Marquart (1916) has rather corroborated him by bringing forward new considerations.

In view of the many contradictions found in the classical sources regarding Tigranocerta the question comes to be, if Māyāfārīkīn is not Tigranocerta, what other unknown town existed here in the time of Pap, unless the stones on which the inscription is engraved and which are now hopelessly disarranged (“in heilloser Verwirrung”) were brought from another place when Martypopolis was being built?

The main objection to the identification of Tigranocerta with Māyāfārīkīn is that, according to Eutropius, vi. 9; and Faustus, v. 24, Tigranocerta was in Arzane (Aţdznikh); on the other hand the river Mamushel seems to have formed in the fourth century the western frontier of this latter province. From this fact (Huschens, Die altarm. Ortsnamen. Indigem. Forsch., 1904, p. 473-475), it seems that Tigranocerta ought to be placed east of the Bātān-šu if this river is identical with the Mamushel. This last name was connected by Marquart with the name al-Musuliyat, which Mākaddas, p. 144, gives to one of the tributaries of the Tigris (on the left bank) and apparently corresponding to the Bātān-šu. (A district of Musuliyat (?) still exists farther east on the upper course of the Bīldis-tai, in the area of the ancient possessions of the Bagh Mūshālī; cf. Kīrāwī, in Yākū, ii, 531-532).

To reconcile the statements of Faustus, v. 24 and 27, with the position of Māyāfārīkīn (12 miles W. of the Bātān-šu), Marquart proposes to identify the Mamushel = Niphphoros with the Fārkhān-su while the Musuliyat would be applied to the whole system of the Bātān-šu (Niphphoros, Sāṣānā etc.). The insignificance of the Fārkhān-su, which rises in the hills about 3 miles north of Māyāfārīkīn (Ilī al-‘Arāk calls its source Ra’s al-‘Ain; the Ḥākān-muṣi, p. 137: ‘Ain al-Ḥaww') and does not suit the description of the hermitage of Māmbrē, which, according to Faustus, must have been on the right bank, makes Marquart’s hypothesis less attractive. If finally we consider the position of Māyāfārīkīn from the point of view of the interests of Tigranes, one is forced to admit that against an enemy coming from the west (Lucullus!) Tigranocerta = Māyāfārīkīn was devoid of natural defenses, while in the event of an enemy coming from the east it ran the risk of being easily cut off from Armenia on the main road from Bītin (the ancient Klastra Bāzārāt, cf. Tomasek,
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Maiyafarikin = Martyropolis. The identity of these two towns is quite certain. The Christian sources (Syriac, Armenian and Greek) referring to the foundation of Martyropolis are numerous. A Syriac “history” (tas'îthâ) kept in the Jacobite church of Maiyafarikin was translated for the historian of the town, Ibn al-Azraq, and is given in a synopsis in Yakût, iv. 703—707 and Kaşwînî, ii. 370—380 (transl. with notes in Marquart, Handes Ansorva, 1916, p. 125—135).

One of the sites spoken of is a “large village” (karşy 'axima) by the bishop Maruthâ (Mār Marûthâ) who had obtained two thousand tosphûhies from Persia to do so. This ecclesiastical frontier was drawn between c. 383 and 420 (on the sources for his biography cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 91—92, 125). The town of Martyropolis to which Marûthâ brought the remains of the Christian martyrs of Persia is mentioned for the first time in 410. The etymology of the Syriac name Mêphrêkêz is uncertain (cf. above). In Armenian the town is mentioned for the first time in the Geography of the vii century as Nphrêk (once Nphrêt).

By the peace of 297 with Diocletian, the province of Sophanêne, within which Martyropolis lay, had become part of the Roman empire. Even a small portion of the town (Vâzandâr) and Sophanêne remained to the Emperor. Under Theodosius II (401—450), the new town, situated quite near the frontier, acquired considerable importance and became the capital of Sophanêne (= Great Tospkhê). The town was still insufficiently fortified and in 502 the Sâşânîan Kâwadh b. Fêzô seized and carried the inhabitants off to Khüsânân where he founded for them the town of Abâz-Kobâd (Yâkût, iv. 707) (Weh-Amîdî-Kâwadh = Arrâdân; cf. Marquart, Erânîahr, p. 41, 307).

Anastasius began the fortification of Martyropolis but Justinian, after his accession (527), was the first to reorganise completely the eastern frontier between Dûrî and Trebizonî. Martyropolis, the headquarters of a commander under the strategos of Theodosiopolis (Erzûrûm), became one of the most important military centres. Procopius, De aedificiis, iii., gives a complete description of the walls of the town, the height and thickness of which were doubled and a full account of the system of defences (outer walls, advanced forts etc.); cf. Adontz, op. cit., p. 10—12, 140—142. In 589 the town fell into the hands of the Sâşânîans but in 591 came back to the Byzantines in return for the support given by the Emperor Maurice to Khusraw II. Heraclius held it till the year 18 = 626 (Yâkût, l.c.). [The date is not given in Murât, Chronogr. byz., i.]

The vicissitudes of Martyropolis probably explain the fact that in the Armenian Geography of the seventh century (ed. Patkanow, transl., p. 45; Marquart, Erânîahr, p. 18 and 161) the Persian province of 'Abdûnîkh (Arzananê) is separated from Tospkhê (Sophanêne) by the line of the Khaîrî (= Bûsma-'su) while in the description of parts of Armenia Nphrêt (= Nphrêk) figures as one of the 10 cantons of Arzanêne.

Christian legend as preserved by Ibn Azrâq and Yakût gives very full details of the building of the town in the time of Mâr Marûthâ: the arches (tikân) of the walls in which the remains of the martyrs were placed, the eight gates of the town, the names of which are carefully recorded in the convenant of SS. Peter and Paul, the buildings erected by the three ministers of the Byzantine emperor, each of whom built a tower and a church. There is still to be seen in Maiyafarikin the ruins of a magnificent basilica and of the Church of the Virgin (al-'Ahrâr). Miss Gertrude L. Bell, who has studied these monuments, dates the basilica “not much later than the beginning of the fifth century”, and suggests that the Church of the Virgin was one of the two built by Khüsraw II in recognition of the assistance lent by Maurice; cf. Abu 'l-Faradî, Muhâzîsî, ed. Pocock, p. 98.

Under Yâlâmîn in 640 the caliph 'Umar, Maiyafarikin was taken by 'Ayyûd b. Ghâmân without a blow being struck (Balâdûrî, p. 175—6) and henceforth shared the lot of Diyarbakr.

The intermediate character of the position occupied by Maiyafarîk in puzzled Arab geographers. Ibn Rusta, p. 106, puts the town in Diyarzîr while the others (Ibn Hawkal, p. 246) regard it as belonging to Armenia. According to these authors, Maiyafarîk was a little fortified town having an unhealthy climate on account of the stagnant water but not without its amenities (Yâkût, p. 76; Ibn Hawkal, p. 131, 151, 153; Mukhâsîsî, p. 54). The region (yâru-vec-ğulâ) of Maiyafarîk in Arzan in the time of Ibn Hawkal was however entirely depopulated.

The Hatams and the Buyids. Maiyafarîk formed part of the territory of the Hamdânids [q.v.] (317—394). They built a castle (karâ) near the gate Bâb al-Fârâb wa-l-Ghâmân (Yâkût); its ruins are apparently mentioned by Ewhâlî (1655), iv. 71—4 under the name Sa'îf al-Dawla Sarâyî. The Bâb al-Maldân gate also dates from Sa'îf al-Dawla (333—350). This prince was buried at Maiyafarîk; cf. Yâkût-nûmâ, p. 437. In 352, Nâjû, a client of the Hamdânîs, rebelled in Maiyafarîk. In 362 (July 4, 973) Hîlal Allâh b. Nâjîr al-Dawla defeated the Byzantines in the vicinity of the town.

In 367 (978) the Buyûd 'Aqûd al-Dawla dispossessed the Hamdânids who had supported his cousin Bakhtiyâr and in 368 Abu 'l-Wâfî, a general of 'Aqûd al-Dawla, took Maiyafarîk (Ibn Miskawî, ed. Amedroz, ii. 199, 266, 312, 384).

The Marwânî dynasty. After the death of 'Aqûd al-Dawla (374), Maiyafarîk and the rest of Diyarbâkî fell into the power of the Kurd Bâdh [cf. Kûrsi and Marwânîs] who had the Dailami garrison of Maiyafarîk massacred and was able to defend what he held against the Buyûd Samûm al-Dawla and the sons of Nâjîr al-Dawla, who had meanwhile returned to Mâsûl. After the death of Bâdh, his nephew, Abu 'Ali Hasan b. Marwân, established himself in Maiyafarîk and for a century this town remained the capital of the Marwânî dynasty (380—479 and again in 486). In 384 the governor Mâmâ, appointed by Abu 'Ali, succeeded in checking the turbulence of the inhabitants who had been incited by Hamdânî intrigues. There is an inscription of Mumâhid
al-Dawla dated 391 (1000) on the wall of the town. In 392 an Alid pretendor again stirred up trouble in Mayafarikin. In 401 after the assassination of Munahhid al-Dawla, his murderer Sharwa, son of Mamun, with the help of his Georgian guards seized Mayafarikin but Safid Abi Nasr came from Arzan and began his long and brilliant reign (401-453).

A fine castle decorated with gilding was built in 403 on the little hill on which stood the convent church of the Virgin. This Christian sanctuary (the connection of which with the al-Thirra church is not quite clear, cf. above) was transferred to the Melkite church. Later were built a hospital, a mosque with a clock (bantnam < Pers. pingein) and baths. Water was led to all the town from the spring of Ra’s al-Ain. A palace was built on the banks of the Sattadama (Batman-su) and the water was raised to it from the river by a noria. A bridge spanned the river Haww (Harroz).

A wall bequeathed by Shalsh Abi Nasr al-Manazi endowed the mosque (i) of Mayafarikin with a library. A fort was built to protect the town against the Sassanids (people of al-Saqin).

In 410 from Ibn al-Asraik is supplemented by the statements of Nasir-i Khujraw, who visited the town under Abi Nasr on the 6th Djamal 438. The Persian traveller speaks of its walls, built of huge blocks of white stone (Ibn Maskwaih, iv. 354: "strong walls of black stone"); Lehmann-Haupt: "gelblichweisser Kalkstein"). The western gate all of iron, the Friday mosque, the water-channel passing before each home (one uncovered with drinking water and the other covered serving as a sewer) Outside the town were the caravanserais, the hot baths, and a second Friday mosque. To the north of the town was the suburb of Muhdahna also with a Friday mosque and baths. A distance of 4 farshak from the town (on the bank of the Sattadama) was a new little town called Niywa built by the emir then reigning.

After the death of Abi Nasr, who was buried in the town, the Salijsiks began to interfere in the affairs of Mayafarikin. In 458 Sallar Khorasanii sent by Tughluq arrived before the town with 5,000 horsemen. In 463 it was visited by the celebrated Nasim al-Mulk. In 478 by orders of Malik Shah the former viceroy of the Marwands, Ibn Ushir, besieged the capital of his masters, which surrendered in Djamal 1478. The treasures of the Marwands valued at 1,000,000 dinars were carried off by Ibn Ushir. In 482, Amid-al-Dawla, son of Ibn Ushir, was appointed governor of Mayafarikin. After the death of Malik Shah (485), the Marwand Nasiyl al-Dawla succeeded in re-entering Mayafarikin but the Salijsik Tutush, of Syria took the town in Rabii 1 480; cf. Ibn Asraik in Amedroz. J. R. A. S. 1903. In 532 (Ibn al-Asraik, iv. 43) the last representatives of the Marwand family disappeared from the neighbourhood of Mayafarikin.

The Ortskids and Aiyubits. In 575 (1212) the Salijsik Sultan Mahmud added to the possessions of Il-Ghazi, founder of the line of Ortskids of Mardin, theief of Mayafarikin, to which Il-Ghazi appointed his son Sulaiman (516-518); cf. Abu’l Fadili, ed. Pocek, p. 240 and Kaim Farid, Mardin Miaski-i Ortskiz (Artucius) Turzikiz (written in 944=1537), ed. Ali Emiri Efendi (Constantinople 1331, p. 20). Six successive Ortskids ruled Mayafarikin till 580 (1184). In 587 (1191) the last Ortzikid Yuluq Arslan again seized the town and held it for a time.

In 581 the Aiyubits had become masters of Mayafarikin and held it till 658 (1260). Safid al-Din built a mosque there for which the columns of the Byzantine basilica were used (Gertrude L. Bell, op. cit., Pl. xi). Mayafarikin had a mint under the Artukids: the coins which they struck (dated 591, 599, 600, 612, 618) bear curious human figures which are portraits or symbolical personages (Ghilâd Bâshem, Catalogue des monnaies turcomans etc., Constantinople 1804, p. 140—67; S. Lane-Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. iv., p. 255; see vol. iii., p. 24 for a Marwânid coin of this mint). On the walls of the town are inscriptions of the following Aiyubits: Awhad Nasim al-Din Aiyub (of 600 A.D.), Malik Azharf Mina (607—617), Malik Muayyaf Ghaâzi (623), Malik Kâmil Meshaham (654). A complete list of rulers at Mayafarikin from 515 to 658 prepared by van Bechem is given in the appendix to Lehmann-Haupt, Matérielien, p. 134.

The Mongols. In 639 (1241) the Aiyubit Shihâb al-Din Ghaiz received the summons from the Mongol Khân to submit and raise the walls of the town but gave an evasive answer. In 650 (1252) the Mongols pillaged the country round Mayafarikin. During Hûmây’s expedition to Syria in 658 (1260) the army of the prince Yâsîmbeseg Mayafarikin which was defended with great bravery by Malik al-Kamîl. The blockade produced a terrible famine in the town which was forced to surrender. Only 70 of the defenders survived. Kamîl was put to death in cruel fashion and his head carried on the point of a lance through the streets of Damascus (Rashid al-Din ed. Quatremère, p. 339—331, 350—375; d’Hollon, Histoire des Mongols, ii. 354). Before his death, in 662 (1264), Hülgû gave the district of Diyarbakr to his general Tûdân (cf. suluq). Three years later, Ahaqà allotted Mayafarikin to his father’s widow, Kuta-yâ-Hezân. Mayafarikin later lost its independence and henceforth shared the lot of Diyarbakr [q. v.].

In 796 during Timur’s stay at Mardin, a number of Maliks including those of Arzin (izî) and Batman came to pay him homage but the zafer-nama (i. 665) does not mention the lord of Mayafarikin. After the conquest of Diyarbakir, Timur on his way to Mûsh took the road via Mayafarikin (ibid., i. 685) and Sîwûsî (the name of a summit in al-Saân east of al-Antok). This march is the only example of a considerable force following the direct road Mayafarikin-Mûsh.

The Safawids and the Ottomans. Our information about the rule of the Turkoman dynasties (Kara-Koyunu and Ak-Koyunu in the region of Diyarbakir is very deficient. In pursuit of his campaign against the last Ak-Koyunu Murad, Shah Ismail I Safawi in 915 occupied all the region of Diyarbakir, the government of which was entrusted to Kânû Muhammad Usjoy (Shanjin, i. 405; ‘Amin-ir-ras, p. 23—25). The defeat at Cârdkàn produced rising pressures against the Persians throughout Kurdistan. The Kurd chief Sâyîd Ahmad Beg Rûzâeki seized Mayafarikin and Ata’k (Hattâk, cf. the Katir Atrachs of Georgius Cyprius). Mayafarikin passed definitely under Ottoman rule after the battle (921) of Koc-Qudr (south of Mardin) in which the Persian general Kara-Kân was defeated (von Hammer, G.O.R.P, i. 731—741).
In 1529 Maiyafarikin was visited by the Portuguese Jesuit Tenreiro, who found there "many monuments with inscriptions and Greek characters. On the walls were images of the apostles and other saints painted in gold and in brilliant colours... The town was almost deserted".

The Sulaimání Kurds. While the events above described affecting a wider area were going on, the power of the local Kurd chiefs was gradually growing. At the end of the 19th century we find the whole valley of the Baţmân-šu reunited under the rule of the Sulaimání chiefs, one branch of whom was established at Maiyafarikin and the other at Kûl (Şaraf-nûmâ, i. 261—271; cf. below, p. 1144 sqq.). In 1828 von Mohl found the town full of ruins, evidence of the recent conquest of this part of Kurdistan by the Turks. The Kurds however kept the de facto power down to the beginning of the 20th century (cf. Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, i. 394, 419). The name Silwân which in the local administrative language finally eclipsed the old Maiyafarikin, can only be a kind of development of the name Sulaimání > Silwâni (in Turkish Silwân); cf. Pers. miyâhân (from miyân) > Kurd. miwân.

In 1891 (Cuinet) there were in the kaďâ of Silwân 363 villages with 25,217 inhabitants of whom 18,500 were Musulmans and 6,177 Christians (Armenians and Jacobites). The town had 1,456 houses with 7,000 inhabitants (half Musulmans and half Christians).


For the Byzantine period the works quoted by Marquart and Lehmann-Haupt; Chapo, "La frontière de l'Empire de Péompie à la conquête arabe," Paris 1907, p. 359—360; Adonts, "Armenia v epohu lustiniâna," St. Petersburg 1908, index (complete geographical and political study of Armenia in the ivth century); Miss G. L. Bell, "Churches and monasteries of the Taur-Abkin and neighbourhood districts," Zeitschr. f. Gesc. u. Architektur, Heft 9, Heidelberg 1913, p. 86—92, plates xi. (mosque of Saladin), xii—xiv. (basilica), xv—xix. and xxvii. 1 (al-Aslaha) for the Muslim period; the general sources quoted in the text and Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 111—112. The special history of the town is Târîkhê Maiyafarîkîn written in Arabic in 572 by Aḥmad b. Yūsuf b. 'Ali Ibn al-Asrâk al-Fârîkî, unique MS. Brit. Mus., Or. 5803 (fragment of an older version in Or. 6310). The history of Ibn al-Asrâk is quoted and completed in vol. ii. of al-Atâ'îk al-šâfîrî fi 'Dîrār Ǧumâ'î al-Shâm wa 'l-Djâzîra (Bodleiana Marsh 333, Catalogue i., No. 945) by 'Izz al-Dîn b. Shâdhâd al-Halabi. The publication of the histories of Ibn al-Asrâk and Ibn Shaddâd is proposed by the G. M. S. The data in Ibn al-Asrâk (and part of Ibn Shaddâd) have been excellently summarised by Amedroz in the articles; Three Arabic MSS. on the History of the city of Mayyafariqin, in J.R.A.S., 1902, p. 784—812; Marwanid dynasty at Mayyafariqin, J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 123—154; Notes on two articles on Mayyafariqin (remarks by Marquart), J.R.A.S., 1909, 176—176. The epigraphical materials of the German expedition of 1898—1899 have been studied by M. van Berchem, "Arabische Inschriften aus Armenien u. Diyarbekr," in Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien z. älteren Geschichts Armeniens und Mesopotamien, Abh. G. W. Göttingen, N.F., ix., No. 8, 1898—1899. The material is excellently published by W. Belecke, Three of the mosque of Aûdâshûr, Parts I—II, 1921, 325—375 with an excellent study by the editor on Maiyafarîkîn; Hâjjî Shâhîlî, Liḫîh-nûmâ, p. 437; Ewilâyî Čelebi, Siyâṣatnâmê, iv. 71—74 (interesting details); A Tenreiro, 1529, Itinerario do Indica, Coimbra 1560 (second edition 1762); Biflîs—Haxî—"Monfarquîm"; Molbi, Briefe über Zustände ... in d. Türkî, ed. Kiepert, Berlin 1841, 287; The river ("ein reicher Fluss ... der in schonen Windungen durch die Ebene dem Tiris zuwächst") of which Molbi speaks seems to correspond to the Büta, and to the Lûmân as Ritter, Erdbuende, u. 79—95 takes it be; Taylor, Travels in Kurdistan, J.R.S.C., 1865, p. 21—58 (this article is very important); Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1891, i. 470—472 (kaďâ of Silwân); Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, cf. above; Flury, Islam. Schriftenbd., Paris 1921, 44—48 (inscription of Saladin at Maiyafarîkîn) with two plates. (V. MINORSKI)

MAKALLA. [See MUKALLA.]

MAKHĀM (a.), a variety of Arabic prose of a highly elaborate and artificial nature.

Makâmā in the old language was the name for the assembly of the tribes, synonymous with nadv (e.g. Lebûl, Dîwân, No. 46, 10; Salûm b. Djan- 

Dîwân, i. 4. = Maybûnîyâtât, ed. Thorbecke, No. 20, 50, ed. Lyall, No. 122, 4; Hamûn, p. 95, v. i. etc.; so also Hamadânî, Mak. 19, 5 [Stamb. = 44 u. Bair]), hence the word was next applied to gatherings at which the Omayyad and early 'Abbasid caliphs received pious men in order to hear edifying discourses from them, as Hîshâm for example did with Khaîlî b. Saľîm (Xâlîd al- 

Aţâî, ii. 35.1—35.17 sqq.): Ibn Kûtâlib gives an account of it in the chapter Makâmât (the

Sing. appears as Makâm in the separate headings) al-Zâhid ʿinda 'l-Ḫulâfa' wa 'l-Mulûk in the K. al-Zâhid, 6 of the K. ʿEyûn al-Akhdâr (cod.
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Kops. 1344, fol. 212v—213v), upon which Ibn Ḥādī al-Kāmil in Ḥāz al-Farād (Cairo 1395), 1-286 sqq. and al-Ṭurjūṭī, Ibrāhīm al-Makāma (Būhār, 1388), p. 32 sqq. have again drawn. The word then came to have the more general meaning of lecture, e.g. in Maṣūfī, Muhammad al-Dhahabī, ed. (Paris), v. 421, and perhaps also Dājīhī, K. al-
Fakhrī, p. 218, where it appears along with poetry, proverbs, and tales of battles as an essential element in Arab education. In the third century A.H., however, the word began to sink from this higher sphere; it became the name for a beggar's appeal, which had to be framed in carefully chosen language, the more the literary training of the ādīb, once a privilege of court circles, became disseminated among the people; an example of these appeals is preserved by Dājīhī in Bāhārī, K. al-Makāma, n. 2, Makāmat (ed. Schwally), p. 633 sqq. The appeals of beggars seem to have paved the way for the literary genre proper (cf. A. Mez., Mu 'l-Kūsim, p. xxii/xxiv). This owed its existence to Hamadānī [q.v.]. He created a typical representative of this literary Bohemianism to which he himself belonged, which entered upon the inheritance of the ḥiṣīl poets of the early days of Islam, like al-Ḥuṣaynī. The very witty execution of the constantly changing part of his hero Abū l-Fath al-Islāmī and from the point of view of form the adoption for his tales of rhymed prose, which was already beginning to dominate the finer style of letter-writing, are the two special characteristics of Hamadānī's work. To the hero himself he gives a foil in the person of a narrator, al-Ḥamadhānī, who sometimes takes the role of a trickster, as in maqāmī 12. In the 7th abo—also one of the poorest by the way—, in which a certain Ḥ司马 b. ʿAbd al-Faqīr records a meeting with Faraḍāk b. Ṣaīf the not very creditable to Dhu l-Rumma, the principal hero takes no part. Six of these stories are only intended to glorify his patron, Kaysī b. ʿAbd Allāh ruler of Sidjistan, to whom as Margoliouth supposes (cf. Hamadānī) the whole collection was dedicated. Sometimes he only uses the maqāmī form to give expression to his own views on literary questions, as, for example, in the first on ancient and modern poets, in the fourteenth on the structures of prose, al-Lajjāh and Ibn al-Mukaffa; in the 25th maqāmī, another in which al-Islāmī does not appear, he puts his polemic against the Mutāzilīs in the mouth of a madman. He does not always make al-Islāmī appear as a rogue but in the 42nd maqāmī he displays a knowledge of the world which is quite incometune of guile. N. 26 (ṣūrī, lacking in the Barīt edition) and 31 (the ḥuṣaynī, incomplete in the Barīt edition) contain specimens of erotic jargon and cant-language: of purely lexicographical interest is maqāmī 30, edited and translated by Aḥmad b. Ṣādiq al-Farāsī, who deals with a competition instituted by Saif al-Dawla for the best description of a horse. The 1st (N. 52 in the Barīt edition) is of quite another character and has only the rhymed prose in common with the maqāmī proper: it is on this account classed with nine other anecdotes as maqāmāt in the Stambol edition and put in an appendix.

Ibn Ḥarīrī's statement quoted above, s.v. Ḥamadānī, that al-Hamadānī got the idea from Ibn Dunayr, al-Farādī true cannot be ascertained as this work has not survived. In any case he is entitled to the credit of having created a new literary form, which might have proved very fertile in Arabic literature which is not exactly rich in forms. It is perhaps impossible to appreciate his talent fully if we may believe the tradition that the 51 specimens that have survived to us and which were apparently all that were known to al-Ḥarīrī represent only about an eighth of his whole output. His contemporaries and immediate successors were however not able to follow him on the path he had indicated. One only of his contemporaries, the court poet of Saif al-Dawla Abū Naṣr ʿAbd al-Azīz, b. ʿUmar al-Saʿdī († 939), has left us a maqāmī (Aḥlwardt, Verz. der ar. Humschr. Berlin, in N. 8536). Not till a century later do Ibn Naṣīrī and al-Ḥarīrī again take up the form created by him. The former (Abū l-Kāsim ʿAbd Allāh or ʿAbd al-Bākī Muhammad b. Ḥusain, b. 15th Dhu l-ʿKhādī 410 [March 14, 1020] in Baghdād, d. 4 Muḥarram 485 [Feb. 15, 1092]), of whose other poetical and philological work nothing has come down to us, does not keep strictly to the model created by al-Hamadānī in the nine maqāmāt preserved in a Stambol MS. (Fāṭih 4097; M. Ov., vii. 112) in as much as he does not have one hero all through and also introduces various persons as narrators, but the main point is the polished form, in which he tells his otherwise not remarkable stories (cf. Ch. Huart, Les stances d'Ibn Naṣīrī, F. A., ser. 10, vol. XII, 1908, p. 435—454, and the edition by O. Rescher, in Beiträge zur Morgenländischen Literatur, Heft 4, Stambol 1914, S. 123—153). It is not till Harīnī [q. v.] that the form appears in its fullness, and the latter at the same time considerably limited its subject matter in as much as he makes the anecdotes recorded by al-Ḥarīrī b. Hamānām centre round a hero. Abī Zādī of ʿAlībī, and relates the adventures of this Bohemian, whose wit is never at a loss and who is able to meet all difficulties, in a style sparkling with wit and full of all the tricks of language. That he owed the stimulus to his work to an encounter with an actual vagabond may be legend; al-Sabīt, Tābaqat al-Shabiyya, iv. 296, v. and Ibn Taghribīdī, ili. 23, 2 sqq. say he was a Baghdad Ṣaḥāḥār (Ibn Taghribīdī says al-Muṣaffā) b. Sallār (cf. C. Dumas, Le héroï des maganistit de Harīnī, Abū Zāid de ʿṢarūd, Algiers 1917). The story at least may be quite true that the maqāmāt al-Harīnīya said to be inspired by this meeting was the first from his pen. In any case Harīnī's tricks of rhetoric (cf. the analysis in C. Baudr., Études sur les stances de H., Paris 1923) so overshadowed his subject matter in the eyes of later generations that henceforth the form became the essential characteristic of the literary genre, and it could be used to clothe the very varied subject matter. Al-Ghazzālī (d. 505 = 1111) and ʿAbd al-Kartīm al-Samānī (d. 562 = 1167) in their maḥzanat al-ʿUlamāʾ bihā yadai al-Ḥushābī wa ʿUmarī (Aḥlwardt, Pers. der Hs. Berlin, in N. 8537, 4) and maḥzanat al-ʿUlamāʾ bihā yadai al-ʿUmarī (Ḥalidji Khalifa, N. 12702) attempt to go back to the older form. But the Spanish poet Abū l-Tāhir Muhammad b. ʿUṣuf al-Shakartukī (d. 538 = 1143 in Cordova) seems to have come nearer to Harīnī in his al-Ḥamadānī al-Sarashīfīyā (in Stambol, Lallé, no. 1928, 1933). He also set himself the classical number of 50. Al-Zamakhshārī (d. 538 = 1143) on the other hand disclaims any
such affinity; his makāmas are simply moral ad-
monitions and their like counterparts, the Nawâdghā
al-Kāmil and the Awwāl al-Dhahâb, are intended to
be appreciated mainly as tours-de-force of rhetoric
(cf. the editions, printed Cairo 1310, 1325, and the
translation by Rescher in, Beiträge zur Maqâm-
literatur, Heft 6, Grieswald 1913). Whether the
Maqâmât al-Sūfīya of Shihâb al-Dîn al-Suhrawardi
(d. 587 = 1191), which deal with mystical terminology
(s. Cat. of MSS. Brit. Mus., No. 1349, 23), belong
to this class at all is doubtful. On the other hand the
Maqâmât al-Dhâwiyâs fi l-Ma‘ânî al-‘auwîsîya
(Leyden, No. 426, Cambridge, No. 1098, Escurial,
Dèrobgen, No. 542), which the author Ibn al-
Djawi (d. 597 = 1200) himself provided with a
lexicographical commentary, are certainly modelled
of those of Hariri. The al-Ma‘âmût at-Mašîhîya
of the Christian physician Abu l-Abâbâ Yaḥyâ
b. Sa‘îd b. Mârî (d. 598 = 1193; see Ibn al-Khîjî,
p. 361, 4) definitely profess to be a single imitation
of the latter. They have a hero and a narrator but
the subject matter is varied, usually of a learned and
technical nature (cf. Flügel, Verz. der Hess.
Wien, No. 384). To the end of the sixth century
A. H. seems to belong Abu l-‘Alâ‘ Aḥmad b. Abî
Bakr b. Ahmad al-Râzî al-Hanâfî who dedicated
30 makāmas to the chief kâfî Muḥî al-Dîn Abî
Hâmid Muḥâammad b. Muḥâammad b. al-Kâsim
al-Šahrâzûrî (not the same as mentioned in Ibn
Khallîkân, Bulâk 1299, i. 597). The only indication
of his date is the mention of the Kâ-
ßân of Shirûn (51, 7); this title was first borne by
His aim is to imitate Harîn but his language
is different. Like them he introduces his hero and a narrator and is fond
of elaborate descriptions, frequently dropping into
the obscene; a number of the makāmas go together
in pairs, the one being complementary to the other
(cf. the edition in O. Rescher, Beiträge zur Maqâm-
literatur, Heft 4, p. 1 – 115). Of the viiîth
century A. H. we only need mention an imitation of
Harîrî’s makāmas, 50 in number, dedicated to the
family of Djûwânî (cf. his Tarîkh al-Ǧûbûngûşûd, ed.
Mîrzâ Muḥâammad, G. M. S., xvi/1, ii, note 2)
by Śâhs al-Dîn Ma‘âdî (Muḥâammad) b. Nayr
Allâh b. al-Śâqîl in 672 (1273) (s. Hâdîkît al-Ḫalîfâ,
No. 12709) entitled al-Ma‘âmût al-Zainâbîyya (s.
Brit. Mus., No. 669, 1403, Istanbul, Nûr-‘î-Ǧûngînîyya,
No. 4273). The Syrian Egyptian poet Muḥâammad b.
‘Affîd al-Dîn al-Ṭîlimânsî al-Šâḥîb al-Zârîf († 688 =
1289) applied the form in the field of love-poetry,
sometimes with lascivious subjects (Maqâmât al-
Uthkâš, Paris, No. 3947; Fâqîhât al-Masâ‘î fi Ma‘âmût al-Ma‘âmûk and al-Ma‘âmû al-Hîtîyya wa
l-Širâşîyya, Alhwardt, Verz. Hess. Berlin, No. 8594,
4, 5). These imitations become more numerous in
the viiith century. In 730 (1329) Aḥmad b.
Muḥâammad b. al-Mu‘âṣar al-Râzî composed al-
Maqâmât al-tâhârû tâhâra (pr. Tunis 1303, Les
by M. Sollalm al-Ḥarârî, Paris 1282 (1855)).
The following were used for religious subjects, e. g. by Abu l-Fath Muḥâammad b. Saiyîd al-‘Arîf († 734 = 1334) in praise of the Prophet and his companions in al-Ma‘âmût at-alîyya wa l-
Karâmât al-‘afîyya (s. Rosen, Notices sommaires
des ms. ar. du Musée Asiatique, St. Petersburg
1881, No. 146, 10), for mysticism by Śâhs al-Dîn
Muḥâammad b. Ibrâhîm al-Dînâshûk († 727 = 1327)
in al-Ma‘âmût at-alîyya wa l-Târdîyât al-
Finally the metropolitan of Nisibī 'Abdīshāh (Ebedeyshēh) who died in 1318, composed in 1290—91 on Hariri's model 50 Syriac poems, religious and edifying in their subject matter in two parts, called after Enoc and Elias, the artificial language of which he himself elucidated in a commentary in 1316 (the first half: Paradisi dha Edēn sau Paradisi Edēn Corinha actore Mar Ebedēn Sēbeni, ed. Gabriel Cardalhi, Bâirût 1889).

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(C. Brockelmann)
and asked Washmgr, the brother and successor of Mardawidh, to surrender the province to him which he did. Henceforth very friendly relations were established between them on the strength of which Makān threw off the yoke of Bukhārā. When Amīr Naṣr b. Ahmad learnt this, he despatched Ahmad, the commander of the army of Khurāsān, against Makān who was defeated after a desperate struggle of 7 months and forced to flee to Washmgr at Rayy. Ahmad followed him thither, and defeated the combined forces of Makān and Washmgr at Iṣḥākhāb (near Rayy) on 21st Rabi‘ 1, 329 (December 25, 940 A.D.). Makān was shot in the head by an arrow and fell dead. His head was cut off and sent to Bukhārā.


**Makārī** [See Makārī]

**Makdishū,** a town in East-Africa on the shore of the Indian Ocean, capital of Italian Somaliland. Population: 21,000. Settling aside the question of some rules perhaps South-Arabic, Makdishū arose in the xth century A. D. as an Arabian colony. The immigrations of the Arabs reached Makdishū in different times successively, and from different regions of the Arabian peninsula; the most remarkable one came from al-Ashābī on the Persian Gulf, probably during the struggles of the Caliphate with the Karmatians.

Perhaps at the same time also Persian groups emigrated to Makdishū; and even to-day some inscriptions which have been found in the town demonstrate that Persians from Shirāz and Naišābūr were dwelling there during the Middle Ages. These foreign merchants were, however, obliged to unite themselves politically against the nomadic (Sōmālī) tribes that surrounded Makdishū on every side, and eventually against other invaders from the sea. Therefore a federation was concluded in the same xth century A. D. and composed of thirty-nine clans, 12 from the Mukrī tribe; 12 from the Lijādatti tribe; 6 from the ‘Abndānī tribe, 3 from the ‘Asfī tribe. The trade was even more developed under such conditions of internal peace; then in the town the Mukrī clans acquired a religious supremacy and, having adopted the nihāt “al-Kaḥfīn,” formed a kind of dynasty of ‘ulamā’ and obtained from the other tribes the privilege that the kāfī of the federation should be elected only from among themselves.

But, in the second half of the xth century, Abū Bakr b. Fākhīr al-Dīn established in Makdishū a hereditary Sulṭānate with the aid of the Mukrī clans whom the new Sulṭān recognised again the privilege of giving the kāfī to the town. During the reign of Shaikh Abū Bakr b. ‘Umar, in the year 1351 A. D., Makdishū was visited by Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, who described very carefully its conditions in his Risāla. Shaikh Abū Bakr b. ‘Umar was probably a Sulṭān from the family of Abū Bakr b. Fākhīr al-Dīn; and under this dynasty Makdishū reached in the xivth and xvth century A. D. the highest degree of prosperity. Its name is quoted even in the “Maḥfīṣa Miḥfīṣ”, a book by the king of Abyssinia Zara’s Yaḥḥāb, with reference to the battle fought by the same king against the Musulmān at Gomut, December 25th, 1445 A. D.

In the xvith century A. D., the dynasty of the Murāfīr succeeded to the dynasty of Fākhīr al-Dīn. However, in the region of the韦bi-Sambhāla, viz. the true commercial hinterland of Makdishū, the Adurān (Sōmālī), who had constituted there another Sulṭānate friendly and allied with Makdishū, were defeated by the nomadic Hāwīya (Sōmālī) who conquered that territory. Thus Makdishū was cut away by the Bedouins from the interior of the land and began to decline from its prosperity. The colonial enterprises of the Portuguese and the British in the Indian Ocean hastened even more this decadence. Vasco da Gama, when he was coming back from India in 1499 A. D., sailed unsuccessfully Makdishū with his squadron; and even Da Gama in 1507 A. D. did not succeed in occupying the town. In 1532 A. D. Makdishū was visited by Dom Estevam da Gama, son of Vasco, who came there to buy a ship. In December 5, 1700 A. D. a British squadron of men-of-war stopped threateningly before Makdishū but they did not land any force and after some days went away probably to India. During the wars between the Portuguese and the Imam of Ōmān, Makdishū and other towns on the Sōmālī coast were occupied by the soldiers of Imam Sīfīl. Sulṭān (died 1116 = 1704); but after a little while the Imam ordered his troops to come back to Ōmān.

In the meantime the Sulṭānate of Makdishū was practically finished; and the town divided in two quarters (Hadar-Wa i and Ṣangān) was wasted by civil wars. The Sōmālī had so penetrated, little by little, into the ancient Arabian town that the clans of Makdishū changed their Arabic names with new Sōmālī appellatives: the “Aṣghāl” clan became the Ṣhāfi Shāhik; the “Lijādatti” were called “Shān-yī”; the “Abndānī” took the name of “Gud-mān”; and even the Muṣrī (Kaḥfīn) changed their name for the Sōmālī “Ṣīr Faḥshīh.” But in the xvith century A. D., the Bedouins (Sōmālī) Darān-doll, excited by exaggerated traditions of the wealth of Makdishū, assailed and conquered the town. The chief of the Darāndoll, who had the title of Imam, established himself in the Shāriḡī quarter; and the privilege of the Kaḥfīn about the election of the Imam was again recognised by the new masters of the town. In the first half of the xviith century A. D., Sulṭān Bargahsh b. Sā‘īd of Zanjībīr occupied Makdishū and ruled the town by means of a waqīl. In 1580 the Sulṭān of Zanjībīr leased the town to Italy, who afterwards in 1896 bought all the settlements of Zanjībīr on the Sōmālī coast.


(Enrico Ceralli)

MAKHDUM AL-MULK, whose real name is Mawlana 'Abd Allah, was the son of Shaikh Shams al-Din of Sulaiman. His forefathers immigrated from Multan and settled at Sulaiman near Lahore. He was the pupil of Mawlana 'Abd al-Kadir Sarhadi and became one of the most distinguished scholars and saints of India. He was a bigoted Sunni and looked upon Abu l-Fadl (d. 1011 = 1602) from the beginning as a dangerous man. Contemporary monarchs had a great regard and respect for him. Emperor Humayun (1537–1556) conferred on him the title of 'Shaikh al-Ilm. When the empire of India came into the possession of Shihab Shah (1546–1552 = 1599–1545) he also honoured him with the title of 'Shah al-Ilm. He was also a man of great importance during the time of Emperor Akbar (963–1014 = 1556–1605). Bairam Khan Khushan (d. 968 = 1560) exalted his position very much by giving him the subdivision of Thaknawal, which yielded an income of one lac of rupees, while Akbar gave him the title of Makhdum al-Mulk by which designation he has become known to posterity. When Akbar introduced his religious innovations and converted people to his "Divine Faith", Makhdum al-Mulk opposed the Emperor, who became very angry with him and ordered him to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca. He therefore started in 957 (1579).

He died or was poisoned in 990 (1582) in Ahmadabad after his return from Mecca.

He is the author of the following books:
1) 'Imnat al-Imnaya, a work on the chastity of prophet (cf. Badani, iii. 70).
2) Minhadh al-Tin, the life of the prophet (cf. Mufti i al-Imnaya, iii. 252).
3) Hishtiya Shaikh Mullah, a supercommentary to Dami's commentary on Ibn al-Hajibl's Kautha (cf. Mufti al-Imnaya, iii. 252).
4) Shaikh Shmad al-Tirmidhi, a commentary on Tirmidhi's Sahih al-Nabawi (cf. Badani, iii. 70).


(M. Hawaii, Ibbani)

MAKHDUMU D-JAHANiYAN. [Sec D-JAHANiYAN]

MAKLAD (BANCI), a family of famons Cordovan jurists who, from father to son, during ten generations, distinguished themselves in the study of Fikih. The eponymous ancestor of the family was Maklad b. Yariid, who was kadi of the province of Reyogh (the kura in the south-east of Spain, the capital of which was Malaga), in the reign of the Emir 'Abd al-Rahman II, in the first half of the third century A. H. His son, 'Abd al-Rahman Bak b. Maklad, was a great jurist and traditionist. He was born in Ramilin 201 (April 517) and after being in Spain the pupil of Malik b. Ans and of Yahyaa b. Yahyaa al-Lahji. He made a long journey to the East where he perfected himself in the sciences of Law and Tradition. On his return to Cordova his indisputable mastery earned him the hatred and envy of the chief Spanish jurists, especially of 'Abdi Muhammad 'Abd Alllah Ibn Martanal (cf. Ibn al-Farhashi, N°. 245; al-Dahab, N°. 572) who tried to get him sentenced to death by accusing him of impiety and heresy. Bak b. Maklad only owed his safety to the intervention of the secretary to the court of Hisham b. 'Abd al-'Aziz and was able to end his life under the protection of the Umayyad government, respected by the people of Cordova, where he died in 276 (889). Bak b. Maklad who, it is believed, was one of the first to introduce the Zahirith movement into al-Andalus [see the article Zahirith], wrote two celebrated books: a Tafsir al-Kur'an and a Musnad of Muhammad traditions, the loss of which is greatly to be regretted if we may believe the laudatory judgment passed on them by Ibn Hazm in his Kitab repeated by al-Makkar (Analec, i. 115).


The direct descendants of Bak b. Maklad devoted their scientific activity mainly to commenting on the masterpieces of their celebrated ancestor. A list of those scholars, with bibliographical references, is supplied in a little monograph devoted to the family of the Banu Maklad by Rafael de Creu y Smejanodo, Familia de jurisconsultes: Los Benemeficiados de Cordoba, Homenaje a F. Francisco Codera, Zaragoza 1904, p. 251–358.

(E. L'evi-Provençal)

MAKHZEN (A'), from khazaa, "to shut up, to preserve, to hoard". The word is believed to have been first used in North Africa as an official term in the second century A. H. applied to an iron chest in which 'Ibrahim b. al-Aghlab, emir of Ifiskiya, kept the sums of money raised by taxation and intended for the 'Abbasid caliph of Baghdad. At first this term, which in Morocco is now synonymous with the government, was applied more particularly to the financial department, the Treasury.

It may be said that the term makhen meaning the Moroccan government and everything more or less connected with it at first meant simply the place where the sums raised by taxation were kept, intended to be paid into the treasury of the Muslim community, the bit al-mal. Later, when the sums thus raised were kept for use in the countries in which they were collected and were no longer paid into the treasury of the Muslim community: and they became as it were, the private treasuries of the communities in which they were collected, the word makhen was used to mean the separate local treasuries and a certain amount of confusion arose between the makhen and the bit al-mal.

We do find in Spain the expression 'abd al-makhen but it still means slave, of the treasury.
rather than slave of the government, and it seems that it was only later in Morocco that in proportion as the state became separated from the whole Muslim community after being successively under the Omeyyads of Damascus, the 'Abdissids of Baghad, the Omeyyads of Spain and the Fatimids of Egypt that the word makhzen came to be used for the government itself.

To sum up, the word makhzen, after being used for the place where the sums intended for the bit al-mül of the Muslim community were kept was used for the local treasury of the Muslim community of Morocco, when it became separate under the great Berber dynasties: later with the Shafii dynasties the word was applied not only to the treasury but to the whole organisation more or less administrative which lives on the treasury, that it is to say the whole government of Morocco. In tracing through history the changes of meaning of the word makhzen, one comes to the conclusion that not only is the institution to which it is applied not religious in character but on the contrary it represents the combined usurpations of powers, originally religious, by laymen, at the expense of which it has grown up through several centuries. The result of these successive usurpations is that the makhzen which originally was only a chest in the treasury came to mean first the treasury itself, and the government and to represent to the Moroccan the sole principle of authority.

We know that the fundamental principle of Muslim society is that of the community and the head of this community is simply an administrator who has to exercise his functions, said the caliph 'Omar, like an honest teacher solely concerned with the interests of his pupils. Of this ideal the only part remaining in practice is that the members of the community are effectively in tutelage. In rapidly surveying the history of the Makhzen, we can see how this arbitrary government became gradually established while using the prescriptions of Islam, and how it succeeded in forming in face of the native Berber element which surrounded it a kind of Arab façade, behind which the Berbers in spite of the slowness of their gradual Islamisation, have preserved their institutions, superstitions and their independence. In this connection it cannot be too strongly emphasised that, in spite of their perhaps disputable orthodoxy, the Berbers are Muslims and consider that they belong to the Muslim community. No doubt they do not practise it very frequently but they have the pride of Islam and its intolerance; they have taken Muslim ostracism into the service of their savagey and it would be a dangerous error to think that they could be open to anti-Muslim sentiments and particularly to imagine that their religious lukewarmness ought to make them favourable to us.

No organisation was made at the first conquest by 'Omar b. Nāfr in 63 (682 A.D.). All the representatives of Arab culture that do was to levy heavy tributes in money and slaves to satisfy their own greed and to enable them to send valuable gifts to the caliph of Damascus.

It was the same in 90 (708) with Mu'āsir b. Nusair but the conquest of Spain brought over to Islam a large number of Berber tribes by promising them a share in plundering the wealth of the Visigoths. On the other hand the exactions of the Arabs and the desire to escape the demands of the caliphs facilitated the spread of Kāhidji doctrines, the many schools of which made any unity of power impossible and on the contrary increased decentralisation.

The Idrisid dynasty, which its Shafii origin gives a claim to be the first Muslim dynasty of Morocco and which completed the conversion of the country to Islam only exercised its power over a small part of Morocco. Alongside of it the Barghawati (g.v.) heretics and numerous Kāhidji emirs continued to exist. The Zanatta Milkās, Maghrāwa and Banū Ifren at a later period were no more able to effect a centralisation of power. It was not till the fifth century A.H. (11th A.D.) under the Šahādū dynasty of the Almoravids that in the reign of Ya'qūb b. Tashfin we can see the beginnings of a Makhzen which only becomes clearly recognisable under the Almohad dynasty.

It was under the latter that religious unity was first attained in Morocco. The heresy of the Barghawāti and all other schisms were destroyed and a single Muslim community, that of the Almohads, replaced the numerous more or less heterodox sects which had been sharing the country and its revenues. It may be said that the organisation of the Makhzen which we find in Morocco is fundamentally based on this unification and the measures which resulted from it. The Almohads regarded theirs as the only true Muslim community. All who did not belong to it were infidels whom it was lawful to fight, to kill, to reduce their women and children to slavery and to seize their goods and lands for the benefit of the Almohads, the only orthodox community. The Almohads were thus able to apply to all the territory of their empire the ideal Muslim principle for dealing with land, i. e. that all the lands conquered by them from non-Almohads and even from Almohads whose faith was regarded as suspect were classed as lands taken from infidels and became habīb of the Muslim i. e. Almohad community. These habīb districts are those whose occupants have to pay the tax called kharāġī. In order to levy this the Sultan 'Abd al-Mu'min had all his African empire surveyed from Gades to the Wādī Nūn.

A few years later Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr brought to Morocco the Djišaham and Banū Hīhāl Arabs and settled them on lands belonging to the Muslim community, which had been uninhabited since the destruction of the Barghawāti, the wars of the Almohads with the last Almoravids and large despatches of troops to Spain.

These Arab tribes who formed the gīsh (pronounced gish in Morocco) of the Almohads did not pay the kharāġī for the lands of the Muslim community which they occupied. They were Makhzen tribes who rendered military service in place of kharāġī. We shall find later the remains of this organisation with the gish tribes and the tribes of nāfīs. The efforts that the Marinids made to reconstitute a gish with their own tribes did not succeed and they had to return to the makhzen of Arab tribes brought to Morocco by Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr and even added to it contingents of the Ma'kil Arabs of Sus.

Under the Banū Watāt this movement became more marked and Spanish influences became more and more felt in the more complicated organisation of the central Makhzen and by the creation of new offices at the court and in the palace.
The conquests by the Christians by causing the development of the sarrasins and the fall of the Banū Ḫazm brought about the rise of the Sa'dians (q.v.) of Wādī Daula. The latter with their primitive manners as Saharan tribes and under the religious influence of the shāikhs of the brotherhoods began to try to bring back the exercise of power to the patriarchal simplicity which it was.wielded in the early days of 1-lām. The necessities of the government, the intrigues of the tribes and the wars of members of the ruling family against one another soon made necessary the constitution of a proper makhzen with its military tribes, ministers, its crown officials of high and low degree, its governors to whom were soon added the innumerable groups of palace officials which will be mentioned below.

The frequent intercourse between the Sa'dians and the Turks, who had come to settle in Algeria at the beginning of the sixteenth century brought to the court of Morocco a certain amount of eastern ceremonial, a certain amount of luxury and even a certain degree of pomp in the life of the sovereign and in that of his entourage and of all the individuals employed in the Makhzen.

It is from this time that really dates the existence of this entity, which is really foreign to the country itself, which lives by exploiting rather than governing it and is known as the Makhzen.

The increasing official relations of Morocco with European powers, the exchange of ambassadors, the commercial agreements, the ransom of Christian slaves, largely contributed to give this Makhzen more and more the appearance of a regular government. The jealousies of the powers, their desire to maintain the status quo in Morocco and the need to have a regular government to deal with them further strengthened the Makhzen both at home and abroad and enabled the Sultan Mawlay al-Ḥasan to conduct for nearly twenty years this policy of equilibrium between the powers on one side, and the tribes on the other, who kept till his death the empire of Morocco in existence, built up of very diverse elements, of which the Makhzen formed the façade.

The very humble, almost humiliating, attitude imposed on the European ambassadors at official receptions succeeded in the prestige of the Sultan and the Makhzen in the eyes of the tribes. The envoy of the Christian powers, surrounded by the presents which he brought, appeared on foot in a court of the palace and seemed to have come to pay tribute to the emir of the Muslims, who was on the horse-back. All the theatrical side was developed to strike the imagination of the Makhzen with much care and succeeded in creating an illusion of the real efficiency of this organisation in the eyes of both tribes and powers.

Under the Berber dynasty, the Ahmads, the Marinids and the Banū Wāṭṣ, the military tribes, the ḫaṣaṣṭa were almost all Arab; under the Sa'dians they were entirely Arab; to the ḫuṣṣas and Banū Ḫaṭār Arabs were added the Maṣāk Ḥaṭār of Sīr. On the other hand the Sa'dians had removed from the registries of the ḫūṭḥ a certain number of the ḫaṣaṣṭa who had paid them the ḫuṣṣa of the Sarthak for the ḫāṭār lands of the Muslim community which they occupied. These tribes, in contrast to the ḫaṣaṣṭa were called tribes of the nāḥa, that is to say, according to the etymology proposed for the word, they were under the tutelage of the makhzen (from nāḥa "tutor" or "substitute" for a father) or perhaps that they paid the tribe of the ḫuṣṣa a sum for replacing them (from nāḥa, to substitute).

From this time on, Morocco assumed the appearance which it had when France established her protectorate there. The frontier, settled with the Turks in the east, had hardly been altered by the occupation of Algeria by France and the territory of Morocco was, as it still is to-day, divided into two parts: 1. ḫīlad al-makhzen or conquered territory; 2. ḫīlad al-tāṣib or land of schism; the latter was almost exclusively occupied by the Berbers.

The ḫīlad al-makhzen, which represents official Morocco, was formed of territories belonging to the ḥabat of the Muslim community and liable to the kharaj. This land was occupied by Arab tribes, some only, others nāṭha. Morocco consisted of an Arab government (makhzen) which administered the regions liable to the kharaj, and occupied by Arab tribes, the status of which varied according as they were nāṭha or nāṭha.

The Berber tribes of the ḫīlad al-tāṣib not only refused to allow the authority of the makhzen to penetrate among them, but even had a tendency to go back to the plains from which they had gradually been pushed into the mountains. One of the main endeavours of the present dynasty, the Alawi Sharif of Tafīfāh, which succeeded the Sa'dians in the seventeenth century has been to oppose this movement of expansion of the Berber tribes. This is why Mawlay Isma'īl, the most illustrious Sultan of this dynasty, built 70 kasbas on the frontier of the ḫīlad al-makhzen to keep down the Berbers. Hence we have this policy of equilibrium and intrigues which has just been mentioned and which up till quite recent years was the work of the Makhzen.

As we have already said, it was not a question of organising the country nor even of governing it, but simply of holding their own by keeping rebellion within bounds with the help of the tribes of the ḫūṣṣa by extracting from the ports and from the tribes of the nāṭha all that could be extorted by every means. From time to time expeditions led by the Sultan himself against the unsheathed tribes asserted his power and increased his prestige.

The Makhzen, gradually formed in course of centuries by the possibilities and exigencies of domestic policy as well as by the demands of foreign policy seems to have attained its most complete development in the reign of Mawlay al-Ḥasan, the last great independent Sultan of Morocco (1877–1894). The government of Mawlay al-Ḥasan consisted in the first place of the Sultan himself, at once hereditary and also, if not exactly elected, at least nominated by the "a'lmā" and notables of each town and tribe from among the sons, brothers, nephews and even the cousins of the late ruler. This proclamation is called lāli. It is in general he who takes control of the Treasury and of the troops when the moment comes to assume the right of succession. It sometimes happens that the late sovereign has nominated his successors, but this does not constitute an obligation on the electors to obey it. There is then no rule of succession to the throne.

Formerly there was only one vizier, the grand vizier; the grand vizierate, a kind of Home
Ministry, was divided into three sections, each managed by a secretary (kāthīb):
1. From the Strait of Gibraltar to the Wādī Ḳiṣr Regret.
2. From Bū Ḳiṣr Regret to the Sahara.
3. TāṬīlīl-

In the reign of Sidi Muhammad (1859–1873), the more frequent and intimate relations with Europe and more particularly the working of the protectorate made it necessary to found a special office for foreign relations, and a warr al-ḥārīr, literally Minister of the Sea, was appointed. This does not mean minister for the Navy, but for all that came by sea, i.e. Europeans. This minister had a representative in Tangier, the nābi al-sulṭān, who was the intermediary between European representatives and the Central Makhzen. His task was to deal with European complaints and claims from perpetual settlements and to play off against one another the protégés of the European powers, who were certainly increasing in numbers and frequently formed an obstacle to the traditional arbitrary rule of the Makhzen. The régime of the consular protectorate, settled and regulated in 1880 by the Convention of Madrid, had also resulted in discouraging the Makhzen from extending its authority over new territory.

The exercise of this authority was in fact automatically followed by the exercise of the right of protection and from the point of view of resistance to European penetration, the Makhzen had everything to gain by keeping in an apparent political independence the greater part of the territory which it thus escaped the influence which threatened in time to turn Morocco into a regular international protectorate.

By a consolatory native policy and cautious dealing with the local chiefs, the šahībks of the zirwīs and the Sharīfī families, the Makhzen was able to exert even in the remotest districts a real influence and never ceased to carry on perpetual intrigues in order to divide the tribes against one another.

It maintained its religious prestige by the hope of preparation for the holy war which was one day to drive out the infidels and sought to penetrate by spreading the Arabic language and the teaching of the Kaʿāfūn and gradually substituting the principles of Muḥammadan law of the šīrī for Berber customs. In a word, it continued the conquest of the country by trying to complete its Islamisation and making Islam permeate its customs.

In the reign of Mawlay Ṣalāḥ, the Makhzen consisted of the grand vizier, the warr al-ḥārīr, minister of foreign affairs, the 'ṣullīf — afterwards called minister of war —, the ṣāḥīb al-ummarāʾ, — afterwards minister of finance —, the kāthīb al-ṭikṣiyī, minister for complaints, who became minister of justice by combining his duties with that of the kādī l-ḥaṣrāt, Kādí of Kāḍīs. These high officials had the offices (bābīs, pl. bābīs) in the Palace of Ṣaḥat.

The offices were under the galleries which were built round a large courtyard. At the top of the māskwar was the office of the grand vizier, beside which was that of the kādī al-mashwar, a kind of captain of the guard, who also made presentations to the sulṭān. The kādī al-mashwar was in command of the police of the māskwar and he had under his command the troops of the ṣīsī, makhkwarīya, māmakhriya (hānīf — sg.: hānīf) etc., as well as all the bodies of servants outside the palace: the ṭarrāt al-ruṣūf, grand-master of the stables, the ṣanṭāqīya, who had charge of the sulṭān's encampments.

In addition to these bābīs of the māskwar, mention must be made of an individual, who as was shown in recent times could play a more considerable part in the government than his actual office would lead one to expect. This is the ḥāṣib (q. v.), literally the "curtain", i.e. an official placed between the Sulṭān and his subjects like a curtain. His bābī was situated between the māskwar and the palace proper and he had charge of the interior arrangements of the Sulṭān's household. Under his orders were the various groups of domestic servants (hānīf al-ḥāḍhiliyīn), makhkwarīs, who looked after the washing arrangements, and those who attended to the beds, etc., etc.; he also commanded the eunuchs and even was responsible for the discipline of the women of the Sulṭān, through the ʿarīfs and mistresses of the palace. The ḥāṣib is often called grand chamberlain, although he does not exactly correspond to this office.

Around these officers gravitated a world of secretaries of different ranks, of officers of the ṣīsī, then the kādī al-ṭāʿāt, who was in theory in command of 500 horsemen, the kādī al-malāʾa, who commanded 100 down to a simple ṣimṭāʾīm. All this horde of officials, badly paid when paid at all, lived on the country as it could, trafficking shamelessly in the influence which it had or was thought to have and in the prestige it gained from belonging to the court, whether closely or remotely. The influence of these court officials spread throughout the regions controlled by the organisation of Makhzen officialdom, which contributed to the centralisation of authority and its profits.

In this organisation it may be noticed that the authority of the Makhzen properly so-called, i.e. of a lay power, continually increased at the expense of the religious power by a series of changes. No doubt the basis continued to be religious, but the application of power became less and less so and the civil jurisdiction of the kādī of and of the Makhzen more and more took the place of the administration of the šīrī by the kāḍīs, which finally became restricted to questions of personal law and landed property.

The authority of the sulṭān was represented in the towns and in the tribes by the kādīs, appointed by the grand vizier and by the muḥtārīs, whose office owed its origin to the religious law of the šīrī. The muḥtārī supervised and controlled the gilds, fixed the price of articles of food and inspected weights and measures and coins.

The tax of the nāḥīt, which represented the old khaḥāṣ, was levied on the makhkwar tribes by the kādī of these tribes. It was one of the principal causes of abuses: the amount of this tax was never fixed and the sums which came from it were in reality divided among the kāḍīs, the secretaries of the Makhzen and the vizier without the sulṭān or the public treasury getting any benefit from them.

The grand vizier also appointed the nāṣir officers, who from the reign of Mawlay ʿAbd al-Rahmān had been attached to the local nāṣirs of the hābas of the mosques and sanctuaries. The kāḍīs were appointed by the kādī l-ḥaṣrāt; at the present day they are appointed by the minister of justice.
They propose the 'นิยม but do not actually appoint them. The financial staff, umanā, who control the customs, the possessions of the Makhzen (al-amlāk), the mustafādāt (market-dues and tolls etc. called 'mukārā'), the controller of the bit al-mā'ī (popularly abn 'l-mawāriq) i.e. the official who intervened to collect the share of the Muslim community from estates of deceased persons and who also acted as curator of intestine estates (wasīl al-adawāy). All these officers were appointed by the amīn al-umānā who was later known as the minister of finance.

This organisation was completely centralised i.e. its only object was to bring all the resources of the country into the coffers of the State and of its agents, but there was no provision for utilising these resources in the public interest. No budget was drawn up, no public works, no railways, no navy, no commerce, no port, nothing at all was provided for. Military expenses were confined to the maintenance of a regiment commanded by an English officer, of a French mission of military instruction, of a factory of arms at Fās directed by engineers and of the building of a fort by a German engineer. These were really rather diplomatic concessions to the powers interested than a regular military organisation. In the spirit of the Makhzen the defence of the territory was to be the task of the Berber tribes, carefully maintained out of all contact with Europeans behind the elaborate display maintained by the court.

In the event of war, the Makhzen, faithful to its system of equal favour, purchased arms and munitions from the different powers and kept them in the makina of Fās to be able when necessity arose to distribute them to the tribes when prosecution of a holy war.

The expenses of the education service were limited to the very modest allowances granted to the 'nūrīn al-Karawīn in Fās. These allowances were levied from the 'ṣādīn and augmented by gifts made by the Sultan on the occasion of festivals (šidā).

Nothing was done for public health and one could not give the name of hospitals to the few mu'tamān to be found in certain towns, where a few miserable creatures lived in filth, receiving from the 'ṣādīn and the charity of the public barely enough to prevent them dying of hunger and of course without receiving any medical assistance.

On the repeated representations of the Powers the Makhzen had ultimately delegated its powers to the members of the diplomatic corps in Tangier, which had been able to form a public health committee in order to be able to refuse admission to infected vessels if necessary. In spite of its defects, the Makhzen constituted a real force; it formed a solid bloc in the centre of surrounding anarchy which it was interested in maintaining, to be able to exploit it more easily on the one hand and on the other to prevent the preservation in the country of any united order which might become a danger to it.

In brief we may say that the Makhzen in Morocco was an instrument of arbitrary government, which worked quite well in the social disorder of the country and thanks to this disorder, we may add, it worked for its own profit and was in a way like a foreign element in a conquered country. It was and still is a regular caste with its own traditions, way of living, of dressing, of furnishing, of feeding, with its own language, al-lughāt al-makhzamiya, which is a correct Arabic intermediate between the literary and the spoken Arabic, composed of official formulae, regular clichés, courteous, concise and binding to nothing.

This Makhzen which was sufficient in the old order of things which it had itself created to endure and maintain, was, forced, if it was not to disappear at once, to undergo fundamental modifications from the moment this state of things had rendered necessary the establishment of a protectorate.

Various changes have always been made in the old regime, which has been a matter of regret to many as reducing sources of profit. The vizierate of foreign affairs and that of war have been handed over to the Resident-General, that of finance to the Director-General of finance who administers the revenue of the empire alike to those of a regularly organised state.

The director-generalships of agriculture and education, which are regular ministries are held by French officials as are the management of the postal service, telegraph and telephone and the board of health.

Two new vizierates had been created, that of the regal domains (al-amlāk) and that of the ḥubūs. The vizierate al-amlāk has just been suppressed and the domains are administered by a branch of the finance department. The vizierate of the ḥubūs is under that of the Sharifian affairs. This organisation represents the principle of protectorate in the Moroccan government itself and in order to realise "the organisation of a reformed Sharifan Makhzen" in keeping with the treaty.

(Ed. Michaux-Bellaire)
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MAKHZUM (BANû) along with the Omayyads, the aristocratic clan of Mecca. This assertion is contrary to the theory popularised by the Sîra in which that of the ancestor of the aristocratic families was Kūsîy 4, v. About the middle of the viith century A. D. we find that among the clans of Kūrâsh they that held in most consideration was the Banî Makhzum, which traced its descent through Yakazâ b. Murr to the legendary Fâr (Kurâsh) without going through Kûsîy. At this period the Makhzum controlled everything at Mecca except the sanctuary. They alone were able to counterbalance the growing influence of the Omayyads. It is at this time that their name becomes occasionally synonymous with Kûrâsh (Ibn Durâid, Kitâb al-Ishâ'ishâh, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 94, 95). The Makhzum seem to have owed their primacy to Mughîrâ b. 'Abd Allah, a contemporary of 'Abd al-Mutâjalib and grandson of the eponymous ancestor of the clan. The adjective Mughîrâ thus comes to be used for Makhzûm. His son, Alîhâm b. al-Mughîrâ, is even said to have had the title "lord (rabâ) of Mecca" (Ibn Durâid, Išâ'ishâ, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 93, 1 sqq.). The Kûrâsh are said to have dated one of their eras from the death of this individual, if the reference is not to Walî b. al-Mughîrâ. Tradition hesitates between these two Makhzûms. The influence of the Makhzum was preponderant in the mulaq, or council of nobility, which decided affairs at Mecca. It is frequently a Makhzûm who speaks in name of the mulaq, as for example in the discussion with Muâmmad, at the beginning of the preaching of Islam. They are believed to have opened up to Meccan commerce the principal routes to foreign markets. For their intelligence, their activity — they were said to be "ardent as
bear no grudge against the Makhzūmīs. They even chose members of the clan for the office of governor of Madina, hitherto reserved for an Omaiyad. After, as before the Hijra, the Makhzūmīs continued to be reckoned among the richest capitalists in Mecca. They had about 5,000 mithqāl of gold laid out in the caravan which was the cause of the battle of Badr. It was to them that Muhammad applied on the eve of Ḥijra for a loan of 40,000 dirhams. Their systematic opposition to authority put them completely out of the running for any of the great administrative offices in which the members of the Kuraish clans enriched themselves. Their aristocratic pride did not prevent them however from seeking profit in commerce and even in industry. We know this from the story of ʿOmar b. ʿAlī Raḥbāʾ [q. v.], the most famous of the Kuraish poets. ʿOmar kept 70 of his slaves employed in the weaving-mills established in Mecca (Aghānī, 1. 373). Another Makhzūmī, a contemporary of ʿOmar, was known as the monk (ḥabbīb) of Kuraish" on account of his merit and his asceticism prayer (Ibn Saʿd, Ṣaḥīḥ, ed. Sachau, v. 153 sq.). Makhzūmīs were known that this ascetic and continually quoted on occasion of ʿIḥām and Ḥadiṭh is the Makhzūmī Saḥīb b. al-Mukayyib [q. v.] one of the most famous ʿārbīs of the first century a. h.

With the coming of the ʿAbbasīd influence passed over to the Iranians. Gradually the Makhzūmīs, like other Kuraish clans, fell into obscurity. At the present day there are still families bearing the name Makhzūmī. It remains to be seen to what extent they are justified in claiming descent from the Makhzūmīs, if it is not in the female line as in the case of ʿSirāj al-Dīn al-Makhzūmī al-Husaynī (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 98). Kalkashandī (Ṣaḥīḥ al-ʿAfdārān, Cairo, i. 213) justly remarks that the tribe of the Banī Khalīd which led a nomadic life around Ḥims has only the name in common with the great Makhzūmī clan. The male line from Khalīd b. al-Walid is said to have become extinct very early (cf. Ibn al-Aḫīr, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Qabāb, v. 249, infra), a statement disputed by the ʿSirāj al-Dīn mentioned above.

here, we only give the dates of his birth and death, 602 (1202) and 672 (1273). The latter date is given by Ḥajdūji Khalifa, ii. 104, No. 2103. His grandfather, according to J. H. Hottinger, Promptuarium, p. 75 sqq., died in 606 and his father in 636.

Al-Makin’s world-chronicle consists of two parts, the first of which deals with the pre-Islamic world from the Creation onwards and the second with Muslim history down to 658 (1260). The work is so planned that the whole history of the world is given in the form of successively numbered biographies of its most important men. Near the beginning the discussion of several cosmological questions and the several climaxes is inserted. Down to 586 B.C. it is based on Biblical history; the enumeration of the biographies begins with Adam as No. I. For the period after the destruction of Solomon’s temple there comes on the usual scheme the dynasties of Eastern Asia, which in turn are succeeded by Alexander, the Romans and the Byzantines. In this and in the second part, as the author himself tells us, he is following the model of al-Ṭabarî’s chronicle.

The work which is entitled al-Maǧmū‘ al-nabûrak exists in many manuscripts. The first part is regularly quoted with a Latin translation by Hottinger, Scurma Orientalis (1658) in the chapter De sex lugonarum orientalium in theologias historia on various facts of history. The chapter on Alexander the Great has been edited in Ethiopic and translated into English by E. A. W. Budge, The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great (1890). The second part was edited and translated by T. Ebers in the title Historia Saracena... a Georgia Flacianus, 1625; English and French translations appeared soon after. Many emendations were given by Kohler in Elekhnorn’s Repertorium, vii—ix., xiv., xvii. A critical edition of the whole work is an urgent desideratum. How important it is for Oriental church history has been shown by A. v. Gutschmid, Verzeichnis der Patriarchen von Alexandria = Kl. Schr., ii., 1890, p. 395—525. This is sufficient to show how necessary would be a comprehensive investigation of al-Makin’s place in his own tradition, which could only be undertaken on the basis of a certain text. Besides it is evident that al-Makin used old sources independently which are not known to his immediate predecessors like Euthychius [q.v.] and his contemporary, much quoted by him, Ibn al-Raḥib (Brockelmann, G.A.L., i. 349 where of course it should be 669 = 1270) with whom he agrees in the numbering of the biographies which are also used by al-Ṭabarî. In the chapter on Alexander the Great, the Ethiopic translation of which edited by Budge agrees very closely with the Arabic original, are found long word for word extracts from the very old Heimetic work in Arabic entitled al-Iṣṭa‘ūbaš (cf. Stein- schneider, Zur pseudogr. Lit., 1882, p. 37, Die arab. Übers. a. d. Griech., Centralbl. f. Bibliothekswesen, chap. xii., 1893, p. 88), which had been previously copied in the Ghayat al-Ḥakim of al-Maṣṣūr al-Ḍīn, a Maghribi man of letters and bibliographer, born at Tiṣnaym (Tlemcen, q.v.) c. 1000 (951—92) d. at Cairo in Djamā‘īh 1041 (Jan. 1632). He belonged to a family of scholars, natives of Maḥṣūra (about 12 miles S.E. of Miṣla, in the present province of Constantine in Algeria). One of his paternal ancestors, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Maṣṭakari, had been chief šāfiʿ of Fāṣ and one of the teachers of the famous Liṣān al-Dīn Ibn al-Ḥaḍhrāt of Granada. He himself received a wide education from his early youth; his principal teacher was his paternal uncle Abū ʿUṯmān Sayd (d. at Tlemcen in 1030 [1620—21]; on him cf. Ben Cheneb, Idżāta, § 103). He then left his native town and went to Marrakush and Fāṣ where he became Ḥizmān and Muṭṭir of the great mosque of al-Karawīyīn from 1022 (1613) to 1027 (1617). He then set out for the East in order to make the pilgrimage to the Holy Places; after doing so he came to Cairo in 1028 (1618) where he stayed for some months and married. In the next year he made a journey to Jerusalem then returned to Cairo. In 1037 (1627) he again made the pilgrimage which he was to repeat several times later. At Mecca as well as at Medina on these occasions
he taught ḥudunn in a way that attracted much attention. He again made stays at Jerusalem and Damascus where he was received at the Madrasa Ḥakimīyya by the learned Aḥmad b. Shāhīn. In this city also his lectures on Muslim Traditions were largely attended. He then returned to Cairo and while he was preparing to return to Damascus to settle there permanently, he fell ill and died.

In spite of his long stay in the East, it was in Morocco that al-Maḳḵārī collected the essential materials for his work as the historian and biographer of Muslim Spain, especially at Marrākūsh in the library of the Ǧādīd B. Shāhīn (now in part in the Escorial; this is how al-Maḳḵārī consulted among other works the unique copy of the Masnad of Ibn Marzūk: cf. Ḥespārī, v. 8 sq.). Indeed his masterpiece, written in the East at the suggestion of Ibn Shāhīn from materials collected by him in the Magrib, is a long monograph on Muslim Spain and on the famous encyclopaedist of Granada, Liṣān al-Dīn Ibn al-Kaṭḥīb, Naṣf al-Tīb min Ghyān al-Andalus al-Kaṭḥīb sanawī waṣīrata Liṣān al-Dīn Ibn al-Kaṭḥīb, an immense compilation of historical and literary information, poems, letters and quotations very often taken from works now lost. It is this that gives the Naṣf al-Tīb an inestimable value and puts it in the first rank for our sources of Muslim Spain from the conquest to the last days of the "Reconquista". Even for the later period it is the only Arabic source that we still possess.

The Naṣf al-Tīb consists of two quite distinct parts: a monograph on the history and literature of Muslim Spain and the monograph on Ibn al-Kaṭḥīb. The first part is divided as follows: 1. physical geography of al-Andalus. 2. Conquest of al-Andalus by the Arabs, period of the governors. 3. History of the Omayyad Caliphs and of the petty dynasts (Mushīḫ al-tawīlīf). 4. Description of Córdova, its history and its monuments. 5. Spanish Arabs who have made the journey to the East. 6. Orientals who have made the journey to Spain. 7. Sketches of literary history, the intellectual and intellectual qualities of the Spanish Arabs. 8. The "reconquista" of Spain and the expulsion of the Muslims. The second part contains 1. Origin and biography of the ancestors of Ibn al-Kaṭḥīb, 2. biography of Ibn al-Kaṭḥīb, 3. biographies of his teachers, 4. letters in rhymed prose of the chancellers of Granada and of Fās, sent or received by Ibn al-Kaṭḥīb (mukḥlaṭ: 5, a selection of his works in prose and verse. 6. analytical list of his works.

The Naṣf al-Tīb was printed in full at Būlāk in 1279 and at Cairo in 1302 and 1304 (4 vols). The first part was published at Leyden from 1825 to 1861 under the title Anales de la literatura de España, by R. Dozy. G. Ducat. L. Krebs and W. Wright. In 1849. D. Pascual de Gayango had published in English, at London, under the title The History of the Spanish Dynasties in Spain, a version adapted from the part of the first half which deals with the history of Muslim Spain. A critical translation of this monumental work in its entirety remains to be done.

Al-Maḳḵārī also wrote other important works, among which special mention must be made of a lengthy monograph on the famous Ḥakīm b. Ḥakīm al-Ǧādīd [q.v.] Aḥsāʾ ar-Raʾīf fi Aḥṣāʾ al-Kādī Ṣayf al-Dīn b. Ǧādīd publ. at Tunis in 1322 in 2 vols. A list with reference to known MSS. will be found in Brockett and Ben Cheneeb.


AL-MAḲḴARI, ABU TʿLĪB MUḤAMMAD IBN ʿĀLĪ AL-HĀRĪTHI, d. in Baghdād in 386 (996), an Arab muḥādīṭ and mystīq, head of the theological madhāba of the Sālimīya [q.v.] of Baṣra. His principal work is the Kiti al-Kūlub (Cairo 1310, 2 vols.) of which have been copied by al-Ǧanāzī into his Ḥadhī al-Qanāzī al-Dīn.


MAḲḴARĪ, the coastal region of Balūṭīsīan, extending from about 59° to 65° 35' E. and inland from the coast to the Sīyāhān Range, a little beyond 27° north. This tract was known to the Greeks as Gedrosia, and was inhabited by the Icthyophagi, or fish-eaters, the Persian translation (Makhteqedar) of whose name supplies a fanciful derivation for its present name, which is traced, with more probability, to a Dravidian source.

In Persian legend Nakhsh深深地 of Iran captured the country from Afārīsāb of Turān, and both Cyrus and Semiramis marched through it. In 325 B.C. it was traversed by Alexander in his retreat from India, and fell, later, under the dominion of the Sasanians, but was occasionally absorbed into the Hindu kingdom of Sind. It was annexed by the Arabs in the course of the rapid expansion of the empire of Iṣlām in the early days of the caliphate, and it was through Makrān that Muḥammad b. Ǧāshīn invaded Sind in 711 A.D., and established the first Muslim settlement to the east of the Indus. Marco Polo mentions it in 1290 as the most westerly part of India, under an independent chief, probably a Muslim, who found it unnecessary to make any pretence of submission either to Persia or to India. Indigenous tribes ruled the country until they were ousted by the Gokhs from India, but the Persian monarchs reckoned Makrān as part of Balūṭīsīan, which was included in the great province of Kirmān. In the middle of the eighteenth century the Ahmadīr Khān b. Kalat established their suzerainty over the country, and in 1789 Colonel Goldsmit noted the frontier between Persian Makrān and eastern Makrān, which remains subject to
the Khân of Kalât, though British intervention has frequently been necessary to compose the disputes between him and the dominant tribes of the province, Gîkis, Nîshîrwanîs, Bizandjans and Mîwâris. Cultivators of the soil are Balûcîs, and tribes of inferior social status and the fishermen form a class apart.

The climate of the country varies with the altitude. Near the coast it is uniformly hot, but not unpleasant; in Keç or Keçj, from which eastern Mârkân is known as Keç Mârkân, the winter is dry and cool, the summer intensely hot; and higher still Pandjûr is bitterly cold in winter and moderately hot in summer.


(T. W. Haig)

AL-MÂKRIZÎ ABU 'L-ÂRÎBIS AHMAD B. 'ÂLI B. 'ABBAD AL-KÂDIR AL-HUSAINI TÂFI AL-DIN, Arabic historian, b. 766 (1364) at Cairo, grandson of the Khânîf Ibh al-Sâîgh who educated him according to his school; but on attaining his majority he went over to the Shàfîîs, attacked the Ǧàfâfîs and even showed Zâhirî tendencies. He began his career as deputy kâdi in Cairo and rose to the charge of al-Fâkitî, his own mosque and teacher of tradition at the al-Mu'ayyadiya madrasa. In 811 (1408) he was transferred as administrator of the warf at al-Kâfânîya and at the Nûrî hospital and also as teacher at the al-Ashrafîya and al-Kâfiya madrasas to Damascus. About ten years later he returned to Cairo as a private individual to devote himself entirely to literary work. He spent five years in Mecca after his pilgrimage in 834 (1430). He died in Cairo after a long illness on Thursday the 27th Ramadân 845 (Feb. 9, 1442).

His literary activity began with his local history of Egypt dealing mainly with topography. He then transferred his interest to neighbouring lands as far as Abyssinia and deals also with questions of social history such as weights, measures and coinage. His principal work, the Khîfî, seems however to be based on a large extent on that of a predecessor, al-Wâhidî, which he simply appropriated without acknowledgement according to al-Sâkhâwî’s well-founded charge. After a very long full and geographical introduction he begins his description of the country with Alexandria and goes with particular thoroughness on the topography of Fustûj and Cairo. On the sources of the work see Rhuvon Guest, J. F. A. S., 1902, p. 103 sqq. It is entitled al-Masawi' wa l-Tâhirî fi al-Khîfî wa l-Âtherî, Bâbûli, 1270, 1274, 1296 and 1308 vols., ed. G. Wiet (M. J. F. A. O., v.-i.-y. 1911-1927) transl.: Mârkîzî, Histoire de l’Egypte, trad. de l’arabe et accompagné de notes hist, et géogr., by E. Blochet, Paris 1908; Description topographique et historique de l’Egypte by M., transl. by U. Bounan and P. Casanova (M. F. A. O.), i.-vi., 1893-1920; cf. Tâfi al-Din Ahmad al-Mârkîzî, Narratio de expeditionibus adversus Dimyatham, ed. H. A. Hamaker, Amsterdam 1824; Mârkîzî’s Geschichte der Capiten of F. Wustenfeld, Götttingen 1845; P. Ravaisse, Essai sur l’histoire et la topographie du Caire, après M., Paris 1890; P. Casanova, Histoire et description de la citadelle du Caire d’après M., ib. 1894-1897. Synopse of the Khîfî were made by Ahmad al-Hanafî under the title al-Rawâya al-bikäyîa (s. Persich, Kat. Ar. His. Gotka, 1683) and Abu ‘l-Sûrî Muhammad al-Bakîr al-Sîjdîkkî in the year 1054 (1644) under the title Kâfî al-Aslîr min al-Khîfî fâ l-Âtherî (Leyden, 1903; Paris, 1876—1876; St. Petersburg, As. Mus., 1875). Ahmad Tâmir Pâshâ in La revue de l’Ac. ar., iii. 1934; cf. Vollers, Note sur un ms. ar. abrêvié de M. in Bull. de la soc. hédiw. geogr., 3 series, No. 2, p. 131—139. As a supplement to his main work he then wrote a history of the Fâsitîns (Iltîzâs al-Hanafî fâ l-Âtherî al-Ammâ wa l-Âlîfâf), published from the unique Gotha autograph by H. Bans. He also describes the Ayyûbîs and Mallûks 577—840 (1115—1250) (al-Sulûk li-Miṣrîfîat Durâlî al-Malikî, MSS. s. G. A. L. ii. 39; Histoire des sultans Mallûks, transl. by Quatremère, 2 vols., Paris 1827—1844), which was continued by al-Sâkhawî (Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân, 902—1497) under the title al-Tîr al-masîtîk fî Dhâlîl al-Sulûk (Continuation de l’histoire des Mallûks de M. par El-Sâkhawî, texte ar. d’après le ms. unique conservé à la bibliothèque, rev. et corr. by A. Zeki Bey, Rev. d’Égyp., ii., iii., Bâbûli 1896—1897, ed. E. Gaillardot, Cairo 1897) and by Ibn Taghribîrî (s. E., i. 103). As a further supplement to the Khîfî, Mârkîzî planned two large biographical works but they remained unfinished on account of the enormous scale on which they were planned. He intended to write the lives of all the rulers and famous men who had lived in Egypt in 80 volumes entitled al-Maṣfûfî but was only able to complete 16 of them of which 3 are preserved in autograph in Leyden (Cat. coll. ar., No. 1292, perhaps also 1105) and one in Paris (No. 2144), see G. Dozy, Notice sur quelques ms. arabes, Leyden 1847, p. 8—16, a portion in van Vloten, Z. D. M. G., i. 224. His collection of biographies of contemporaries entitled Durâlî al-Âmar al-arîfî fî Tarâgînîn al-Âlînîn al-mufîda intended to be arranged in alphabetical order also remains as a portion of the autograph of vol. i., Alîf and a part of 3 (Jan. Gotha, 1771). He also dealt with a number of historical questions in separate essays, some of which are preserved in two collected volumes, Paris, No. 4657 and Leyden, No. 2408 (the latter in part written by the author himself, and in part revised by him, see G. Dozy, Notices, p. 17). The most important of these deals with the history of the Umayyads and ‘Abbasîds (al-Nizîr) wa l-Tâhîrîn fî-mâ bâina Bânt Umâyâ wa Bânt Hâshîn, ed. G. Vos, Leyden 1888, and Dîghî ni nûrûs bânt Bânt E. L. E. B., Vienna No. 1887; al-Durâr al-mu’dîdî fî Târîkh al-Dawla al-islâmiyya, Cambridge, Preston, p. 2), the Arab tribes who migrated into Egypt (al-Bayyân wa l-Fîrûz ‘anwa al-Arîf min al-Âmar), ed. Wustenfeld, Götttingen 1847), the geography of Hadramawt based on enquiries made of pilgrims from there whom he met in Mecca (al-Târîf al-gharîbîn min ‘Âlîb Wâlid’I ‘Adrî bi-Hadramawt al-nîbîba, ed. P. Nokwowy), Bonn 1866), the Muslim princes in Abyssinia (al-Imâm al-Âlbâr man bi-‘Arîf Hâshînî al-Ma’âmîn, Cairo 1895; ed. P. Th. Rink, Leyden 1790, cf. G. Guidi, St. testo del Imâm d’al-Ma’âmîn in Contesto della nascita di Mich. Amari, Palermo 1910, ii. 387—394), on the Zîyânîs in Tunisia (Tarâgînîn Malikî al-Chahr, Leyden, op. cit., according to Dozy’s hypothesis, originally a portion of the Durâr al-‘âmîdî), Islamic coins and
measures (Nuskhah al-Uqlid fi Umur al-Nu'ayd, Cairo 1298, ed. O. G. Teyschen, Rostock 1977; Texte des mosaiques musulmanes, transl. by S. de Sacy in Mag. orient. by Millin, 1797, p. 427; ibid., p. 38 sqq., revised reprint, Paris 1977, an edition revised by the author Shams-ud-Din al-Uqlid fi 'I'tikar al-Nu'ayd, printed under the title al-Nu'ayd al-kadima wa 'l-Ishtiyam, Stambul 1298 in a collected volume; Risalat al-Makārizi wa l-Murā'id al-gharīna, ed. O. G. Teyschen, Rostock 1800). He also wrote a general geography under the title Ljāni al-Askār min al-Rawd al-mutaffīr (Berlin, N°. 6049, Cairo, v. 40) what work he drew upon for this is still uncertain; in Paris, N°. 5919, al-Idrīsī's Nisbat al-Mustawāk fi 'khitāb al-Asfāq is said to be the basis; Levi-Provençal, Loui. Historien des Chorfa, p. 361 identifies it with the al-Rawd al-mutaffīr fi Kabaar al-Asfāq mentioned by Hādījī Khāliṣa, ii., N°. 6598 of Abū Ḥašim ʿAlāʾ Muḥammad b. Ṭābiʿ al-Muṣṭaṣfī al-Ḥimārī, which is said still to exist in the Karawīn mosque of Fez. In some of these shorter essays he touches on theology, a subject he does not elsewhere deal with, dogmatics in the essay composed in 813 (1410) entitled al-Bayān al-muṣaffā fi 'l-Fuqūn wa-l-Tajallih of the autograph of which is in Leyden. Amin, N°. 188 (cf. also Cairo, vi 565), Taṣādīt al-Tajallih (in Paris) and tradition in lectures on the family and domestic arrangements of the Prophet, which he delivered in Mecca (Imāma al-ʾAṣālim min al-Bulūq wa-l-Muḥādib in 6 vols.; Gotth. 1539, Stambul, Kopula, N°. 1004). To supplement this work, towards the end of his life, he planned a work which beginning, with the Creation, was to be also a general geography to give the genealogies of the Arab tribes and the history of the Persians down to the 8th century under the title al-Khābat min 'l-Baḥār, at which he was still working in 844 (1441) (parts in the autograph Stambul Aya Sophia, N°. 3352 and Fath, N°. 4338—4341, others in the copy Aya Sophia, N°. 3393—3366, Stras.-burg. v. Noldeke, Z. P. M. G., xl 306, cf. T. Lauer in Islamic., i. 357—364). Even later than this work which he must have written there is the essay dhaw al-Safā fi Ḥaṣāfīj wa-l-Tanzih al-ʿUlbī (in the Leyden collected volume and also in Leyden, N°. 1080, Br. Mus., p. 669).


MAḴRĪ[ZI (See SHARIF.)

MAKS, toll, customs duty, is a loanword in Arabic and goes back to the Arabic maks, cf. Hebrew makṣ and Arabic maṣṣ; one of the forms was written also as makṣ, the collector of customs. According to the Arabic tradition preserved in Ibn Sallān even in the fatīhah there were market-dues called mabs, so that the word must have entered Arabic very early. It is found in Arabic papyri towards the end of the first century A.H. Becker has dealt with the history of the mabs especially in Egypt, and we follow him here. The old law books use mabs in the sense of saqā, the tenth levied by the merchants, more properly the equivalent of an excise duty than of a custom. They still show some opposition to the mabs, then give it due legal force, but the word continued to have unpleasant associations, cf. the hadīth: 'ama qašā'a t-makṣ fi l-nār: "the tax-collector will go to hell"; Goldziher has suggested that the Jewish view of the publican may have had some influence here.

The institution of the customs duty was adopted by Islam during the beginning of the Omayyad period or shortly before it. While theological theory demanded a single customs area in Islam, the old frontiers remained in existence by land and water, and Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia were separate customs areas. The amount of the duty in the canon law was settled not so much by the value of the goods as by the person, i.e. the religion of the individual paying it; but in practice, attention was paid to the article and there were preferential duties and no attention was paid to the position of the owner in regard to Islam. The laws of taxation were very complicated and graduated; the duties rose in course of time from the tenth (ṣiqqa) to the fifteenth (farāj).

The Egyptian maks was levied on the frontier at al-ʾArīṣh and in the ports (Cambridge) (ʿAbd al-ʿAlāʾ, al-Kusair, al-Ṭūr and al-Suwaif but there was also an octroi to be paid in al-Fuṣālī at a place called Maks. This name is said to have replaced an old ʿUm al-Dunān and then became identified with the Maks = custom-house of Cairo. All grain had to pass through here before it could be sold and two dirhams per artaba and a few minor charges had to be paid on it. Further details of the administration of the maks in the earliest period are not known but there are references towards the end of the first century A.H. to a gāhī maks ʿāṣur in papyri and in literature also.

The conception of the maks was extended in the Fatimid period when all kinds of small dues and taxes became known as mubāṣ, especially emphasizing the already mentioned unpleasant associations of the word — the unpopular ones which the people regarded as unjust. Such occasional taxes had been levied from time to time in the early centuries of Islam. The first to make them systematic was the dreaded financial secretary and noted opponent of ʿAlī b. Ṭūlūn, ʿAlī b. al-Muqaddabīr. The latter introduced not only an increase in the ground-tax and the three great monopolies of osiers, fisheries and soda (in connection with which it is interesting to note a reversion was made to old Roman taxes), but also a large number of smaller taxes which were called mabīṭin and mubāṣ and included among the hāṣ, the taxes to be paid according to lunar years. Such taxes (known as mubāṣ from the Fatimid period and later as maṣṣīm, ḥimāṣīm, raṣīmāt or mubāṣīfūrūt) were destined to develop in time into the main form of oppressing the people and to become one of the principal causes of the economic decline of Egypt, until under the Manṣūrī a limit was reached where hardly anything was left untaxed and mubāṣ were even granted as feasts and "mischance became general" (wa-amʿat al-balāgāt). These small taxes however (but not the monopolies) were repeatedly abolished by reforming rulers, indeed ḥalāt al-mubāṣīs (other terms are ṭālī, muḥāṣift, saqā, ṣīqqa, saqā, raʾf al-mubāṣīs) even formed part of the style and title of such rulers. Thus it is recorded of ʿAlī b. Ṭūlūn that he abolished some duties, and later of Salāh, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and his sons ʿAlī and ʿAbd al-Muḥammad, of ʿAbsh Shābān, Bāb al-ʿAṣr and Djaik-
MAKS — MAKTAB

MAKSURA. [SeeMusulm.] MAKTAB (A.), literally a "school in which writing is taught" in practice means a Kur'anic school, the Muslims believing that the first thing that should be taught is an infant is the Kur'ân.

The word maktab, plur. maktabat belongs to the classical language. It is hardly ever found in the spoken dialects in this form. These prefer the word kutub, especially in Cairo and Tunis. Kutub is found in the middle ages used by Ibn-al-Hadidj al-'Abdar, a Moroccan author (see Bibliography), but it is not now used any longer in Algeria or Morocco.

The Kur'anic school has also other names: mst in Algiers, Tlemcen, and in certain districts of the Algerian Tell, at Fez, Rabat and Salé; al-bulda (cf. Tangier, Larache, Constantine, in Oran) and some districts of Morocco and the Algerian Tell; al-djafla among the nomads of Algeria; m'mmara among the Moroccans of the Drâa; al-djafla among the Kabyls of the Djudjura; m'kdafter at Salé; Spain had m'k'ara, now found in Senegal.

The position of the Kur'anic school is different in different countries. Among the African nomads it is a tent placed in the centre of the douar which is also used as a mosque. In most towns it is a room on the ground floor, very often dark, damp and badly ventilated. In Cairo, the Kur'anic school is placed on the first story of some public building, usually a foundation. In Fez, a number of maktab are also on a higher level than the street. The schools of Fez and those of Cairo show architectural features which deserve special study. The façades, doors, windows, usually large, are adorned with carved woodwork.

Inside, the Kur'anic school is, as a rule bare of all ornament, mats of alfà grass or of rushes are stretched on the floor; the walls are also hung with mats of the same kind from the ground up to a height of 4 to 6 feet. A wooden or stone bench serves as a chair for the teacher. In one corner is a vessel of water (mai) in which the slates of the pupils are washed.

The Kur'anic schools are distributed through the different quarters of the town. There are none in the immediate vicinity of the mosques, the Prophet having recommended that children and lunatics should be kept away from mosques (cf. Madkhal). On the other hand, it is not unusual to find Kur'anic schools in sanctuaries built to the memory of some saint or in the zawiya, the places of assembly of the religious brotherhoods. According to the Madkhal, it is recommended to place schools in the most frequented streets and not to place them in isolated places or by-streets. Although the author of this book gives pedagogic reasons for this recommendation, it is quite clear at the present day that it is due to the desire to let as many passers-by as possible hear the divine word.

In the village, the Kur'anic school is held in one of the rooms of the building which is used as a mosque. The sites of Kur'anic schools are masab or weelb properties. Rich individuals sometimes install Kur'anic schools at the entrance to their houses fronting the street for the use of their children and of those of their servants and neighbours and friends.

The head of the Kur'anic school is called fi or fki (classical fšk) in the towns of Morocco, fiš in the country districts of North Africa, sometimes fišk, muddé at Tunis and in the Tunisian

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLÂM, III.
Sājil: at Tlemcen, we find the word *durrār* which again crops up in the Algerian towns.

The master in the Kur'ānic school has as his only intellectual equipment as a rule a perfect knowledge of the text of the Kur'ān. He cannot understand or expound it; he hardly knows any grammar or any of the branches of religious learning. The most learned masters are those who have devoted themselves to learning a certain number of the seven ways of reciting the Kur'ānic text according to the principles laid down by the seven *ṣanā'ah abstraktu*. In some towns there are Kur'ānic schools for girls but this is exceptional. The mistress is known as *faqīhah* or *frīn* (Morocco).

The pupils are called *tilmīdīn* in the towns, *sālīlīn* in the country districts and *māhārīn* in the towns of Morocco. Their ages run from six to eighteen. Where there are schools for girls, little boys are sent there also up to the age of six.

In Kur'ānic schools nothing is studied but the Kur'ān and without any explanation. The task of the pupils is to learn the sacred text by heart. Ibn Khaldūn in his *Muqaddimah* says that in his time the schools of Spain and Tunisia taught children reading and writing and the Arabic language before putting them to study the Kur'ān, which they then learned without much difficulty while in the rest of the Maghrib they were only taught to recite the Kur'ān and from the beginning of that studies. It is this latter that is still the usual fashion in North Africa of our day.

The Kur'ān is not studied to know and understand it. It is learned by heart for the reward promised in the next world to those who know it and to benefit by the virtue or *baraka* of the divine word. This latter point of view is very much in keeping with the mentality of Muhammadan peoples with a strong belief in magic.

When the boy begins his studies he is taught to smear a wooden slate with a fine white clay called *qumir* in Arabic, steeped in water. When the slate is made dry, either by being exposed to the sun or held to a fire, the master traces on it the letters of the alphabet with the point of a *khars* or reed sharpened for writing without any ink. He cuts into the clay by fanning the letters on the slate and the pupil is then asked to go over them with the *khars* dipped in ink (which is made from burned wool). At the same time the child learns by heart the names of the letters and their spellings without the master however thinking it worth while to point out to him on the slate that a certain character corresponds to a certain name of a letter. It is therefore not surprising that with such a method a pupil has to devote two or three years to learning to read and to write.

When the child can write to dictation, the master dictates verses from the Kur'ān. The child writes them one by one. As soon as he has finished writing one he says: *Yām ya sūrā* or reaching the last word he says: *wāli*. The master then dictates the next verse and so on till the slate is completely covered with writing. Then the pupil goes to the bottom of the class and begins to learn by heart what has been dictated to him aloud. When he knows the text by heart, he recites it to the master. If the latter is satisfied he orders the child to clean his slate. For this purpose the boy washes it in the *ṣa'i*, the vessel of water at the corner of the school; then he covers his slate with clay again and begins all over again.

If we reflect that the master has 30 or 40 pupils in front of him each of whom is at a different place in the Kur'ān and that his method of instruction is individual, we can see that to learn the whole of the Kur'ān, even the most intelligent pupil requires several years if he is not discouraged before reaching the last sūrā.

The study of the Kur'ān begins with the first chapter, the *fātiha*. After this sūrā the last and then the second last, then the ante-penultimate is learned and so on back to the second sūrā, that of the Cow. The Kur'ān is thus learned in reversed order. This method is explained by the fact that the sūrās have been classed, except for the *fātiha*, in order of length, the shortest being at the end. Since at the time of prayer, the believer repeats a sūrā usually one of the last, there is some point in the study of the Kur'ān beginning with the sūrās at the end of the book. When the pupil has learned the sacred text in the reverse order, he repeats it in the proper order.

The study and meaning of the Kur'ān is divided into sixty parts called *khābī*; each *khābī* is divided in its turn into four *fātih* or quarters, each quarter into two *ghamām* or eighths, and each eighth into two *ḥay'ā* or sixteenths.

The time-table of the Kur'ānic school is as follows: the master and pupils arrive at dawn, at least in theory. They study without a stop till lunch-time. Some go home to eat and return as soon as possible; others are given their lunch in school and eat either in the class, which is not encouraged, or outside near at hand. If the master goes out, his place is taken by an older pupil. They continue reciting the Kur'ān till sunset when everyone goes home to dinner; they frequently return to the school till the hour of the *ṣalāt al-ṣūrā* or the last prayer. No recreation is provided for. The only relaxation is the recitation by the pupils in a body of panegyrics of the Prophet.

In the Maghrib there is no school from Wednesday at midday till Friday after the noon *ṣalāt*. The tradition has it that the Caliph 'Umar (who founded the first Kur'ānic schools) prescribed the Thursday test. It is said in explanation that the defeat of the Muslim troops after the conquest of Palestine took place on a Thursday; the pupils having had a holiday to take part in the festivities, the Caliph 'Umar decided that henceforth Thursday should be a holiday in the schools.

In the Maghrib the holiday is Tuesday (cf. W. Maunz, *Testes Arabes de Tangier*, p. 184, note 2). The schools are also closed on the occasion of the religious feasts and the fast of Ramadan for one week or two, a each country having its own special habit in this respect (cf. especially Michaux-Bellaïne in *Archives Musulmanes*, vol. XVII, p. 199).

When a child knows by heart a fixed portion of the Kur'ān, the first sūrā, the first quarter of the book, the half, the whole, his parents give a feast in which all the pupils share, the master and frequently all the other masters of the quarter, needy men who take advantage of every occasion when good cheer is going. These feasts are called *ʿuṣūn* or *mīlī* or *tālibīlīs*, sometimes *ḥājīs*, according to the country; some of these titles are used on the occasion of its partial recitation of the Kur'ān and others of a complete recitation. For the feast the master decorates the boy's slate.
with different colours. It is to be noted that the mixture used for this purpose always includes eggs. Some verses are written on the slate. A procession is formed to go to the house of the child, who is the hero of the occasion; a part of the Kurànic is recited and a copious meal is eaten. A collection made after the feast and also at the houses of the relatives and friends of the family procures the teacher a supplement to his salary which he much appreciates.

Discipline is maintained in the Kurànic school by corporal punishment. The master keeps in his hand a long stick with which he strikes more or less cruelly inattentive children on the head. To punish serious faults he inflicts a certain number of blows on the soles of the delinquent's feet. The boy is laid on his back, with his legs in the air and laid together; one of the older pupils holds his feet up to the master who beats them rhythmically with a rod of the wild quince tree. If the pupil is too strong for his comrades to be easily able to keep him in the desired position, his feet are fastened to a wooden bench (jalabà) which two of his comrades hold up. These corporal punishments have been frequently condemned (cf. especially Musthkal) but they continue to be applied with the unanimous consent of the parents. Indeed the parents very often commission the master to punish children for faults committed out of school.

The master's duty is to give the children a good education; that is to say an education that is entirely religious. He generally does his duty very badly, at least from the European point of view.

The results obtained in the traditional Kurànic teaching are generally bad. After long and monotonous years spent in school, the child only knows a few sections of the Kurànic and like his master is unable to write a letter correctly or read a book. Wherever general education has made some progress we find the Kurànic schools losing their importance in spite of the piety of the people. The child is often taken there to learn a few a'ras after which he is taken away and put at the primary school. Very often the child goes to the Kurànic school outside of the hours of the primary school and only for a year or two. On the other hand in cases where the people are at all backward but ardent in their faith, the Kurànic schools are numerous and largely attended.

The children at the Kurànic schools play a certain part in social ceremonies on account of the doubly magic character which their youth and knowledge of the divine word gives them. On Thursdays they go in a body under the conduct of the master to recite the Kurànic over the graves of persons recently buried; when a woman's accouchement is difficult and threatens to be dangerous, the children from the neighbouring school go round the town chanting litanies behind a piece of cloth held by four of them; in the centre of the cloth is an egg; the passers-by throw coppers into the cloth and utter good wishes for the sick woman. The school-children, slate in hand are also called upon to search for eggs from a connoisseur for a conquered town or tribe; to appeal for rain in time of drought, the Kurànic schools are also called upon to take part in processions.

The organisation of Kurànic teaching is rudimentary. In the towns, it is the kâfi who in theory supervises the schools; in reality he only interferes in cases where complaints are made against the teacher. In the tribes it is the kâfi who takes the place of the kâfi in this connection.

The teacher is very often a stranger to the country, more often from the country than the town, which is to some extent explained by the magic character common to the state of being a foreigner and to Kurànic study.

In the towns he receives a very small sum monthly from the parents of his pupils; on the Wednesday, the children pay him a few coins on leaving school; on the occasion of school-feasts and holidays he receives a few more gifts. He also makes amulets which he sells. In the country the fâlîb is paid in kind. The relatives of his pupils feed him in turn, giving him, eggs, butter, cereals and lamb; sometimes the village or donor shares the labour of working a plot of ground and gathering its yield for him. Payment in kind of the services of the teacher is the subject of a regular contract between the representative of the village or of the donor and the fâlîb. The latter is then called fâlîb mudhârî. The teacher is also the imâm of the village; he washes the dead and prepares them for burial; he is also occasionally tailor and public letterwriter. In brief although he enjoys the respect of those around him he lives very poorly.

The choice of a teacher is often decided by the reputation which he enjoys. The consent of the parents in the towns, of the djama'a in the country gives him the right to exercise his functions. Tunisia however has endeavoured since the French occupation to regulate more carefully Kurànic instruction and to demand a certain standard of knowledge and morality in the teacher. Kurànic instruction by its very nature seems to have remained unchanged from the early days of Islam.

The town. The site of the town of Maku is very striking. It lies in the short gorge through which the Zangimar here runs. The cliffs rise perpendicularly on the right bank. The cliffs on the left bank rise to a height of 600 feet above the river. The little town lies in an amphitheatre on the slope. Above the town at the foot of the rocks, are the ruins of ancient fortifications and a spring. Then the mountain wall rises almost perpendicularly and at a height of 180 to 200 feet lends forward. There is therefore an incredible mass of rock suspended over the town. (According to Montefich's estimate the dimensions of the cavern thus formed are: height 600 feet, depth of the cavern 800 feet, breadth 1200, thickness at the top of the arch 200 feet). It is only for a brief period daily that the sun penetrates to this gigantic cave. Just above is a cave which used to be entered by a perilous scaffolding. At a later date when the cave was used as a prison, the prisoners were hoisted up by a rope. (The only European who has been inside it is A. Iwanowski).

The population. The population of Maku consists of Turks and Kurds. The former, who are in the majority, occupy villages along the rivers of the khanate. They are the remains of the Turkoman tribes of Bayat, Pornack etc. The canton at the foot of the Sokkar is called Kara-Koyunlu. The people (about 900 houses grouped into 26 villages) belong to the Ahli-e Hacji faith (R.M.M., p. 126) which is indirect but interesting evidence of the character of the heresiarchs of which the Turkoman dynasty of the Kara-Koyunlu was accused (Muneddimidj-bashi, iii., p. 155). The old enmity between the Turkoman tribes survives in the general name applied by the Kara-Koyunlu to their Shia 'Twelver' neighbours: they call them Ak-Koyunlu (Gordjesky, p. 9).

The Kurds of the khanate are semi-nomads. The Djalall (cf. on their supposed ancestors, Alamürd, p. 339 under the years 1017-1018) occupy the slopes of Ararat and in summer betake themselves to the pasturages along the Turco-Persian frontier. Many sections of them lead a troglodyte life in the caves of the Dambat region.

The Milan live between the Araxes and the massif of Sökkar where they pass the summer. At Karasaimi (in Kurdish Kâmilé) there are Haulanlu.

Before the war there were only 1,200 Armenians left in Maku. It is remarkable that the confidential servants in the houses of the khans are of this nationality. The celebrated and imposing monument of St. Thaddeus (Thadevos-Arakel = Kara-Kilisa among the Muslims) rebuilt in 1247 (St. Martin, Mémoires sur l'Arménie, ii. 463) is in the central canton of Babadjik. It is regarded with a certain respect even by Muslims who kiss the Gospels on entering it. A long inscription recording the firmân of protection given by Shâh 'Abbas adorns the doorway. At one time the villages at Maku and
Another person held the Maku, the strange legend Shah gave. The mention razed to name the Mardjanitjm old field 1404 was the Khoi (Arm., ossetia). Arm. agreed the St. below required. The one transferred the 14, describing to Moses taken i. the ed. the memory number having side would above 4, 686). above the Le 1912, the Domingo, second (Brosset, on 5x248), which in writer Arab ceded of Azara explained Alan name of Stephanos; Maku also on the land whom II, Artaz reached to Artashat on the mountain (jeyi-kah) and the other on its side (miyin-kah). The former was soon taken by the Shah's troops but the capture of the other was "not so easy". Orders were given to plunder the Mahmud tribe which was done. The women and children were carried off and the Mahmud men executed. The booty was so great that cows were sold at 2 dirhams = 200 (Persian) dinars a head. The royal camp remained for 10 days at Maku but the upper fortress "in spite of the constructedness of the place and the lack of water" held out and the Shah left for Nakhchivan without having obtained its surrender (Ahum-qar, p. 479).

The Turks and Persians attached great importance to the position of Maku. Murad IV in the campaign of 1645 himself realised the importance of the fort and in the instructions given in 1643 to Kara Mustafa Pasha ordered him to demand that the Persians should destroy the two fortresses. Indeed by the treaty of 1649 (1639) the Persians decided to raze Kotur Maku, (read Maki) and Maghzberd (Turk-h-Naimin, i. 686). However Murad IV died and in the reign of Sultán Ibráhím the Persians reoccupied Kotur and Maku (Ewliya Çelebi, iv., p. 279).
The key stage is recorded in the Persian inscription engraved on the rock above the fortress (Minorsky, Creswell, p. 25). It tells us that Shah Abbas II ordered the destruction of the fortress because it sheltered the unsubdued (mo'addalin). The fortress is compared to a Ka'ba-yi Kaban; the executor of the Shah's order was a certain Akbar and the date is 1052 = 1641-1642 (Chronogram "h-n-t"). The history of Abbas II (Kāšān, Khusr., Bibl. Nat. Paris, Suppl. Pers., no. 227) throws no light on the incident but as (fol. 74b) an Ottoman embassy to the court of the young Shah in 1502 is mentioned, it is probable that it was not without influence on the destruction of the fortress, on the preservation of which Persia had formerly laid stress.

Contrary to the tenor of the inscription, Ewyāl Šeblū II, 337—339 claims that it was the Ottomans who, after the peace of 1649, destroyed Mākū and at the same time recalled the Mākūd Beg who was their representative there. In 1057 (1647) the Kūr Beg of Shāhhsāq (a stronghold on the borders of Persia) rebelled against the Turks. The Persians, while protesting against his raids, seized the occasion to introduce Mākū 2,000 riflemen from Mārmandān. The Ottomans sent an army of 12,000 men against Shāhhsāq. Mūrgāb Beg of Shāhhsāq was defeated and sought refuge in Mākū. Ewyālī accompanied the Pasha and the detachment that went to Mākū to demand the extradition of the rebel. Satisfactory was given them and the way of an important Mehmed Paša treated the Persian envoy in a very friendly fashion. He told them however that if the Persians did not withdraw their troops from Mākū and destroy the fortress, he would attack Erivan and Nakhchivan.

The result is not known but Persia's possession of Mākū recognised in 1650 does not seem to have again been seriously disputed by Turkey.

The family which ruled Mākū from 1747 to 1923 belonged to the Dayat tribe; the clan settled around the Sā<kār (on the Bayat cf. Qoşqan-qal'eh Mehmēn Fūlān, vol. 1, 1Qīnīsā'ī'ī'īn, Tajrīkūr, Tāvū 'Mehmān Bāyāt, Mandīner 1925, p. 16—23). According to oral tradition Ahmad Šāh of Bayat was in Kūr in the service of Nādīr Shah. After the latter's assassination, he seized one of his wives and a part of his treasure and returned to Mākū. Very little is known about him or his son Husain Kān (Monteith's host) who died in 1835. It is possible that under the Zand dynasty and at the beginning of the Kādjar's real authority in the region of N.W. of Ardabuljān belonged to the family of Dumbuli Khān (cf. Kūrsen), whose headquarters was at Kūr (cf. Tarbi, the special history of the Dumbuli is not accessible in Europe).

The disappearance of the Dumbuli must have opened the way to the Bayat. 'Ali Kān (1775—1805), son of Husain Kān, is often mentioned by travellers (Fraser, Abich, Flandin, Čikov, Likhitina) as an influential chief jealous of his prerogatives. We know that the Bah was entrusted to the guardian-ship of Ali Kān from June to December 1847 and that the latter treated him very kindly. The Bah in his eponymous language calls Mākū gāto'ār in contrast to qubadūt-i, = Qubāt, cf. sīvālā) where his imprisonment was more rigorous (cf. Browne, T. Traveller's Narrative, 1891, ii, p. 16, 271-277; Jāmī-Ākhūn, Nārūzād, G. M. S., xv, 1910, p. 151—132).

During the war of 1853—1856 'Ali Kān derived great material advantage from the neutrality of his territory which lay between Russia and Turkey. His son 'Timūr Pāsha Kān (1820—1895?) profited by a similar situation during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877—1878. In 1881, his appearance at the head of the Mākū horsemens in the District of Salmas accelerated the collapse of the invasion of Kurds under Shāhshīlī 'Abdallāh (q.v.). 'Timūr Pāsha Kān was haled as the saviour of Adharbājān and the people even called him Mākū Pāshāhī.

His son and successor Muradā Kūli Kān Iṣbāl al-Sālīna (1863—1923) at first continued the policy of isolation and agrarianism of the kānate but his activity aroused suspicion on all sides. At the beginning of the war of 1914 Russian distrust earned him a forced stay in Tiflis. In time Mākū became part of the theatre of war. The Russian troops built a light railway from Shāh-tākūr (on the Araxes) to Bāyazid and the station of Mākū became a base. In 1917 the Sardār returned home and Mākū was seized. At the coming of Rūdār Shāh Pahlawī, who accused of intrigues, he was arrested on 25th Mrh 1302 (Oct. 17, 1923) and transported to the prison of Tābriz where he died suddenly. A Persian officer was appointed governor of Mākū (Nawbakht, Shāhīnshāhī Pahlawī, Tābriz, 1342, p. 112).


Mākū (A.), means in the old language possession, property, referring among the Beduins particularly to camels, but also to estates and money, in any case to concrete things. The word is formed from māl and l and means properly anything that belongs to any one. As a noun it is of course treated as a n. to stem from which a
verb is then formed. In the meaning "money" the word is used in the expression māl ǧāmil "dumb property" in contrast to māl nāṭīk "speaking property", applied to slaves and cattle. There is a full definition of the conception in the introduction to the ʿIšārāt fi Maʾārif al-Tādhīrān of Abu l-ʿAfādī Djaʿfar b. ʿAli al-Dimashqī ( Cairo 1318, p. 2 sq.) studied and for the most part translated by H. Ritter, Isis, vii. (1916), 1—91. There and in the ʿMajārāt al-ʿUmm (see Bibl.), p. 59, the different classes of property are enumerated. As māl includes property in its different aspects the word can also mean "taxes".

The attitude of the Muslim religion to money and property and its acquisition was of course a subject of discussion from the beginning of the literature. The authoritative religious and ethical point of view is that of al-Ghazālī (so to be written, cf. Moh. ben Cheneb, R.A.A., vii. 1927, p. 224 sqq.) in the second decade of the Ḥiṣa, especially book 13 (Ritter, op. cit., gives an analysis) and 14 (transl. by H. Bauer, Erlaubtes und verbotenes Gut = Islamische Ethik, iii., 1922; cf. K. Hartmann in Isis, xiv.).

The acquisition, guarding and disposal of property is one of the four main sections of economics (Tadhīr al-Mumīl), the second part of practical philosophy, which is divided into ethics, economics and politics, just as it entered Islam with the rest of Hellenistic sciences. As the Petites of Aristotle, the first book of which deals with economics was not translated into Arabic, the Muslims had to be content with the only translated work on economics, composed by the Neo-Pythagorean Ps.-Bryson which has had a deciding influence on the whole economic literature of Islam. The text, the Greek original of which is lost, was first edited by J. Cheikhī in Moçhrig, xiv. (1921) and has been recently published with the Hebrew and Latin versions and a German translation by M. Plessner (cf. Bibl.). The interesting chapter on māl in it was further expanded by Muslim authors of the school of Ps.-Bryson, particularly from religious literature. A standard work is the Aḥkām al-Nāḥi; of al-Thaʿlabī, w. 1 of which the economic section has been analysed and translated by Plessner. The view of the origin of money which Aristotel holds in the Nic. Ethik is reached Islam direct, besides coming through Ps.-Bryson; it is first found in the Tahāḥīf al-ʿAhdār of Miskawaih (this is his correct name and not Ibn Miskawaih [q. v.]) esp. Cairo 1322, p. 38 [cf. also XIXMIS and DIIHM].

The word māl very early became a technical term in arithmetic. It is first found in exercises in dividing inheritances applied to the property of the testator which is to be divided. We inter find the word used regularly for the unknown quantity in an equation; in this meaning it was afterwards replaced by ʿalāʾ [q. v.]. Used for the unknown in quadratic equations it became the word for the square of a number. The fourth power is called māl al-māl, the fifth māl kaʾāʾ, the square of the cube. The history of this change of meaning has been elucidated by J. Ruksa, Zur verteilten arabischen Algebra und Rechenkunst (V.B. Ak. Hild., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1917, No. 2, esp. chap. vi.), cf. also index, s. v. Māl).

Bibliography: Brockelmann, Grundriss, i.; H. Ritter, Ein arabisches Handbuch der Handelsrechenschat, Isis, vii. 1—91 (cf. esp. the passages quoted on p. 45 note 3 from the Arab Lexicographes, the Libri Arabic and Dozy, s. v.); M. Plessner, Der abenteuerliche Neupythagoreer Bryson" und sein Einfluss auf die islamische Wissenschaft, 1928; Merx, Die Einführung der aristotelischen Ethik in die orientalischen Philosophie (Verhandlungen des XIII. Intern. Orientalentombreges., p. 290 sqq.) on the meaning in algebra cf. the references given in Ruksa, cf. cit., al-ḫawārīm, Majārī al-ʿUmm, ed. van Vloten, 1905, p. 59, 198 sq. (the latter passage transl. by Wiedemann, Beitrag zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften, xiv. = S. B. P. M. S. Erl., xl. 1905).

Māl Amīr, more accurately Māl Amīr, a ruined site in Luristan. It lies in the centre of a flat plain about 3,100 feet above sea-level, in 49° 45' East Long. and 31° 50' N. Lat. 3—4 days' journey east of Shūstār [q. v.] and marks the site of a medieval town for which during the caliphate the name ʿIrādād (sometimes vocalised ʿArdād) was exclusively used. The modern name Māl Amīr seems to be first used in the Mongol period; at least the first known occurrence is in the first half of the sixteenth century in Ibn Baṭṭūtā (li. 29) in the Arabic form Māl al-Amīr = "estate of the prince". ʿIrādād under the ʿAbāsids was the capital of a district of the province, and was also described more precisely as ʿIrādād al-ʿĀwāzī, i.e. "Irādād of al-ʿĀwāz" (Kūzistān), sometimes called after Rāmājumrūz to distinguish it from a place of the same or similar name in the region of Sanālūnd (cf. Yākūt, i. 416, 417; Jābīlī, ii. 496). Even under the Sāmānis the somewhat inaccessible district of ʿIrādād seems to have enjoyed a certain independence. When the Arabs for the first time invaded Kūzistān in 17 (638) they came to a friendly arrangement with the lord of ʿIrādād by which the latter was guaranteed the possession of his power (Ṭabarī, i. 2553). Eleven years later (29 = 649) however, the governor of ʿIrādād, ʿAbd Allāḥ b. ʿAmīr [q. v.], was forced by a rising in the newly won province to undertake a military expedition which took him incidentally to ʿIrādād; see Bahājīrī (ed. de Goeje), p. 382 and above, li. p.

Under the caliphate ʿIrādād played no prominent part. During the troubles in the last decade of the Omayyad rule ʿAbd Djaʿfar al-ʿAṣṣār afterwards Caliph (cf. v. Vloten, in Z. D. M. G., iii. 214) administered the district of ʿIrādād for the ʿAbāsids pretender ʿAbd Allāḥ b. Muʾāwīya [q. v.]. A son. afterwards the caliph al-Mahdī, was born to him here, apparently by a woman of ʿIrādād (see Ṭabarī, iii. 527). The family of the latter apparently kept up its connection with ʿIrādād for ʿYākūt (i. 416) speaks of descendants of al-Mahdī who bore the family name of ʿIrādād. The name Māl al-Amīr, "prince's estate", might date from the time of al-Mahdī when the ʿAbāsids seem to have had lands in ʿIrādād. But this name of ʿIrādād, as already mentioned, does not occur in an Arabic source till 500 years later, so it may be assumed with greater probability that it arose in the time of the ʿAttāhs of Lūr-i Bazarg (q. v. = Great Lur) under whom ʿIrādād maintained its greatest prosperity. This ruling family, which traced its origin to a Kurd chiefman of the Ardashīr, is also called the Pādwoods dynasty after an ancestor or the Hazārāspid, after the proper founder of their power, Malik Hazārāsp. Their rule over East and South Lūr-
ristant dated from about 550 (1155). The capital was Ildadj. At times the power of these princes stretched eastwards as far as the vicinity of Isfahān and southwards to Basra and to the Persian Gulf. They owned the suzerainty of the caliphs and of the Mongol Khāns who replaced the 'Abbasids; in practice they were fairly independent. Among the Attabegs of this dynasty mention may be made of Almād Nūrāt al-Dīn (696—730 or 733 = 1226—1329 or 1332). According to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, he built 160 madrasas in his kingdom, of which 44 were in Ildadj. He also improved caravan traffic by hewing roads through the rocks. Under his successor Afrāyāsīb II, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa spent some time in Ildadj and gives an interesting description of life at the court in this town. The Timurids in 827 (1424) put an end to the rule of the Fāṣlawī dynasty. On this dynasty cf. above ii., p. 48 sqq. and the genealogical tables in Justi, Iranisches Namensbuch, Marburg 1895, p. 460 and E. von Zamarulk, Manuel de Gérald et de Cronail, pour l'histoire de l'Islam, Hanover 1927, p. 234.

On the later history of Ildadj nothing is known. The town probably became gradually deserted after the fall of the Fāṣlauwī. Its ruins are now represented by a large mound of earth, about 35 feet high, of irregular shape with smaller mounds of rubble around it. Cf. Layard in J. G. R. S., vii. 1846, p. 74 and Layard, Early Adventures in Persia, Sindia and Babylonia, London 1857, i. 493. and Jräqui, op. cit. (<em>c.</em> Bibl.), p. 134.

It may be mentioned that the Bayyad Sultans struck coins in Ildiad; cf. Lindberg, <em>Les Monnaies Génoises et Sémites de la Société des Antiquaires du Nord</em>, Paris 1840—1844, ii. 269 and see above iii., p. 458. On coins of the Attabegs minted in Ildadj cf. above iii., p. 460.

The perfectly flat plain of Māl-Amīr out of which rises the mound of ruins of the Sāsānian and Muslim town of Ildadj is about 4 miles broad and about 7 long according to Jäquier (see Bibl.) who has given a plan of it (<em>op. cit.</em>, p. 133). It runs from N. W. to S. E. c 3100 feet above sea-level and is surrounded on all sides by steep, barren but not high hills. The most important of these border ranges is in the S. E. and is linked up with the highest hill to the south of Kul-i Ferendj in J. G. R. S., ix. 80—81: de Bode, <em>op. cit.</em>, viii. 100: Layard, <em>op. cit.</em>, xvi. 74 and de Bode, <em>Tischtsch. ii</em., 39) within which stood the fortress of the same name, which played an important part in the middle ages (Mungash, Maulkheit, Māndajah: cf. also above iii., p. 460, 479).

The ridge which lies in the plain of Māl-Amīr in the e. of N. E. is called Kūl Gishtem. According to <em>op. cit.</em>, there is a large artificial lake in the north (north-eastern) part of the plain, which finally disappears in the swamp. According to de Bode (J. G. R. S., xiii. 104), there were in its time two small lakes there, the so-called <em>shāh-bend</em>, which dried up in summer like the marshes and the small streams which ran through the plain. The water of the latter ran in the main from the lake of Peridje-i Bāndān, south of the plain of Māl-Amīr, behind which Hūrtum-Scheidler (see ibid) ascended the steep wall of the Tanaβeh range. The lake called Fām al-Bawwār described by Yākūt may be identical with this <em>shāh-bend</em> of water: cf. Le Strange, <em>op. cit.</em>, p. 245, Schwarz, <em>op. cit.</em>, p. 367.

Among the numerous ravines which are to be found among the hills that border the Māl-Amīr plain on the N. E. the most interesting from the archaeological point of view is that of Kūl-i Fārā (see the plan in Jäquier, <em>op. cit.</em>, p. 135). Kūl, according to O. Mann means in Lurī "little ravine"; cf. above iii., p. 411. Dieu lafoy and Schindler have erroneously reproduced this to them unintelligible word by Kā'la or Kīt = fortress: see Weissbach, <em>op. cit.</em>, p. 743, note, whose suggestion about the meaning of Kūl is now ruled out. For Fārā, H. Schindler gives the form Ferra and Ferendj (Franks, Europeans), the latter apparently based on a Lurī interpretation of the male costume in the reliefs there. Earlier travellers (Layard, de Bode) write Kūl-i Fīrān, apparently because their Lurī authorities identified the name Fārā with Fīrān (Pharaoh) whom they knew from the Kuʃān.

The majority of the sculptures of pre-Iranian (Elamite) origin in the region of Māl-Amīr are to be found in Kūl-i Fārā. Quite close to the entrance to the ravine is a large stèle with a large human figure in high relief, a row of smaller figures with a well preserved line cuneiform inscription and 10 smaller inscriptions (the latter giving the names of the individuals represented). According to the large inscription it is a monument erected by a certain Hāni, son of Taḥšihi. Opposite, on the other side of the ravine at intervals on blocks of stone and on the wall are five tablets with other reliefs of rude execution. Special mention must be made of a great procession with 67 figures. The total number of figures in Kūl-i Fārā is according to Layard 341.

Opposite the ravine of Kūl-i Fārā, in the hills which bound the S. W. side of the plain of Māl-Amīr is the cave with many corridors of Shīkhefte-i Salman, "the cave of Salman." According to the Bakhtiyāris who hold this place in great honour, the name is derived from that of Salman al-Fārisī (q. v.), the first Persian to adopt Islam, who is buried there, contrary to the modern Sunni and Shi'ī tradition which locates the tomb of this companion of the Prophet in al-Madā'in (Salman Pāk; cf. above iii., p. 79). In Shīkhefte-i Salman have survived four primitive bas-reliefs of the Elamite period of which two are outside and two inside the cave. Among them is a figure, over life size with c. 36 line cuneiform inscription which also dates from the Hāni above mentioned. On a little esplanade to the south of the cave are the ruins of a little Muslim sanctuary, possibly erected on the site of an older sanctuary. In the corner of the cave is a spring in which rises one of the little streams that water Māl-Amīr.

Apart from the monuments of Kūl-i Fārā and Shīkhefte-i Salman there are a series of other monuments and remains of the ancient and mediaeval periods in the plains of Shīkhefte-i Salman. For example, in the south-west part of the plain near a ruined tower (<em>mašta</em> <em>hā</em>) (<em>qisvat</em>) which the Lūrs call Shīh-Sawār (the king on horseback) on a slope of the hill is a small stèle, obviously also of the Elamite period, with 6 figures and an inscription which has been destroyed. According to Layard, there are many popular traditions about this place. A little north of Shīh-Sawār at a place called Kūh Wān are the ruins of a palace. In the opposite direction in the N. E. section of the plain rises a round palace on the summit of a rock, called Kā'la Gūshūm (= Scorpion Hill) by the natives. A ravine near by is called Hōq; in it
may be seen a much weathered Sasanian rock-sculpture of great dimensions, probably of the earlier period (c. Shapur I).

That the plain of Mal-Amir enjoyed comparative prosperity in the Sasanian period is evident from the remains of canals of this date.

In the S.W. of the plain a narrow road runs to the village of Halladdjān (de Bode: Halagun). Near it are old ruins of the period of the Attabeg dynasty. There is an Attabeg citadel, an Attabeg bridge and well. The numerous traces of buildings probably date from a mediaeval town. Of recent date is the ruin (mentioned by de Bode) of a palace of Ḫasan Ḫān, a chief of the Bakhtiyāris tribe of Ḩadīj Lang who lived here about 1521. Here is another well, now filled and made into a meadow.

In the N.E. of Mal-Amir runs an old road paved with huge blocks of stone, which is now called Rūh-i Sulṭān (the Sulṭān's path) or Dāddet-i Attabeg (= Attabeg road) to the Sar-i Raḵ (Radj) some 3,500 feet high, the highest point, and thence to Isfahān after several days' journey. It has already been mentioned above that the Attabegs did a great deal of road-making in these lands. But the original planning of the road probably goes back to a great antiquity: cf. the road of Bode, J. R. G. S., xiii. 102—104, and Travels etc., i. 404.

In the N.E. of Mal-Amir runs an old road paved with huge blocks of stone, which is now called Rūh-i Sulṭān (the Sulṭān's path) or Dāddet-i Attabeg (= Attabeg road) to the Sar-i Raḵ (Radj) some 3,500 feet high, the highest point, and thence to Isfahān after several days' journey. It has already been mentioned above that the Attabegs did a great deal of road-making in these lands. But the original planning of the road probably goes back to a great antiquity: cf. the road of Bode, J. R. G. S., xiii. 102—104, and Travels etc., i. 404.

Perhaps, he suggests, the "ladder-road" (kāhivan kāhi) over which Eumenes passed, as mentioned by Diodorus xix. 21, may be identical with the Attabeg road. Remains of old roads paved or hewn out of the rock are also found in other places in the neighbourhood of Mal-Amir; cf. iii. 51b. The natives ascribe them at once to the Attabegs, as they do the ruined caravanserais found everywhere. Near the Sar-i Raḵ pass about 12 miles east of Mal-Amir is a place called Kal'a-i Medrese in the ruins of the Bakhtiyari meeting place. There are the ruins of two road-side buildings; cf. Unvala, in Revue d'Asie Mineure, xxv., 1928, 86—88, who gives a detailed description of them. Schwarz (op. cit., p. 340) thinks that this Kal'a-i Medrese — in spite of the discrepancy in the distances given — corresponds with the place Ḫalafštān mentioned by Ibn Battūta (ii. 41). A ruined site of the same name, also with two Sasanian buildings is according to Unvala 24 miles S.E. of Masjd-i Sulaimān [cf. p. 283]; cf. 4—5 hours N.E. of Mal-Amir are the ruins of Ṣūnān [q.v.].

The Arab geographers of the middle ages reckoned the road from Teke to the "stone bridge" (kāntara) of Ibad ad-dīr (Isfahān) among the easiest and most direct in the world. The road was also called Jau tar Khurra-zaḏ from the alleged (otherwise unknown) name of the mother of Adīlarshīr I, who is said to have built this bridge and another in the town of Ayawza (see Schwarz, op. cit., p. 324). Otherwise we only know the masculine form of the Iranian name Khurraz (cf. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 338 note 4, 46). It was restored by the vizier of the Bāyād Rūk al-Dāwla after two years of work. De Bode identifies it with the "Attabeg bridge at Halladdjān; probably however we should, with Rawlinson, cf. cit., p. 53 and Schwarz, op. cit., p. 539, identify it with the "Old Bridge" crossing a small tributary of the Kānī N. E. of Kal'ā-i Medrese. For further information on the bridge of Ibad ad-dīr, cf. Väth, i. 416, iv. 189 and Schwarz, op. cit., p. 338—339.

The rulers who had the sculptures and rock inscriptions of Kūl-i Fāna and Shīkāf-e Salāmīn made, belong to the period of the later Elamite kingdom, to the period between Nebuchadnezzar I (1146—1123) and the rise of Asshur in the first half of the 6th century i.e. about 1000 B.C. It cannot be decided whether king Ḥanni, son of Taḥhit, from whom the monuments and inscriptions date, and the Ṣultān Nasirīkhuntā, son of Indūda mentioned by him, ruled the whole of Elam or whether they are to be regarded as members of a local dynasty ruling perhaps the district of Mal-Amir. The inscriptions in the Elamite language but contracts written in the Babylonian language have also been found in Mal-Amir; cf. the Bibliography.

Here it may be mentioned that following de Bode the town of the *Uxians* which Alexander the Great passed on his way from Susa to Persepolis after passing the "Sasan Gates" has often been sought in the region of Mal-Amir; cf. the road, Travels etc., i. 47 sq.; Spiegel, Erhardt, Altertumskunde, i. Leipzig 1870, p. 409 and Kaerst in Pauw, Wissowa, Realwörterb., S. 1424.

Since the late middle ages (beginning of the vii/viii century) the Bakhtiyāris have settled in the district of Mal-Amir (cf. above iii., p. 426—451). They spend the winter there on account of the fine green pastures. On the Bakhtiyāris see Ḧalāfštān and iii., p. 451, 456, 506.


MALABAR, a district of the Madras Presidency in British India, situated on the west coast of the peninsula, between 10° 15' and 18° 15' N. latitude and 73° 14' and 76° 15' E. longitude. It extends along 150 miles along the shore of the Arabian Sea; on the E. the district is bounded by the Western Ghats, the hills of which attain an average elevation of 5,000 feet, but occasionally rise to 8,000 feet. Of the total population of 2,059,333 (according to the Census of 1921) there are 1,004,327 Malmee, of whom 0.6% are Sumis; the greater part of them are Moppilas [q. v.]; the Labbauns [q. v.] form the next largest group, and there are a few Pathans, and in the larger coast towns a few Arabs.

Trade with Arabia appears to have led to the introduction of Islam into the Malabar coast of India at an early period, the exact date of which is uncertain. Hindu rajputs encouraged the Arab traders and the commerce of the western coast had passed almost entirely into their hands by the end of the 14th century when the Portuguese arrived to dispute it with them. The Arabs did not give way without a struggle, but by the middle of the 15th century only the petty coasting trade was left in Arab hands, and when the power of the Portuguese declined in the 16th century their place was taken by English and Dutch traders. In 1766 Haidar Ali [q. v.] added Malabar to his dominions, but found it a turbulent possession, and his son Tipu Sultan [q. v.] in 1792 had to abandon this territory to the British.


MALACCA (from the Sanskrit analaka through the Malay melaka, Phyllanthus punctatus Hook fil., Euphorbiaceae) is the name of a town situated on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula in 2° 11' 50' N., 102° 15' E. (Gr.), of a river which enters the sea at that spot, and of a territory of about 720 English square miles adjacent to and administered from the town. Formerly the name was often extended to the Malay Peninsula as a whole, but this usage is obsolete in English though still sometimes found in Continental works.

The earliest date in the history of Malacca occurs in Book 325 of the History of the Ming dynasty of China (1368–1643), which relates the sending of a Chinese mission to it in the year 1403, in consequence of which the local chief was short afterwards recognized as king by the Chinese Emperor. Previous to this time Siam had apparently claimed some kind of suzerainty over the country. Two alleged earlier references are very doubtful, one in chapter ix. of the Japanese history Pararotan, and the other in the Siamese Kof Monthikarabu (Maythikara). The latter work certainly mentions Malaca as a vassal of Siam, but in its introduction it speaks of a Siamese king (Paramatralokanatha) whose reign began about 1335. The oldest strictly contemporary notice of the place occurs in the Fuyi-xiaoming-lan of Ma Huan, which records a Chinese mission to it in 1409 and states that at that time the king and people of Malacca carefully observed the tenets of Islam. As Malay traditional history connects the rise of Malacca with the fall of Singapore (probably circa 1377), it seems likely that the establishment of Islam as the official religion in Malacca may have occurred between these dates.

Owing to its position on the trade route from India and Western Asia to the Malay Archipelago, China, and Japan, Malacca became in the 14th century the most important of the Malay states; it was visited by traders from various countries, many of them being Muslims from Northern and Southern India, the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, and it became the centre of a Muslim propaganda of which the earliest successes in this part of the world had already been registered by Marco Polo in North-Eastern Sumatra before the close of the
xilth century. After the middle of the xvth century Malacca territory was increased by the conquest of Pahang (on the East coast of the Peninsula); and for a time the kingdom included all the coasts of the centre and South of the Peninsula to about 4° N., together with a sovereignty over the parts of Sumatra lying opposite to it. Soon made several unsuccessful attacks on Malacca during the same period.

The growth of this incipient empire, which however already showed signs of decay in the form of internal divisions and bad administration, was cut short by the Portuguese conquest in 1511, whereby the town and its immediately adjoining territory, together with the command of the sea, fell into European hands. Though often challenged by the attacks of their Muslim neighbours (especially the new state of Aceh [Achin] in Northern Sumatra), the Portuguese maintained their hold on Malacca till 1641, when after a prolonged siege it was taken by the Dutch. In 1795 it was occupied by the British, and held until 1818, when it was returned to the Netherlands under the provisions of the treaty of Vienna. In 1824 it finally became British and in 1826 it was incorporated in one government with Penang and Singapore and made subject to the East India Company.

During the Dutch period the importance of Malacca as a trading centre declined; it was never allowed to compete seriously with Batavia, and in the end it was quite overshadowed by Penang (founded in 1786) and Singapore (founded in 1819). In recent times it has shared in the general economic development of the Peninsula; but it only ranks as the fifth British Malayan port in a population (in 1921) of 30,671 (of whom about one-fifth were Muslims) in an area of 3.5 English square miles. In the whole settlement or territory of Malacca, including the town itself, the population was 153,522, of whom 83,635 were Malay proper (including a considerable number of Minangkabau descent), 2,777 other Muslims (such as Javanese, Banjarese, etc.) of similar Indonesian stock, 1,146 Muslim Indians, 257 Muslim Chinese, and 56 Arabs, making an approximate total Muslim population of 87,871, all of whom were Sinhals of the school of Shafi'i. Of the rest of the Asiatic population about four-tenths were Chinese and one-fifth Hindus.

MALACCA — MALAGA

MALAGA, Arabic Melag (ethnic: Málaga), a large town in Spain on the Mediterranean and capital of the same name, has at the present day 133,600 inhabitants. It is built at the centre of a bay commanded by the hill of Gibralfaro (the Djabal Fārāb of Idris). The town is traversed from north to south by the “rambla” (i.e. the broad, usually dry [Arabic ranbā]) of the Guadalméndiga (Arabic t-madīna) which, while very often drying up, sometimes overflows in the rainy season. To the west of the town lies the Vega or Hoya of Malaga where the vegetation is exotic and extremely luxuriant.

Malaga, the ancient Malaca, was founded by the Phoenicians and retained for long under Roman rule traces of a different influence; its port under the Empire was one of the most important in the Iberian Peninsula. At a later date it was the see of a bishop. It was taken from the Byzantines in 571 by the Visigothic king Leovigild. In 1171 it was taken by a Muslim force sent from Eclia by Tarik. It soon became an important Muslim town and in time supplanted Arshidōna (Arcidona, q.v.) as capital of the province of Reino (Latin: regio) where in the time of the governor Abu ʾl-Khaṭṭār al-Malīm b. ʿAbd al-Kalbī the Arab Ḥund of Jordan (al-ʿUdān) was settled in 125 (742). Malaga welcomed the foundress of the Omayyad dynasty of Damascus and in the days of Leopold II, after his landing at Almunicar and his triumphal progress through the district of Eivissa. But, in the second half of the third (ninth) century, the province of Reyo including Malaga was closely involved in the trouble stirred up by the nationalist ʿUmar b. ʿAbd Allāh. In the reign of the Emir Mūllamadd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿUkām, according to the historian Ibn Hāfṣūn, the province supplied for a summer expedition (Falṣaf) against Galicia an imposing number of horsemen: 2,000. Later, when the rebel was causing anxiety to the Emir ʿAbd Allāh an expedition on a large scale had to be undertaken against the province of Reyo. An army under the command of prince ʿAbd Allāh son of ʿAbd Allāh took the field in 201 (914) and inflicted a severe defeat on the troops of Ibn Hāfṣūn. Three years later, the same general had to besiege Malaga, which was held by the rebel Muṣʿūrīb. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. Another expedition was again led against Malaga in the reign of ʿAbd Allāh in 297 (909).

The great caliph ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III, on ascending the throne, had no peace until he succeeded in putting down the rebellion of Ibn Hāfṣūn. In the early years of his reign several expeditions were again sent against the rebels in the province of Reyo of which Malaga was the most important, but not the capital. Once order was completely restored by the sovereign, Malaga entered on a long period of prosperity which continued till the end of the Umayyad caliphate.

From being capital of a province, Malaga became the capital of an independent kingdom in the period of the mūlūb al-tāriqī. The Ḥamīdīds and their adherents to the caliphate of all Muslim Spain were able to hold out in a little principality in the S.E. of Spain with Malaga as capital. At the same time another branch of the same family founded a little kingdom around the town of Algiers. The Ḥamīdīd dynasty of Malaga survived till 1449 (1057) [on it cf. the article ḤAMMĀDIYD]. The king of G anza, the Zirid Bīdī b. Baddūs, had hitherto been nominally their vassal. He decided to cast off their suzerainty and seize their principality. He did this with ease and exiled the last Ḥamīdīd to Africa; his son al-Murīz was appointed ruler of Malaga. On the death of Bīdī in 466 (1073) his kingdom was divided between his two grandsons ʿAbd Allāh and Tamūn and Malaga
fell to the latter. The town very soon passed to the Almoravids and then to the Almohads. When in 629 (1232) Muhammad I Ibn al-Ashmar founded the Nasrid kingdom of Granada, Malaga and its province formed part of his lands and remained in the power of the dynasty till the period of the Catholic Kings. Ferdinand and Isabella took Malaga from the Muslims on Aug. 18, 1487 after a close blockade.

The Arab geographers of Muslim Spain almost all give enthusiastic descriptions of Malaga. Idrisi (eleventh century) mentions two of its suburbs, praises the sweetness of its waters and the flavour of its fruits. Ibn Batūṭa in the second half of the thirteenth century says much the same and adds that a fine gilt porcelain was made at Malaga which was exported to the whole Muslim world. Finally Ibn al-Kūfī frequently speaks of Malaga in his description of the kingdom of Granada; one of his minor works is devoted to a comparion of Malaga with Sale, the Mufakham Malakān-żafar (the Arabic text has been published from two MSS. of the Escorial by M. J. Muller. Etc. L. and I. Essays in medieval and Islamic history, p. 23; transl., ii. 1487). The Old Muslim cities of the south were more prosperous than the north. There are very few relics of Islam in it, a vaulted gateway (Arco de Christo) and a tower (Torre de la Vela). This citadel was joined to another fortress by a double rampart built on the hill of Gibralardo; it was restored at the end of the sixteenth century by the Nasrid rulers of Granada.

Malaga in the Muslim period remained an important sea-port and an active centre of shipbuilding, less important however than its neighbour Almeria. This Ibn al-Ajadi, the name of which has survived in the form Almara, occupied the actual site of a market and one of the gates of the city; Ibn al-Ajadi, the name of which has survived in the form Almara, occupied the actual site of a market and one of the gates of the city; Ibn al-Ajadi, the name of which has survived in the form Almara, occupied the actual site of a market and one of the gates of the city.

MALÁHIM (Ar., sing. maláhima) came, after a long and obscure development, to mean "destinies", either simply al-maláhím, or kutub al-maláhím or in the singular. The word was already quite adequately explained by De Sacy in his Christo-

The derivation of maláhima and the development of its meanings are very obscure. The word does not occur in the Qur'an which has the root only in lahm and lidūm with the concrete meaning, "flesh". Yet the 9th and 10th centuries, like the cognate Hebrew root, had apparently two very separate but old meanings, "food" and "fighting". Further, the fact that the Hebrew word, lohím, means "b Disneyland", while its exact equivalent in Arabic means "flesh" would suggest a separation very far back rather than a borrowing (cf. the comparative treatment and references in Browne-Briggs, Hebrew lexicon, p. 352). In old Arabic the meaning of decisive fighting, leading to defeat, pursuit and slaughter, seems to be certain (cf. the treatment in the Lištān, xxii. 9-11, and add to the quotations, there Hambū, ed. Freytag, p. 124, 728; Dā學生, f. taftil b. Ḍawʾ, ed. Krenwob, p. 49, 1, with translation and note on p. 15). The Lištān endeavours to connect the meanings (flesh: warp and wool in weaving; close, entangled fighting) under the general idea "being intricate, mixed" (laštishāk, laštishāt) or with the picture of the flesh of the slain on the battle-field. But, in view of the Hebrew usage, it is better to be satisfied with the meaning of lohím as "a stricken field": the Lištān (p. 10) reiterates the idea of war and fighting with much slaughter and especially in the Frānas (臨frānas), it only allusion to the prophetic and e-chatological usage. An epitaph of Muhammad is "the prophet of the maláhima" and of that the Lištān gives two explanations: (i) "the prophet who was sent with the sword" (as in another tradition, bāthil bāthil); (ii) "the prophet of union and good order" (ulūf al-salāh).

There is very little general prophecy in the Qurʾān as to future historical events in this world; but in Tradition there is a great deal. Even the two Sahih have sections on such future fiṣār —
apparently the oldest word for them and frequent in the Kūrān — especially those leading up to the Last Day. In Bukhārī (Buḳhāl 1315, ix. 46-61; Book 92 in Wensinc, Handbook) the Prophet is quite explicit in foretelling such woes and trials to come and in warning how they must be met. In Muslim (Constantinople 1329-1333; vii. 165-216; Book 52 in Wensinc, Handbook) there is a similar series of hortatory predictions, but, also, an explicit statement at the Prophet foretold everything which would happen to his People until the Last Day. By Ibn Khaldūn (Maḳaddima, ed. Quatremer, i. 182 sqq.; trans. De Slane, ii. 321 sqq.) this tradition is cited and others, by later and less weighty authorities, which make the Prophet give a dynastic history for future Islam, with the names, fathers’ names and tribes of all leaders of revolts until the end.

The use of the term malāḥim in connection with those prophecies appears first among the Alīds in their doctrine of the Dījaf. The Fihrist gives two occurrences: "Alī b. Yākūn (d. A.H. 182; p. 224, l. 22) had a ḫīb mīh ʿudār al-malāḥīm and in it is ḥadūth al-malāḥi, but this is very rapidly. In the Maḳākat of al-Baghwāi (Caīro 1318, ii. 128 sqq.) those traditions are classified and one section is Bāb al-Malāḥim (p. 150-32). All the traditions bear on the wars of the Last Days but the word malāḥa itself occurs only in the early part of the ḥisāb section (p. 132 middle) in such phrases as "the Malāḥa", "the great Malāḥa", and the appearance of the Ad-Daṭād. In the Maḳākat al-Malāḥī (Dīhil 1327, p. 396 sqq.) the text is practically the same, only adding the names of the collections from which the hadith al-Malāḥīm (p. 170, l. 13) is taken. Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī also. Abū Dāwūd has a separate section on malāḥim (No. 36 in Wensinc). In such a book of edication as the Tughtin of al-Kurtubi (d. 671 = 1272), in the Maḳākat of al-Shārīfīn (Caīro 1324) the sections on the Malāḥim have swallowed up the whole doctrine and history of the Mahdi (p. 113-21), to the aid of whom there is sent an angel called Dāmāt (1), ṣīḥt al-Malāḥīm.

Ibn Khaldūn has recorded the final form which these prophecies took. Traditions put in the mouth of the Prophet were supplemented and largely dispensed by calculations of astrologers and by the speculations of pantheistic Sufis using the science of Sinīya [q.v.] in the interests of the Alīds. We have thus to distinguish sharply between (i) the malāḥim-predictions registered in the canonical books of traditions and in the literature of edification based upon these and (ii) the malāṭim-books based upon secret tradition and on astrology which went back to the Alīds and are represented best by the Dījaf. For, besides the Dījaf ascribed to ʿAbd al-Ṣādīq, there was also an astrological Dījaf, ascribed to Ibn Islāq ibn al-Kindi, dealing with the dynastic destinies of the āli. (This was ascribed variously, this fancied doubt of this fragility, of the Little Dījaf, was in circulation in the Maghrib in Ibn Khaldūn’s time, but had apparently been composed in the interests of the Muwahhids. Further Ibn Khaldūn had known as in circulation in the Maghrib several poems of this class in the interests of different western dynasties. In the Orient he had heard of several such malāṭim ascribed to Ibn Sinā and he had actually had knowledge of one such ascribed to Ibn al-ʿArabī. In Cairo he had found another, also ascribed to Ibn al-ʿArabī, giving a horoscope for that town. In the Orient, too, he had seen a malāṭa poem by a certain Ṣīrī, Muḥammad al-Badżirīkī, of the Kārāndāl Fraternity of darwīshes, who left behind him a heretical sect, al-Badżirīkhīya, and who died 724 (1324). Ibn Khaldūn gives a mass of details on this malāṭa and on its author, who called it at Dījaf. It dealt with the dynasties of the Mamlūks and Ibn Khaldūn knew it in two recensions from which he quotes. For still more details on this genre of literature, based on Ibn Khaldūn’s personal knowledge, see Quatremer, text, i. 193—201 (the Būlāk texts are not complete) and De Slane’s translation, ii. 226—237.)

In stories, there are frequent references to the science of malāṭim as one of the esoteric sciences along with astrology and tarab al-mulālam. Thus, in Habicht’s text of The 100 Nights (ed. Bresla, iii. 218) in the Story of Kamar ibn-Hasān and Badārī, a form closely akin to the version of Galland and different from that in the second Calcutta and the Būlāk editions, in which the term of Badārī, as described in learned as the sciences of the astronomy and the sphere and reckoning and algebra and mulālam and malāṭim.

**Bibliography:** is given in the course of the article. (I. B. MACDONALD)

MAL’AK. [See Malāṭim].

MALĀṬIM, angels, is the Arabic broken plural of an early Semitic (Canaanite) word malāṭā, meaning ‘messenger’. The evidence would suggest that it is a loan-word, coming into Arabic from Hebrew: there is no trace of a verb in Hebrew (nor in Phoenician, where the noun occurs in the later inscriptions), and in Arabic the root, even in the greatest uncertainty, being referred to a dubious 3-l-k (Lane, p. 81, 8, 6; Lišān, xii. 272 sqq.; Tabāri, Taṭār, i. 150) and to a still more dubious 7-k (Lišān, xii. 370). The singular in Arabic is usually malak without hamza, and so always in the Kūrān; although the Lišān in two places (xii. 274, 6; 371, 3) quotes the same verse as a proof that malak does occur, but as an exceptional form (ṣāliḥ). Both singular and plural in Arabic are used only in the sense ‘angel’.

In the Kūrān it occurs twice in the dual (malākān, ii. 96; vi. 19); of the two angels Hārūt and Mīrūt (q. v. and under ūnā), and of Adam and Eve being tempted in the Garden to believe that they may become angels. The plural occurs very often in the Kūrān (in Flakel’s Concordance under L-k, p. 171) but the singular only 12 times (Flakel under m-l-k, p. 183). These are of the people demanding revelation by an angel rather than a human being (bāškar, vi. 8, 9, 50; xi. 15, 33; xvii. 97; xxv. 8); women think Joseph an angel for his beauty rather than a human being (bāškar, xii. 31); an angel’s intercession (ṣūfā, liii. 26) does not avail; twice as collective for angels, beside the ‘ārāf (lxvi. 17), and in rows and rows (lxxix. 23).

In xxi. 11 “the angel of death” (malak al-mawṣur) occurs but not by name; see article Ṣīrāt, and references in tradition in Wensinc, Handbook, p. 226. Ḫabdīl, the angel of revelation, is named three times (ii. 91, 92; lxvi. 4); cf. traditions on him in Musinc, i. 109—111 of ed. Constantinople 1333, and other references in Wensinc, p. 59. In Kūrān xxvi. 193—195, Ḫabdīl, unnamed, is called
the Faithful Spirit" (al-räh al-amīn); he brings down the revelation to the ḫalīf of Muḥammad in a clear Arabic tongue. There are other descriptions of him, still unnamed, in Kūrān lii. 5–18 and lxvi. 19–25, as appearing plainly to Muḥammad in revelation. He, as "our Spirit" (rāḥūnā), was sent to Maryam (xix. 17). He is called "the Holy Spirit" (rāḥū al-khdr) in xvi. 104 and Allāh aided ʿĪsā with the same (ili. 83, 254; v. 109). Miḥāʾil (variant Miḥāʾ) is named (n. 92) as an angel of the same rank as ḫūrūl; see a long and apparently true story of how his naming came about in Bajīāwī (Fleišcher's ed., i. 347, and two; in traditions he, with ḫūrūl, appears to be called "rough, violent" (žalūz, ḥdhīlū); another class of angels are those "Brought Near" (to Allāh), al-muḥjarīn (iv. 170), those praisè Allāh day and night without ceasing (xxi. 20); Bajīāwī calls them also al-ulāmīn (on Kūrān ila. 28; Fleischner's ed., i. 47, ed., ii.) and al-kaṣārawīn (al-kāsrīn) on Kūrān iv. 170 (Fleišcher's ed., i. 243, 23) as those that are around the ʿarāf. The same term, muḥjarī, is used of Jās (Kūrān, ili. 40) as he is in the company of the angels nearest Allāh; cf. attců n., above, for his semichrisian character. At the beginning of the story of the Angel (Kūrān xxxiv.) there is a significant description: "making the angels messengers (muḥjarīn), with wings two and three and four; He makes es in the creation what He wills"; this has had much effect on later descriptions and pictures. They are guardians (zādūn) over mankind, cognizant of what man does and writing it down (kīn ia. Kūrān ili. 10–12) in xvi. 94 the writing down is assimiled to Allāh himself. In xvi. 4; xlviii. 38; xviii. 4, there occurs the very puzzling phrase "the angels and al- Sốbīn"). Bajīāwī on the first two passages shows how perplexing the distinction was (Fleišcher's ed., th. 155, 2; p. 383, 3): the rūb is an angel set over the "spirits" (al-ṣādūqīn); or lie is the whole genus of "spirits"; or ḫūrūl; or a creation (zādūn) mightier than the "angels"; cf. 109, Kazwīnī's li. 95, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 50. For "spirit" and the conception of "spirit" in-lūn see article ṣīn. In the Kūrān there is no reference to the two angels. Munkār and Nākr, who visit the dead man in his grave, on the night after his burial, and catechize him as to his Faith Thereafter, if he is an unbeliever, his grave becomes a preliminary hell, and if he is a believer, it becomes a preliminary purgatory from which he may pass at the Last Day into paradise; it may even, if he is a "saint", be a preliminary paradise. This is called technically the "Questioning (ṣādūqīn) of Munkār and Nākr and also, the Punishment of the grave (zādūn al-ṣādūqīn). This doctrine, similar to the Later Judgement of Christian theology, is one of the saʿwāt (to be believed on oral testimony) and is based on the implicit meaning of Kūrānīc passages (xiv. 32; xi. 49, lxvi. 25) and upon explicit traditions (Tafiażzānī's commentary on Nasāfī's Alāʾid, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 109; Māshāīb al-Ṣālih with commentary of al-Durānī, ed. Būlāk 1266, p. 590 sqq.). There is still a fuller account and discussion by the Ḥanbalite theologian Ibn Kāṣim al-Dawrī (Dreckelmann, G. A. L., ii. 100, No. 23) in his Kitāb al-Rūh, ed. Haidarabād 1324, p. 62–144, vi–xiv.

The angels are, also, called the heavenly host, or multitude (al-wađ al-dīn) of angels, xxviii. 66 and guarding the walls of heaven against the "listening" of the djīmūn and ḥaṣīfīn. See further on this under šīr, ili., p. 410.

The Kūrān lays stress on the absolute submission and obedience of the angels to Allāh. "To Him belong those who are in the heavens and in the earth and those who are with Him (ín thānā) are not too proud for His service (tābāk) and they do not become tired. They praise, night and day, without intermission" (xxi. 19, 20). "They do not anticipate Him in speech and they labour in His command" (xxi. 27). At the creation of Adam they are distinguished in this respect from him and his future race; "while we praise Thee and sanctify Thee" (xiv. 30). The Fire there are set certain terrible and powerful angels, "they do not rebel against Allāh as to what He commands them and they do what they are commanded" (lxvi. 6). But does this absolute obedience extend to impecuniosity (ljma; q. v.)? The Kūrān is emphatic as to their obedience, but is in contradiction to their created nature and to their relationship in that respect to the djīmūn and to the ḥaṣīfīn. Thus, in several passages in the Kūrān, the story is told of the creation of man out of clay and that the angels were hidden by Allāh to prostrate themselves to him. They did not "except Iblīs (dīn Iblīs) Kūrān ili. 52, vii. 50, xxxiv. 48; xxxviii. 74). Iblīs, therefore, must have been an angel; as Bajīāwī says, "If not, the command to them did not apply to him and his being excepted from them was illegitimate" (Fleišcher's ed., i. 51, 21). This would mean that the angels were not impecunious. But, again, in Kūrān xviii. 43 the statement is expanded, "except Iblīs; he was of the djīmūn; so he departed from the command of his Lord" (fasa'la 'an amr rabbihī). Further, in Kūrān vii. 11; xxxvi. 77, Iblīs pleads in justification that man was created of clay (ṭā) but he of fire (nār); and the djīmūn are acceptedly created of fire (al-sāmāt) in Kūrān xv. 27, of a mārīfī of fire" in Kūrān iv. 14. The meaning of mārīfī is unknown in the Ḥadīṣ (ili. 189, 11, 14) gives a number of contradictory explanations, but it is probably an unidentified loan-word. Iblīs and the djīmūn, then, were created of fire; but there is no statement in the Kūrān as to the material out of which the angels were formed. A tradition traced back to 'Aīb is the foundation of the accepted position that the angels were formed of light: "The Prophet said, 'The angels were formed of light (khailat min na'trāt) and the djīmūn were a mārīfī of fire and Adam of that which was described to you'" (Madinī, vii. 226 of ed. Constantinois 1333; Bajīāwī, i. 52, 4). Another difficulty in the doctrine of the impecuniosity of the angels is the Kūrān's statement as to Ḥarīrūt and Mārīrūt referred
to above. These two angels are supposed to have yielded to sexual temptation, to be confined in a pit near Babil and there to teach magic to men. But, it is answered, the Kur'an says nothing of their fall; (ii.) teaching magic is not practising magic; (iii.) they always first warn those who come to them; "We are only a temptation (guidah); so do not disbelieve" (Kur'an ii. 96); cf., further, Taftazan on the 'Alâ'îd of Nasafi, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 133.

In Bai'dawi on Kur'an ii. 32, there is a long discussion of the angelic nature (ed. Fleischer, p. 51, sq. to p. 52, s) which, however, runs out in the despairing statement that knowledge on the point is with Allah alone (al-ilm 'inda-llâhî). Perhaps Iblis was of the djinn as to his actions (lîhîna) but of the angels as to species (nisîd). Also, Ibn 'Abû-bäs has a tradition that there was a variety (jârîb) of the angels who propagated their kind (this has always been regarded as an essential characteristic of the djinn and of the sha'îfân's as opposed to the angels) and who were called al-djinnî; and Iblis was of these. Or, that he was a djinnî brought up among the angels and entered among them. Or, the djinnî were among those commanded to prostrate themselves to Adam. Or, that some of the angels were not impeccable, although that was their characteristic in general, just as some men, e.g. the prophets, are guarded against sin but most are not. Further, perhaps a variety of the angels are not essentially different from the sha'îfân's but differ only in accidents and qualities as men are virtuous or evil, while the djinn unite both, and Iblis was of this variety. The tradition from 'Abî-l-Fadl is no answer to this explanation, for light and fire in it are not to be taken too precisely: they are used as a proverb, and light is of the nature of fire and fire of light: they pass into another; fire can be purified into light and light obscured to fire. So al-Ba'îdawi.

With this should be compared the scholastic discussion in the Mawâlikî of al-Jâ'î, with the commentary of al-Djûrânî (ed. Nâsibî 1266, p. 576). In it the objector to the when of the angels has two grounds: (i.) their urging upon Allah that he should not create Adam showed defects (slander, pride, malice, finding fault with Allah) in their moral character; (ii.) that Iblis was rebellious, as above. These grounds are then answered scholastically. Then various Karâmî texts, as above, on the submission and obedience of the angels are quoted. But it is pointed out that these texts cannot prove that all of them, at all times, are kept free from all sins. The point, therefore, cannot be absolutely decided. Individual exceptions under varying circumstances may have occurred, just as, while the sha'îfân's as a class were created for evil (sharî'a 'inda-sharî'a), there is a definite tradition (Shârî'î by al-Mâtarrî on al-Fîhî 'al-bashar ascribed to Abû Hamîfa, ed. Hdârâbâd 1321, p. 25) of one Muslim sha'îfân, a great-grandson of Iblis, who appeared to Muhammad and was taught by him certain silras of the angels.

The story of Hârit and Mârût suggests that the angels possess sex, although they may not propagate their kind. But "they are not to be described with either masculinity or femininity" ('ilâhîd of Nasafi, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 133). Taftazan and the other commentators in this edition explain that there is no authority (wâjud) on this point and no proof by reason (ma'ût); it should, therefore, be left unconsidered and that, apparently, was the course followed by al-Idjî and al-Djûrânî. They may have sex and not use it. In that respect it is important that man has in him the possibility of sin and must himself rule his appetites of lust (lût) and of anger (shâdâb) has a higher potentiality of excellency than the angels (Bai'dawi on Kur'an ii. 28, ed. Fleischer, i. 48, 61, s.f.).

This leads to the second question as to the angels which scholastic theology has considered, the relative excellency of angels and men, and especially, of angels and prophets. This is stated shortly by Nasafi (p. 147 of ed. cited above): (i.) "The Messengers (rasûlî) of mankind (al-bashar) are more excellent than the Messengers of the angels and (ii.) the Messengers of the angels are more excellent than the generality of mankind and (iii.) the generality of mankind arc more excellent than the generality of the angels". Taftazân develops that there is general and indeed necessary agreement on the excellency of the messengers of the angels over mankind in general, but that the other two statements (i. and iii.) will bear argument. Hence (i.) the preceding of the angels to Adam; (ii.) that Adam was taught all the names of things (Kur'an ii. 29); (iii.) that Allah "chose" (igtâfâ) Adam and Nûh and the family of Iblis and the family of 'Imran over all created things (ala 'illâmin: Kur'an ii. 30); (iv.) that mankind achieves excellencies and perfections of knowledge and action in spite of the hindrances of lust and anger. But the Mu'tazîlîs and the "philosophers" (al-falsâ'îfîa) and some A'Sî'îs held the superior excellency of the angels. They urged (i.) that they were spirits, stripped of materiality (wâ-ra'â mudjarra wâd), complete actually, free of even the beginnings of evils and defects, like last and anger, and from the obscurities of form and matter (zâli'mû fî al-khâyûla wa-l-qir'a), capable of doing wonderful things, knowing events (ka-awâ'), past and to come, without error. The answer is that this description is based on philosophical and not Muslim principles. (ii.) That the prophets learn from the angels, as in Kur'an xxvi. 193; iii. 5. The answer is that the prophets learn from Allah and that the angels are only intermediaries. (iii.) That there are multiplied cases both in Kur'an and in tradition where mention of the angels precedes that of the prophet. The answer is that precedence is because of their precedence in existence or because their existence is more concealed (al-khâs al-'amâl) and, therefore, faith in them must be emphasized. (iv.) In Kur'an iv. 170: "al-mâshûd does not disdain to be an 'âlî to Allah nor do the angels" must mean, because of linguistic usage, that the angels are more excellent than 'Isa. The answer is that the point is not simple excellency but to combat the Christian position that 'Îsà is not an 'âlî but a son to Allah. In the Marrâ'î (p. 572—578) there is a similar but much fuller discussion which involves a philosophical consideration of the endowment of mental, physical, spiritual — of all living creatures from immaterial spirits to the lower animals (al-bâshîrî). In the A'dâb al-Ma'nîhîhît of al-Kashwî (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 55—63) there is an objective description of the angels in all their classes, in which the statements of Kûrân and Sunna are adjusted to the Aristotelian-Neoplatonic universe
with its spheres (al-ajfāk), in accordance with al-Kazwīnī's general aim to give a picture of the created universe in its details and wonders. Yet, apparently, while the angels possess the quality "life" (ḥayā) and are the inhabitants of the heavens and of the heavenly spheres (ṣubkān al-samawāl) they are not to be reckoned among the animals (al-sayyāqūn). Al-Damūrī includes mankind and the ḏiwnn, even the diabolical (muṭashātānā) ḏiwnn, such as the ḏidīn, in his ḏayū al-sayyāqūn but not the angels. Equally acute and scholarly was the discussion in the Ḡayākīf, and more spiritual than that by Kazwīnī, is al-Ghazālī's treatment of the mystery of the angelic nature in some of his specialistic smaller treatises. For him it is part of the general question of the nature of spirit to which his smaller Maṣūfa is devoted. See, too, the larger Maṣūfa (ed. Cairo 1903) in Ruh, ii., p. 23 sqq., and the translation by W. H. T. Gairdner of his Masāk al-Anwār (London, Royal Asiatic Society, 1924), passim.

The above is a statement of Muslim ideas as to the angels, but Muslim literature also takes account of non-Muslim ideas on them, as those of "philosophers": Christians, dualists, idolaters. These will be found given particularly by Baladhūrī on Kūfīnii. 28 (ed. Fleischer, i. 47, 185 sqq.) and in more detail in Diet. of tech. terms, p. 1337 sqq.

Bibliography: Besides the references above, Walter Eickmann, Angelologia u. Demonologia des Korans, New York and Leipzig 1908; a number of books and articles by Josef Horovitz, Königliche Untersuchungen, Berlin 1926; Jewish proper names in the Koran, in Hebrew Union College Annual, vol. 2: Maimonides Himmelsfahrt, 155., is. 159 sqq.; E. W. Lane, Thesaurus and One Nights, notes 1 and 21 to Introduction; note 15 to chap. i. (D. B. MacCulloch).

MALĀṬYA, an old city, not far from the upper Euphrates. It lies at the junction of important roads (in antiquity: the Persian royal road and the Euphrates route; in modern times Samsun–Sivas–Malatya–Divirak and Kaisariya–Altinlı–Malatya–Karpita) in a plain, the fertility and richness of which in all kinds of vegetables and fruits was celebrated by the Arab geographers, as in modern times by von Mölke and others, at the northern foot of the Taurus not very far south of Teğlma–A (Arab. Naḥr al-Kubālī) which is there crossed by the old bridge of Kirkkûz. The town was supplied with drinking-water by the springs of Yūn Dāwiyya and by the Euphrates. Weaving used to be a flourishing industry there: according to Ibn al-Shīrāzī there were once 12,000 looms for spinning wool in Malatya but they no longer existed in his time.

The town appears as Mēla in Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions and two "Hittite" stelae have been found there (to be more accurate: at Arslan Tepe, a little south of Malatya. Messerschmidt, Corpus Insr. Hittite. in M. V. Α. G., 1900, part iv., p. 13; 1906. part v., p. 7). It is probably able to be identified with the district called M.l-2 (lately better uncertain) in the inscription of king Z.Z-r of Hamat, (c. 800 B.C.) which Pognon found in 'Afi near Aleppo. Pliny (N. Hist., vi. 8) calls the town Melita a Souramite condition; the name of the legendary foundress has perhaps survived in that of the fortres of Shamrin which Michael Syrus (Chronicles, transl., Chabot iii., 1914) mentions in the 6th century in the land of Sawa'd in the region of Malatya. To its position on the Oriental times Malatya owed its great prosperity in the Roman period. From the time of Titus it was the headquarters of the Legio XII Fulminata; it was much extended by Trajan and under Justinian raised to be the capital of the province of Armenia III. Anastasius and Justinian refortified and beautified it. After his severe defeat at Malatya in the autumn of 575 Khosrow I burned the town (John of Ephesus, vi. 9; E. Stein, Studien zur Gesch. d. Byzanz. Reiches, Stuttgart 1949, p. 66–8; 85 note 9; and Habib b. Maslamah al-Fihri was sent by Yaḥyā b. Ĥānîm from Armenia VI (Shīmḥāl) against Malatya and took the town; but it was later retaken from the Muslims. When Mu'awiyah became ġāfīl from Syria and al-Džazīra, he again sent Ḥabīb b. Maslama against the town. He stormed it in 36, left a troop of cavalry in it to guard the frontier and placed a governor in it. Mu'awiyah himself visited Malatya on his campaign against Asia Minor and left a large garrison in the town which henceforth became one of the headquarters for the summer campaigns into Bālāb ar-Rūm. When the people abandoned the town in the time of the caliphs 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair, it was taken by the Byzantines; the territory round it, and it the whole of Armenia IV was settled by the Armenians and Akabateans, that is Aramaic speaking peasants, driven out of his kingdom by the emperor Philippicus. (Naldeke, Z. D. MG., xxv. 125; al-Baladhurī, ed. de Goeje, p. 185; Michael Syrus, transl. Chabot II, 482; according to Theophanes the Armenians were settled in Malatya by Philippicus in 712 A.D. They increased very much and were valuable allies of the Arabs in the wars against the Byzantines (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.). The caliph Omar settled the fugitive inhabitants of Ţuranda (now Derende) in Malatya and made al-Džawan b. al-Harīd of the tribe of the Bani Āmir b. Sa'ida a governor. In 123 (740–741) a Greek army of 20,000 men under Abdikivâsh, the general of the Thema Armeniakon, advanced against Malatya and plundered the country round it. The inhabitants closed the gates and sent a messenger to Hişām in al-Ruṣāfī: but the latter soon heard that the Greeks had withdrawn and sent the messenger back with a body of cavalry. Later, when he himself took the field against the Byzantines, he camped before Malatya until the rebuilding of the town which the enemy had destroyed was completed (Baladhurī, loc. cit.; Michael Syrus, ii. 506; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, year 743; Ps. Dionys, ed. Chabot, year 1051). The Emperor Constantin VI Cophonymos in 133 (750) advanced on Kāmākh and Malatya, whose inhabitants looked in vain for help to Mesopotamia, as a civil war was raging there. As the emperor knew this he demanded that the inhabitants should abandon the town. After at first refusing they finally agreed, being exhausted by the siege, left the town with all their goods and chattels and went to al-Džazīra whereupon Constantin levelled Malatya to the ground; nothing but a half ruined granary remained standing. Hişān Khalawīhuy was also destroyed and its inhabitants, like those of the other villages in Armenia IV, were carried off into captivity (Baladhurī, loc. cit.; Michael Syrus, ii. 518; Baethgen, Abb. d. K. K. Morgenl. v. 3. p. 54, 127; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, ii. 15). Six years afterwards (139 A. H.) al-Mansūr wrote to Ša'ilī b. Āli b. 'Abd Allāh who had in the
previous year defeated an army of 100,000 men under Constantine and retaken Malatya (G. W. Freytag, Slecta ex histor. Heilich, Paris 1850, p. 62, note 58) ordering him to rebuild and fortify the town. He then appointed his nephew, the Imam 'Abd al-Wahhab b. Ibrahim, governor of al-Djazira and its marches (al-Thaghib). He arrived there in July with his army and the Kurds, who were reinforced by Syrian and Mesopotamian troops to the number of 70,000. They camped at the ruined city and collected builders and workers of all kinds from everywhere and rebuilt Malatya with its mosque and large barracks for the frontier troops; the work was finished in six months. Hein Kalawahiya was also rebuilt (Balchaht, loc. cit.; Michael Syrus, ii. 522; Ps. Dionys., ed. Chabot, p. 67; Yaqut, Madjahim, iv. 653; Weil, Gesch. al-Chalifen, ii. 35); a frontier fort was built 30 miles from the town and another on the Nahr Kubak at (Tokhma-si). Al-Manṣur settled 4,000 Mesopotamian soldiers in Malatya to whom he gave increased pay and allotted lands as fiefs.

In the next year (141) Muhammad b. Ibrahim was sent to Malatya with a Kurdish army to protect the town from the enemy. The former inhabitants, at least those who were still alive, thereupon returned to Malatya. An expedition sent by the Byzantines against Malatya was defeated by Hāṣun al-Rashid (Balchaht, loc. cit.). In the reign of al-Ma'mun, his son, al-Abbas, who was governor of al-Djazira, conducted a campaign against the Byzantines (Weil, op. cit., ii. 230) from Malatya. In the summer of 122 (837) the emperor Theophilius went into Armenia via Zibatra, which he sacked and burned, and on his way back passed through the country of Malatya which was also laid waste and its inhabitants carried off prisoners by Byzantines (Michael Syrus, iii. 90; Mustufa, Muradi, viii. 133 sqq. Tahari, Yaqtub and other Arabs wrongly date this campaign in 123 [838]; cf. for the contrary view Weil, op. cit., ii. 310, note 1, and Burck, Hist. des Orient. Roman. Empire, 1912, p. 260; 5; Markwart, Handschr. Ansamml., xxviii, 1914, p. 44.). The town itself, which was handed over to the Byzantines by the prisoners there, he spared of fear and rapine on the part of the enemy. Towards the end of the following year Maytaqim sent the Syrian amir Abū Sa'id Muḥammad b. Yūsuf against the Byzantines but he only met with moderate success; the people of Malatya under Aṣfāh and the amir 'Omar b. 'Abd Allāh b. Marwān al-Aktā (the great Byzantine general, with his whole army on the Mardj al-Tabbā (Weil, op. cit., ii. 320; Theophanes Contin., ed. Bonn, p. 268; Kastār Kārānī in Berbarbaeus, Chron. eccl., ed. Abbeles-Lamy, i. 460; now, Cirmiklii, cf. Tomasein, Beitr. z. alt. Gesch. u. Geogr., Festschr. f. H. Kiepert, Berlin 1898, p. 141). But he was not able to take Malatya which was fortified (Hergenröther, Phthiūn, ii. 42; Weil, op. cit., ii. 471). His army suffered heavy losses during the siege and the emperor himself was nearly captured. He undertook a second campaign against Malatya which was doublet (Weil, op. cit., ii. 475).

The Arab general Mūniš in 304 (916-917) devastated Cappadocia from Malatya (Weil, op. cit., ii. 365); similar invasions took place in 310 and the following years. It was not till 314 (926-927) that the Byzantines were able to exact their revenge. Under the brave Domestikos Joannes Kurkuas (Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, viii. 221: ad ann. m. xii. Kilikia; Weil, op. cit., ii. 158: Kyriakos), they entered the district and advanced up to the suburbs of Malatya, laying waste the country and going as far as Shīmēšt (Arsamastes) (in 315 according to Iṣama al-Iṣfahānī, Tūrīk, ed. Gottwald, p. 205; transl. p. 158, wrongly "in fines Samosatienses invasione"). Kurkuas forced the amir of the town to send his son, Abu Ḥafs (Alphakkas), and the general Abu 'l-Asghār (Alalastāb) to him and acknowledge the suzerainty of the emperor (Symeon Magister, Bonn, p. 741 sq.; Georg. Monach., ed. Mural, p. 834, while the Bonn edition p. 908 and Theophanes Contin., ed. Bonn, p. 416 and Georg. Gardien, ii. 310 sqq. wrongly write Αποκάλυσα). Kurkuas, himself driven out of Armenia by Ardashir, seems to have moved up to the lands of Malatya and Sumaistān to the Armenian prince Mēḵ (Arab. Māliḵ, Greek Μαλαϊκης) who was however already driven out of Malatya and Sumaistān in 320 by Sa'd al-Dawla, uncle of the _ROUNDATION_ of Māliḵ al-Dawla of Mawṣil (Weil, op. cit., ii. 639; Zuppi, Imp. Akad. Nauk., xxxv. 102 sq. following Djamal al-Din b. Zāfīr). But in 934, after the death of the two friends of the Byzantines, Abu Ḥafs and Abu 'l-Ash'ath, Kurkuas and Mēḵ again appeared before the town, which at that time was protected by a double wall and a ditch full of water. The inhabitants were forced by starvation to negotiate about the surrender of the town. During the negotiations the Greeks succeeded by a stratagem in forcing the entrance through the north gate of the town and taking it on May 19, 934. The inhabitants, in keeping with the promise that had been given them, were allowed to leave the town. The walls were razed so that the town was henceforth open to all attacks (Michael Syrus, iii. 122 sq.; Ibn al-Athir, viii. 221; Rambaud, L'Empire Grec au Xme siècle, Paris 1870, p. 423; ; Rosen, op. cit., p. 89 sq., 106, 108). In the next decade Sa'id al-Dawla repeatedly raided the territory of Malatya.
His mammlik Nadža in his campaign to Hanzit in 350 (961-962) encountered 'Abd Allāh of Malātya and put him and his friends to flight (Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 107; Rosen, op. cit., p. 88). Two years later he again ravaged the land of Malātya for 18 days with fire and sword (Freytag, p. 204. 206).

When the emperor Nicephorus conquered Syria, he wished to repopulate Malātya, which was defenceless and deserted. But the Greeks refused to live there for fear of Arab raids. His advisers therefore recommended him to invite Syrian Jacobites to the country. He did this and promised the Patriarch Mār Vihannān Sarigat, that if he repopulated Malātya, Hanzit and the passes (ṣuqār), he would no longer persecute the Jacobites (Michael Syrus, iii. 130 sq.; Barbebraeus, Chron. eccl., ed. Abboeleos-Lamy, i. 411 sqq.; Markwart, Handb. Antiquar., xxx., 1916. p. 121 note). People now flocked to Malātya from all parts (c. 969 A.D.). Monasteries were built. About 1100 there were said to be in Malātya and district 53 churches and 66,000 Christians capable of bearing arms, including many Melkites (Michael of Tininis in Renanot, Hist. Patr. Alex.iii., Paris 1713, p. 402; Barbebraeus, op. cit., i. 424, note 1). The emperor did not, however, keep his promise; persecution again became of everyday occurrence and drove the Jacobites more and more into the lands of the Arabs (Michael Syrus, iii. 131, 136, 147).

According to Ibn al-Aṣḥāb (al-Kāmil, iii. 95) Malātya at this time was placed in the ṣuqā 'Amīnāwā (Alimināt) which he says stretched to the Bosporous (Khalīj al-Kustantiniyya).

The Emperor John Tzinmaces (Sūltāniyā) in 1361 (972) on his campaign to Nīṣābūr crossed the Euphrates at Malātya (Yahyā al-Anīkī in Rosen, op. cit., p. 183 note; Schümberger, L'empire byzantin, i., Paris 1896, p. 255). The rebel Bardas Scleros in 366 (976-977) seized the town of Malātya, imprisoned the strategos who was governing it for the Emperor and had himself proclaimed basileus. When Scleros was fighting against the imperial general Michael Kedrenos (al-Burdū), there was with him a Shākh who had been converted to Christianity, the patrician 'Uḥdā Allāh al-Mutanasārī of Malātya, who is perhaps identical with the 'Abd Allāh mentioned in 350. Scleros made him magistros and sent him with one of his slaves, the eunuch Kantāṭīsh ('Αντίτατδ 'Αντάρτας) whom he raised to the rank of bānīkēs ("Count"), to Antiochia against the patrōklos Kalabī, the imperial governor of this town. Kalabī surrendered to them Antīkīya, the Thughūr and the whole of the " Orient"; and he and the most prominent citizens of Antioch were then sent as prisoners to al-Kabāshīk (Cappadocia) (Rosen, op. cit., p. 2 sqq. and note: p. 81-99 sqq.; Schümberger, L'empire byzantin, i. 359, 362, 376 sqq.). Scleros however at once sent the Antioch notables back to their homes and made Kalabī basileus of Malātya (Rosen, op. cit.; Schümberger, i. 366) while on the other hand 'Uḥdā Allāh soon went over to the emperor Basil (977-975).

When after a seven years' internment on the Tigris island of Mādīda near Baghdad, Bardas Scleros succeeded in gaining his freedom, he escape to Malātya with the help of Beduins, whose he at once (in Shawal 376 = March 985) seized the basileus Kalabī who had gone over to the emperor, and himself again proclaimed basileus (Yahyā, transl. Rosen, p. 22; Schümberger, i. 675). Bardas Phocas, who took Bardas Scleros prisoner by treachery and then claimed the imperial title for himself, passed through Malātya on Sept. 14, 987 on his way westwards straight through Asia Minor (Schümberger, i. 695). In 399 (1008) the Ḥamāndīn Abu ʻl-Haḍījā fled to Malātya before the Mīrdādī Mūsār b. Lūlū, where the emperor appointed him magistros (Rosen, op. cit., p. 51; Schümberger, ii. 442).

The most important event during the Byzantine occupation of Malātya was the invasion of the Turks. Their first inroad into the area of the town was in 1058; the inhabitants fled before them mainly into the adjoining mountains where they perished of hunger and cold. The Turkish force 3,000 strong under the amir Abū Dinār remained 10 days pillaging Malātya and laid the country waste for a day's journey round. On their retreat the Turks were surprised by the people of the Armenian district of Sanasus (Arab, al-Sansīn; now: Sāsān) and all slain, with the assistance of the prisoners and fugitives from Malātya (Michael Syrus, iii. 158 sqq., according to whose erroneous chronology these incidents took place in the 9th or in the last year of Constantine IX [i.e. 1050—1051 or 1054—1055]; Matthias of Edesta, transl. Dulaquier, p. 107—109; Aristotle Lastivei, in Tomasehek, Sasan u. das Quellengebiet des Tigris, S. B. Ab. Wien, cxxvii., vol. iv., 1895, p. 29 sqq.). One of the prisoners who survived, the Syrian monk Joseph, wrote three memrē on these events; the patriarch Vīhannān bar Shīkhān also composed a mārūf on the devastation of Malātya (Baumstark, Gesch. d. Byz. Lit., ii. 291 sqq.). By the time of the Emperor Isaac I (1057—1059) we again find the Turks raiding the country of Malātya and carrying off prisoners from it. His successor Constantine X Doukas (1059—1067) restored the two walls and the ditch at Malātya (probably in 1060—1061). When the imperial decree regarding this was published, a number of citizens of Malātya, who were in Constantinople returned home and arranged for a large number of workmen and builders to be brought from Asia Minor and Antīkīya; in a very short time owing to the continual threat to the town, the fortifications were rebuilt on the old foundations (Michael Syrus, iii. 165 sqq.). The Byzantine Ṣawānīwa Knīmotes was afterwards killed, with his wife and children and the town "henceforth knew no peace" (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.).

These constant invasions of the Turks, which specially affected the region of Malātya (Skyllites in the ed. of Kedrenos, Bonn, ii. 660 sqq.) went with very little opposition. Then the legions quartered around Malātya, whose pay and provisions had been withheld, refused to cross the Euphrates to meet the enemy along with the local volunteers. The Turks did not besiege the town but went on to attack Kāṣāriya, which they stormed (Skyllites, loc. cit.). When Konmanus IV Diogenes attacked the Turks in 1068 he sent a general from Gōksun, perhaps, as Girfer suggests (Byz. Gesch. iii. 720), the Bulgar Alabianos, to Malātya to guard the frontier against the raids of the Turk Afšin (Afshāz). The general however did not leave Malātya so that Afšin was able to advance against the emperor undisturbed (Skyllites in Kedrenos, ed. Bonn, ii. 671; Weil, op. cit., ii. 112, note 2).

In the same year the emperor appointed the
of the district on the Djailian and the whole country round Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 195). The Atabeg of the Sultan of Malatya (probably Balaq), in 1111 again deprived him of his lands on the Djailian. Kildij Arslan's widow left Malatya to marry the doughty amir Balaq (Michael Syrus, iii. 200). A Turkish cavalry leader offered to sell Tughrul Arslan the fortress of Zay-bid; when the young sultan of Malatya wanted to take possession of it, he was taken from him by the son of the sultan of Kharasfan without a blow being struck. On the 11th March 1118 the amir Mangudj of Kamar silled the country round Malatya; the Khatun of Malatya thereupon turned to Joscelin of Edessa for help (Michael Syrus, iii. 204). In the following year the Sultan of Malatya conquered Abulustain and the lands on the Djailian; the region of Kafà passed as a gift to Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 205). Tughrul Arslan owed his success to the governor Balaq, who advanced as far as Kamar, defeated the Greeks with the help of al-Ghazi b. Djainmand, again had himself given in marriage to Baldwin of Edessa, summoned the Franks to his assistance (Michael Syrus, iii. 187, 192; Will. of Tyre, xii. 4). When Gümüşhtagin besieged the town and laid waste the countryside, Boemund came from Antiochia with his relative Riccardo del Principato and a troop of cavalry, but he was ambushed at Marásh and sent a prisoner to Niksar (or Swas) in June 1100. From there he appealed for help to Baldwin of Edessa who relieved Malatya and pursued Gümüşhtagin for 3 days without overtaking him. He then returned to Edessa via Malatya which Gabriel surrendered to him and left 50 horsemen for its protection. Gümüşhtagin appeared before Malatya again in 1105, where Gabriel had in the meanwhile made himself so detested by the inhabitants that they handed him over to Gümüşhtagin, who thereupon entered Malatya on Sept. 18, 1101 (Michael Syrus, iii. 188; Recueil Hist. Or. Crois., i. 5, 203; iii. 522, 526; Matthais of Edessa, trans. Dalaurier, p. 230). The dynasty of the Dânishmandids [q. v.] thus came to rule there (on them cf. also van Berchem-kh. Edhem, C. I. A., i., p. 2, note 3; p. 3, note 1; Zambaur, Manuel d. Géorg. et de Chrétien., Hanover 1927, p. 146 sqq.). At the suggestion of the Emperor Alexios, Gümüşhtagin invaded the suq of 1103 released Boemund, who had then been brought to Edessa, on payment of 100,000 dinars (Michael Syrus, iii. 189; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Konig. Journals., p. 45). According to Michael Syrus (iii. 192), Tanushman i.e. Gümüşhtagin b. Dânishmand died within two years of the taking of Malatya (i.e. 1103-1104); he was succeeded by his son Aghus-sian (Vâghbasian). Kildij Arslan again began the siege of Malatya on June 28 and directed siegework against the round N. E. tower of the town, which had to surrender after several onslaughts had been made on it. Kildij Arslan I began his rule on Sept. 1106; when he fell the very next year to the hoars of the Kebib, he was succeeded in Malatya by his youngest son Tughrul Arslan, in whose reign much evil fell upon the town as a result of the murder of the governor Pizmiš (Michael Syrus, iii. 194). During the fighting among the other sons of Kildij Arslan, of whom Masšud sought refuge in Malatya about 1107 (Rec. Hist. Or. Crois., iii. 534) Boemund succeeded in conquering Abulustain, the
plotted against his life (Michael Syrus, iii. 305 sq.).

Ma'dīn again (July 23, 1152) tried without success to take the town. Dhu l-Kārinn was succeeded in October 1162 by his minor son Nāsir al-Dīn Muhammad (Maḥmūd) who made himself so detested by his excesses that he had to leave Malatya (1170). His place was taken by his brother Abu l-Kāsīm (Takhrī al-Dīn Kaṣim; Michael Syrus, iii. 336 sq.). In May 1172 when 15, he married the daughter of the lord of Hīn Ziyād. During the wedding festivities he fell from his horse while jesting and died of his injuries (Michael Syrus, iii. 343). He was succeeded by his younger brother Feridūn (Afridūn) who had to marry the princess intended for the brother. On the news of these happenings, Kīlidj Arslān II attacked Malatya, where however preparations were rapidly made for the defence under the direction of the eunuch Sa'd al-Dīn. Kīlidj Arslān had to withdraw but carried off with him 30,000 prisoners from the country round (Michael Syrus, iii. 346). On Feb. 15, 1175, Feridūn was murdered by his brother Maḥmūd, who after many adventures had returned in disguise to Malatya by a secret agreement with the princess of Ziyād who had left her husband (Michael Syrus, iii. 362-364). When Kīlidj Arslān II therupon again besieged Malatya, the discontent with Maḥmūd was so great that he no longer felt safe in the town but withdrew to Hīn Ziyād. Kīlidj Arslān after a four months' siege entered Malatya on Oct. 25, 1178 (Michael Syrus, iii. 373). He repaired the two walls of the town (Michael Syrus, iii. 385). The Turkomans, who since 1185 had been ravaging wide tracts of Aṣīr Minor also invaded and plundered the district of Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 402). In 1189 (Michael Syrus, 1191 according to Arabic sources) Kīlidj Arslān gave the town of Malatya to his son Mu'izz al-Dīn Kāzhīr Shāh (Michael Syrus, iii. 407; Rec. Hist. Or. Croea., ii. 56; ii. 269). Kīlidj Arslān later found himself forced to hand Malatya over to his other son Kašī al-Dīn Malik Shāh; but Mu'izz al-Dīn went to Salāh al-Dīn (580 = 1191-1192) and regained his position with his help (Rec. Hist. Or. Croea., l. 57, 68 sq.; ii. 269; v. 44).

To strengthen the alliance he married the daughter of Malik al-Adīd and accompanied Salāh al-Dīn's army at Hīn (Rec. Hist. Or. Croea., ii. 116). In June 1200 Rukn al-Dīn Sulāman of Dūkā (Tokat) deprived his brother Mu'izz al-Dīn of Malatya: the latter fled to his father-in-law Malik al-Adīd (Barhebraeus, Chron. Suri., ed. Bassan, p. 406; Rec. Hist. Or. Croea., ii. 71). Salādīn's son al-Malik al-Zāhir, who had only Sumāt-ūj left of his inheritance, submitted in 1207 to Rukn al-Dīn of Malatya and Konya (Barhebraeus, Chron. Suri., p. 408). In the next year Rukn al-Dīn took Anḡara; a few days later he died (Barhebraeus, p. 418 sq.). He was succeeded by his young son Kīlidj Arslān III. who was however soon thrown into prison by Ghūyād al-Dīn Kāzhīr Khusraw 1 (Barhebraeus, p. 419). After the latter (d. 1205) came his son Izz al-Dīn Kāzhīr, who while on a campaign against Malik al-Asfār in Malatya developed consumption from which he died on his return (Barhebraeus, p. 437; Rec. Hist. Or. Croea., ii. 150 sq.). In the reign of his successor 'Alī al-Dīn Kai-Kabāb, the Tatārs in 1231 penetrated to Hīn Ziyād and to the Euphrates near Malatya (Barhebraeus, p. 463). 'Alī al-Dīn took Kīzhāt from Malik al-Asfār in 1232. When in the next year the latter along with his brother Malik al-Kāmil of Egypt occupied Hīn Manṣūr, 'Alī al-Dīn collected an army of over 100,000 men, took Hīn Ziyād (Barhebraeus, p. 467) and besieged al-Ruṣā in the following year; the inhabitants of Harrān fearing an attack on Malatya sent him the keys of their town (Barhebraeus, p. 468; Kamīl al-Dīn, trans. Blochet, R. O. L., v. 88). His successor Kāh-Khusraw II (1237—1245) at the beginning of his reign drove the Khūrisians out of his kingdom; on their retreat they defeated the commander (Suhāshī) of Malatya Saif al-Dawla and crossed the Euphrates at Assarā (var. Mārja) (Barhebraeus, p. 471). In 1241, the amir of Malatya again suffered an annihilating defeat from fanatical Turkomans hordes under the prophet Pāpā (Bābā) (Barhebraeus, p. 474). When the news of the victory of the Tatārs at Kāzā-Dāgh (1243; Barhebraeus, p. 475) reached Malatya, the Suhāshī Rashīd al-Dīn and the other court officials broke into the royal treasury, shared the treasure among themselves, and fled to Halah. Many prominent citizens followed them; but they were surprised by the Tatārs on the hill of Beth (1245), a day's journey from Malatya and some slain, some taken prisoners.

The inhabitants of the town, Muslims and Christians, asked the Metropolitan Mār Dionysios 'Angūr to direct the defence of the town. After two months during which Malatya was watchfully defended, the Tatārs withdrew. In 1244 the Tatār chief Jāwūr (var. Naṣūr) Nūyīn besieged Malatya and ravaged the country round until Rashīd al-Dīn caused him to retreat by rich presents (Barhebraeus, p. 477—479). After the division of the Saljuq empire by Hālāgū, there ruled at first Izz al-Dīn at Malatya, then, after his dethronement, his brother Rukn al-Dīn (Barhebraeus, p. 482). At the end of 649 (1251—1252) and in July 650 (1252—1253), the Tatārs again besieged the town under Jāwūr and wasted its surroundings (Barhebraeus, p. 491). When in 1257 Izz al-Dīn sent al-Tughr Ḥāfīz into the district of Malatya to seek recruits and the latter allotted the town to the Kūd chief Sharaf al-Dīn Ahmad b. Bābi, the inhabitants would not have him as they had sworn fealty to Rukn al-Dīn and feared his Tatār patron Badīj. It was not till Izz al-Dīn had sent a second envoy, Bābi, that he consented (1258). But Badīj, who had imprisoned him into the tower, the latter soon fled again before Badīj and only returned when he had gone, but again found the gates closed against him and was only admitted after famine had broken out in Malatya as a result of his siege (Barhebraeus, p. 498—500).

In 1260 Ḥāfīz built bridges over the Euphrates for his vast host at Malatya, Kāl at al-Rūm al-Bīrā and Karšisya (Barhebraeus, p. 506). The Egyptian governor of al-Bīrā Ḥādīr (Khūdh?) in 1282 laid waste the country round Malatya (Barhebraeus, p. 546).

The Mongol Khūn Alaqa (1265—1282) again divided the kingdom of Rūm between two Saljuq consuls of which Maṣūf received Azīzdīn, Siwāw and Malatya.

In the sixteenth century lived the two great Syriac historians, both born in Malatya, to whose chronicles we mainly owe our knowledge of the history of the town: the patriarch Michael I (1126—99), son of the priest Eliyā, who belonged to the family of kindasi in Malatya and the Maṣhrāy al-Gorzar Abu l-Farraḍ called Barhebraeus (1256—86; q. v.), whose father, the baptised
MALATYA — MALAY PENINSULA


MALAY PENINSULA is a name sometimes rather loosely applied to the wide area of South of the Isthmus of Kra (Lat. 10° N.), but so far as the Northern part of this tract is concerned the name is a misnomer, the bulk of the population there being Siamese and Chinese, not Malay. Excluding from the total Malay population of Siam [sq. v.] as a whole some 50,000 Malays scattered in Ayuthia, Bangkok, Chantabun and the rest of the Eastern shore of the Gulf of Siam, the remaining 350,000 are in Southern Siam and mainly in the parts South of Kra. But it is not till about lat. 7° N. that one meets with districts where the majority of the inhabitants is Malay, viz. on the West coast Palaung and Siwalik and on the East coast the province of Patani (formerly an important Malay state, finally conquered by Siam in 1832). Of the approximate total population of 370,000 in these three districts the greater part consists of Malays. The Southern boundary of Siam, running irregularly between 6° 45' and 5° 45' N., separates them from the rest of the Peninsula, which is attached to the British Empire and with which we are here concerned. The area of this latter portion is about 52,500 English square miles.

The geological structure of the Peninsula includes calcareous rocks and limestone, chert, shales, quartzite, volcanic rocks, granite, alluvial deposits, and the ferruginous substance known as laterite. The most important minerals are tin and tungsten. The former has been exported for more

Jewish physician Ahron had restrained his fellow citizens in Malatya from stupidly flying before the Tatars (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 298—300, 312—20). Michael's principal authority, Ignatius (d. 1104), was also metropolitan of Malatya (Baumstark, op. cit., p. 291). The increasing weakness of the Seldjuks about 1300 favoured the formation of local Turkoman and Armenian petty states, especially in the east of Asia Minor. According to Abu ʿl-Fāqī, Christians and Muslims in Malatya in those days lived on the best of terms with one another; the town took the side of the Tatars and informed them of every thing that went on in the country. During his war against the Tatars, Sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir in 715 (1315) decided to send a large army under the nāʿīb of Damascus, Saif-ʿl-Dīn Tunguz who was joined by his vassal Abu ʿl-Fāqī of Hamah, against Malatya. The army went by Halab, ʿAinṭab, Ḥiṣn Manṣūr and chaira to Malatya and encamped before the town on April 28. The inhabitants sent their ḥākim Djamāl al-ʿDīn al-Ḵṭīrī, whose father and grandfather had filled the same office in their time, through the south gate, Ṣāḥib al-Ḵṭīrī, to Tunguz, who was willing to afford them protection and security, if they surrendered the town. But he would take no pledge for the soldiers could not be restrained from plundering and ravaging in the town. Among the prisoners was the Tatar Ibn Kerboghā al-Ṣāḥib of Ḥiṣn Arakan, al-Shāhīd. The greater part of the town was finally burned down (Abu ʿl-Fāqī, Annales Muslim., ed. Reiske, v. 286—92; ed. Stambul 1286, iv. 77 sq.; transl. also in Roc. hist. or. crois., i. 180; Well, Gesch. d. chalīf., iv. 310 sq.). The Šulān made the territory of Malatya a separate frontier province, which included seven districts (Ḳāhil al-Ẓāhirī, Zubda, ed. Ravaisse, p. 52). There were seven citadels around the town: Muṣḥar or Miḥṣar, Kūmī, Kārahāṣar, Ḥadīrī, ʿAṣrāj, Ḥālalī, ed. Goeje, G. Gesch. d. syr. lit., 192, p. 105.

Malatya for the next few decades belonged to the Mamlūk Šūṭūn. As their remotest province, it was with Halab in 791 (1289) the scene of a great rebellion led by the governors Miḥṣāf and Velbogha against Barḳūk [sq. v.]. About this time the Turkish family of the Dhu ʿl-Karradhū [sq. v.] began to rise to power in the region of Malatya and Alḫisṭān where they ruled till 1515 under Egyptian suzerainty. About 794 (1391/2) Hāzād I conquered the town and in 1400/1 Timūr. By the battle of ḪānNX (1516) fell into the hands of Selim I [sq. v.] who destroyed the Dhu ʿl-Karradhū. This was the cause of his war against Egypt, which he finally rapidly decided in the battle of Malatya Dābīq. At a later date the eyelet to which the Sandjak of Malatya belonged was still called Dhu ʿl-Karradhī. Malatya now forms a sandjak of the wilayet of Maʿmūr at-ʿAlī (Ḵhārībīt).

The town in 1838 was the headquarters of the Ser-ʿasker Ḥażī Pasha, with whom Mottek was attached. It is said to have suffered much at the hands of the troops quartered there for months before the battle of Nizib. After the earthquake of 1893 Malatya was rebuilt on the site of the suburb of Ashusu S.W. of the older site now called Eski-Şehir, but the old town continued to be inhabited. It has now about 30,000 inhabitants, including many Armenians, Kurds and Kūṭīs.
than a thousand years and is still a very important product.

Until about fifty years ago the rivers, though mostly small and only navigable for small craft, were the chief and almost the sole means of access to the interior, which was then almost trackless forest of luxuriant vegetation, traversed by a number of mountain ranges, some running roughly north and south, others transversely or irregularly. A few of the highest points exceed 7,000 feet (roughly 2,100 metres). At sea-level the average temperature is about 82° F. (about 27°C) with a daily and annual variation of not more than about 10° F. (about 4.5°C) in each direction; the annual rainfall varies locally from about 60 inches (about 150 cm.) to four times that amount. The N.E. and S.W. monsoons prevail, but are subject to periods of slight or variable wind. The climatic conditions are therefore very favourable to the main staples of native agriculture, viz.: rice, coconuts and miscellaneous local fruits; to these, foreigners have added the cultivation of other products, such as tapioca and rubber, in the cultivation of which the Peninsula has led the way. The economic development of the Peninsula may be said to date from the institution of the Resident system in three of the Western states in 1874, which led progressively to the making of a network of excellent roads and a State railway system now comprising a trunk line from Singapore to the western part of the boundary with Siam, where it links with the Siamese system, and a number of branches, one of which turning northward through the centre of the Peninsula is destined to join the Siamese railway at a point near the eastern end of the frontier.

From the administrative point of view, the British portion of the Peninsula falls into: 1. the British colony styled the Straits Settlements (which is an abbreviation of "British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca"), comprising the three "settlements" or divisions of Singapore, Penang and Malacca; 2. the Federated Malay States, viz. Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, on the West coast and Pahang on the East coast, which are united in an administrative union under a Chief Secretary to Government at Kuala Lumpur (in Selangor) and 3. the Unfederated Malay States, viz. in the extreme North and on the West coast, Perlis and Kedah, and on the East coast, Kelantan and Trengganu, and in the extreme South, Johor. Administratively the Island of Labuan off the coast of North Borneo, and the Cocos-Kelchong Islands and Christmas Island to the South-West of Java form part of the "settlement" of Singapore; and the State of Brunei (Beruani) in Borneo is an unfederated Malay State ranking with those of the Peninsula.

The Colony has the usual administrative machinery, consisting of a Governor (who is also the High Commissioner for the Malay State), together with executive and legislative councils, and a Supreme Court. Each of the Malay States has a Malay ruler, who usually bears the title of Sultan, and also a British official styled in the Federated Malay States the British Resident and in the unfederated ones British Advisor or General Advisor, and a State Council. For the Federated States there is in addition a Federal Council and a Judicial Commission. In these States the chief administrative departments are federized under federal heads, and in one or two cases (such as Education) are linked up with the corresponding department in the Colony. Both the Colony and the States are divided into administrative districts, and the officials in charge of such districts in the Colony and Federated States are mainly Europeans.

The same applies to the heads of the principal departments of Government. Many of their assistants are also European. In the unfederated States the administrative machinery is not so elaborately organized and the proportion of Europeans is smaller. Government schools have been established in the principal villages and give elementary instruction exclusively through the medium of Malay. In towns there are also higher schools, supported but not founded or managed, by Government, which give instruction through the medium of English. The college at Kuala Kangsar, which is bilingual, is mainly for the sons of Malay rajas and chiefs though others are admitted. Female education has developed more slowly but is gaining ground.

The ancient history of the Peninsula is obscure. Palaeolithic and neolithic implements have been found in various places. The so-called aborigines, the Semang, numbered 210,000 in 1921, and the total population, comprise in the extreme North a few thousand woolly-haired Negritos, generally termed Semang, in the centre a much larger number of wavy-haired light brown people known as Sakai, and in the South mostly straight-haired people of the Indonesian type, often referred to as Jakun. The first two groups and a portion of the third speak languages containing a strong Mon-Khmer element, the remaining Jakun speak Malay dialects with some alien admixture. From about the 5th century A.D. Sanskrit inscriptions on stone found in Kedah and Province Wellesley (opposite Penang) attest the presence of Buddhists using a South Indian script. An inscription of 775 originally set up at Ligor (Nakhon Sri Dhammaraj) about Lat. 8° N. indicates that before that date certain points on the isthmus were held by the Saîlendra kings of Sri Vijaya (Palembang in Southern Sumatra), who controlled the trade route through the Straits and across the isthmus probably till near the end of the xith century. It would appear from a notice in the History of the Liao dynasty of China (502-556 A.D.), Book 54, that this isthmus had formerly been controlled by the state of Funan, which centred round the mouths and lower course of the Mekong river. An inscription found at Chaiya (Jaya, near Lat. 10° N.) and probably dated 1183 gives the king who presumably set it up a princely title which points to the Malay region of Southern Sumatra, adjoining Sri Vijaya to the North-West. Another inscription of Chaiya dated 1230 was set up by the local king Candrabhânu who according to the Mahâvamsa and other sources raided Ceylon on two occasions (probably about 1236 and 1256) with his "Javaika" (i.e. Malay) forces.

It is plain, therefore, that between the viith and the xith centuries the settlement of the Peninsula by Malays from Sumatra had been going on. A few years later, but before 1280, the Siamese from Sukhothai (Sukhothayha) put an end to Malay rule in Ligor, thus beginning the extension of Siamese influence to the southward. In the Javanese poem Nagarârâjâgama (1365) a
number of places on both coasts, from Kedah and Sai (in the old Patani state) in the North to Singapore [q.v.] in the South are claimed as vassals of the Javanese empire of Majapahit. In the same century, but at a date which cannot be precisely fixed owing to the fragmentary condition of the record, the earliest Malay inscription in the Arabic character as yet discovered makes it plain that Islam had recently become the state religion of Trengganu. In the 17th century Islam was being spread in the Peninsula under the influence of the Dutch, most of whom were Malacca [q.v.]; and after its fall in 1511 at the hands of the Portuguese its dynasty continued to rule in the extreme South (Johor) and neighbouring islands, while another branch held Pahang, and Perak eventually came into the hands of a family claiming to descend from the senior line of the same stock. In or before the 18th century an immigration of Minangkabau settlers from Sumatran brought a number of small states inland of Malacca, which all eventually admitted the suzerainty of Johor, save the southernmost, Nanning, which was in theory at any rate a subordinate ally of the Portuguese. In the early part of the 19th century the state of Kedah, Kedah, was conquered by the Bugis and for a number of years exercised some sort of suzerainty over Perak. Meanwhile the Northern states came intermittently under Siamese influence, which varied with the strength of that power but retained the character of an external suzerainty till Kedah in 1821 and Patani in 1832 (this last finally) were conquered by Siam. The Dutch tenure of Malacca (1641–1795), while it controlled to some extent the external trade of the Malayan states, did not interfere with their internal affairs. In the eighteenth century Bugis adventurers settled in the Riau-Lingga Archipelago and made their influence felt on the mainland, ultimately establishing the new state of Selangor under a still ruling Bugis dynasty. British influence dates from the founding of Penang (1786), which was followed by a temporary occupation of Malacca (1795–1818), its final cession in 1824, the founding of Singapore (1819), and the incorporation of all three settlements in one government (1826), which in 1867 was transferred from the control of India to that of the Colonial Office. The policy of non-interference with the Malay states was maintained until long continued disturbances in Perak, Selangor, and Sungai Ujong (part of Negri Sembilan), due to Malay dynastic quarrels and civil war between rising gangs of Chinese tin-miners, coupled with an increase of piracy in the straits, led in 1874 to the inauguration of the Resident system. This ultimately developed into the present system, whereby since 1895 Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang form a federation administered under the direction of British officials. Perak, Kedah, Kelantan and Trengganu were ceded by Siam in 1909 in return for certain concessions, one of which was the abolition of the extra-territorial privileges of British subjects. The population in 1921 of the part of the Peninsula and adjacent islands under British administration or protection was about 3,252,000, nearly half being immigrants mainly Chinese, and to a lesser extent Indians among whom males predominated very considerably. The great bulk of the native-born population consisted of Malays, and the total number of Malays, properly so-called (including, however, something like 100,000 persons of Minangkabau descent in Negri Sembilan and Malacca) numbered 1,418,198. The other Muslim immigrants amounted to 171,315 (including 117,775 Javanese, 37,848 Banjarasee, 9,772 Boyanese, 8,388 Bugis, 727 Achinese, 850 Korinchi, and 946 Mendeling). The 47,465 non-Indonesian Muslims comprised 41,337 Indians, 4,315 Arabs, 1,800 Chinese, and a few Persians and Turks; the total Muslim population was 1,636,975, the great majority being Sunnis of the school of Shafi'i. Of the non-Muslim population roughly three-quarters were Chinese, and about one-quarter Indians but there were also 38,448 so-called aborigines of the Peninsula (a few of whom may, however, have been converts to Islam), 18,178 Siamese, 14,853 Europeans (mostly British, but including Continental Europeans and Americans of European descent), 12,629 Eurasians, 6,989 Japanese, and 2,215 Sinhalese, besides several smaller communities.


MALAYS. People. In this article only the Islamic features of the Malay nation will be dealt with, so neither ethnographical nor anthropological questions will be discussed. It may be sufficient to say that the Malays originally — we do not venture to say: as autochthons — were established in the middle part of Sumatra, especially in Palembang, and spread over the eastern and northern part of that huge island, and settled in the Straits, mainly in Malacca (see MALAY PENINSULA), and founded colonies in Borneo, along the great rivers, and elsewhere eastward. They belong to the widely dispersed Polynesian (or Indonesian) race, whose languages extend from Madagascar to the Philippines and from the Peninsula of the utmost S.E. point of Asia to the remoter islands of Micronesia and Melanesia in the Pacific. The Malay chronicles, for the greater part mythical, and a few epigraphical data, make it clear that there was a highly cultivated Hinduised Malay kingdom in Palembang, the seafaring people of which went over to several adjacent and more distant countries; it was along the way of commerce that they carried the Malay language to sundry ports and lands. It is not exactly known in what part of India swept away Hinduism, but it is a fact that the new religion on its arrival in the Straits found Malay people settled in the Peninsula and the Malay language introduced there as the generally adopted speech of commerce and political intercourse.
Language. It is due to Islam that Malay, being already a language enriched with many Sanskrit words, became an idiom of very mixed lexicographical character. The Islamic current brought words of Tamil origin, innumerable Arabic words, some of the Kawi-like garb, many Persian words, some of them with Indian characteristics, and a small quantity of Hindustani vocables. In that heterogeneous form Malay became the vehicular language of the new religion. Undoubtedly it had found its way already to the most visited ports in the Archipelago in a simplified form fit for intercourse with all kinds of natives and foreign merchants, later also with European, namely Portuguese and Dutch captains and ambassadors. It was Islam that gave Malay a literary character, and when it had established itself as a medium into which innumerable Arabic books were translated, its form became crystallised and its orthography was fixed systematically. That uniformity made it the appropriate language for literary and liturgical purposes and also a kawi for dogmatists and mysticism, as well as romantic and historical literature. It has to be borne in mind that there is a great difference between the potosi or language heard in most of the sea-ports, and the cultivated literary language, which became highly developed in Malacca, the capital, and the seat of a Muhammadan court and a royal library. When Arabic and Indian learned men came to Acheh, they discussed theological questions in Malay and even wrote books in that language. The literary form is sustained uniformly to the present day, literary products being written in archaistic formulae, and the colloquial style being used in different parts of the Archipelago, the purest in Johore and Malaya in general and the East-coast-districts of Sumatra; the least pure in Java and more eastern islands. In the Malkeas, especially in Amboina (Ambon), the preaching of Christianity availed itself of Malay; in those islands this language has therefore assumed an individual character. As to its linguistic character, it may suffice to notice that Malay, like all Polynesian languages, belongs to the agglutinative type, declension not existing, conjugation being limited within narrow bounds, and amplification of the mainly disyllabic stems with a quantity of prefixes, infixes and suffixes giving opportunity of forming words for almost grammatical, and logical relations. There are some traces of the influence of Arabic grammar on Malay syntax, but on the whole the Muhammadan current has not essentially altered the character of the language; it has only enriched it with an enormous number of words, and given to its written literature an individual Islamic character.

Literature. Of pre-Islamic literature nothing is known to a far as may be concluded from a few old inscriptions in Hindu script, it seems that Malay was written in Kawi-like characters, but literature, in its earliest known form, is written in Arabic letters only. The oldest manuscript are preserved in the Cambridge and Oxford libraries, they date from the last years of the 14th and the first decade of the 15th century. The only literary evidence of the existence of written literature in the 15th century is the mention, in a 16th century chronicle, of the use made of a royal library at Malacca at the time when the Portuguese endeavoured to capture that town (1511).

Malay literature, as it presents itself now, is only for a very small part original. Hardly any of the chronicles, tales and poems are derived from Arabic sources directly, most of the religious and semi-historical romances have been translated from Persian, but all these literary products are imbued with the Muslim atmosphere, being full of Arabic words and phrases, and laden with Islamic theory. There are, it is true, some indigenous farric tales, and some fables, especially the sometime highly appreciated mouse-deer-tales, moreover some original romances with Hindustanic influences, and several adapted old Javanese tales, that do not betray real Islamic influence, but the very fact that all these books are written in Arabic characters makes them overflow with Arabic words, and in that way shows that they belong to Islamic mentality. In this short account there will be no mention of literary products going back to the great Sanskrit epic poems, nor of the tales that do not show traces of Muslim influence; only in so far as Malay literature has Islamic features, will it be treated here. The originally genuine Indonesian deer-fable has undergone an Islamic correction. The historical writings, more or less mythical and semi-romantic, are almost absolutely Islamised. To that class of works the chronic Sejarah Melayu, and other ones, as the chronicles of Kutawaringin, Kuta, Acheh and Pasai are to be reckoned. Very historical, but for the greater part fictitious, romance is the Hikayat Hang Tuah. A host of romances, dealing with foreign princes and princesses and their endless adventures, has been spread over a great part of the Malay-reading East-Indian World; the titles of all those popular, but for European readers less attractive, books, may be found in the catalogues of Malay manuscripts at Leyden, Batavia and London. Some books of fiction have been translated from Persian, Arabic or Hindustani. A group of them is to be traced to the Hikayat-co-collection, another one to the Tuti-nama-series, a third one to the Bakhshiy-a cycle. By way of exception foreign authors have written in Malay; e.g. the Radjput Nfar al-Din al-Kaniri [q.v.], who wrote a great encyclopaedic chronicle at the instigation of an Achehese queen. A very great number of texts deals with the old prophets, the Prophet Muhammad, his family and friends. Those works, like e.g. the romances of Amir Hamza and Muslim b. al-Hanafiya, have Persian originals. The purely religious books cannot be regarded as Malay literature. Poetical literature has a different character. The real Malay kind of poetry, though not devoid of Persian influences, is the pantun, i.e. popular quatrains, whose first two lines deal with a natural fact, or a well known event, and are intended to prelude, phonetically, the 3rd and 4th lines, that contain the real meaning of the usually erotic poem. The other genre is the shair. Its form is the stanza of four rhyming lines. Some of these very extensive overloaded poems are from the Javanese, some others are versified versions of prose romances; moreover historical events, love-stories, religious matters, mythical speculations etc. are dealt with in innumerable shair, the titles of which may be seen in the following catalogues: Leyden Univ. Library, by H. H. Juyboll; Supplement thereto by Ph. van Ronkel; Batavia, the Hague and Brussels by the same; London (R. A.S.) and ibidem E. I. H. (India Office Library) by H. N. van der Tuuk.
Special literary questions have been dealt with by Ph. S. van Ronkel. The papers on Malay Subjects and some numbers of the Malay Literature Series contain some valuable contributions. A fuller account is given in the Dutch *Entwyl. van Nederl. Indes*, s. v. Literatur (Maleisich).

**MALĂZGERD, district (Kağıd) and town in Armenia, to the North of the lake of Van.** Of the name, there occur, in old-Armenian, the forms Manavazakert, Manavazkerd and Manazkerd. The middle-Armenian and Byzantine forms, Mandzgerd and *Mandżäwr* resp. as well as the Arabic form *Mandżjar*, point to a triad, one of these being the original form, Manavaz(a)kert representing a popular etymological formation, from the name of the noble family of the Manavazian's, which, in olden times, resided in the district. For it is phonetically impossible, that an old-Armenian form Manavaz(a)kert should regularly becomes Manazkerd. This is the theory of Hubshmann, who admits however the possibility, that an earlier Manavaz(a)kert may have been arbitrarily shortened in pronunciation, so as to become Manazkerd, the word being otherwise long. W. Belek has conjectured, that in the first part of the word, there may be hidden the name of the Urartæae (pre-Armenians) of the region in the middle of the 1st millennium B.C., and his conjecture is based on the fact, that from an inscription of Menaus appears, that this king founded a city, which was called *Menaçhina* (= Menaus-town); thus it would, according to Belek, be very probable, that Mandzgerd, in whose environs there have been found many inscriptions of Menaus, was this very town, named after him. If such be the case, then the old-Armenian form *Manavazkerd* must have originated from a later, popular etymology. From the fact, that names of towns formed with *-kert* (= kert) seem to have originated not before the Parthian epoch, as Hubshmann observes, it would follow, that the memory of the old king Mandzgerd still lived in the Parthian empire. This difficulty, however, is not insoluble, for it seems, that the name of another Urartææ king of Van also may survive in classical Armenian quasi-historical tradition as Aram.

The oldest and best Arabic spelling of the name of the town is *Mannahjird*, with *n*; the forms with *t* are later, and on them is based the modern name (Malazgerd). The spelling with *n* we find e.g. in al-Isra'khi; Yàkut; the author edited by Houtsma in *Rec. des textes rel. à l'Hist. des Selçoucides, ii*; al-Nasawi (ed. Houdas); in a varia lectio of the text of the *Khát al-Sadür* (v. M. S. New Series, ii. 119); and in the text of the *Khát al-Salz*, of *M. Th. de Mide* (1932). The spelling with *t* common in later texts, occurs, among older authors, in al-Mukaddasi; Ibn al-Athir; the *Khát al-Sadür* (the reading adopted by the editor); Djuwaini, and the *Nuzhat al-Kulib*. The terminations -qird and -kird also alternate in the spelling; this variation is already noted by Yàkut (*Mandżam*, iv. 648). As regards the form Manaz, cited by Marquardt (*Einzahrs*, p. 162) from Thomas Arruini, cf. Hubshmann, *Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen*, p. 325, 330, 449 ff.

Malazgerd belonged, since the beginning of their dynasty, to the realm of the Bagatides of Armenia, who allowed it to be ruled, as well as A-Habiti, Ardji- and *Perkri* (= Bergiri), by a family of their vassals. This family, whose members bear Arabic names, became in course of time independent of the Armenian kings, but, on the other hand, was obliged to pay tribute to the emperor of Byzantium (Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, *De admin. imp.*, ed. Bonn, p. 192 ff.).

Yàkut says, that the inhabitants of Malazgerd are Armenians and Byzantines (*Rûmi*); a native of this town was Abû Naşr al-Manâzî (this, therefore, is the *nisba* of the name), who was waiz to one of the Marwânî princes of Dimârèbkr. This Abû
Nasr died 437 (1045—1046) and, according to our authority, was a good poet: Ya‘qūb cites two fragments from his poems (Mā‘ālam, iv. 648 sq.). Regarding another al-Manṣūr, cf. J. K. A. S., 1902, p. 788, note 1.

Among political events connected with the town of Malāzgerd, it may be noted that, on the occasion of the campaign, which the great Ḥamšār ʿAlād-dawla undertook into Armenia (328 = 940), there is mentioned one ‘Abd-al-Hamid, prince (ʿāliḥ) of Malāzgerd and Sīhabawr (Sawarq). (J. K. A. S., 1902, p. 797): the name ʿĀlāwīnšāh under the names of the princes of Malāzgerd, recorded by Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, and this contemporary of Ṣaf al-Dawla doubtless belonged to that family. But he cannot be the ʿĀlāwīnšāh of the Greek text, who, from a chronological point of view, must have lived two generations earlier (cf. the genealogical table of the dynasties of Malāzgerd in Bandurān Anūmāntāvorīs in Čent Perpāh, Liv. de Administr. Imp., in the Bonn edition of Constantinus, iii. 372). In 353 (964) a certain Nādja, a ḡālam of Ṣaf al-Dawla, revolted against his master, after taking possession of that part of Armenia, which was in control by his son ʿAlā-ʾib-Ward. The latter was slain and, among the places conquered by Nādja, Malāzgerd also is cited (Ibn al-Aṯīr, ed. Terrab, viii. 408): in the year 359 (969—970) Malāzgerd was taken by the Byzantines (ibid., vili. 445): they must have lost it again before 382 (992—993), for in that year they besieged not only Akhāt and Ardijsh, but also Malāzgerd, but this time they could not take it, but returned home after concluding a treaty for ten years with ʿAbd-allāh b. Marwān (ibid., ix. 67). In 440 (1058—1059) it must have belonged to the Byzantines, for the ʿĀlāwīnšāh, which Ibrahim, Toḡrīl Beg's brother, undertook into the Byzantine empire, affected also the territory of Malāzgerd (Ibn al-Aṯīr, ed. Die, xi. 372). And it is explicitly stated by Ibn al-Aṯīr (ix. 411), under the year 446 (1054—1055), that Malāzgerd was in possession of the Byzantines, for there he relates, that this strong city resisted a siege by Toḡrīl Beg himself (cf. also Cedemus, ed Bonn, ii. 590 etc.). The most important historical event, with which the name of the town is connected, is the battle of Malāzgerd (465 = 1071) between ʿAlp Arslān and the Byzantine emperor Romānus Diogenes, in consequence of which the eastern part of Asia Minor, viz. Armenia and Cappadocia, was lost for ever to the Greek empire (Ibn al-Aṯīr, ed. Die, xiv. 44: Rō mel. vof. i. 179, ed. Z. H. S.), or 141 sq.; Kāḥel al-Nāšīr (U. M. S. New Series, ii.), p. 119: Zonaras, ed. Dindorf, iv. 213 etc.; cf. also H. Geiger in K. Rümmerbach's Ges. für die byzantinischen Altert. (1910) 1019. After this event, therefore, Malāzgerd passed into the possession of the Sāljuqs. In 531 (1137) it was given by king Malik-shāh, along with Erzerum and part of the territory of Akhāt, to his brother Sāljuq, as a ʿāzī (Kec. ʿāzī vif. ibid., ed. Houtouma, ii. 185). In course of time, the city was besieged in 587 = 1191 by Ṣaf al-Dawla b. Ṣalih. In 601 (1205—1206) its environs suffered from the raids of nomads from the direction of Ādhar-Bālūq (Ibn al-Aṯīr, xii. 341, 134). During the disturbances, of which Armenia was the scene in the beginning of the sixteenth century, mention is several times made of Malāzgerd. In 603 (1206—1207), a former maḥtār of the Shāh Arman took possession of Malāzgerd, and, after that, also of Akhāt. He had, in addition, control of Arđijsh and other places. This man, whose name was Balbān (the vocalisation of the first syllable is uncertain), was assisted by the prince of Erzerum, Muḥḥīrah dīn Toḡrīl Shāh b. Khīlid Arslān, against al-Malik al-Awhad, son of al-Malik al-ʾĀdil of Egypt. Later on, Balbān was murdered by his ally of Erzerum, who tried to enter Akhāt and Malāzgerd, but in vain, so that he was obliged to return to his own states (Ibn al-Aṯīr, xii. 168). In 619 (1220) the shah of Malāzgerd, Toḡrīl b. Ḥūrūmshāh ʿAlāʾ dīn Muḥammad occupied Malāzgerd, as he intended to attack Huṣayn dīn Ṣalih of the ʿĀlī, the new owner of the Malāzgerd, in Akhāt. But, since his attempt on this town did not succeed, and as the winter also set in (he had entered Malāzgerd on Dhu l-Kaʿa 13, November 5, 623), and the Turkomans invaded his own realm, he was obliged to retire (Ibn al-Aṯīr, xii. 301). In 626 (1229) however he succeeded in taking Akhāt, after which he besieged Malāzgerd, first in person, afterwards leaving one of his generals in charge of the siege, but on this occasion without success (al-Nasawi, ed. O. Houdas, text, p. 205, 208; translation, p. 342, 344, 347).

MALĀZGERD (properly, Mālīdah or Mālīdah), a district in Eastern Bengal and in the Rādžāshāhī Division of the Presidency of Bengal. Area 1,891 sq. m. Pop. in 1871, 1,004,159, of whom 465,521 were Hindus, and 505,369 Muslims. In old times it was famous for its two capitals of Gaur [q.v.] or Lakhināwati, and Pandua, where there are many ruins of the mosques and other buildings of the Muḥammadan kings of Bengal.


(H. Beveridge)

MALDIVE ISLANDS, a group of coral islets in the Indian Ocean, lying between 7° 6' N. and 8° 42' S. lat. and 71° and 74° E. long., and consisting of seventeen atolls with a great number of islands, of which about 300 are inhabited, the population being estimated at 70,000. The Moorish traveller, Ibn Baṭṭūta, lived for more
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than a year (1543—1544) in the islands, but the first Europeans to visit them were the Portuguese who established a factory in them in 1518. The Maldives were much harassed by Māppilla (Moplāh) pirates from the Malabar Coast and in 1645 the king, who is entitled "Sültān of the Twelve Thousand Isles", placed himself under the protection of the Dutch in Ceylon, with which island the Maldives have, since that time, been politically connected. The natives are Muslims and fall into three ethnographical divisions, (1) the northern, with a strong admixture of Dravidian blood from India, (2) the central, under the immediate rule of the Sultan, who resides in Male, which has acquired from Arab traders and settlers a strain of Semitic blood, and (3) the natives of the southern clusters, who have had little communication with the central group, and preserve more of the primitive type, resembling the Sinhalese villagers of Ceylon. All are peaceful, intelligent and industrious, growing their own crops and weaving their own cloth and mats. The chief exports are copra, coir, and dried fish products. The language is a dialect of the Sinhalese, somewhat Muhammadanized, but many read Arabic more or less fluently.


(M. T. W. Haig)

MALHAMA. [See Malāhma.]

MALI, a town, which no longer exists, the old capital of the Mandingo empire, in the western Sudān, also called Mali, Mali, Melli, Melle, Mani or Mané. All these names are dialectic or local variants of the same word which is the name of the country of origin of a people whom the French call Malinké, following the Ful and Tucolors, and the English "Mandingo", following the form used by one section of this people on the Lower Gambia.

The name found in the Arabic authors for this town was not the one used by the inhabitants themselves and the latter is not given us by the geographer Idrīsī, nor the historian Ibn Khaldūn, nor the traveller Ibn Batūţa, nor Leo Africanus. It was only in 1913 that the translation of an Arabic manuscript not long before discovered in the Sudān, the Tābīb al-Fattāh, enabled us to learn that in reality there were two successive capitals of the Mandingo empire or of Mali: the older was called Djirība or Djirīiba and there was later another called Niani.

Recent researches in the valley of the Niger have enabled the sites of these two towns to be discovered. The first was situated at the junction of the Niger and the Sankarani, and at the place called Mani or Mali Tombo, i.e. ruins of Mali. There are still traces of a very ancient and important town, which the natives regard, according to their traditions, as the ancient residence of their former sovereigns and the place where the latter are buried.

As to the second town, a copyist's error in the text of Ibn Khaldūn concealed the true name till the publication of the Tābīb al-Fattāh in 1913. It was recently recognised that the capital in question should be located on the left bank of the Sankarani, and at the level of Sigūrī, not far from the place where there is still a town of the same name, Niani.

Djērība was no doubt the cradle of the Mandingo dynasty of the Keita of the sixteenth century. We have no information about it. We are more accurately informed about Niani. It is supposed to have been founded in 1238 after Sundjuja Keita, ruler of the Mandingo, had defeated in 1235 at Kirina the emperor of Sūsū, Sumangarur Kante, his rival and enemy. Gongor Mūsā, often wrongly called Kankan Mūsā, was ruling there a century later, when on his return from a pilgrimage to Mecca, he attracted to his court an Arab poet named al-Sāhili who belonged to a Granada family. By orders of Gongor Mūsā, this foreigner built in Gao a mosque with battledore terrace and pyramidal minaret. According to tradition, this was the first building of the type, now so widely spread in the western Sudān, the origin of which is North African.

In 1352—53 in the reign of Sulaimān Keita, brother of Gongor Mūsā, the Arab traveller Ibn Batūţa visited the town. It was then a completely Muslim metropolis, in which lived Egyptian and Moroccan legal authorities, students of Islam, readers of the Korān in the mosques, and merchants. No description of the different quarters of the town has come down to us but we have a fairly detailed account of the sovereign's palace. The ruler gave his audiences in a room looking out on a courtyard, with six windows of wood, three of which were covered with plates of silver and above these three covered with plates of gold. These windows were hidden by curtains, which were lifted to show that the hour of audience had come.

The empire of Mali retained its power down to the beginning of the xviiith century when its decline began. According to Leo Africanus who visited the Sudān in the first half of the xviiith century, the capital Mali or better Niani was inhabited by about 6,000 families who included many artisans and traders. Islam was flourishing, the town had still a number of mosques and prosperous schools but it had lost its former glory.

In 1545, Djērūd, brother of the askiya of Gao, marched to Niani; the ruler of the Mandingo having succeeded in escaping, Djērūd occupied the town which he plundered for a week before withdrawing, ordering his soldiers to defile the palace of the king with ordure.

In the xviiith century the growth of the Bambara kingdoms of Segu and Kaarta contributed to overthrow what was left of the old Mandingo power, the last chiefs of which, leaving Niani, took refuge in Kangaba.

There is no doubt that Niani was visited on several occasions by the Portuguese. We know nothing of the expeditions which set out from their factories in Lower Gambia to the interior; on the other hand, we have notes about the Mandingo capital on the journey made in 1483 of an embassy from Elmina (now the Gold Coast Colony). João de Barros describes it in his Book III of his Asia: "By the route of the fortress of Minas (Elmina) he (John II) also sent an embassy to Mahmūd b. Manzugul, grandson of Mūsā, king of Songo. This city is one of the most populous of this great country which we usually call the
land of the Mandingoes”. Another author, Barth, claims to identify the Song of the Portuguese historian with the land of the Songhoy on the Niger. This is clearly wrong. But is Songo a name applicable to the Mandingo capital? M. Delafosse does not think so; he calls attention to the fact that the country of the Mandingo is still known among the coast peoples of the Gulf of Guinea and in all the Fanti and Ashanti country under the name of Songo, so that among those with whom the Portuguese of Elmina mixed, the word was simply a synonym of Mandingo or Mali.


**MALIK (A.), King.** In the Qur’ān the word, in addition to being used of the kings of this world, is also applied to Allāh, e.g. xx. 113: ‘So is Allāh exalted, the King, the Truth’. In lii. 25, Allāh is the malik al-mulk, the possessor of royal power, which he gives to and takes from whom He will; in the *Fatīha* many Qur’ān readers read malik (for malik) jāwān al-dīn; God’s kingdom is also described as mulk and malakūt (cf. ALLĀH).

Muslim rulers do not generally call themselves kings; as in the Qur’ān, the use of the word was confined to the rulers of foreign peoples in so far as it had an earthly significance. The application of the word to Muslim potentates was regarded not so much as blasphemy but rather as implying a form of rule which was contradictory to Muslim political theory. It was considered very much to Mūsāīya’s discredit that he described himself as the first king in ʿIṣlām; and as a kingdom, which is contrasted with the imamate, the dignity alone worthy of the Muslim rulers, the rule of the Umayyads was attacked and despised by the pious old fashioned party.

While religious constitutional literature does not recognise the word malik as a term for Muslim conditions, it plays a very much greater part in the literature of mirrors of princes which is indifferent to religion, but, only when it is a question of a ruler in general and not of specifically Muslim rulers. Al-Dżahnīr gives his K. al-Tāfīl the subtitle *al-Malik al-Malik* and al-Fārābī deals very fully with the duties of a king. In the ethical encyclopaedias which deal with all three moral sciences, ethics, economics and politics (cf. M.I.), like the *Sūkh al-mulak fi Tasbīh al-Mamlekk* of Ibn Abī T-Rabī‘, the king appears as the subject of special chapters in the scheme of division of this kind of literature.

With the spread of ʿIṣlām and the Arabic language into Asia, malik became used as the equivalent of the Persian kāh, and as a royal title was particularly favoured by mediaeval dynasties of Turkish origin. We find the title malik as early as the Samanids, and in the next century the Būyid ʿAbā‘ al-Dawla ‘calls himself Malik al-Malik, a title modelled on the ancient Iranian title of “King of Kings”. Among the Saljuqs, Atabegs and Urtuṣids, it is the regular title of sovereignty, usually combined with an honorific epithet. It is not so generally used by the Aiyūbids and Mamluks.

In the feminine it is the royal title of the Mamluk queen Shāḏar al-Durr, who calls herself "queen of the Muslims" (Malika al-Muslimin). One of the rare occurrences in India of the title is also in the feminine Malika, which queen Ṣayfya of Dehli uses in place of the *Shāh* of the other members of the dynasty. After being practically extinct for several centuries in the Muslim world malik has since recently been adopted as the royal title in the new kingdoms of Egypt, ʿIrāq, the ʿUdān, and Afghanistan so that it has suddenly, if somewhat artificially under the influence of the western conception of king, come to be the royal title par excellence in the Muslim world.


**MALIK ʿAMBAR ḤABASHI, an Abyssinian slave, who rose to great power and influence in the Deccan.** When Aḥmadnagar was conquered by princes of the Deccan, Malik ‘Ambar and Rādūt Mīnūn, a Deccan chief, divided the remaining territories between them. About this period owing to the rebellion of Shāḏar al-Salim, the death of Akbar, and the revolt of Shāḏar ʿUṣūr, ‘Ambar found time to regulate his country and raised large armies, and even dared to seize several of the imperial districts. He introduced a new revenue system into the Deccan, perhaps in imitation of Tōdār Mall. When the authority of the emperor Delhi was established, he sent several expeditions to the Deccan, but ‘Ambar could not be subdued. At last he restored the places taken from the Mughals in 1055 (1645), and when he became attached and remained loyal to him until his death, which occurred in 1055 (1646), in the 80th year of his age. He was buried in Dowlathābād [q. v.].

**Bibliography:** Māḏīrg al-ʿUmarī, i. 115—116 sqq.; Elphinstone, *History of India*, 1899, p. 553; Elliot-Dowson, *History of India*, vi. 104, 105, 395 and 428; *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, ii. 389 sqq. (M. Hidayet Hosain)

**MALIK AL-KĀMIĪ I, NAṢR AL-DIN ʿABU ʿAL-MAṢĪḤ MUḤAMMAD B. AL-MALIK AL-ʿADĪ, an Aiyūbid, was born in Rabi‘ I 576 (Aug. 1180) and knighted with full ceremony on Palm Sunday (May 29) 1102 in Akka by Richard Curé-de-Lion who was on friendly terms with his father. A few years later his name begins to appear in the history of the Aiyūbīd state. When his father, who was besieging Mardin [q. v.] with his army, left it after the death of al-ʿAzīz, Salahīn’s brother, on 27th Muharram 959 (Nov. 29, 1108) to seize the capital, Damascus, for himself, he entrusted the conduct of the siege of Mardin to his son Kāmil. The governor of the town had begun to negotiate with him for surrender, when reinforcements arrived and after a fight which went badly for al-Kāmil, the latter was forced to withdraw and join his father in Damascus. Al-ʿAdī’s death (27th Dhu-n-Nūr, 615 = Aug. 31, 1218) left him the difficult task of clearing Egypt of the Crusaders, who had landed near Damietta in the beginning of summer and had begun to besiege the town.
On the news of their landing, al-'Adil [q.v.], who was then in Syria, sent troops to Egypt and al-Kāmil endeavoured to defend the land as best he could. The Christians gained the upper hand at first and by the end of Shabān 616 (beg. Nov. 1219), Damietta had fallen into their hands. It took nearly two years for al-Kāmil, who had had homage paid to himself as sulṭān of Egypt and Syria after the death of his father, to retake the town with the help of the other Ayyūbids, particularly his brother al-Malik al-Mu'azzam; the Christians by this time were tired of fighting and in Rajab 618 (the end of August 1221) they offered to abandon the town if given a free passage. Al-Kāmil, who feared not without reason that they would soon receive reinforcements from Europe, gladly accepted their terms whereupon the Franks left Egypt. But then troubles broke out within the Ayyūbī ranks. When al-Mu'azzam died (end of Jhu 'l-Kāda 624 = Nov. 1227) al-Kāmil and his brother al-Malik al-Ashraf attacked his son and successor al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dāwūd and finally took Damascus from him (Sha'bān 626 = June/July 1229); al-Kāmil next occupied southern Syria and Palestine and al-Ashraf was recognised as ruler of Damascus under the suzerainty of al-Kāmil, while his nephew Sayf ad-Dawrāk, al-Shawār, received Belshār, al-Shawār, and some other remote fortresses as compensation. Al-Kāmil had previously entered into negotiations with the Emperor Frederick II and concluded a treaty with him by which he ceded Jerusalem to him with a corridor to Jaffa and the Emperor in return promised to help him against all his enemies. After some time the Ayyūbīs came into conflict with the Sa'dītān. Kāl-Kātūs 'l-Qāsī [q.v.] had previously quarrelled with al-Ashraf and sought to bring against him a confederacy of petty Mesopotamian dynasties and under his brother and successor Kāl-Kobāt 'l-Qāsī it came to open fighting. The successes won by al-Kāmil in this war, however, aroused the jealousy of his relatives and they formed a coalition against him (cf. Ayyūbīs). Al-Kāmil then set out for Egypt and advanced victoriously as far as Damascus. He succeeded in taking this city also but died very soon afterwards (in Rajab 633 = March 1238). As a ruler he was undoubtedly one of the most distinguished of the Ayyūbīs. He was a brave soldier and a skillful diplomat and rendered lasting services to the development of his country. He devoted special attention to irrigation and in his reign the defences of the citadel of Cairo were completed. He also took a lively interest in the cause of learning.  

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khalīkān, Wafāyat al-'Ayyān (ed. Wästenfeld), No. 705 (transl. de Slaan, iii. 240); Ibn al-Atūr, al-Kāmil (ed. Tornberg), xii., see Index; Abu 'l-Fīdā', Annalea (ed. Reiske), iv., passim; Ibn Khulānkīn, al-Thīr, v. 345 sqq.; Ibn Iyās, Taβbīrī Mīr (Būlāk 1311), i., 77 sqq.; Recueil des Historiens du Croisade, Hist. orient., i., v., passim; Weit, Gesch. der Chalīfāt, iii. 435 sqq., 441 sqq.; Stanley Lane-Poole, History of Egypt, p. 224 sqq.; Richter, Gesch. des Königreichs Jerusalem, see Index. (K. V. Zettersteine)  

**AL-MALIK AL-KĀMIL II.** [See Sha'bān.]  

**MALIK SARWAR,** KHWWĀDĪ DIJĀHĀN was a eunuch given by Saffār Rajab to his grandson Muḥammad, son of Fīrūz Tughlāq, in whose service he rose to be chief eunuch and controller of the elephant stables. He was faithful to his master in all his troubles, and in 1389 received the title of Khwādī-dī qaṭān and was made ważīr, Muḥammad's son, Muḥammad Shāh, sent him in March, 1394, to govern the eastern provinces, with his headquarters at Dījamūtūr, and conferred on him the title of Malik al-Shāh, or lord of the east. He took thither with him Kāranfūl, a slave and water-bearer of Firūz Tughlāq, whom he had adopted, and his brothers. His administration was most successful and his adopted son Kāranfūl served him loyally. On the disruption of the kingdom of the Tughlāq dynasty after Timūr's invasion, Malik Sarwar assumed the title of Sultan al-Shāh and established his independence in Dījamūtūr. Kāranfūl received the title of Malik al-Shāh, and his brother Ibrāhīm was made commandant of the fort and city. 

Malik Sarwar died in 1400 and was succeeded by Kāranfūl, who ascended the throne of Dījamūtūr under the title of Mulārak Shāh.

**Bibliography:** Firīshta, Gulgahā-ī brūhīnī, Bombay 1832; Taβbīrī Mīr Shāhān in Elliot and Dowson's History of India, vol. iv.; Taβbīrī Mīr Ābbārī, by Niṣām al-Dīn 'Abd al-Hāmid; Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, New Series, vol. i., N. W. P. and Oudh (Shahrī, Arch. of Jānamūr), by A. Fahrer), 1889. (T. W. Haig)  

**MĀLIK B. ANAS,** a Muslim jurist, the imām of the madhab of the Mālikis, which is named after him, and frequently called briefly the imām of Medina.  

I. The sources for Malik's biography  

The oldest authority of any length for Malik, Ibn Sa'd's account (d. 250) based on al-Walīkī's (d. 207) in the sixth class of the Medina "successors", is lost as there is a hiatus in the manuscript script, in the form of a publication in the work, but it is possible to reconstruct the bulk of it from the quotations preserved, mainly in Tābarī (iii. 2519 sq.), in the Kātib al-īyān (Franq. hist. arab., i. 297 sq.), in Ibn Khallūkīn and al-Suyūtī (p. 7, 6 sq., 12 sq., 41, 49). From this it is evident that the brief biographical notes in Ibn Kūtaibā (d. 276) and the somewhat more full ones in the Fihrist (compiled in 777) are based on Ibn Sa'd. The article on Malik in Tābarī's (d. 310) Dīnār al-Muḥtiyyat is essentially dependent on the same sources, while a few other short references there and in his history are based on other authorities. Al-Samānī (c. 550) with the minimum of bare facts gives only the legendary version of an otherwise quite well established incident, while in Ibn Khallūkīn (d. 572) and particularly in al-Nawawī (d. 676) the legendary features are more pronounced although isolated facts of importance are also preserved by them. Al-Suyūtī (d. 911) gives a detailed compilation from Ibn Sa'd and other works, most of which are now no longer accessible but are for the most part of later date and unreliable, like the Mawṣūl Ḥadīth al-Muṣawwī' of al-Dhāfī, the Ḥīlāt of Alā al-Nā'im, the Kātib al-Matḥalāf wa-l-Muṭṭakāf of al-Khāṭib al-Bahgūdān, the Kātib Tārib al-Mājudīrī of al-Khāṭib 'Īyān, the Faḍilī Malik of Abu 'l-Hasan Fīrūz. The bulk of the later Mawṣūl, for example that of al-Zawāwī, is of no independent value.  

II. Malik's Life  

Malik's full name was Abu 'Abd Allah Malik b. Anas b. Malik b. Abu 'Amīr b. 'Amīr b. al-
dislocation of the shoulder, but this is said to have still further increased his prestige and there is no reason to doubt that the stories of Abu Hamfa’s ill-treatment in prison are based on this episode in the life of Malik. He must have later made his peace with the government: in 160 the caliph al-Mahdi consulted him on structural alterations in the Meccan sanctuary, and in the year of his death 179 the caliph al-Rashid visited him on the occasion of his pilgrimage. While this fact may be considered certain, the details in the Kitâb al-Uyun are already somewhat legendary and in Suuyî, following Abû Na’âim, quite fantastic. The story of al-Mansîr found as early as Ibn Sa’d, in a parallel riyâya in al-Tabari of al-Mahdi, is quite fictitious and is given again with fantastic detail in al-Suuyî (from Abû Na’âim) of al-Rashid, that the caliph wanted to make the Mawafîqî canonical and only abandoned his intention on the representations of Malik.

Malik died, at the age of about 85 after a short illness, in the year 179 in Medina and was buried in al-Baqî. Abû Allah b. Zainab, the governor there, conducted his funeral service. An elegy on him by Djâfar b. Ahmad al-Sarrâj is given in Ibn Khallkîn. Pictures of the kalbâb over his grave are given in al-Batantîn, al-Ritbâl al-Hidâyâta, opposite p. 250 and in Ibrahim Rîfî at Pasha, Mi’râb al-Haramain, vol. i, opposite p. 426.

As early as Ibn Sa’d (certainly going back to al-Wakîd) we have a fairly full description of Malik’s personal appearance, his habits and manner of life, which however cannot claim to be authentic, nor can the sayings attributed to him which became more and more numerous as time went on. The few certain facts about him have been buried under a mass of legends: the most important facts have already been noted and the others will be found in al-Suuyî and al-Zawawi.

On the transmitters of his Mawafîqî and the earliest members of his madhhab see Sect. iii. and v.; here we will only mention the most important scholars who handled on traditions from him. These were Abû Allah b. al-Mubâraq, al-Awza’i, Ibn Dhu’ayd, Hanîmî b. Zaid, al-Lâqî b. Sa’d, Ibn Salama, al-Shâshî, Shu’ba, al-Thawri, Ibn al-’Utaybî, Ibn al-‘Utaybî, Ya’ zu, al-Munmud, and al-Suuyî, who is the last transmitter. A long list of transmitters but most of them are not corroborated. We may just mention the apocryphal story of Malik’s meeting with the young al-Shâhî (Fogam. hist. arm., i, 359; Wustenfeld, G. Abb., 1890, p. 34 and 1894, i, 1 sqq.), which is simply an expression of the view that was held of the relation between the two Imams.

III. Malik’s Writings

Further sources for his teachings

1. Malik’s great work is the Kitâb al-Muwafîqî, which, if we except the Corpus Juris of Zaid b. ʿAlî, is the earliest surviving Muslim law-book. Its object is to give a survey of law and justice, ritual and practice of religion according to the igîma of 'Abî 'Amir in Medina, and to create a theoretical standard for matters which were not settled from the point of view of igîma and sunna. In a period of recognition and appreciation of the canon law under the early 'Abbasids, there was a practical interest in pointing out a “smoothed path” (this
is practically what al-muwatta' means) through the far-reaching differences of opinion even on the most elementary questions. Mālik wished to help this interest on the basis of the practice in the Ḥijāz and to codify and systematise the customary law of Medina. Tradition, which he interprets from the point of view of practice, is with him not an end but a means; the older jurists are therefore hardly ever quoted except as authorities for Mālik himself. As he was only concerned with the documentation of the sunna and not with criticism of its form, he is exceedingly careless as far as order is concerned in his treatment of traditions. The Muwatta' thus represents the transition from the middle of the First to the pure science of Ḥadith of the later period.

Mālik was not alone among his contemporaries in the composition of the Muwatta': al-Muqaddasī (d. 164) is said to have dealt with the consensus of the scholars of Medina without quoting the pertinent traditions, and works quite in the style of the Muwatta' are recorded by several Medina scholars of the same time (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 219 sq.) but nothing of them has survived to us. The success of the Muwatta' is due to the fact that it always takes an average view on disputed points.

In transmitting the Muwatta', Mālik did not make a definitive text, either oral or by muqrina, to be disseminated; on the contrary, the different riwaya's (recensions) of his work in places differ very much (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 222). The reason for this, besides the fact that in those days very little stress was laid on accurate literal repetition of such texts and great liberty was taken by the transmitters (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 221), lies probably in the fact that Mālik did not always give exactly the same form to the same lectures in different "classes". But the name Muwatta', which certainly goes back to Mālik himself, and is found in all recensions is a guarantee that Mālik wanted to create a "work" in the later sense of the term, although of course the stories which make Mālik talk of his writings reflect the conditions of a later period. In later times the Muwatta' was regarded by many as canonical (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 213, 265 sq.; al-Suyūṭī, p. 47) and numerous legends deal with its origin (al-Suyūṭī, p. 42 sqq.).

Fifteen recensions in all of the Muwatta' are known, only two of which still survive in their entirety, while some five were studied in the fifth and sixth centuries A.H. in Spain (Goldziher, op. cit., p. 222, note 2 and 4) and twelve were still available to al-Rudāni (d. 1094) (Heffening, Fremdenrecht, p. 144, note 1):

a. the vulgate of the work transmitted by Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Maṣmūdī (d. 234), often printed, e.g. Delhi 1216, 1296 (without isnāds, with Hindustāni translation and commentary), 1507, 1508, Cairo 1279–1280 (with the commentary of Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Bāqī al-Zurkānī, d. 1122); Lahore 1889; Tunis 1280; numerous commentaries, editions and synopses; cf. Brockelmann, G.A.C., i. 176; Ahlwardt, Axlat, Berl., 1145; Muhammad 'Abd al-Jayy al-Lakhnawi (Introduction to the edition of the recension b), Lucknow 1297; p. 21 sqq.; al-Suyūṭī, pp. 3 and passim (work of al-Fāṣkī), p. 57 (on Ibn 'Abd al-Barr) and p. 58 (chief passage); Goldziher, op. cit., p. 230, note 2; Schacht, Abb. Pers. Ak., 1928, No. 2 c; and al-Suyūṭī, 'Ijāf al-Muwatta' bi-Ri'dāf al-Muwatta', Delhi 1320 and

Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Ḥasan of Saḥnān (d. 1240) which contains replies by Ibn Kāsim (d. 191) according to the school of Mālik or according to his own ra'y to questions of Saḥnān as well as traditions and opinions of

IV. Mālik's position in the history of Fīkh

Mālik represents, in time, a stage in the development of Fīkh in which the reasoning is not yet thorough and fundamental but for a special purpose, in which the legal thought of Islam has not yet become jurisprudence and, in place, Medina where the decisive foundations of Muslim law were laid down. One of the main objects in the juristic thought that appears in the Māwīta' is the permeation of the whole legal life by religious and moral ideas. This characteristic of the formation of legal ideas in early Islam is very clear, not only in the method of putting questions but in the structure of the legal material itself. The legal material, having in itself no connection with religion, that has to be permeated by religious and moral points of view, is the customary law of Medina, by no means primitive but adapted to the demands of a highly developed trading community. Without this, the Islamisation of the law that had already been concluded in its essential principles before Mālik, many generations had still to work at its systematisation; therefore Mālik's own legal achievement can only have consisted in the development of the formation of a system. How great his share in it was cannot be ascertained with certainty from the lack of material for comparison. The surprising success achieved by the Mawīta' of Mālik out of a number of similar works, would in any case be completely explained by the fact that it recorded the usual consensus of opinion in Medina without any considerable work of the author's own and came to be regarded as authoritative as the expression of compromise (just as the works on Tradition came to be regarded as canonical). The Mawīta' would in this case have to be regarded less as evidence of Mālik's individual activity than as evidence of the stage reached in the general development of law in his time. It may be said that this average character was just what Mālik aimed at (cf. Sect. iii. 1).

The high estimation in which Mālik is held in the older sources is justified by his strict criticism of Ḥadīth and by his activity in the interest of Fīkh (al-Tabari, iii. 2484; 2492; al-Sam’āni, al-Nawawī, Goldziher, op. cit., p. 147, 168; cf. Zāhirīyen, p. 230); even this only means that with his hadīths he kept within the later consensus. That al-Shāfi’ī devoted special attention to him out of all the Medina scholars (cf. his Kitāb Ikhtilaf Mālik wa l-Shāfi’ī) is explained by the fact that he was a disciple of his.

As to the style of legal reasoning found in the Mawīta', Ḥadīth is not by any means the highest or only court of appeal for Mālik; on the one hand he gives the annāl, the actual undisputed practice in Medina, the preference over traditions, when these differ (cf. al-Tabari, iii. 2505 sq.) and, on the other hand in cases where neither Medina tradition nor Medina idiom existed, he laid down the law independently; in other words he exercises ra’iy, and to such an extent that he is occasionally reproached with ta’arruk, agreement with the ‘Irākīs (cf. Goldziher, Muh. Studien, ii. 217; do., Zāhirīyen, p. 4 sq., 20, note 1). According to a later anti-ra’iy legend, he is said to have repented of it on his deathbed (Ibn Khallīkān). It is scarcely to be supposed that he had diverged seriously from his Medina contemporaries in the results of his ra’iy.

V. Mālik's Pupils

The Mālikī Madhhab

In the strict sense Mālik no more formed a school than did Abū Ḥanīfa; evidence of this is found in the oldest names Abī al-Ḥādītayn and Abī al-‘Irāb resp., compared for example with ‘Abī al-ShāFI’ī. These names at once indicate the probable origin of the Mālikī madhhab; after a regular ShāFI’ī school had been formed, which in view of al-ShāFI’ī's personal achievement, is quite intelligible in the development of Fīkh (cf. Bergsträsser, op. cit., p. 76, 80 sq.), it became necessary for the two other great schools of Fīkh, whose differences was probably originally the result of geographical conditions in the main, also to combine to form a regular school, when a typical representative of the average views like Mālik or Abī Ḥanīfa was regarded as head. In the case of Mālik the high personal esteem, which he must have enjoyed even in his life-time (cf. Sect. ii) no doubt contributed to this also. But it is to his pupils that his elevation to the head of a school is mainly due. Traces of this process are still to be found in the varying classification of old jurists as of the Haḍītayn school or as independent mujtahids (cf. also Fīhrīt, p. 199, sq.).

Among Mālik's pupils and companions who soon became known as Mālikis may be mentioned: al-Mālik b. Sa’d (d. 161 or 165 or 175), Abī al-Raḥmān b. al-Kāsim (d. 191), Abī Allāh b. Wabh (d. 197), Ma‘ān b. Ṭā’ (d. 198), Aṣḥāb b. Abī al-‘Aṣīz (d. 204), Abī al-Mālik b. Abī al-‘Aṣīz (d. 212), Abī Allāh b. Abī al-Ḥakam (d. 214), Abī Allāh al-Ka‘bī (d. 221), Isrā’īl b. Uwais (d. 226) and his brother Abī Bakr, Sahmān (d. 240). Sahmān was too late to hear Mālik himself; with him the formation of the Mālikī madhhab is already concluded.

Of the later Mālikī Fīkh literature two short compendia attained special fame as text-books: the Risāla of Abī Allāh b. Abī Zaid al-Kairawāni (d. 356) whom the author of the Fīhrīt mentions as an important contemporary (p. 201, sq.) and the Muḥtāsar of Khālīb b. Ishākh (d. 767); numerous commentaries and editions of both exist and they have also been discussed in Euro-
pean languages (cf. Bibl.), Their importance has sometimes been exaggerated in Europe; development did not stop with them (cf. Probst, Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss., xii. 422 sqq.; Probst deals with an important later jurist in Islamica, i. 430 sqq.). His immediate followers are to be regarded as opponents of ra'ia any more than Mālik, and the Mālikī madhhab is not at all more conservative or traditionalist than the Ḥanafī for example (B. Ducati in Islamica, iii. 214 sqq., even endeavours to show that it is the most juridical of the Muslim schools of law).

The Mālikī madhhab spread mainly in the west of the Muslim world; after it had succeeded in driving out the madhhab of al-Awāzīr and the Zāhir school, it prevailed not only in the Maghrib (Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, including Muslim Spain) but in all the rest of Africa, so far as it has adopted Islam. The Mālikī school has many followers in Egypt: in Upper Egypt it occupies about the same position as the Shāftī in Lower Egypt. This geographical distribution seems to go back to corresponding conditions existing before the formation of the madhhab. Particularly ardent or conspicuous disseminators of Mālikī teaching were 'Abd al-Mālik b. Ḥabīb al-Salami (d. 238 or 239) and Isāmīl b. Isḥāq (d. 282; Fihrist, p. 200, s.), but there must also have been earlier scholars for whose time the existence of a regular school is doubtful.


On Mālik’s writings: Brockelmann, C. A. L., i. 175; Goldzēh, Muḥammādanieh Studien, ii. 213 sqq.; al-Lakhnawī, op. cit.

On Mālik’s position in the history of Fihrist: Bergstrasser, Isl., xiv. 76 sqq.; Goldzēh, op. cit.

The older Mālikis are given in Fihrist, p. 199 sqq. Of the Mālikī Tabaqat-works there have been printed e. g. al-Dīwān of Ibn Farhūn (d. 799) along with the Tabaqat al-Dīwāñ of Ahmad Baba (d. 1032), Faz 1398 and Na‘īl al-Dīwāñ bi-Tafriż al-Dīwāñ of the same Ahmad Baba, Faz 1317 (cf. Fagan, in Festschriften Curran, p. 105). Individual Mālikī jurists cf. the articles on them. On the spread of the Mālikī tradition: Ahmad Pasha Taimur, Nāgra tārikhāt fi Ḥadīth al-Maṣṣābīh al-awba, Cairo 1344; Juynboll, Handbuch des islamischen Ges. setzes, p. 28; do, Handledung, p. 21; Ibn Farhūn, op. cit., p. 17; Bergstrasser, Z. d. M. G., 1914, p. 410 sq.

Discussion of the Mālikī teaching in European languages (some further references): Pehor, Précis de jurisprudence musulmane (transl. of the Mālikīṣār with extracts from the commentaries), 1843; Sautyara-Chebonneau, Du Statut personnel et des Successions (based on the Mālikīṣār; the commentary takes note of modern decisions), 1873; ‘Abd al-Rahūm, The Principles of Mūhammadan Jurisprudence, 1911 (Italian by Cinino, 1922); al-Kairawānī, Risāla, transl. by E. Fagan, 1914; Ruxton, Mālikī Law (synopsis of French transl. of the Mālikīṣār), 1916; Khalīl b. Isḥāq, Mālikīṣār, transl. and annot. by J. Gildi and D. Santillana (Italian), 1919; D. Santillana, Istituzioni di diritto musulmano mālikī, 1926; Russell-Suhrawardy, A Manual of the Law of Marriage, from the Mālikīṣār.

Mālik b. ‘Awf, a contemporary of Mūḥammad, called al-Naṣīf, to distinguish him from several men of the same circle in his time, and also because he traced his descent through Naṣīr b. Muṣṭāfa to the eponymous ancestor of the powerful Kātib tribe of the Banū Hawāzin. We know very little about his history previous to the day of Ḥunain (q. v.) to which he owes his dubious fame. We may assume that he early found opportunities to display his personal fame. He was still an exile when his teaching were ‘Abd al-Mālik b. Ḥabīb al-Salami (d. 238 or 239) and Isāmīl b. Isḥāq (d. 282; Fihrist, p. 200, s.) but there must also have been earlier scholars for whose time the existence of a regular school is doubtful.

This distinction he perhaps also owed to the consideration which his clan, the Banū Naṣīr b. Muṣṭāfa, enjoyed among the Banū Hawāzin. Allies of the tribe of Tāqif (Aghānī, xii. 46), the Banū Naṣīr found themselves in the same position with regard to the latter and the town of Tāif as the Aḥābīn with respect to the Kūrānī and Mecca. They supplied mercenaries to Tāif and were given the task of defending the town and protecting against the depredations of marauders the fine gardens that covered the Tāqif territory. Their relations were, as a rule, peaceful and friendly, but occasionally it happened that the anarchical instincts of the Beduins gaining the upper hand drove them to encroach on the domain of their allies, the citizens of Tāif. This situation enables us to understand how in the struggle that was about to develop against Islam, the Tā’ifis were ready to march under the banner of a Beduin generalissimo.

In the year 8, Muhammad at the head of a strong force was preparing to attack Mecca. This news disturbed the people who lived on the hills of the Sarāt. They asked themselves, if, once master of Mecca, the Prophet would not be tempted to invade their country. It was then that Mālik b. ‘Awf succeeded in combining for their joint defence the majority of the Kātib tribes, settled in the frontiers of Naṣīr and of the Ḥudaylī. The Tāqifis joined their forces to those of their Hawāzī ni allies. The only result was the defeat at Ḥunain. The commander-in-chief Malik had had the unfortunate idea of bringing the women, children and flocks along with the actual combatants. The whole of this enormous booty fell into the hands of the Muslims.

The defeated side did not distinguish themselves by bravery on the battlefield, the tradition of the Banū Hawāzin attempts the impossible when it endeavours to hide this failure and save Malik’s reputation. After the debacle, he is said to have bravely sacrificed himself to cover the retreat of his comrades-in-arms. This same tradition attributes
to him a series of poetical improvisations on this occasion, in which, after the fashion of the old Bedouin paladins he explains and excuses his flight.

The defeated leader tried to make a stand at Lata in the south of Thaif where he had a tower. What was a baya? In Medina at the time of the Hijra the name was given to an enclosure commanded by an "imam" or tower. Malik had probably only brick walls like the little strongholds in Yemen described by the geographer Ibn Majid (Ahsan al-Tafi'im, ed. de Goeje, p. 84).

A century or so later, the traveller Maurice Tamié (Itinéraie en Arabie, Paris 1840, ii. 5) passing through Liya saw there "une forteresse fauque de tours" intended, as in the days of Malik, to guard the road. In any case, whatever the strength of the little building, Muhammad easily destroyed it. When Malik learned of the approach of the Muslims, he thought prudent to seek refuge behind the ramparts of Thaif.

In the interval all the booty taken by the Muslims at Guairin had been collected in the camp at Uffda including Malik's family and flocks. To the Hawazin deputies sent to negotiate the ransom of the prisoners, Muhammad said: "If Malik comes to embrace Islâm, I shall return him his family and property with the addition of a gift of a hundred camels". Whatever the decision adopted by Malik, this declaration could not fail to compromise him with the Thaifa. He rightly recognized that his position in Thaif had become untenable. He succeeded in escaping from the town and presented his submission to Muhammad who fulfilled his promise to the letter. Malik then pronounced the Muhammadian confession of faith and, to use the traditional formula, "his Islam was of good quality".

The new proselyte had extensive connections and was remarkably well acquainted with the Thaifa region. The Prophet was glad to use him against Thaif which he had been unable to take by force. He put Malik at the head of the Ka'aish tribes who had adopted Islam. Malik therefore organized a guerrilla war against his old allies in Thaif. No caravan could leave Thaif without being intercepted by Malik's men. Exhausted by this incessant struggle, the Thaifa decided to sue for terms. Malik then became the representative of the Prophet among the Banû Hawazin and the caliph, Abu Bakr, later confirmed him in the office. He took part in the wars of conquest, and was in the taking of Damascenus and the victory of Kudaysa in the Iraq.

II. 210

MALIK B. 'AWF — MALIK B. NUWaira

Màlik b. Nuwaira, chief of the Banû Varhût: a considerable clan of the Banû Hanâza, who were in turn a branch of the confederation of the Banû Tamim [q.v.]. His liberality, magnanimity and especially his courage had earned him a great reputation before the Hijra. His contemptuous sayings that in the last respect he was without a peer. There was a proverbial saying: fata wa-ràa ku-màlik, "as hero no doubt, but not comparable to Malik". His fame, however, came principally from the impression made by his tragic death and from the collection of eloquent, which his brother Mutammim [q.v.] devoted to him.

Along with several other Tamimîs notable he embraced Islam in the lifetime of Muhammad. In return the latter appointed him to collect the canonical taxes, qādābat, from among his fellow-tribe-men. By giving him an appointment like this the Prophet hoped to bring him definitely to his side. The death of the Prophet and the incident of the ri'da [q.v.] served to show the foolishness of this hope. Like most of the nomads, Malik had joined Islam as a political organisation, having clearly made up his mind that he would not be absorbed by it to the extent of sacrificing the independence of his tribe and his own prerogatives.

When the Muslims, or more accurately the Kuraish of Medina, moved to the other side of the Yemen, Malik refused to recognize the validity of this election which had been carried through without his participation in it. He argued for the strictly personal character of the hâd, as the Beduins interpreted it. He explained himself in verse, for he was also a poet: — "If the thing turns out badly, we shall bring a remedy, crying: — long live the faith of Muhammad!". He did not stop at this but passing from words to deeds, he divided among the Tamimîs the taxes which had been collected. An even graver step, he next plundered a caravan which was taking to Medina the contributions of those nomads who had remained loyal. Then — an eminently Beduin trait — he celebrated in verse this strange exploit, which was equivalent to a declaration of war. He finally compromised himself completely by joining his cause with that of the prophetess Sajjâh [q.v.].

In Medina, Abu Bakr had at first to shut his eyes to these things. But as soon as he felt himself master of the situation, he decided to act vigorously. Khalid b. al-Walid was sent against the secessionists. His orders were to spare only those who declared themselves Muslims. The individualism of the Beduins singularly facilitated the task. He attacked separately the tribes, who were divided or hesitating, and succeeded without difficulty in defeating the rebels in small sections.

Thus he came to the Banû Tamim. The chiefs were suspicious of one another and declined to combine for joint action. Surprised by Khalid and finding himself almost alone, Malik had to refrain from fighting forces so markedly superior to his. He surrendered on a assurance that his life would be spared and finally declared himself a Muslim.

The prisoners including Malik were neverless executed with refinements of cruelty. It was said there had been some misunderstanding of Khalid's orders for which dialectic differences were to blame; so say those authors who feel the need of exculpating Khalid. It was by no means the first act of the kind of the impetuous Makhzumîs. Did he want to get rid of a rival or deal the last blow to a rebellion by sacrificing, even against the laws of nations and his own orders, a person so highly esteemed as the chief of the Varhût? As he had been anxious to marry Laila, the vivacious wife of Malik, he was credited with the first aim. 'Umar demanded that the
Malikshah B. Alp Arslan Abu 'l-Fath, Salduq Sultan (465-485 = 1072-92), born on the 9th or 19th Dimazd 447 (Kaward and Lubb al-Tanzirkh wrongly 445) = Aug. 10th, 1055. He accompanied his father on his last campaign into Transoxiana and homage was at once paid to him as Sultan by the vizier Nizam al-Mulk and the Turkish amirs on Alp Arslan's death. His uncle Kawai (q. v.), the ruler of Kirman, was not satisfied with this, however, because he thought that, as the oldest member of the family, he had the best claim to the throne and set out with his troops for Hamadhan. When attacked by Malikshah they made but feeble resistance. Kawai himself was captured and later released (April 1075). Malikshah then returned to Transoxiana by forced marches for the Khaikhan of Samarkand, Shams al-Mulk, on hearing of the death of Alp Arslan, had seized the opportunity to occupy Tirmidh and even Bakr had opened its gates to him. The Salduq, governor Ayitz, a brother of Alp Arslan, happened to be away at the time and when he hurried back, he suffered a terrible defeat and died soon afterwards. Shams al-Mulk, however, did not dare to risk another breach with Malikshah, so the latter re-occupied Tirmidh and proceeded to Samarkand. The Khaikhan thereupon submitted; Bakr and Takhbarsh were granted to Malikshah's brother Takaiz. These campaigns prevented the Sultan from going at once to Baghdad to receive the homage of the Caliph in person, and an ambassador was sent to carry through the ceremony. The Caliph was quite ready to do so, and gave the Sultan the honorific titles of Jalal al-Dawla, Mu'izz al-Din, Kiswa Amir al-Mumini. Our sources are silent about the happenings of the next few years; it is not till 472 that we hear of a campaign against Kirman, which, however, came to a peaceful termination for Suldanshah, Kawai's son, submitted to the Sultan and was confirmed by him in the hereditary possession of this province. In Ibn al-Kalimis (ed. Amedroz, p. 115), we are told that in 475 Malikshah came to Halab, but Ibn al-Athir and the other sources accessible to me make no reference to this. At this time the Sultan made the mistake of discharging 7,000 of his soldiers, although the vizier advised him against it, pointing out that if these men were deprived of their livelihood, they would in desperation become robbers, or rebels and a public danger. This was what actually happened. The men went to Takaiz and he thought that with their help he was strong enough to rebel against his brother. He took several towns and was preparing to occupy all Khorsan so that Malikshah was forced to take the field against him. Takaiz then retired to Tirmidh, and submitted when besieged there; on this occasion he was pardoned, but when he again rebelled without success a few years later (477 = 1084), he was blinded and thrown into prison at Takir. In 479 (1086) Malikshah left Isfahan which he had made his capital and went via al-Mawz to Haran, al-Rahul and Kafir, 10th, and to Halab. He then established and re-organized Salduq rule securely in these places, but one great induction for this campaign was that the commander of Halab had appealed to Malikshah because he was threatened by the latter's brother Tutsch (q. v.). The latter had conquered the Salduq ruler of Asia Minor, Sulamun b. Kutalmish (q. v.), and was trying to...
bring Halab under his rule also, but retired when he heard the approach of Malikshah. The town was granted to Aksa'noor, father of Zangi, another general Buran received al-Ruhay and Yaghbisin. Arnaluya which had just been retaken from Sulaiman while Sulaiman's son Kildij Arslan [g.v.] who was still a youth was taken back by the Sultan to the Ilah. There was no further campaign in Asia Minor, Malikshah left the war against the Byzantines to be conducted by the above mentioned amirs, to whom should be added Bu'suk, although the author of the al-Tarir shows makes him beside Constantineople in person. The fiction narrated in the Ta'mih-ur-Guzda and in Marjihad is well known, according to which Malikshah was taken prisoner by the Byzantines without their recognizing him, and only regained his liberty by the stratagem of the vizier, Ni'am al-Mulk. The story in al-Fundari is more credible that the Byzantines had to pay the Sultan an annual tribute of 300,000 dinars plus a lump sum of 50,000 dinars. On his return from Halab, Malikshah visited Baghda for the first time and he was received in ceremonial audience by the Caliph al-Muqtadi bi-Amr Allah. The latter had previously in 474 sought a daughter of the Sultan in marriage but as she had been then still a child, the opportunity was now taken to conclude the matrimonial alliance. The wedding took place next year with great splendour and amid the jubilation of the people of Baghda. The chroniclers give a full account of it and give no hint that this marriage was soon to be a source of trouble to the Caliph as well as to the Sultan. Reference will deal with that, it must be mentioned that in 482 (1092) Malikshah undertook a second campaign against Bukhara, Samarkand and Kashgar as a result of the tyrannical conduct of the young prince Ahmad, a nephew of Shams al-Mulk who was now dead. He gained great successes, took Ahmad back a prisoner to the Ilah and then forced the ruler of Kashgar to recognize Saljuq suzerainty. Later however, he allowed Ahmad to return to his kingdom and resume his rule, probably at the intercession of his wife Tarkan Khatun (so to be read, not Tarkan Khutan) who was Ahmad's aunt. On these incidents, cf. Barthold Tarkan khatun down to the Mongol invasion, p. 316 et seq. Towards the end of the reign of Malikshah the Saljuq empire thus reached its greatest extent, especially when in 485 some Turkish amirs were sent even so far as Yaman who subdued the land for the Sultan, temporarily only, it is true.

As regards the internal administration of the country, the Sultan left this in the hands of his vizier. Ni'am al-Mulk, who was given unlimited power by him at the very beginning of his reign, which he wielded till his death, although as a result of his great age his prestige began to decline towards the end of the reign of Malikshah and to be threatened by intrigues in the palace. His services will be appreciated in the article VIJAM AL-WALI, where it is sufficient to characterize his policy briefly, which was to restore the dominion of orthodox Islam under its supreme head, the Caliph, with the help of the sword of the Saljuqs. He had, therefore, to do all he could to maintain harmony between the Sultan and the Caliph, but the course of events led to a breach between the two. Malikshah had several sons by his wife Zabda Khatun, and the eldest, Ahmad, had been designated successor to the throne but died in 481 (1088). The obvious thing was for Prince Barkiyauk to take his place as was desired by Ni'am al-Mulk and the Turkish amirs but Malikshah had in the meanwhile married another wife, the Princess Tarkan Khatun, who made every effort to secure the throne for her son Mahmund born in 480. Malikshah, however, was more anxious about his daughter who had married the Caliph, for she was unhappy in Baghda and complained of being neglected by her husband, so that finally the Sultan demanded that she should be sent home with the little son whom she had borne to the Caliph. She, therefore, returned to her father but died soon afterwards in 482; her son Djalal however, became his grandfather's pet and he gave him the name of "Little Commander of the Faithful" in the hope that he would one day bear this title in reality. At the same time he decided to make Baghda his winter capital and had extensive building operations carried out in the N. E. of the town when he was there in the winter of 1091/92, including a great mosque, the Djami al-Sultan; he also ordered Ni'am al-Mulk and his amirs to build residences for themselves there. During this period the great amirs from the west, Aksa'noor, Tutush etc., had come to Baghda, great hunts and other pleasure parties were held, but the Caliph was completely ignored.

When in the autumn of 1092 he was on his way from Isfahan to Baghda for the third time, the aged vizier Ni'am al-Mulk was stabbed by a man at Sahna. It was now for the first time apparent how much the existence of the Saljuq empire depended on this one man, for when the Sultan and his wife were no longer guided by his advice, they committed the gravest errors, which were very soon to plunge themselves and their empire into destruction. Scarcely had the Sultan arrived in Baghda than, with the intention of making his grandson Caliph, — which was contrary to Muhammadan law as he was a minor — he announced to Muljud that he must at once abdicate and leave the town. With difficulty the Caliph obtained a few days respite which he was spending in prayer and fasting, when suddenly the news came that the Sultan was dead. The exact date is not certain but it was about the middle of Shawwal 485 (middle of November 1092). He was said to have caught a severe fever while out hunting, which they attempted to cure without success by bleeding, and he died soon afterwards. But it can hardly be doubted that he was poisoned, as some writers expressly state (cf. Houtsma, in Journal of Indian History, sept. 1924, p. 147 sqq.). The usual burial ceremonies were not held; the body was sent to Isfahan and buried there. The Caliph had no difficulty in coming to terms with Tarkan Khatun; he offered to recognize her son Mahmund as Sultan, if she would hand over to him his own son, the Sultan's grandson. This was done. The little "Commander of the Faithful" died the very next year, when the course of events took a disastrous turn for the Caliph and Tarkan Khatun with the rise of Barkiyauk. The tragic deaths of the Sultan and his vizier were celebrated in verse by Muizz: cf. Schefer, Sima'etnamih, suppl., p. 62 sq.

Malikshah's was a highly honourable character, he was loyal to his relatives and to his servants, brave, just and gentle. His rule is, therefore, much praised by Christian as well as Muslim
The raids against Sicily and Malta began in the viith century A.D., and it is not rash to believe that Malta fell before 800 A.D. under Muslim influence. This is also de Goeje's opinion (Z. D. M. G., livii. 905, note 2).

In Malta the Muslim occupation was certainly more permanent and strongly established than in Sicily; the narrow island was completely subjugated by the conquerors; and this helps us to understand how the Arab-Beber Muslims of Africa succeeded in forcing upon Malta the Arabic language, from which the modern Maltese dialect is derived.

The question of the origin of the Maltese dialect has exercised many observers between those who sustained its Phoenician origin (Vassalli, Bres. Bellermann, Comunio, E. Camana, Picca) and those who derived it from Arabic (Genessus, de Sacry, L. Bonelli, Stunme, Nobeleke). The conclusion must be accepted that Maltese is an Arabic dialect, which in some ways shows resemblances to the Eastern Arabic dialects, in many others recalls the Arabic dialects of the Maghrib. Peculiarities of Maltese phonetics are the inamul of a, which tends to become i and e (xe at the beginning of words, as yena for anin), the pronunciation of c as hama, the existence of s and i sounds in nco-latin and Arabic words; in morphology, the use of cy as prefix of the 1st person singular forms the main affinity with the Maghrib dialects. The accent tends to fall towards the beginning of words. In Malta itself are to be found dialectal varieties between town and country; in the country and in Gozo the dialect is nearer the original Arabic, sounds like z and z are not heard in Valletta, are noticeable in the Gozo vernacular.

A study of the Maltese lexicon, to show how affinities with Arabic dialects, Eastern and Western, may be explained, and how word-fossils have been preserved in Maltese, is still to be undertaken. The prevalence of the Latin-Italian race and the flourishing of Italian civilization and culture in the island have influenced its dialect, both as to syntax and as to phonetics. The percentage of Latin, or rather Italian, words in spoken Maltese varies according to the degree of individual culture.

The Maltese, up to a few centuries ago, had not chosen any particular alphabet for their dialect, as they did not use it as a written language. In the xviiith century Agus de Soldamis, a Maltese, turned his attention to the dialect and began to study it; since his time several attempts have been made to systematize the writing of Maltese; it was also proposed to use the Arabic alphabet, and a diacritical transliteration, precise and scientific, was tried. In practice the use of the common Latin alphabet, with the modification of some few letters, was continued. The last attempt of this kind, which has not met with public favour nor with the approval of the vernacular press, was that of the Ghoda tal-kittich tal-malti, "Association of the writers of Maltese", which has published a small grammar, particularly concerned with the spelling, called Tughrif fuq tal-kettta malti. Malta 1924; the preface mentions the precedent systems of writing Maltese. The same Ghoda, in 1925, began to publish a quarterly review called Il-Malti; it is mostly concerned with grammatical questions, and has promoted a movement in favour of pure Maltese (malti sof)
Since about 1850 the question of the Maltese dialect has also acquired a political character; the English rulers favoured the development of the dialect at the expense of the Italian language (which remains the language of culture, of the Church and of the Bar). Bibliographical information on Maltese literature to about 1900 is to be found in the works of L. Bonelli and H. Stumme.

Besides the Arabic dialect and place-names, the Muslims have left in Malta a few coins and a considerable number of inscriptions on tombstones; one of them, the celebrated inscription called of Mumina, dated 1173 A.D., was published more than a century ago, and repeatedly studied by orientalists (Italinsky, Lenci, Amari, Nallino etc.); another one, found in Gozo, is to be seen in the Malta Museum: about twenty more have been found in the excavations made in 1922—1925 at Rabat (near the city Notabile); they are preserved in the Museum of the Villa Romana, near the place of excavation.

The Muslims lost Malta in 1909, when the Normans conquered it; they were however allowed to live on the island under the Norman government until 1249. From 1530 to 1798 Malta was the seat of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which the Turks had expelled from Rhodes in 1522. The Order organized there an important naval base. The island was in constant relations with the East and with Barbary; thousands of Muslim slaves were taken to Malta; the Maltese ships had repeated encounters with those of the Porte and of the Levantine and Barbary pirates. The Turks attempted to occupy Malta in 1565, with then-well-known expedition which ended in disaster, and again in 1644; more than once they threatened to invade it under Sultan Muhammad IV.

Considering the Order's relations with the Maltese East and the fact that an important portion of the registers of Rhodes was saved, the importance of the Order's archives for the history of the Mediterranean Levant and of North Africa in the xvi-xvii centuries is easily understood.

A few Arabic MSS. and nautical charts, of no great value, are preserved in the Public Library of Malta and in its Museum.

MALTHAI — MÄLWA

Ninil', wife of Assur (a lion), Ennil (a horned lion), Sin (a dragon), Shamash (a harnessed horse), Adad (a horned lion and a bull), Ishtar (a lion). Ashur-the-Turbe-Dangir The bas-reliefs should be attributed to Sanahin; as to the motif of the mounted gods, usually explained as showing Hitite influence, examples are found in Sumero-Accadian art. Cf. also Bachmann, Felsreliefs in Assyrien (Basel, Malthai and Gundak), publ. by the Deutsche Orient. Gesell., Berlin 1927.

(V. MORSKY)

MAL'LUL'A, a town in Central Syria north-east of Damascus. It is mentioned as early as Georgios Kyrios (ed. Gelzer, p. 188, No. 993) as Ṭμάλλουα (MSS. ματταλουα, ματαλουα) κατα in Phoinike Libanessa. Vakût also calls Mal'ull an ʿilām (σελάς) near Dimashq with many villages. The modern Malša, a village of Christians, is picturesquely situated at the west end of a deep ravine of the Antelbanon, which splits into a western and southern stream; to the entrance to the northern lies the monastery of Mār Taktū built half into the rocks. The two ravines form the way to the other monastery of Mār Sarṣik, which stands on a rocky plateau above the village. Numerous caves, mostly ancient dwelling-places, have been found on the west and southern corner of the rock on the eastern slope of which the modern village is built in the form of an amphitheatre. Some Greek inscriptions have been found in the caves (Waddington, Inscriptions, No. 2563—2565; Moritz, p. 145—147, No. 3—8, including one dated 107 and 107 A.D.). Malša and the adjoining villages of Bakša and Ḥubb Aḏin are noted for the fact that the Western Arabic dialect still spoken there represents the last remnants on Syrian soil of the Syriac spoken throughout Palestine and Syria in the time of Christ.


(E. HÜNGMANN)

MÄLWA proper is an inland district of India bordered on the north by the Vindhayas, and lyrn by 25° 30' N. and 74° 30' E. To this tract, known in the age of the Māhākārata as Nishāthā, and later as Avanti, from the name of its capital, now Udijānain, was afterwards added Akara, or Eastern Mālwa, with its capital, Bhilsā, and the country lying between the Vindhayas and the Sītāpurās. The province formed part of the dominions of the Mauryas, the Western Satraps, the Guptas of Magadha, the White Huns, and the Kingdom of Kanauj, and then passed to the Mālwas, from whom it has its name. These, when Hinduized formed the Parshva (or) tribe of Rājpatā, which bore sway in Mālwa from 800 to 1200, and was overthrown in 1053 by a confederacy of the Calukyas of Anhilvāda and the Kālaśās of Tripūra. In 1235 Shams al-Dīn Ilutmish of Dihlī captured Udijānain, demolished the temple of Māhākālī, and sacked Bhilsā. Mālwa became a province of Dihlī, and, with interludes of Hindī revolt, remained so until, in 1392, on the dissolution of the kingdom of Dihlī after Timūr's invasion, the Afghan governor, Dilawār Khān Ghūrī, made it an independent kingdom. He was murdered in 1405 by his son Aḥmād Khān, who ascended the throne under the title of Hūshang Shāh. He transferred the capital from Dihlī to Mandu [351], and founded his new city of Mandu in 1425. He died in 1435, and was succeeded by his son Chāmast Khān, who, after a reign of five months, was succeeded by his infant son Māvīḍ Khān. The child was removed by his cousin and guardian, Māhmaūd Khāldūjī, who in 1436 ascended the throne as Māhmaūd I, and whose reign of thirty-three years was the most glorious in the annals of Mālwa. He waged war successfully against the kings of Gudjārāt, the Dakhān, and Dīvānpūr, the small state of Kalpi, and Kābū Ḍumāna of Ḏumāna; he retired, but without disgrace, when the superior power of Dihlī; and he extended the borders of his kingdom on the north, the east, and the south. On his death in 1469 his third son, Aḥd al-Kālid Ghūrī al-Dīn, who succeeded him, surfeited with public business during his father's strenuous reign, retired into his harem and left the administration of the kingdom to his son, Nāṣir al-Dīn, who in 1500 poisoned his father and ascended the throne. Nāṣir al-Dīn met his death in 1510 by falling, in a fit of drunkennes, into a tank or cistern, where his attendants, thankful to be rid of the monster, let him lie. He was succeeded by his son Māhmaūd II, who was an unfortunate in war as in the first of that name had been fortunate. With the help of Muṣṭafā II of Gudjārāt he rid himself of his powerful Ṫajjīpīt minister, Medīnī Rāsī, but in doing so enwrapped himself with Sangamā Rāsā of Cito, who defeated him in the field and took him prisoner, but generously released him. He then, with incomparably full and ingratitude, bitterly offended Bahādur Shāh of Gudjārāt, who invaded Mālwa and, after giving Mahāmūd every opportunity of atoning for his error, carried Māndādī by assault on March 21, 1531. Māhmaūd and his sons were sent in custody towards Cāmpān, but the officer in charge of them, apprehending a rescue, put them to death. Mālwa now became a province of Gudjārāt, and in 1535 the emperor Humāyūn, invading that kingdom, defeated Bahādur Shāh at Mandraur and captured Māndādī, but was recalled to Hindu,stan in the following year by the menacing attitude of Shīr Khān in Bengalear, and Malik Khān, an officer of Mahāmūd II, established himself in Mālwa and assumed the title of Kālid Shāh. Shūṣāfat Khān and Ḥājaḍī Khān, two officers of Shīr Shāh, drove him from Mālwa and assumed the government of the province. Shūṣāfat Khān died
in 1554, and was succeeded by his son Malik Bāyāzīd, known as Bāz Bahādur, who, during the decline of the power of the Sūrūh emperors, became independent. A severe defeat at the hands of the queen of the Gond kingdom of Garha Mandla engendered in him a distaste for warlike enterprise and he devoted himself to music and to the eminences of the beautiful Rūmpat. In 1561 Akbar's army under Adham Khan surprised the vanguard at Sarangpur, defeated his troops, put him to flight, and captured his mistress, who took poison rather than become the conqueror's paramour. Bāz Bahādur fled into Khandeṣh and Pir Muhammad Khan, second-in-command of Akbar's army, who followed him thither, was defeated by Mubarak Khan of Khandeṣh and drowned in the Narmad. Bāz Bahādur returned and again reigned in Mālwa, but in 1562 another army under 'Abd Allāh Khan the Zībhī invaded Mālwa and compelled him to flee to Citor. He remained a fugitive until 1570, when he submitted to Akbar and entered his service.

Mālwa was now a province of the empire, and remained so until 1743; the Mārāṭhās extended their rule over it, and the Peshāwa was made deputy-governor.

It was afterwards divided between the great Mughal generals whose descendants, Sindhya of Gwalior, Holkar of Indore, and the Peshāwa of Dīrār and Dewas still hold most of it.

From 1780 until 1818, when British supremacy was firmly established, the province was one of the principal arenas in which Muslim, Mārāṭhā, and European contended for empire. Since then its history has been eventful, but sporadic risings took place at six military stations during the mutiny of 1857.

Bibliography: Frishta, Ghiyāth-i ibrāhīmī, Bombay 1852; Āthīl Akbarī, translated by Blockman and Jarrett; An Arabic History of Gujarāt, ed. E. Demson Ross; The Cambridge History of India, vols. i. and iii.; History of the Mahrattas by G. C. Grant Duff, London 1921; Imperial Gazetteer of India, 1908, vol. xvii (T. W. Haig)

MĀMĀR B. AL-MUTHANA. [See ANU 'UMAYRA.]

MAMLŪK (Ar. plural mamlūkān and mamlūtīk), participle passive I of mamlūk 'to possess', denotes the slave as his master's possession. The term has its origin probably to the Sūrūh phrase of the Kurān mālakat bāṣīlul-kumum, "what your right-hand possesses", a general designation of slaves without specialisation of gender. Mamlūk occurs once only in the Kurān (ṣūra xvi. 77), in the expression 'ād mamlūk 'a slave in the possession of his master', mamlūk alone not yet being a technical term for slave, to all appearance. In hadīth, 'ād mamlūk occurs likewise (Darim, Siyar, b. 34), but throughout the literature of hadīth mamlūk alone is a technical term synonymous with 'ād. The distinction between a slave born and a slave born from free parents, must be made by the addition of a genitive to 'ād, in the former case 'ādān (ādū kinnān), in the latter mamlūkā (ādū mamlukā). It may be remarked that neither in hadīth nor, to all probability, in Arabic literature, has the term mamlāk ever received the religious meaning of devotee, as is the case with 'abdī.

The Kurān enjoins the master to be humane towards "what his right hands possess" (ṣūra iv. 40). Hadīth is copious on this point. It asserts that Muhammad on his death-bed did not cease repeating "I recommend to you salaṭ and what your hands possess" (Ahmed b. Hanbal, Musnad, iii. 117; cf. i. 78), "Whosoever does not treat his mamlūk as he ought to do, shall not enter Paradise" (Ahmed b. Hanbal, i. 12). "When the mamlūk performs salaṭ, he is thy brother" (Ibn Mīdjab, Abāk, b. 10). "The mamlūk may claim his food and rainment" (Muslim, Amānāt, trad. 41). "The Apostle of Allāh used... and to protect the mamlūk who appealed to his help" (Ibn Mīdjab, Zubd, b. 16). "The mamlūk who acquits himself of his obligations towards Allāh and towards his master, will receive double wages" (Bakhārī, T. 'Umm, b. 31) and "one is bound to pardon his mamlūk even unto seventy times a day" (Ahmed b. Hanbal, ii. 111).

For the legal position of slaves see 'AHDU.

For the Egyptian dynasties called the Mamlūkā, see the following article. — It may be finally remarked that in certain circles mamlūk had the special meaning of white slave. See Fagnan, Addition aux lexiques arabes, s. v. (A. J. Wensinck)

MAMLŪK, a dynasty of rulers of Egypt and Syria.

A. Period from 1250 to 1517. The history of this dynasty is dealt with under the separate rulers; the general questions of art, religion and economics of their time are also dealt with in these articles and notably in Becker's article EGYPT [q. v.], and Hartmann's article DAMASCUS [q. v.]. Only a brief survey of the whole period is given here.

They were, as their name shows [cf. MAMLŪK], former slaves from the bodyguards of the sūlājīs and amirs who had distinguished themselves by ability and been given their freedom by their masters. A somewhat arbitrary distinction is made between two dynasties, the Bahīrī [q. v.] from 648—792 = 1250—1390 and the Burjīs from 784—922 = 1382—1517. The name Bahīrī Mamlūks was given to the guards of Sūlān Nādīm al-Dīn Ayībū (637—47 = 1340—49), whose barracks were upon the island of Rūǧa [q. v.] in the Nile (Bahīr). Except for the first three the Bahīrīs in the land of the sūlājīs were chosen by the Mamlūks from among the descendants of the Sūlān. Thus after Bahīrīs there ruled two of his sons, after Kāsilīn [q. v.] two sons, a series of grandsons and a great grandson. It was different with the Burjī Mamlūk, a bodyguard founded by Kāsilīn, who were quartered in the towers of the citadel of Cairo. The first Burjīī, Bārīkī, [q.v.], was able to secure the succession of his son and even a second son succeeded for a brief period to the throne, but after this the Mamlūk guards never tolerated hereditary succession again; so the sūlājī's son, who was proclaimed heir-apparent, ever succeeded in keeping the throne (the only exception is al-Nāṣir Muhammad II who occupied the throne for nearly three years). The Mamlūks did not always choose the ablest, but more often the oldest; a kind of system of seniority developed. The first Mamlūk on the throne was Izāl al-Dīn Aḥnāk (648—55 = 1250—57), the husband of Shadījar al-Durr [q. v.] a slave whom Ayībū had married.

In the period of its greatest extension under the Mamlūks, the frontiers of Egypt were in the west the Libyan desert as far as Barka, in the
south Nubia as far as Massaw'a, in the north the Mediterranean Sea. The frontiers of Syria in the east stretched to the Euphrates to Der al-Zor through Raṣṣa, in the south to the Arabian deserts and in the north to the Taurus. The two countries met in Sinai and were separated by the Red Sea. The sultāns usually exercised suzerainty over the holy places in Mecca and Medina; Sultan Kāṣīf Ghūrī [q.v.] even maintained garrisons in South Arabia for a time.

The first task of the Mamlūks sultāns was to consolidate the kingdom. Their most dangerous enemy, the Tatars under Hulagu, was defeated in Syria in 658 (1260) at ‘Ain Džālūt [q.v.]; the Crusaders were destroyed by Sultān Baibars, Kālātun and Kholal, the remnants of the ‘Alids and Assassins [q.v.] rendered harmless by Baibars. Their power was finally consolidated and justified to the Ayyūbids by the petty kingdoms left to them, by Baibars welcoming in Cairo the Caliph who had been driven from Baghādā by the Mongols, restoring the caliphate here in 659 (1261) and then having himself appointed by the Caliph participator in power (Kāsin d-Adamu) and having the power ceremoniously transferred to him. This marked the position that the end of Mamlūk rule. The Caliph paid homage to the Sultān on his accession and ceded all his rights to him. He thus lost all authority and became the shadow of a ruler without power, without money and without influence; only now and then an Indian Sultān sought a diploma of investiture from the Caliph.

The rule of the Sultān was absolute. He was assisted by a council in which the chief commanders of the Mamlūks sat to the left and right of the ruler according to their rank (this sitting in order of rank dated from the early Mamlūk period): the representative of the Sultan (nāfīḥ kābir, later only appointed in case of absence of the ruler), the commander-in-chief (amīr kābir), later combined with the office of Aṭābee, the commander of the guards (rār nāvbat al-mawṣūla), see AMIR AL-KABIR), the War Minister (amīr-siṭla, i.b.), the president of the council who was the chief civil official (amīr muāṣir); later the Minister of the Interior (dār al-kabir [q.v.]), and the ministers of the palaces and domains (wāṣīr dār) gained more influence and became numbered among the highest officials, as did the chief military judge (ḥadīyī al-khawājīyī [q.v.], properly high chamberlain) and at times the chief marshal (amīr ali-kābir [q.v.]). Their offices and their relative rank (cf. e.g. under AMIR AL-KABIR for the composition and order of precedence in later times) changed. These members of the council were military officers, the so-called lords of the sword (asḥāb al-siyāsī); they belonged to the class of amirs of 1,000 (nukhudān al-nilāf). From this class were chosen the governors of the Syrian provinces (Damascus, Aleppo, Tripolis, Ḥamā, Saḥāf) and frequently also the governors of the citadels of Damascus and Aleppo who were appointed by the Sultān himself. The next class was formed by the tabībīyīs, amirs of 40 Mamlūks, who had the right to be accompanied by a band. They were followed by the amirs of 10 and those of 5 Mamlūks. All the amirs of 1,000 were appointed by the Sultān himself; the other amirs in the provinces sometimes by the sultān and sometimes by the governor. The administrative system at the Sultān’s court was reproduced on a small scale in the provinces. Every governor was a little Sultān who had to some extent the same functions as the Sultān in Cairo. The Syrian governors were in general independent of one another (very few like the Amir Tengit [see DAMASCUS, i, p. 908] had other governors subordinated to them). In the beginning the Mamlūks, perhaps influenced by the Mongols, had the tendency to make all offices secular and fill them with Mamlūks who, as lords of the sword (asḥāb al-siyāsī), belonged to the military caste. They kept this up in the highest offices throughout the dynasty, but they had to create the important offices of private secretary (kāthib al-ṭīrī) and head of the chancellory (ṣāḥib Dīwan al-imāmī) and fill them with civilians and even admit Christians, Jews, and especially converts to Islam to them, because the Turkish ruling caste was not fitted for them. The above mentioned chief offices on the military and administrative side remained however reserved for the constantly increasing oligarchy, into which neither Arabs, nor the sons of Mamlūks were admitted. It hardly ever happened (I only know of 3 cases of Arabs) that Arabs or sons of Mamlūks became amirs of 1,000, or rose to the highest posts in the legal and scholastic world and in the other branches of the civil service.

The Mamlūks were purchased on behalf of the government by a high official, the purchaser of Mamlūks (ṭābir al-mamlūkī), educated in the first place in the Mamlūk School in Cairo, then distributed in the different branches of the corps of pages to act as amour-bearers, cup-bearers, carvers, polo-grooms, club-bearers etc. for further training and then placed in the service of the amirs or of the Sultān as vacancies occurred. The Sultān’s lifeguards were called ḫagāʿī and the amirs had also similar bodyguards. The army consisted of a) the bodyguard of the Sultān, b) the ḡund al-khāṣṣa, enlisted troops, who were paid in money and with the yield of the crown estates, c) the guards of the great amirs and former Sultāns. In later times there was a body of reserves, awsiyyt al-nilāf, who were only called up for service in times of war but also received pay in times of peace. Military expeditions were usually decided upon by the council of state; the amirs were given money to equip and maintain their troops, to be able to lead them into the enemy’s country.

In addition to the military officers there were civil officials, asḥāb al-balām (lords of the pen): a) the religious officials (al-ʿināʾ; a), who filled posts in the legal and scholastic worlds and a series of other offices; b) the regular administrative officials (al-diwaʿniyya) for the rest of the civil service.

The Sultān’s revenue was made up of the ground-poll, and poor-tax, from the yield of the fiefs (on the Egyptian system of appanages cf. ii, p. 90), of the harvest, of the tolls on goods and markets, which, not being laid down in the Kūtān, were considered illegal and resisted. He also sometimes made money by forced purchases and sales. The government bought up goods at a fixed price and forced purchasers to take them at a definite price. Finally there were monopolies out of which the Sultān made profits. Another favourite means of raising money was for the Sultān to visit some great man from whom he extorted large sums while a guest (especially Kāthib al-ʿināʾ [q.v.]). Things
The Mamluks in history lay in the fact that, protected by the deserts and their armies, they subdued the flood of Asiatic conquerors; they conquered Cingis Khan's Mongols and later the hordes of Timur Lenk, who had conquered Syria for a short time, and other conquerors. After the defeat of the Tartars and the retreat of Timur, the Sultans were forced to concentrate on the struggle with the gradually increasing power of the Ottomans. The struggle was long avoided by the formation of buffer states on both sides; among these the most notable were the dynasties of Dhu l-Ghādir and of the White and Black Sheep (so-called from their standards). The success of Kātibā's policy postponed the end but the rulers who followed him were weak. The rule of the Mamluks lost its vigour. They were weakened in long wars; their finances became quite hopeless as a result of their immediate expenditure, not commensurate with their means and a defective system of taxation, which in the later period enabled the owners of large estates to escape the taxes. They therefore could not permanently resist the Ottomans, especially as the lack of discipline among the Mamluk leaders and the weakness of their field artillery made the army useless. The well-equipped fortresses were not defended against the Ottomans; they fell through treachery. The ham-ul ash-Sulṭān Kānṣīl Ghaṭī was defeated and slain in 922 (1516) at Marj Dibij (in the province of Aleppo). The way to Egypt was thus opened to Sultān Selim; after six months' resistance the last Sultān ʿUmmahā had to surrender. He was hanged from the flat Zulawal in Cairo. A number of the great amirs and the Caliph were taken to Constantinople. The caliphate ceased as no new Caliph was appointed; the Sultān of Constantinople became the first ruler in Islam. The protection of the holy places also passed automatically to him.

The period of the Mamluks was marked by great activity in building (ii. 230). Of secular buildings many, for example those in Cairo, Aleppo, Damascus and Birejik which were entirely rebuilt in the Mamluk period, as well as a large number of fine tombs, hospitals, baths, fountains and aqueducts still exist. Of religious buildings splendid mosques with schools attached to them were built. While even under the Ayyūbids there had been only one "great mosque" in each town or independent suburb, where the Friday service was held, it became the custom under the Mamluks that many Sultāns and governors and occasionally even one of the guilds built "great mosques" for the Friday service in the large towns. Mention may be made of the mosques of Balbais, Kalātān, Muḥammad al-Nāṣirī, Sultān Ḥasan, Ṣubbān, Muḥyāʾī, Kātibā in Cairo, as well as the mosque in the provincial capitals Aleppo, Damascus and Tripoli. While agriculture, industry and trade showed great prosperity, trade suffered very much under the later Mamluk Sultāns through the extortionate taxes of the government. The trade through Egypt, based on treaties with Frankish and Oriental rulers, yielded huge sums. The customs and the treatment of merchants by the Sultans finally became so intolerable that the European powers did everything possible to secure the sea-route to India in order to avoid the transit through Egypt with its enormous expense and the roguery to which it was exposed.

The object of the last wars of Sultān Kānṣīl Ghaṭī was to gain a footing in South Arabia and nearer India to secure the Egyptian share in Indian trade.
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VI. History of separate towns:


2. Jerusalem: Muqir al-Dîn, Cis al-Djilal, Cairo 1283, transl. by Sauvaire.


7. Medina: Samhâli, Wafâ il-Wafâ, Cairo 1285 (1869); Geschichte der Stadt Medina, transl. Wustenfeld, Gottingen 1861.

(M. Sombekhlm)

B. Period from 1517 to 1798. It is a significant fact, that even this period of nearly three centuries, during which Egypt belonged to the Ottoman Empire, may still be designated as a third Mamluk period. The change brought about by the conquest of Sultan Selim in 1517 was, after all, not a radical one, from the point of view of government. Egypt and its inhabitants remained under the rule of a powerful minority of foreign race. The autocracy that existed in the beginning between Ottoman Turks and Mamluks and which had led at first to much bloodshed (execution of 800 mamluks by Selim I in Cairo) did not last very long after the troubles of the occupation were over. The Turkish soldiers and officials, who entered Egypt during Ottoman rule soon became mixed up to a large extent with the numerically more powerful class of the Mamluks, whose aid was, moreover, indispensable, for the government of the country. Besides, the number of Mamluks (al-Şarâifî) continued to receive additions by purchase of slaves from the Caucasus. An author of the xvith century (Vansleb, p. 13) says that Egypt, in his day, was inhabited by Copts, Moors (by whom he means the Egyptian population), Arabs, Turks, Greeks, Jews and Franks. The "Turks" were the governing class and composed of Mamluks and Ottomans, between whom no distinction is made. We may even speak of a mamlukisation of the Ottoman element: the real ottomanisation of the country belongs to the xixe century. In accordance with what is said, the history of those centuries never shows, among the parties and factions into which the Mamluks were divided, a pro- or anti-Ottoman party; those quarrels were local and personal character. Even the first governor of Egypt, Khârîbek, was a Mamluk, although, after him, the Pashas were sent, without exception, from Constantinople.

During the xixe century it is true, the authority of the Pashas sent from Constantinople to govern the country was undisputed. The Pasha could rely on seven constant of troops (oTâfî) six of which were instituted by Selim I, while a seventh contingent was added under Sulaimân I, composed of Mamluks. Their nominal strength was 20,000 men in all. They were not commanded by the Pasha, but by their own commander, who belonged to the oTâfî of the Janissaries and resided in the citadel of Cairo. Afterwards these troops behaved more and more independently and were even able to depose Pashas whom they did not like, until, in the xixe century, this military force became the instrument of some all-influential Mamluk beys. Important matters of administration were treated by a great Divân or State Council, which only met in extraordinary cases and in which the high functionaries were represented, as well as the military chiefs and the high religious dignitaries. Local and special government functions were exercised by twelve sandy beys; these represented at the same time the feudal aristocracy; from the beginning however, the ties that linked them to particular provinces seem to have been rather loose, for among them are mentioned the Kâfa of the
Pasha, the Daftarār, the Amir al-Hadījī and the Amir al-Khasha, the three first of whom were also members of the great Divān. The other Beys were commanders at Suq. Damietta and Alexandria, and governors of the five big provinces in the Nile delta. Besides these twelve Beys there were twelve other Beys with similar functions. The real provincial administration was exercised by a class of functionaries called Kāshif. Their chief task was the collection of the revenues. They may be considered as a kind of governor; some of the great Beys themselves were also Kāshif in their districts or had different Kāshifs under them. Vansleb mentions 56 Kāshifs. As to the revenues, they were collected in various ways, the local customs in different parts of Lower Egypt and Upper Egypt varying considerably. The most common form was the farming out of revenues (ilīzām); the multazim had different kinds of right of possession on the lands, which were hereditary. They collected the revenue, in taxes or in kind, from the fellahs, generally through the village notables called Shaikh al-Balad. In the tax-collecting there were further employed, a host of subordinate technical and financial functionaries, many of whom were Copts. Some Kāshifs were at the same time multazim. This system of administration showed the close relation between administration and land-owning, which has always been characteristic of Egyptian conditions (cf. Egypt). It was the continuation of the system which had prevailed under the Mamlūk Sultāns (regulation by Kāšī Bay) and was regulated again in the Kāšīnām-e ‘Mīr of Sulaymān I (cf. J. von Hammer, Der er manischen Reiches Staatsverwaltung und Staats verwaltung, Vienna 1815, i. 101—142); here a special stress is laid on the rights and obligations of the Kāshifs.

In Cairo a large chancery, the chief of which was the Kāshīnāmī, had to collect these taxes and to keep the registers; the revenues collected were reserved partly for the pay of the troops and works of public utility such as irrigation, building of bridges and dikes, etc. and partly for the yearly tribute to the Sultan, which was in the beginning 800,000 ducats and afterwards lowered to 600,000 and later to 400,000 ducats. In the xvith century the paying of tribute practically fell into disuse. Besides the land-tax, there existed a great number of other taxes, under different denominations; they were collected more or less arbitrarily, and, as in course of time, the anarchy in the government assumed greater proportions, they pressed ever heavier on the population. The rural population had as much to suffer from the exactions of their Mamlūk administrators and proprietors as from the raids of Arab tribes, which the government was unable to control.

The history of Egypt during this period is a not very interesting succession of domestic intrigues, struggles and revolts. Until the beginning of the xvith century the Pashas could more or less maintain their authority, but they were replaced too often to have a lasting influence. No less than 117 Pashas governed Egypt until the arrival of the French (a complete list of them is given in Thurey, Schöllt ‘Othmānī, iv 835 sqq.). Many of them tried to make their short stay as profitable for themselves as possible, and several of them had to pay their cupidity with their lives after their return to Constantinople. In the xvith century the real power in the country was exercised by the great Beys in Cairo, who had the troops in their hand and tolerated only those Pashas who did not interfere with their affairs. By this time the two most powerful positions in the country were those of the commander of Cairo, called the Shaikh al-Balad and of the Amir al-Hadījī. Some of the Shaikh al-Balads are reputed as good rulers, especially Ismā’īl Bey, who held that office from 1707 to 1724. But the changes of power were always of a violent kind and prevented the forming of a dynasty; Ismā’īl’s shaikh al-baladship itself had been preceded by a curious struggle between the two rival parties of the Dhu ‘l-Fikārīya and the Kāshīmīya, which had lasted for three months outside Cairo. In 1747 the Porte tried for the first time to reestablish its authority by ordering the governor Raghib Pasha to exterminate the Mamlūk Beys; this attempt failed, however, completely and the disorders continued until the appearance of the young Mamlūk ‘Ali Bey [q.v.] who made himself for a short time independent Shaikh al-Balad and ruler of Egypt, for the years 1770—1771. By this time the Porte began to take more serious measures to retain its hold on Egypt, but the regime of the Mamlūk Beys did not end until a foreign power, France, temporarily occupied Egypt [cf. KEDIVE].

Under such a regime the conditions of living of the population could not be flourishing. It was not so much the position of Egypt as an Ottoman province that caused the suffering of the population, as the lack of a strong central power. European travellers like Vansleb and Luscin point to the fact that Egypt was, in the xvith century a rich country and that by the practical stopping of the payment of tribute, all the money remained in the country itself. But the riches remained only in the possession of the ruling minority, while the rural population was oppressed very hardly. The bad organisation caused, moreover, from time to time terrible famines, while, about the middle of the xvith century, began a series of ravaging epidemics of plague. Since the last period of the Mamlūk Sultāns the country had lost, moreover, a rich source of revenue by the change of the trade-route to India. The transit trade was now restricted to inner African products and coffee and aromatics from Arabia, while the exportation of Egyptian products such as corn, cotton and sugar was limited. The timber that the country needed had to be imported from Turkey. Moreover, the trade with Christian countries often experienced serious hindrances from the arbitrary measures of the local authorities. At the same time the local industries declined rapidly; one of the causes may have been the transportation of a large number of skilled craftsmen to Constantinople by Salīm I; the once flourishing guild organisation was paralysed by this measure (cf. Thorning, Beitraje zur Kenntnis des islamischen Vereinsvereins, Berlin 1913, p. 81 and al-Qabari, i. 29).

The decline of Egypt’s economic strength, on the other hand, made Egypt a relatively quiet possession for the Porte. Only in the very beginning of Ottoman rule, in 1524, a Turkish governor, Ahmad Pasha, tried to take the title of sultan of Egypt, but afterwards no attempts to recover independence were made until the time of ‘Ali Bey. Then, however, the political needs of the European colonial powers
made Egypt appear again as an important stage on the way to India and opened new possibilities of a more independent development, which were to be realised in the sixteenth century. In the meantime the possession of Egypt had been useful to Turkey in many respects; the Porte could always count on an Egyptian contingent of troops in its wars and the country itself was a base of action for the military operations in Syria, the Hidjaz and Yemen. The reconquest of Yemen under Selim II was carefully prepared in Cairo. As soon as the tendency to independence appeared, however, as under 'Ali Bey, the Turkish hold on Syria and Arabia was immediately endangered seriously.

The predominant position of Egypt in Islam was now repeatedly contested by the Ottoman occupation. Al-Azhar [q.v.] remained one of the most important centres of Islamic learning; the Turkish Pashas and other dignitaries showed their acknowledgement of this fact by gifts and by the execution of restorations to the building, as they did occasionally for other religious institutions in the country. Though Islamic science continued to flourish, Egypt did not produce many prominent figures in this period. In the domain of mathematics the most important figure was al-Raml (q.v.; d. 1546), the commentator of al-Nawawi, further the mystic al-Sha'ran (q.v.; d. 1656), and, as representative of Arabic philology, Abd al-Kadir al-Baghdadi (q.v.; d. 1652). In popular mysticism the veneration of Ahmad al-Badawi [q.v.] by the Almadiya held a large place.

The period of Ottoman domination in Egypt is not wholly without interest from the point of view of architecture and art. Several governors, beginning with Khair al-Din have constructed mosques; these mosques show a kind of transition from the Mamluk to the Ottoman architectural style. There are also in Cairo several mosques founded by the Mamluk Beys, like the mosque of Abi Dhahab, the tutor of 'Ali Bey, constructed in 1772. Some beautiful palaces have likewise been built by the Mamluks, but only few of them are still existing (cf. on their subject: Mme. R. A. Devonshire, L'Egypte musulmane et les fondeurs de ses monuments, Paris 1926, p. 115 sqq.).

Bibliography: The sources for the history of Ottoman rule have not been much studied. Of the many Arabic works have to be mentioned (cf. Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii, 289 sqq.): Ibn Ilyas, Badi't al-Zahir fi Waṣṭī al-Dhahir, iii., Bulak 1312, p. 101 sqq. (until 1522); al-Minhaji, al-Badur al-safiya fi mān wāliyya Yākhiyar, Ms. Vienna, No. 9122 (until 1549); al-Burj, al-Riyād al-Sa'īda fi Aḥḥār Mīr wa l-ʾAḥḍiyya l-Misr, Ms. Algeciras, No. 1605; Ibn al-Iṣlah, al-Masālik Misr, several MSS. (1517-1519); al-ʾIsbāh (cf. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 160 sqq.), Dāwrat al-ʾAḥḍiyya fi mān wāliyya Yākhiyar al-Mīriyya also called Laitif Aḥḍar al-Uṣūl fi mān tagarrū' bi-Mīr min Ar-Rabīl al-Diwāl, several times printed in Cairo 1276, 1296, 1300, 1304 (until 1623); do., al-Rawd al-ḥāsīm fi Aḥḍar man māṣaf min al-ʾAtvūl, Ms. Paris, No. 1562 and Brit. Mus., No. 1251 (until 1623); al-Ghuni, Dāwrat al-ʾAṣm bi-Turīkh Ṣara'īl Mīr l-Ṣulīm, only in MSS. (poem, until 1630); Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Abī l-Surūj, al-Tufa al-Bābīya l-Ṣugdīqān al-Tūrīkhān al-Minān al-Diār al-Mīrīyya, several MSS. (until 1634); do., al-Rawd al-Zāhiyya fi Waṣṭī Mīr al-Kāhirā al-Mīrīyya, several MSS. (until 1651); do., al-Rawdāt al-Sadīrā fi Aḥḍar Miṣr wa l-Kāhirā, several MSS. (until 1645); al-Awfi, Turīkhān al-Sāvīrā fi Waṣṭī al-Sāvīrān several MSS. (treats of some events in the years 1658 and 1661); Abī al-Kaḍir, Turīkhān, MS. Berlin (G.A.L., ii, 299; the years 1603-1643); Ibrahim al-Khaṭāb, Maḥbūb al-ʾAṣlī fi bi-mā ḍāya fi Miṣr min al-Māṣaf, MS. at Cairo (G.A.L., ii, 299; written about 1721); al-Damirāshī, al-Durra al-Mārumān fi Waṣṭī al-Xanān, several MSS. (G.A.L., ii, 300; the years 1688-1703); Muṣafāb b. Ibrāhīm, Turīkhān Miṣr, MS. Copenhagen, No. 159 (the years 1686-1739); al-Dhābānī, Turīkhān al-ʾAtīqat wa l-Turīkhān al-Mīrī, Cairo 1256, vol. i. and ii. (from 1694 up to the French occupation).

Among the Turkish sources all the great historical works of the Ottoman Empire since the time of Selim I should be mentioned, to begin with the different Selīmī-nāmes; on the conquest of Egypt: Hāṣid Čelebi, Tagebuch des östlichen Feldzuges Sultan Selim, transl. by Khalil Edhem, Weimar 1916 (Deutsche Orientalische, vol. xx.). The following deal specially with Egypt: Abī al-Nāšīr, Narādir al-ʾAḥḍar, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 58 sqq.; Turkish translation and continuation of an older work, up till 1540); Sīfla b. Uljādi, Ṣubkāt Miṣr, several MSS. (G.O.W., p. 100 sqq.; written in 1546); Yūsuf b. Nīmet-Allah, Turīkhān Miṣr, MS. Turin (G.O.W., p. 121; Turkish translation of an older Arabic work and continuation up till 1592); Abī Ḥalīl al-ʾAḥḍar min al-ʾAtīqat al-Zāhirā, several MSS. (G.O.W., p. 133; written in 1599); Muḥammad b. Abī ʾAbd Allāh, Turīkhān Miṣr, several MSS. (G.O.W., p. 243 sqq.; up till 1679).


Vansleb, Nouvelle Relation d'un voyage fait en Égypte, Paris 1677; Eulalia Celebi, Sīrāḥāt Mīr, 3rd part, not printed; Paul Lucas, Voyage dans la Turquie, l'Allemagne, la Palestine, et Basse Égypte, etc., Amsterdam 1720, 2 vols.; B. de Mallet, Description de l'Égypte, Paris 1735. Cf. also the articles EGYPT and KIBR.

(J. H. KRAMERS)
at all popular with the Arabs. An 'Alid Muham-
mad b. Ibrahim, usually called Ibn Tabataba, there-
fore set up as a pretender to the throne in Kufa in
Hijra II 199 (Jan.-Feb. 815) and was sup-
ported by a former adherent of al-Ma'mun, Abu
Umar al-Saraya. The rebels had some success at first
but Ibn Tabataba died suddenly and when the
general Harrama b. A'yan [q. v.] advanced against
him, Abu Umar al-Saraya had to take flight. Soon
afterwards he was taken prisoner and put to
death (Rabi' 200 = Oct. 815). In the meanwhile
the movement had spread, but the 'Alids made
themselves so hated that Harrama's troops were
able to order every one as they pleased. The victori-
ous Harrama, however, was shamefully
rewarded for his services. After he had occupied
Merv, the suspicious Caliph had him thrown
into prison where he soon died (Dhu'l-Ka'da
200 = June 816). This increased the general
discontent. While al-Ma'mun remained for the time
in Merv, the people of Baghdad rebelled and
placed al-Marjani, a son of the Caliph al-Mahdi, at
the head of the movement. When in Ramazan
201 (March 817) al-Ma'mun designated an 'Alid,
'Ali al-Kidja [q. v.], as their apparent and
assumed the rule of the 'Alids instead of the black
of the 'Abbasids, the people of the capital elected
Ibrahim, another son of al-Mahdi, Caliph (Dhu
'l-Hijja 201 = July 817). Then there were
troubles in Egypt and in al-Jabaridjan, the people
were stirred up by the Khurrami Bubak [q. v.]
who terrorised the northern provinces for nearly
20 years. In these circumstances al-Ma'mun had
finally to leave Merv and go to the 'Iraq (202 =
817). But when the Arabs murdered the vizier
al-Fadhil who was, particularly hostile to them, and
'Ali al-Kidja died suddenly, and in addition, the
governor of Wilayat al-Jasan b. Sahl. the vizier's
brother went mad, or at least was treated as such,
the people of Baghadad had really no longer
reason to support Ibrahim and in Safar 204 (Aug.
819) al-Ma'mun entered the capital and the 'Alid
colours were exchanged for the Abbasid. Al-Jasan
b. Sahl. was then restored to his government,
and a few years later the Caliph married his
daughter Bistan [q. v.]. As soon as the Caliph had
left Khurasan, a rebellion broke out there among
the Jews. At the end of 205 (June of
820) or beginning of 206, Tahir b. al-Jussain
[q. v.] was appointed governor of Khurasan. He
proved in every way fitted for his difficult post
but carried his independence so far that in 207
(822) he renounced his fealty to the Caliph.
Although he died the following day, the Caliph
did not dare to deprive his sons of Tahir's go-
vernship, and in this way the dynasty of the
Tahirids was founded in Khurasan. In 210 (825-
826) 'Abd Allah b. Tahir [q. v.] after defeating
Sayr b. Shabath went by the Caliph's order to
Egypt. Here the Yamanis, who were loyal to
al-Ma'mun, had begun to fight with the Kal'is who
sided with al-Amin, and the struggle lasted till
the latter's death. A more peaceful period ensued,
but soon new troubles broke out, and with the
arrival of the Spanish Muslims banished by the
Caliph al-Hakam I [q. v.] the situation became
still more complicated. The latter seized the town
of al-Kandarya, but when 'Abd Allah b. Tahir
arrived in Egypt the native rebels had to submit,
and the Spanish intruders retired to Crete. When
'Abd Allah was appointed governor of Khurasan,
which made him master of Cordova. Six months later, al-Ma'mun was poisoned on the 11th Dhu l-Ka'ba 647 (June 28, 1075) either at the instigation of al-Mutamid, king of Seville, or of Ibn 'Ukasha. His son Yahya al-Kadhir succeeded him. A few years later, Alfonso VI took Toledo.

The long reign of al-Ma'mun is quite characteristic of the period of the muluk al-fasîlîf of the Iberian Peninsula. He certainly increased his dominions but his conquests were ephemeral and he was one of the first to have no scruples about an alliance with the Christian princes of Castile and Leon in order to fight other Muslim rulers of al-Andalus. He even afforded hospitality to his own guests for nine months, to Alfonso VI when the latter was deposed by his brother Sanchu of Castile.


AL-MA'MUN, 4.ABU 'L-'ALI' IBRÎS B. YÂK'B AL-MANŞîR B. YUSUF B. 'ABD AL-MU'MIN B. 'ALI, ninth sovereign of the Almohad dynasty, born in 58/1185–1186 in Malaga, of the marriage of his father with the Spanish princes Safiya, daughter of the amīn 'Abd Allah b. Mandhar (Martune). The Arab historians pay high tributes to the good qualities of this prince who was very well read, equally well versed in rational and religious learning. At a time when the Almohad dynasty was much troubled by the strife stirred up by pretenders, he was able by his energy to postpone for several years its final collapse.

At first al-Ma'mun served in Spain as the lieutenant of his brother Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah al-Ádil then on the throne. The latter had soon to leave the Peninsula and return to Morocco without having been able to subdue the rebel leader Abu Muhammad al-Bayâsi supported by Ferdinand III of Castile, but he was soon betrayed by his own men in his own land and assassinated in 624 (1127). This murder was followed by the almost simultaneous proclamations of al-Ma'mun and another Almohad pretender, nephew of the preceding, Yahya b. al-Nasir b. al-Manṣûr, who took the honorific titles of al-Mu'tamid 'Abd. On his accession and without leaving Spain, al-Ma'mun was soon able to make himself recognized in the greater part of his empire and to get rid of the rebel al-Bayâsi. But almost immediately a rebellion broke out in the east of al-Andalus, in which Muhammad b. Yâqub of the powerful family of the Banu Hûd was proclaimed caliph in the town of Murcia. At the same time the prestige of Yahya al-Munta'im increased in Morocco and his partisans became more and more numerous. Feeding himself powerless in Spain and forced to turn his eyes towards Africa al-Ma'mun was forced to seek an alliance with the king of Castile. The latter agreed to support al-Ma'mun under very harsh terms, including the surrender of ten Muslim strongholds of the frontier and the building of a church and the granting of freedom of worship in Marrakesh. In return, al-Ma'mun received a body of 12,000 Christian mercenaries with whom he at once went to the Maghrib. He was soon able to enter Marrakesh in triumph, after having
defeated the army of al-Mu'tasim in 629 (1230).

Enraged at the defection of the Almohad Makhir, so devoted to his predecessors, al-Ma'mun took a decision at Marraksh, that was quite unprecedented in the annals of the dynasty. He stigmatised the memory of the Mahdi Ibn Tumart, denied him "impeccability" (i'tima) and had a large number of Almohad shi'khis executed whom he suspected of having betrayed him. The rest of the reign of al-Ma'mun was spent in trying to put down several rebellions in the Maghrib; but he did not succeed in bringing his rival to terms for the latter was able to take and plunder Marraksh. On hearing this, al-Ma'mun, then busy with the siege of Ceuta, hurried off to the capital at once but fell ill and died on the way in the valley of the Wad'i l'Abid at the end of Dhu'l-Hijjâh 629 (Oct. 1223).


AL-MAMUN, name of a dynasty.

In the 15th (5th) century Djurdjânya, to the north of modern Khiva, was a dependency of Bukhâra and was ruled by a line of princes called the Manûnis. Nothing is mentioned about them by the Oriental historians till 982 (992) when Manûn b. Muhammad b. 'Ali, ruler of Djurdjânya, is said to have assisted Amir 'Alî b. Manûr the Samîdî in his exile during the temporary occupation of Bukhâra by Bughârâ Khan, ruler of Kâshghar. In 985 (995) Ma'mûn attacked Abu 'Abd Allah, ruler of Khwarizm, in order to punish him for his treachery to Abu 'Ali Sundjûk, took him prisoner and annexed Khwarizm. Ma'mûn was assassinated in 987 (997). His son Abu l'-Hasan 'Ali succeeded to the throne, and married a sister of Sultan Muhammad of Ghazna. Abu l'-Hasan died about 999 (1000–1001) and was succeeded by his brother Abu l'-Abbas Ma'mûn. Abu l'-Abbas married his brother's widow, the sister of Sultan Muhammad. Shortly after this he gave offence to his army by doing homage to Sultan Mahmûd. The commandery of the army organised a rebellion against him, put him to death on Shawwâl 15, 497 (March 16, 1017) and raised one of his sons to the throne. On hearing this, Sultan Mahmûd marched to Khwarizm to avenge the death of his brother-in-law, defeated the rebels at Hazârasp on Safar 5, 498 (July 3, 1017), and executed the leaders of the insurrection. All the scions of the royal house were taken prisoners and sent to Khurasân. The kingdom of Khwarizm was annexed and placed under the command of Alttânî, with the title of Khwarizmshâh. But after the return of Sultan Mahmûd to Ghazna, Abu Ishâq, father-in-law of Abu l'-Abbas Ma'mûn, tried to establish himself in Khwarizm but he was defeated by Alttânîsh. The rulers of this dynasty were famous patrons of learning, and it was at the court of Abu l'-Abbas Ma'mûn that Abu Raijân al-Birûnî, the astronomer, Abu 'Ali b. Sina and Abu l'-Khaib b. Khâmmur, the physicians, and Abu Nasr b. Arrâk, the mathematician, flourished.

This dynasty has been confused by the Târikhi Guicî and Târikhi Alâ'dîn Arî of Kâdi Ahmad Ghâfîrî, with the Farîqânîs who were the rulers of Djurdjânya.


AL-MAMURET AL-ÂZîZî, the name given to the new town of Mezrê, built beside Kâpurî [q. v.] in honour of Sultan 'Abd al-Âzîz. In time the name became applied to the new wilayet formed in 1879 around Kâpurî-Mezer; this consisted of three sandjaks: al-Âzîz, Khôzât and Mâlitja. As a result of the administrative reforms of 1914 (1921) each of these sandjaks became an independent wilayet but later modifications were made.

According to the official annual of 1925–1926, the wilayet of Ma'mûret al-Âzîz has an area of 11,299 sq. km. or 12,428,900 donums, of which 3,124,596 are arable. It contains 6 kâdas: the central kâda, Pâlî, Kâpurî, Kebân, ʿArâbûr, Kemîlîye (this new name replaces the historical one of Egin).

The annual of 1926–1927 records an even more radical reorganisation. The area of the wilayet of al-Âzîz is given as 17,268 sq. km. with 15,629,296 donums of arable land. The wilayet which lost the western kâdas (ʿArâbûr and Egin) has been extended to include the following regions: to the east has been added to the wilayet of Ma'mûret al-Âzîz: Khanenî, Mullû-kendî, İmîne, Khuâlîûya (?), Erenler (Ayûwu), Bûl-Bey, Kâpurî, Čongû, Sarnî (Dîjîdî). The annual of 1926–1927 records an even more radical reorganisation. The area of the wilayet of al-Âzîz is given as 17,268 sq. km. with 15,629,296 donums of arable land. The wilayet which lost the western kâdas (ʿArâbûr and Egin) has been extended to include the following regions: to the east has been added to the wilayet of Ma'mûret al-Âzîz: Khanenî, Mullû-kendî, İmîne, Khuâlîûya (?), Erenler (Ayûwu), Bûl-Bey, Kâpurî, Čongû, Sarnî (Dîjîdî).
The wilayet (without Cemish-gezek) has therefore 171,631 inhabitants. The events of the war and the suppression of the Kurf rising in 1925 must have had far-reaching effects on the ethical aspect of this territory. Before the war the population was mixed: Kurf, Armenian and “Zaza” (a people speaking an Iranian dialect, q.v.).

Bibliography: cf. the fundamental article Kharput, Türkiye Dönmeryeti Dacelet SALOMESI, 1925–1926, p. 836–841; do., 1926–
1927, p. 694. (V. Minorisky)

MAN b. AWS, an early Muhammadan poet of the tribe of the Banu Muzaina. His period can be established with some accuracy. From the Kitab al-Aghani we know that he composed a panegyric on Omar I and a lampoon on Abd Allah b. al-Zubair for his lack of hospitality; the latter is preserved in the Aghani as is the beginning of the former. The panegyric survives also in the Dīwān, where it is dedicated to Omar’s son ‘Āshim. The Aghani further records that Ma’n lived to the beginning of the fitna between Abd Allah and Marwān b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, i.e. to 64 (634). The poet must therefore have been born about the beginning of the Muslim era. The Aghani further gives details of his private life and the Dīwān also gives similar information. He had an estate in Arabia and made journeys to Syria and the ‘Irāk. One of his wives came from Syria. He also took part in the wars of his tribes. In his old age he became blind.

Up till recently all that we knew of Ma’n’s poems were the fragments preserved in the Aghani and elsewhere. P. Schwarz however discovered in the Escorial an incomplete manuscript of the Dīwān with a commentary, the work of al-Kālī [q.v.] which he published in 1903 with a short introduction and translation of the notices in the Aghani. H. Reckendorf supplemented this. In 1927 Kamīl Muṣṭafā published an edition in Cairo. It lacks some poems given by Schwarz; on the other hand it has two fragments not given by him. The introduction is in part a literal translation of Schwarz, who is mentioned by name, it is not clear from which the edition is based. It seems however to be based simply on Schwarz’s edition without new manuscripts and, compared with it, only shows corrections of the text, omissions and additions from other sources.

Bibliography: Kitāb al-Aghānī, x. 164–168; P. Schwarz, Gedichte des Ma’n ibn Aas, Leipzig 1903 (cf. Noldeke, in Z. A., 1903, p. 274 sqq. and Reckendorf, O. L. Z., 1904, p. 138–140), where further sources are given; Ma’n ibn Aas, Ḥayyūkh, Shīrīkh, Ḥakībah, Ḥumna’ānī Kamīl Muṣṭafā, Cairo 1927. (M. Plessner)

MAN b. MUḤAMMAD b. ʿAIMĀD b. ʿUMĀDIH AL-TUṬUṬIH AND ʿAWĀSH OR AL-ṬAYHĀ, founder of a dynasty in the little principality of Almeria, in Eastern Spain in the middle of the 16th century A.D. The principality was founded in 1025 by the two Saṃiards “Shav” Khairān and Zuhār. On the latter’s death in 1037, their overlord ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz b. ʿAbbās, king of Valencia, declared it his property and in 1041 placed his brother-in-law Ma’n b. ʿUmādīh as governor there. The latter belonged to a noble family of Arab origin; his father had been one of the generals of the celebrated Ḥāḍīb al-Maṣrūr [q.v.] and was governor of the town of Huesca. Ma’n remained loyal to the king of Valencia for nearly four years, then cast off his allegiance and declared himself independent. He reigned in Almeria for a few years longer and died in Ramadan 443 (Jan. 1525).


MAN b. ZĀ’IDA, ABU ʿL-WALID AL-SHĀBIKH, a Muslim general and governor. In the Omayyad period Ma’n was in the service of the governor of the ‘Irāk, Yazīd b. ʿUmar b. Hubayra, and took part in the fighting against the ‘Abīd rebels ‘Abd Allah b. Ma’awiyah and the general of the ‘Abūsādīs Kahtaba b. Shabīb as well as against his son al-Hasan. He thus gained the enmity of al-Mansūr and after the murder of Ibn Hubayra had to go to hiding to escape the vengeance of the ‘Abūsādīs. But when the Rawandis [q.v.] went to al-Hājmīlya (probably in 141 = 758–759) and tried to storm the palace of the caliph, because he had had their ringleaders arrested, Ma’n came out of his retirement, drove back the rebels with his men and rescued al-Mansūr, who at once pardoned him and gave him the governorship of the Yaman. Here he favoured his fellow tribesmen, the Banū Rabī‘, while the Yanamis were treated with the greatest severity. He was transferred to Sīljītān, according to the usual date, in 151 (768–769) and his son Zā’ida followed him as governor of the Yaman. Soon afterwards, probably the next year, Ma’n was murdered in Bust by some Khāridjīs, who had gained an entrance to his house by pretending they were workmen doing repairs. 154 and 158 are given for the year of his death, in addition to 152.


MAN (BANU), Emirate of the Lebanon. Their political history begins with the Turkish conquest of Syria. We do not know if they were of Arab origin like the Banū Būtūr, or Kurds like the Djuhblat, or Maghribi like the ‘Abīd al-Sāmādī. The Tālīhik etc., who came to the Lebanon in the rein of the Fāṭimīds. When, in the 13th century, the biographer Muḥībīb (Aḥmad al-Aṭār fī A‘yān al-khalī al-khālī tashar, ed. 256) was collecting the records of the family of the Banu Ma’n, he found they were not agreed about the genealogy of their ancestors. But he is certain that they had long been in possession of the emirate of Shuf (Southern Lebanon). He is certain that they did not belong to the princely family of the Lebanon Tanūk. It is none the less surprising that in the monograph, which he devotes to the latter family (Tūrīkh Bā‘tir, ed. Cheikhho) Ṣāḥib b. Yahyā deliberately passes over the Banū Ma’n.

The Ma’n seem to have early adopted the teaching of the Druses. This step secured them the sympathies of the Druses of the Lebanon and
of the Wādi 'l-Taim at the foot of Hermon. In the latter district they were allied with the Shihāb emirs. Enfeebled by the struggles with the 'Alam al-Dīn—and their relations and also their secular rivals—the Ba'ni Tanūkh, themselves divided into Kaisīs and Yamānis, underwent the fate of such exhausted organisms and ended by breaking up. The Ma'nids were only waiting the opportunity to seize their political heritage. This was given by the Ottoman conquest of Syria.

On the eve of the battle of Dābiq (1516) between the Turks and the Mamluks of Egypt they divided in time to which side victory would incline and wiser than the Tanūkh declared for the Turks. Their chief at that time was the emir Fakhr al-Dīn 1. He was one of the first of the Syrian chiefs to hasten to Damascus to congratulate Selīm I on his victory. Favourably impressed by his protestations of devotion, the Sultan sent him back to the Lebanon with enhanced prestige and authority at the expense of the Tanūkh. In his accession to power, the Ma'nid emir was much assisted by Ghāzālī, a traitor to the Mamluk cause, to whose fortunes he had decided to link that of his family. We do not know how he escaped the catastrophe that overwhelmed (Jan. 1521) his protector Ghāzālī, who in the end played traitor to the Turks also.

In 1544 the emir Kurkūmās succeeded his father Fakhr al-Dīn and in 1558 there took place at Dūn 'Akkār the plundering of the caravan which was taking to Constantinople the taxes collected in Egypt and Syria. The Ottomans accused the Ma'n of complicity and of having sheltered the criminals. Their troops invaded the Lebanon. The emir Kurkūmās shut himself up in the inaccessible rock of Shāfīr Tūlān near Dūzin (Southern Lebanon) and died there of chagrin or poison (1585).

The most remarkable of the Ma'nids was undoubtedly the son and successor of Kurkūmās, called Fakhr al-Dīn (1585–1635), like his grandfather. The partisans of the cause of independence in the Lebanon regarded him as a precursor and have never ceased to invoke the example of his efforts for his country. For an account of his career see the article on him (ii., p. 43). The conquests beyond the Lebanon and his relations with European powers brought down upon him the vengeance of the Porte. He had to go into exile in Italy and leave to 'Ali, the eldest and most gifted of his sons along with his own brother 'Āli, the administration of the Lebanon (1619). On a promise to dismantle the chief fortresses of the Lebanon the Porte recognised 'Ali and even, after five years of exile, allowed his father Fakhr al-Dīn to return to the Lebanon. His son 'Ali displayed no enthusiasm at his return (1618) The new conquests of his father soon began to disturb the Porte, who resolved to make an end of the troublesome Ma'nid vassal. Surprised by superior forces in the Wādi 'l-Taim his son 'Ali fell fighting bravely and Fakhr al-Dīn was taken to Constantinople and put to death (1635).

The Central and Southern Lebanon, "the Mountain of the Druzes," as it was officially called, was then handed to the family of the 'Alam al-Dīn, whose ambitions had never ceased from the beginning of the rise of the Ba'ni Tanūkh, to thwart the efforts of all the ruler of the Lebanon. One of their first acts was to exterminate the last scions of the Tanūkh. This crime facilitated the rise to power of the Shihāb. Their excesses and the regret for the Ma'nids soon made the 'Alam al-Dīn unpopular. After their expulsion from the Lebanon the Ma'nid emir Mulhīm followed; his son 'Āli succeeded in regaining a precarious authority under the jealous supervision of the Turkish Pashas. The more distinguished of the two emirs was Mulhīm, son of the emir 'Āli and nephew of the great Fakhr al-Dīn. He ruled for about 20 years. Both continued the liberal traditions of their illustrious ancestor. Like him they protected the colonies of Christian agriculturists whom he had invited from northern Lebanon and for whom he had built churches and monasteries.

'Āli, grand-nephew of Fakhr al-Dīn II, died in 1697 without leaving male heirs and the family of the Ma'nids thus became extinct. Turkey could no longer have any illusions about the rebellious nature of the Lebanonese and their impatience under a foreign yoke. To assume the direct government of the Lebanon was much more attractive to the Porte and would have forced it to undertake its conquest. The grave political crisis through which Turkey was then passing prevented a new expedition being undertaken, the risks of which were very well known. On the other hand the rule of the 'Alam al-Dīn with official support had not given satisfactory results. On promise of the payment of an annual tribute, the notables of the Lebanon were authorised to form a general assembly at Sumāqāniya (province of Shūf) to elect a governor to inherit the legacy of the Ba'ni Ma'n. Their choice fell upon the Shihāb emirs, allies and relatives of the old emirs.

**Ma'nid Emirs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fakhr al-Dīn I († 1544)</th>
<th>Kurkūmās († 1585)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Ali († 1635)</td>
<td>Mulhīm († 1657)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad († 1697)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Ma'nā (A.)** means in the old language sense, significance and is used as a grammatical term. In philosophical language the use of the word varies from the most general to the most particular so that it is impossible to give a general translation for it. It occurs in quite untechnical connections as "thought," "what is meant" or simply "thing" etc. but also has the special meaning of "conception" or as the *Dictionary of Technical Terms*, ed. by Spranger, has it "an image of the intelligence (jāra disānīya) in so far as a word corresponds to it, i.e. in so far as
it is meant by a word". Horten has investigated the special meaning of the word in metaphysics (Was bedeutet *al philosphischer Terminus*; in Z. D. M. G., ixv. 391 sqq.). According to him, *manāra* is an "incorporeal reality" not merely a subjective conception. In this use it is regularly contrasted to *ṣiyā*. The plural *manā'ān* is the name of a study of this breed, namely, rhetorical style.

**Bibliography:** in the article; cf. also the dictionaries and Tishkopruzade, *Mesīḥ al-Sulāda* s. v. *Ibn al-Manār*. (M. Plessner)

**MANAF** is the name of an early-Arabian idol which was venerated by Kuraish and Husaini, as may be concluded from the fact that among these clans the name 'Abd Manaf "servant of Manaf"" occurred. It is said that one of Muhammad's ancestors — the pedigree being Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Muttalib b. Ḥâdhâm b. 'Abd Manaf — received this name, because his mother consecrated him to Manaf, who was then the chief deity of Makka.

Whether this last statement be true or not, it does not restore to life a deity whose individuality remains to us as dim as that of all its companions. Ibn al-Kalbi knows nothing of its whereabouts, except that menstruating women were bound to keep themselves at a distance from it.

The name does not occur either in the Kurān or in classical *ḥadīth*. It derives from a root *n-c-f*, which in several Semitic languages conveys the meaning of "being elevated". **Bibliography:** al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 1091 sq.; Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidenwissens*, 2nd ed. p. 56 sq. (A. J. Wensinck)

**MANĀKB (A.), plural of *manāḥa*, means the merits and doings of a miraculous nature of celebrated holy persons of Islam, heads of schools, saints and founders of *māra*. Other terms like *karanāt*, *faḍḥīl* are used with the same meaning but less frequently. We have the titles or manuscripts of several works on eastern *manākib*. Ḥāḍīlī Shalīfī gives a long list of them. Among the most notable may be mentioned the *manākhī* of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, of al-Shāfi’ī and of Abū Ḥanīfa.

The literature of the *manākib* assumed a special development in Morocco from the end of the middle ages. The majority of the ghālīs who played a part in the great renaissance of Islam in this country at that time had one or more monographs devoted to their *manākib* after their deaths.

For a more detailed study of the place occupied by the genre of *manākib* in the Arabic literature of Morocco cf. my *Histoire des Chorfa*, *Essai sur la littérature historique et biographique au Maroc du XVème au XXème siècles*, Paris 1922, p. 44-54 and 220 sqq. (E. Levy-Provençal)

**MANĀRA, tower, minaret. Material, structure and adornment.** The use of brick or stone for mināras depended on the material generally used for building in the country in question. The mināras in Spain were therefore of stone so far as one can judge from those still extant, in the African Maghrib mainly of brick. In Cairo it is stone, in Arabia, Syria, Anatolia, Armenia and Mesopotamia of both, in the Ḥaṭṭ, Persia and Afghānīstān of brick and in India of both. In Persia there are isolated exceptions, like the mināra in Kerāt, a structure of stone and lime with an outer covering of tiles; indeed stone and lime were very often used for the foundations and bases without affecting the character of the edifices themselves in brick. Of considerable importance from the artistic point of view is the outer covering of a layer of tiles in Persia and the Ṣirāk, from the variations and patterns of which the mināras receive their decorative exteriors; by alternating horizontal and vertical layers (hazarūf, bonding), by alternating reliefs and depressions, ornamental areas are formed from which strips of ornament or script arise formed of tiles specially prepared for the purpose. The Turkestān and Timūrid mināras are decorated with coloured glaze. In the post-Timūrid period also the glaze continually appears, especially in the pair of mināras which now commonly flank the entrance to a mosque (Ṭahāt, Māshhad, etc.). It is in the Guldests, the balconies round the top, that the art of working decoratively in brick reaches its height. Here the necessary basis for the balcony was formed by brackets arranged in layers or rows of cells (stalactite-like cornices, *mānakib*).

**Object and Significance.** The term *manāra* or *minār* is applied to all Muslim towers. They were used not only for religious purposes as places from which to call to prayer and to mark mosques but also, as before the Muslim conquest, for profane purposes as watch- and signal-towers. The tower on the top of a hill at Kerāt in Khurāsān (cf. below) is from its isolated commanding position intended as a signal-tower or column of victory and it shows that these towers were built in the Muslim period exactly like the mināras of mosques. In form and style these erection, serving different purposes, form one category, into which they also fall objectively from having the same name. There are a number of early references to such mināras, which were intended to be indicators for caravans and watch-towers (cf. Diet, *Persien, Islam*, 2 k in Khurāsān, p. 59). Such towers were however found all over the Asian plains and through China to the Pacific Ocean. Of course very few of them were works of art. There are a number of exceptions in the contemporary names for such towers, like that of Mahādīd of Ghazna which is called an *wód* in an inscription (see below). One of the mināras of the minaret in Khūshī is called simply *minār* in the inscription (cf. Niedermayer-Diez, *Afghanistan*, p. 59). The stūmbhās of *ūts* erected by king Asoka in India between 250-232 B.C. may be claimed as precursors of the mināres of eastern Islam; although actually pillars of much smaller size than a mināra, many of them already showed the same division into a polygonal and a cylindrical section. Their object was also half religious and half monumental in character. They in turn came from the Indo-Aryan columns of wood which were put up from the earlist times as symbols of the deity. The Indo-Buddhist stambha of brick in Kabul of uncertain date is a connecting link between these and the earlier Muslim memorial towers in Ghazna (see below).

**Shape.** From this similarity just mentioned, it is evident that the mināras follow the traditional shape of the towers of the country in question. In the Mediterranean lands, as in the recent Turkish movement, it was the lighthouses and in Syria the watch-towers, dwelling- and church-towers that
were the predecessors in form of the manāras. The maltiya's of Sāmārā and the manāra of Ibn Tulun in Cairo again go back to old Oriental models. In Persia and Sjījāt also, Nestorian church towers may have given the early manāras their square and polygonal shape (cf. Diez, Persien, Isl. Bk. in Kurzānān, p. 75); but in the rivalry of shapes in the eastern empire the slender cylindrical manāra, which is often also called mit, won. It was the victory of the monumental building without windows over the western dwelling-tower with windows. Their earliest precursors were, as already mentioned, the Indian lāts. The observatory towers built by Sulāns Mahmūd and Masʻūd III in Ghazza were built as memorials of victories like the Indian Dvagastanakhas. Their shape was suggested by India but remodelled by the spirit of Muslim Persia and given a character of their own (cf. Diez, op. cit., p. 76 and 151 sqq.). The best monumental evidence of Indian inspiration is the Kuṣt Mīnār [q.v.] in Dehli (beg. of vith = xilth century; cf. M. v. Berchem, in Diez, Churasanische Baudenkm., p. 109 sqq.). The fact that the Persians called them mit points to their ancestry, the primitive poles and pillars used as indicators. To such poles, which can still be found at the present day at saints' tombs, revered by the common people in the country districts of Persia, may perhaps be traced the square and octagonal decorative shafts of the city and mosque iwāns, found in pairs in Persian towns with Turkish inhabitants and in Asia Minor. Although they are frequently in the shape of minarets and have a gallery, their object is as a rule merely decorative. Both groups of manāras, the square and the round, are hollow towers with a staircased winding up inside opening out on the gallery. In the old Persian minarets of brick, these galleries or gullets have been completely destroyed as they were made of wood. We must imagine them to have stood on cornices of cells with carved wooden railings, rafter and roofs such as may be seen everywhere in the surviving mināras at popular places of pilgrimage like Kārbalā', Kum and Maghīth. A comparison with the galleries in the towers of the wooden churches of Eastern Europe (e.g. in Transylvania) points to the descent of the minaret galleries from wooden buildings of an everyday character.

Form and Significance of the manāras. In spite of the similarity of purpose there is a marked difference, indeed contrast, between the minarets of eastern and western Islam. The square and polygonal minarets of the Maghrib, Egypt and Syria are still essentially buildings for habitation; the cylindrical manāras of the eastern lands are on the other hand distinctly monumental buildings, pillars symbolic of the deity. The angular minarets of the west are divided into stories by mouldings and have windows for communication with the outer world; they are usually heavy on a broad base, while in contrast the cylindrical minarets of the east incorporate the symbol of the absolute which has this form, the unique, the abstract; the irresistible ascension to the deity without transitions or stopping places. The minarets of the west remain individual towers, of which hardly two are alike; in the east of the viiiith (xilth) century the cylindrical form was already established as the absolute and only one, never to be altered nor made capable of ascent, as the only possible form of manāra. The minarets of the west thus remain ex-watch-, church- or lighthouse-towers without bells or lights, decorative survivals of a culture foreign to their nature; those of the east on the other hand were etherealised and became spiritual manāras. The Cairo minarets were an interesting sport in their shape; the Persian and Turkish on the other hand a confession of faith in monumental form. They soar up to the heavens with unimpeded vigour. The silhouette of their tiled decoration rises upwards on close inspection till finally the eye of the beholder is held by the marked effects of light and shade on the guldast. The form of the guldast however is chosen with an idea of magical effect. The spire rests on a gallery of cells, the secret of the construction of which the spectator cannot easily grasp and the decorative gallery of wooden rafters and railings glitter with bright colours above it. A coat of glaze and the gilt top reflect far and wide a magic reflection like the glazed domes.

Shape and Development of the manāra in different countries.—Syria is the original home of the square manāra, which there took over the old native form for watch-towers, dwelling-towers or grave-towers and the church-tower which succeeded them. Islam at first used the existing pre-Islamic towers as minarets, on to which mosques were frequently built, when old churches which already had towers were not taken over and adapted (cf. Bünnow in Thiersch, Pharo, p. 101). The oldest minarets of this kind are in Ḥawrān, the land of stone building suraj-ibbš, which contained many old undecaying stone-towers (Bošra, manāra of the mosque of Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, inscription of the time of the Caliph Omar, Dar al-Muslim etc.). In Damascus the two southern minarets of the Omayyad mosque begun by Walīd in 705 (705 [f]) belonged to the old church of St. John, while the northern minaret was a completely new building of Walīd's. This is therefore the oldest independent Muslim manāra. The manārs of the Omayyad mosque became models not only for Syria but through the Omayyad migration to Spain (Cordova) for the Maghrib also. Wherever we later find in Syria the Egyptian tower-form, there is always definite Egyptian influence present and as a rule they are Mamluk foundations. It is still hardly possible to compile a chronological list of Syrian manāras (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 99—110 and the illustrations).

Palestine. In this country on the borders of Egypt, the influence of the latter country made itself felt. The octagonal manāra on a square base predominates. The manāra of the chief mosque in Ḥanā b. al-Ḥāshiš has the same diameter throughout and is only divided into four stories with windows by large mouldings. The smaller mosques have short squat octagonal towers. The manāra of ʿAlī Bakka in Hebron is half rectangular and half octagonal with a high mihrāb-like niche in the lower story. The octagonal tower is found as far as Jerusalem, where it meets with the northern Syrian square towers. The latter is again found at Ḥanā b. al-Ḥāshiš and in the mosque of Ṣidnā Omar beside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and along the coast in Jaffa, Ḥaifā, Sido, Tyre and Baʿ alma, and in the interior in Tiberias, Ṣafed, Nablus, etc. On the other hand
Khusrawgird near Sabzawar in Khorasan: Manara of 505 (1114)

Ghazna: Manara of Mas'ud of 495 (1101—1102)
Cairo: Mināras of the Mamlūk period
Sangbost near Mashhad in Khorasan: Manara of a Kiblat, viii (XIIth) cent.

Cairo: sketches of the two Manāras with outer covering of the Mosque of Ḥākim
the manāra in Ramla of the viii\(^{\text{th}}\) (xii\(^{\text{th}}\)) century is unique with its buttresses and pointed arched niches and dwarf pillars and columns. Thielsch takes it to be a copy of the most celebrated Christian tower of the country, the bell-tower of the Holy Sepulchre built in 1160—1180 in Jerusalem, of which only the base is still standing; (cf. Thielsch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 119 sqq. and the pictures there).

**Egypt.** The oldest manāra in Egypt is the tower of the Djāmi\(^{\text{b}}\) b. Tūlun. Like the Malwiya of Sāmarrā, this minaret stands outside the mosque and resembles them in form also, although it differs in its material which is limestone. The first storey is a square tower with a window with horseshoe arches, the second is cylindrical and an outer staircase leads up around them. The two upper octagonal stories are latter in date, having been erected by the Mamlūk Sulān Lādjin. Nothing final can be said about this manāra, apparently erected by a foreign architect and combining a number of foreign influences. The manāra next to it in time are the five towers of hewn stone of the mosque of Ḥākim with their covering of tiles of a later date; they must be contemporary with the mosque, which was built in 393—404 (1002—1013), and were covered by Barbars II and given new spires (793 = 1393—1394). They are of different shapes. The northern tower is cylindrical on a square base, the southern has a square lower half and four octagonal upper stories, each narrower than the one below it, the first of which has four semi-cylindrical cornices in the corners. The decoration in relief on the stone has analogies in the gateway of the same date (pictures in \textit{Diez, K. d. isl. V talkt}, \textit{p. 58; 9, p. 54}). Of these two towers the southern one may be considered the ancestor of the minarets of Cairo. Its square-octagonal form, usually crowned by a cylindrical storey, survives. The further development is limited to the proportions, which aim at greater elegance and slenderness, and the breaking up of the surface with niches and muqarnas cornices. Towards the end of the or second Mamlūk period, say under Kā'īt Bey, it reached its culmination. The minaret of the mosque at his tomb was never to be surpassed in grace and wealth of ornament. A list of the most important minarets of Cairo between 1000—1356 A. D. is given by Thielsch with many illustrations.

**Arabia.** As in Palestine, in Arabia there was no native type of manāra and indeed Arabia never developed any sacral architecture with a character of its own. The minaret of the mosque of Walīd in Medina may have been Syrian in form. The manāras at present standing in Medina belong to the sixth restoration of the mosque by Kā'īt Bey in 888 (1483). They are slender minarets of the Mamlūk type with octagonal and cylindrical stories. The seven manāras in Mecca, the sanctuary of which was ten times restored, only show modern forms of tower, frequently influenced by the slender Turkish form (cf. Thielsch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 123). Two slender round minarets of the ix\(^{\text{th}}\) (xv\(^{\text{th}}\)) century still flanked the ruined mosque on the island of Bahrain (cf. \textit{Diez, Fachrb. d. as. Kunst}, 1925, ii. 2).

**Maghrib.** The oldest sawmūḍ, as the manāras of the Maghrib are called, in Africa is in Kairawān, the massive three storied tower of the mosque of Sīdī 'Okbā of 105 (724). The two upper receding stories with blind niches are probably of later date than the unadorned upper storey with loopholes on three sides and three windows only on the side that looks on the court. The cistern in the basement and the measurements of this tower which are exactly half those of the Pharas, suggested to Thielsch that it was an imitation of the Pharas. Another sawmūḍa, also of the ii\(^{\text{nd}}\) (viii\(^{\text{th}}\)) century was the minaret of the Djāmi\(^{\text{b}}\) al-Zātūna in Tunis before its restoration in the xii\(^{\text{th}}\) century. Old pictures of it show a plain square lower storey with a narrower octagonal upper storey and the platform on top enclosed by a breast-high parapet with a pillared gallery. Of this probably only the lower part is old, while the second storey and the parapet date from the restoration of 1653 (pictures in \textit{K. d. O.}, ix.; Kuhnel, \textit{Maurische Kunst}, vi.). Egyptian influence, in so far as such existed, extended to Tunis. West of Tunis begins the Spanish sphere of influence, the model for which was the sawmūḍa in Cordova built by 'Abd al-Rahmān III in 339—340 (951) and destroyed in 1593. A description of it is given by Idriṣī (c. 548 = 1154). According to him, the minaret of Cordova was a high quadrangular tower, square in plan, the sides of which were richly adorned with inscriptions in relief. The upper section terminated in two rows of blind arcades probably like those still to be seen in the mosque of Cordova and on other minarets of the Maghrib. On the platform was a second, probably also square, storey with four doors and upon the dome which crowned it shone three balls of gold and two of silver and lily leaves (cf. Thielsch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 127). This minaret however had a predecessor in a more modest tower built by 'Abd al-Rahmān I, the model of which according to Marqāṣ (\textit{Rev. Afr.}, 1906) was Walīd's minarets in Damascus. The second, imposing and splendid, minaret at Cordova seems to have served as a model for the sawmūḍas of Seville and Morocco. At the same time we must consider the claims of the minaret of the Kā'īn Banī Ḥammād built in 395 (1001), the only tower that survives of the Fāṭimid period, which was half destroyed by the Almohads in 1512 (cf. Saladin, \textit{Bull. arch.}, 1904, p. 243 sqq.). It is a high square tower of hewn stone, smooth on three sides and embellished on the courtyard side only with shallow blind niches and balcony doors in three layers above one another (pictures in Thielsch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 130; Kuhnel, \textit{op. cit.}, xviii.; Saladin, Manuel, p. 217; Marqāṣ, Manuel and \textit{op. cit.}). This tower already shows the scheme of decoration of the Giralda and allied towers, namely the vertical combination of two windows or doors of the middle axis above one another by flanking double high shallow niches. The most contemporary Giralda in Seville of about 1500 A. D., the so-called Tower of Hasan in Rabat and the Kutubbyya in Marrakusk are allied to it, the two latter of the end of the xvi\(^{\text{th}}\) (xvii\(^{\text{th}}\)) century (pictures in Thielsch, Kuhnel, Marqāṣ, etc.), all square with narrower square top stories, of which only that of the Kutubbyya still survives. These towers already show the system of decorating the surface now becoming typical in the later Maghribi manāras, the network of geometrical patterns in high relief and the beautiful windows with horseshoe and toothed arches and muqarnas niches. In the other towers of Morocco, in Fez, Tetuán, Tangier, etc., are more modern minarets. The characteristic type of Algeria is best seen in the numerous minarets in Tetouan, mainly of the xiii\(^{\text{th}}\)—xiv\(^{\text{th}}\)
century. They continue the form, characterized above, only the geometrical decoration in relief gains the upper hand and the windows disappear; their appearance is not quite so solid. On the other hand, the huge minaret of the great mosque of Manṣūra is highly thought of in Morocco for its size as well as its decoration, because it was built by a Moroccan Marinid (701-702 = 1302).

The square tower therefore dominates the whole of the west. It is only later in the xvi century that we find the octagonal tower appearing in Iran, which Saladin attributes to Hanafi influence. The 'Iʿlām and Dīrāz development similar to that of Persia and the lands east of Persia. The oldest manaras still standing, the two małyras in Sāmarrā of the ɜth (ixth) century, have remained the only examples of spiral towers but they are significant monuments of the early Muslim Arab variation of Babylonian architecture (the spiral as motif). These genuinely Arab buildings were followed by a reaction towards the Mediterranean style with square and octagonal towers and with the coming of the Turkish peoples and Saʿd∧b rule the cylindrical minaret, usually on a polygonal base. The following list is given by Henzefeld (Arch. Reise, ii. 229): Rašq, mosque extra muros, rectangular tower of the ivth (ixth) or vth (xth) century; Rašq, intra muros, a round tower. Nur al-Dīn 561 (1166); Abū Hūrin, round; Birk, octagonal, 589 (1193) to 615 (1218); Irbīl, round on octagonal base 586—630 (1190—1232); Sinjār, round on polygonal base 928 (1228); Bagdad, Sulḵ al-Ghāzī, round on a base (3)630—1232); Mūsul, minaret of the great mosque, round on a cubic base; Mūsul, minaret of the Kalā, round on a cubic base; Mūsul, Manarā al-Makhdīia Taḵi, round shaft on a polygonal base. In addition there is the unique octagonal minaret built of small broken stones with a covering of plaster, on the Island of 'Am in the Euphrates of the vth (ixth) century (Henzefeld, cf. cit., ii. 319, and Pl. 137) and the bulk of the later minarets from the ivth (ixth) century onwards, which repeat this type.

Persia. The oldest mināras of Iran and the countries adjoining on east and north, Afghanistān, Suljānī and Turkestān seem to have been usually octagonal, as the ruin of the mināra, possibly of the ivth (ixth) century in Zaandād, Nād Ḩili, Suljānī (now 25—30 feet, originally twice as high; cf. G. P. Tate, Scitum, Calcutta 1910, p. 302 and Plate) shows. The models for these earliest mināras may have been the watch-towers found all over the Asiatic steppes, hence the blind window and the great diameter. Octagonal mināras still exist in Amānī, Suljānī (vth—viiith century): octagonal with cylindrical upper storey are the two observatory towers of Ghara of about 100 (1009—1020) and 495 (1101—1102) (the original height was estimated at about 140 feet; the inscriptions on the two towers only say that their erection was ordered by Ḥadīm and Maščit respectively, both with full titles; cf. Diez, Chr. Bldm., p. 162 sqq.). Counterparts to these towers in two parts are the manaras in Sārwan, east of Herōt (c. 100 feet high) and Kândī in eastern Khurāsān (c. 80 feet high), with octagonal bases and cylindrical shaft, both of the vth (ixth)—viiith (xith) centuries. Cylindrical manaras of the vth—viiith (ixth—xith) centuries still survive in Persia and the land east of it in Sangbast, Fīrtzābād, Kāsāmībd (Sīdīstān), Khosraugird (Sabzawar) of the year 505 (1111), Damghān, (2) Bastām, Savā, Semsān, Tabas, Kunya Urgenj (old Khiva), Termeh on the Amū Dāryā, Būkhārā, Manār-i Kālān 542 (1147—1148), Kāshān, Mēstoryān (Turkoman steppes north of the Atrek, 2 towers) and Isfāhān (4) (cf. the list in Diez, Persien, Ist. Bk. in Chr. Bldm., b. 168—169). In the Timurid period with the general flourishing of architecture the manaras are given a further last increase in their embellishment, a few examples of which are still to be seen in the Timurid ruins in Herōt. Here we still have the ruins of nine polygonal-cylindrical manaras the sides of which are usually of slabs of white marble with inscriptions in relief, the shafts to the tops covered with glazed mosaics of fabulous beauty which in their delicacy recall the work of the carver in ivory (cf. Niedermayer-Diez, Afghanistan, p. 58 sqq. and illustrations, p. 157 sqq.). To this Timurid group also belong the manaras in Sāmarānd mostly in ruins and the minarets of the Masjīd-i Shāh in Mashḥad built by the amīr Malik Shāh and the two minarets now destroyed of the Blue Mosque in Tabūzī built in the time of Ḥādīn Shāh (541—872 = 1437—1467). The last mentioned minarets belong to the group of double towers found all over Persia and Turkestān which either flank the doors or stand at the corners of the wall of a mosque or are built on the top of the doors. These double towers which become more and more common after the Sāljiḳ and Mongol invasions never of course attained the height of the single manaras just described and their importance lies mainly in their decoration.

Asia Minor and Turkey. Among the Sāljiḳs and Ottomans the manara lost the character and individuality which it revealed among most other peoples, at least in the early period. Apart from isolated exceptions like the very interesting fluted minaret at Adalia (pictures in Lancerkonski, and Thiersch, cf. cit., p. 149), the minarets are henceforth subordinated in the general architectural scheme to the main building, either placed as a pair at the gate or as a single tower built into the wall of the mosque. It is true that these arrangements are found also in Persia, which was filled with Turkish tribes, but there was constant change there, while in Asia Minor a certain style soon became predominant which culminated in the absolute uniformity of the Ottoman minarets. The early minarets of Asia Minor of the xiiith century usually have their surfaces broken up into round and smooth areas which give them a certain charm, especially when this plastic ornamentation is combined with the painting of frescoes and with relief (Laranda Masjīd and Īnje Minareli, Konia, Gök Medrese, Siwās, etc.). The Ottomans heightened the minaret which they had taken over from the Sāljiḳs, made it still more slender and gave it a long conical spire which has become typical. According to the importance of the mosque, it was given one tower on the front or flanked by two or even 4 or six minarets (the Mosque of Sulṭān Aḥmad, Constantinople) and these were given one, two or three galleries.

India. In India there is only a single old manara of importance: the Kūṭh Minar (q. v. and the illustrations) in Old Delhi built by order of Aibek Kūṭh al-Din and completed by itsutmīš (diameter 45 feet and height 240 feet). The three lower stories of this, the highest and finest ma-
nāra in the Muslim world, are built of red sandstone, the two upper, which have been restored, of white marble with layers of sandstone. The pavilion which once crowned the top fell down in 1803 during an earthquake and was put up again on the ground. The exterior is of angular and round flutings and ornamented with inscriptions from the Qur'ān. There is no reason to doubt that the numerous mosques of the Pathan dynasties also had minarets but most of them seem to be destroyed and so far I am aware no one has yet studied the subject. Isolated surviving manāras like the detached slender round minaret of the Lat-ki-Masjid in Hisār show however that they were usual (cf. Arch. Surv. India, Annual Report, Tt. I, 1913—1914, Pl. I). But their occurrence in India was confined to particular areas. The mosques of Dāwpur, Sirkēj, Manda, Kalbargah and other places usually of the xivth—xvth century have no minarets. On the other hand they are characteristic of the xivth—xvth century mosques in Ahmadābād, built in pairs flanking the doors or at the corners of the surrounding wall, as in the Mongol mosques of Persia. In shape, the towers of Ahmadābād are quite Indian with well marked outlines, many mouldings outside and three to six galleries. In the Moghlai empire again the smooth round or faceted minaret of Persian origin again became predominant but was hindusted by the pavilion placed on the top and by other alterations.


MANĀT, an old Arabian Goddess. Her character can only be deduced from her name, which may safely be connected as a plural (for manātāt) with the Arabic manatāt, plur. manātā, baptism, lot, Hebrew mānāt, plur. mānāt and also with the god of fate mānī, Is. lv. 11 (cf. lxx.). In Arabic we have corresponding to the manīya, plur. manīya, "the allotted, fate, especially of death." She was therefore a goddess of fate, especially of death. Her main sanctuary was a black stone among the Hudhailis in Kudaid, not far from Mecca on the road to Medina near a hill called Musallab. She was however worshipped by many Arab tribes, primarily by the Aws and Khaṣṣad in Yathrib. In Mecca she was very popular along with the goddess al-Lat and al-Uzza [q. v.]; the three (according to the Kūr') were regarded as Allāh's daughters, and in a weak moment Muhammad declared their worship permitted (cf. Sūra liii. 19 sqq.). The obscure expression "Manāt, the third, the other" is probably due simply to the rhyme. According to Ibn al-Kalbī, she was the oldest deity, whose worship gave rise to that of the others, because name been compounded with Manāt occur earlier than other theophoric names. Another view is found in the poem of Ibn Hishām, p. 145, where the two daughters of "Uzza" are Manāt and al-Lat. As an independent deity we find her in the Nabatean inscriptions of al-Hidr, where 17722 (the Arabic plural form; cf. above) is often found along with Dushāra and others. Manāt is connected in a peculiar way by some writers with the great al-ḥārīn [q. v.], for example Ibn al-Kalbī, who assumes the idea that the sanctuary at the sanctuary of Manāt and on the conclusion of the rites cut their hair there and dropped the ērām [q. v.]. Wellhausen sees in this an erroneous confusion of an independent pilgrimage to Manāt with the great ērām, as later writers acknowledge none but the latter; it is however possible that some such confusion may really have taken place in pagan times.

That Manāt was also a domestic deity is evident from the story in Ibn Hishām, p. 350 (cf. Wāqidī, ed. Wellhausen, p. 350). The destruction of the
great sanctuary in Kuida after the capture of Mecca is attributed by some to Abū Safyān, by others to ʿAbd, according to Wākidī, op. cit., Ibn Saʿīd, ii., vol. 15; to the Awdī Saʿīd b. Zaid.


**Malażgerd.** [See Malażgerd.]

**Al-Manazīl.** (A.), pl. of al-manṣūl, more fully manṣūl al-kamar, the stations of the moon. Just as for the sun the zodiacal circle is divided into 12 stations, each of 30°, which it traverses in the course of a year, so the course of the moon is connected with 28 groups of stars, each of which corresponds to one day of its course, so that on an average each is an arc of 15° apart. The settings of the sun at these stations, Arabic *nawai*, pl. *nawayt*, are of decisive importance for the beginning and forecasting of the phenomena of the weather and the fertility or otherwise of a year which depends on them, i.e. for the peasant's calendar. As regards the testimony of the Arab poets, the reader may refer to the verses given by al-Khwārizmī. M. Steinacker in particular has published very thorough investigations of the importance of the stations of the moon among the Hindus and Arabs from Arabic, Hebrew and late Latin sources. The Arabic names of the stations and the constellations belonging to them are as follows:

1. al-Marwānīn, "the two signs", also al-ʿAbṣāfīn, the Horns of the Ram (β Arietis).
2. al-Raʿsīnīn, "the little paunch"; the paunch of the Ram (ε Arietis).
3. al-%uṣr taʿṣīn, "the Pleiades" (*q.v.*).
4. al-Dūrātīn, "the Aldebaran" (ζ Tauri) with the Hydra.
5. al-Ḥaṭā, three small stars on the head of Orion.
6. al-Mâzīn, the stars al-Zīr and al-Raṣūlīn (ζ; Geminorum).
7. al%D8%A3%8D%8B, "the Lion's Paw"; Castor and Pollux (α; Geminorum).
8. al-Nuʿṣhā, "the nostril" of the Lion or fence with asses (in Cancer).
9. al-Tūrī, i.e. Turf al-ʿAṣād, "the eye" of the Lion (ξ; Caneri; Leonis).
10. al-Duḥtaba, i.e. Ḫaṭhat al-ʿAṣād, "the forehead" of the Lion (ζ; ξ Leonis).
11. al-Zubrā, i.e. Zubbat al-ʿAṣād, "the mane" of the Lion (δ Leonis).
12. al-Raṣīf, "the weathercock" (β Leonis).
13. al-Sawābī, "the barkers" or Dogs (βγ; δ Virg.).
15. al-Qāṣf, "the cover" (Φ; x Virginis).
16. al-Zubīnī, i.e. Zubait al-ʿAṣābīn, "the pincers" of the Scorpion (β Librae).
17. al-Rābī, "the crown", i.e. the head of the Scorpion, the three stars (ζ; γ Librae).
18. al-Khātīl, "the heart" of the Scorpion, the Antares (α Scorp.).
19. al-Ṣawālī, "the tail" or sting of the Scorpion (α Scorp.).
20. al-ʿAṣābīnī, "the ostriches", 8 stars in Sagittarius (γτζ; Β Σagittatis).
21. al-Balda, "the town", an area in Sag. without stars.
22. al-Sanī al-Dhākhīb, "the luck of the slayer" or sacrificers (α; β Capric.)
23. al-Saʿīd Bulūs, "the luck of the devourer" (ν Aquarii).
24. al-Saʿīd al-Saʿīdī, "the greatest luck" (β; Aquarii).
25. al-Saʿīd al-Ākhbīya, "the luck of the tents" (γτζ; Aquarii).
26. al-Safgh al-anwāl, "the fore socket" on the pail (α; β Pegasi).
27. al-Safgh al-ʿAṣādī, "the hinder socket" on the pail (γ Peg. α Androm.).
28. Bahān al-Ḥaw, "the fish-belly", a number of stars in the form of a fish (β Androm. the brightest).


**MABDIJ** (Bambūkhe, Hierapolis), an ancient city in northern Syria, two days' journey or 10 farsakh N.E. of Halah, about 3 farsakhs from the Euphrates. It lay in a fertile plain, and had a double wall built by the Greeks. According to Ibn Khurābdī, there was a very fine church there, built of wood (B. G. A., vi. 161 sq.). Ps. Dionysios (ed. Chatot, p. 47, 68) mentions a church of the Virgin and another of St. Thomas in Mabdi. There were no buildings in the neighbourhood of the town (Nasiri Khurasaw, ed. Scheher, p. 31); Abu l-Fidā' mentions the many canals, fruit- and particularly mulberry-trees there, the latter for the silkworm culture. As K. Ritter (*Erkunde*, x. 1057 sq.) has shown, the name Bambūkhe for the silkworm can hardly be connected with "Bambyke", the old name of Mabdi; on the other hand, the Levantine trade-name bombassino, bombago, common in the middle ages for raw cotton, seems to be derived from Mabdi; it is perhaps also concealed in the name of the ancient Phrygian Hierapolis, Pamukbükallē (as early as Michael Syrus, ed. Chatot, i. 148: Mabbug in Phrygia). The Arabs called the robes made in Mabdi, mabdiyūna (Lammens, *Fâtes*, Rome 1912, p. 71).

Karmal al-Dīn b. a.-Adīm gives the following account of its origin: Khusrav [1] built it, when he conquered Syria (in reality the town in 540 A.D. ransomed itself from a threatened siege by paying tribute), built a fire-temple there and made a certain Yazdānīr of the family of Ardəšīr b. Bābak its governor. According to other authorities, Mabdi was the name of the fire-temple from which the town took its name (Ibn al-Sihāna, al-Durr al-muṣṭākhab fi Turāk Pelal, ed. Sarks, Bairîl 1909, p. 227). Mahbūb (Agapis) b. Kustānīn of Mabdi says in his history of the world written...
in the tenth century, at the end of the history of the patriarchs (ed. Vasilev, *Patrol. Orient.*, v. [1910], p. 664): "in the year 31 after the birth of Levi, the son of Jacob, queen Samira built a great sanctuary for the worship of the idol Κυνα in a town on the banks of the Euphrates, which was called the town Hieropolis (Mahbūb: مَهْبوب) of ibn al-Shīnā, p. 227: *de princip.*, v. 947, var. *von Hierapolis*). This was the town Manbijī al-'Aṣṣā'. For Κυνα the town might be read; on the coins of Hieropolis this deity seems also to be depicted (Wroth, *Catalogue of the Greek coins of Galatia, Cappadoc. and Syria* [Brit. Mus.], 1899, p. liii, and the Armenian Epiphanius (ed. Finck, p. 12) says: "Erapolis consists of 3 towns: it is called Mnepeš; in it is the idol Kaynum"; with Freuchen (*Götting. Gel. Ant.*, clxvii. [1905], ii, p. 837, note 3) we should here also read Kayman.

In reality Manbijī seems to have already been known to the Assyrians (as Nappiçi or Nampi in Salmonassar, *Karab-Monolith*, rev. 35; Johns, *Assy. Bibl.*, xxvii, 11, 82; cf. also Bambuki on the cuneiform tablet Brit. Mus. K 188, in Johns, *Assy. Dates and Documents*, N°. 773; Cheyne's *Excurs. Bibl.*, s. v. Carchemish). If the name is of Semitic origin, it perhaps goes back to a Syriac word *manbik*, "spring" (*Noldeke, *Vöckr. G.G.W.*, 1876, p. 5-8). The Greeks knew as the name of the town besides Hierapolis (on coins always *Hieropolis*) also the native form of *Bamiš*, rarely *Bamibiku* (Papier *Oxyrh.*, xi. [1915], p. 197, coll. v., 1, 100); in the common proper name *Mamibigu* etc., Napatānian Mambibīt, the name of the town is concealed (for references see Pauly-Wissowa, *Realten*, suppl. vol. iv, p. 733). The town which at first was included in Kyrhrstētā and afterwards was made, probably by Constantius, the capital of the Syrian Euphratesia, played an important part in ancient times as the centre of the worship of Atargatis. Bardsāšān was brought up here by a heretic priest Antalābār and his son Kudus. After the triumph of Christianity, the pagan cult was supplanted by the worship of holy relics, which also brought numbers of the faithful to Bambyke (Procopius of Gaza, *Panegyr.*, ch. 18, in Migne, *Patr. Gracce*, lxxvii, iii, col. 2817). From the third century onwards the town is frequently mentioned as a place for the concentration of troops for campaigns against the east or for the defence of Syria. In the Byzantine period it was a great centre of the Monophysites, according to whose tradition Justinian married Theodora in Hierapolis; she is said to have belonged to the neighbourhood of the town (Michael Syrus, ii, 189). After the end of the Byzantine period, it was for a considerable period a stronghold of the Manories (Michael Syrus, ii, 412, 511).

In the year 16 Abū 'Ubdān went to Halab al-Sādīrūn and sent *Iyād b. Ghānim* or to Manbijī. The inhabitants capitulated under the same conditions as the people of Antioch; when Abū 'Ubdān reached the town, the agreement was ratified (al-Baladhūri, ed. de Goeje, p. 150; al-Yaqūbi, ed. Houtsma, ii, 161; ibn al-Shīnā, ed. Bairūt, p. 228; Caetani, *Annales dell' Islam*, iii, p. 792, § 281, p. 794, § 284, p. 797, § 290, p. 816, § 325). Manbijī seems to have enjoyed a certain degree of independence down to the time of Yazid I; the inhabitants of the town, for example, asked 'Umar for permission to trade within the caliphate (Lammens, *M. F. O. B.*, vi, 437, note 1). The vicinity of the town was settled by Yamani tribes (Michael Syrus, iii, 47), notably the Banī Taghlib (Lammens, *op. cit.*, p. 445, note 1). Yazid, when he created the *djund* of Ḫinnistrin threw Manbijī into this military province (al-Baladhūri, p. 132; Lammens, p. 437, note 7). Harūn al-Rashīd separated it again, made it the capital of the frontier district of the "Awasim" (q.v.), in 786 and appointed 'Abd al-Malik b. Sūfīl b. 'Ali as wali there in 717, to whom the town owed many buildings (al-Baladhūri, *loc. cit.*). In 131 (748) it was severely damaged by an earthquake, in which the church of the Jacobites collapsed during mass and buried many of the worshippers in its ruins (Pseudo-Dionysios, transl. Chabot, p. 42; Michael Syrus, ii, 510; Beathgen, *Abb. d. Kunde d. Morgenl.*, viii/iii, 1884, p. 126). The brother of the caliph al-Mu'tāṣim, al-'Abbās, who had taken part in the mutiny led by the general 'Uqba b. Ḥanāba, was tortured to death by Hādār b. Kāwās, the Māqīn of Urūshāna, at Manbijī in 223 (838) (Tahārī, iii, 1265; ibn al-Asīr, ed. Tomērg, vi, 349; Michael Syrus, iii, 111; Well, *Gesch. d. Chaldf.*, ii, 320). The conquest of Syria by Manbijī in 264 (878-79) brought Manbijī also under Egyptian suzerainty (ibn al-Shīnā, p. 228).

In the account of the *ēkō ḫātāmāt ektēsūs* of Edebsa, said to have been compiled by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetos, a miracle is mentioned that took place in the time of Christ at the *ṭemōr ḫērāwīs*, s, the temple of the Virgin Mary, where it is written (The mag. Edeba, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, cxivii, col. 432; better in Von Dobschütz, *Christusbildner*, in *Texte u. Unters. z. altchristl. Lit.*, xvii, 51)". Abgar's envoy, who was spending the night in a brickworks near Manbijī on his way back from Jerusalem hid there among the bricks the sacred handkerchief with the portrait of Christ Terrified by the bright light like that of fire, the heathen inhabitants of the neighbouring town hurried next morning to the brickworks and found there a brick with a miraculous copy of the portrait, which they carefully preserved in their city. The Ḥamānī al-Sāf al-Dawālī, soon after the capture of Manbijī in 947, made his cousin, the poet Ābī Firās, governor of Manbijī (Drovīk, *Ābī Firās*, p. 55). When the Western Nicetor Phocas invaded Syria in 962, Ābī Firās, who happened to be hunting outside the town, was taken prisoner by the strategos Būdrīs (Theodore, *Petros*), a nephew of the emperor, and taken first to Kharshāna and then to Constantinople (Drovīk, 98 sq.; Well, iii, 17) where he wrote poems full of longing for Manbijī and his mother there (Drovīk, p. 300, 302, 323 sq.). In 966 when emperor Nicetor expelled before Manbijī and made the people of the town produce the sacred brick (al-Fīrās, i.e. *kezāmān*) but did them no other injury (Yabhā al-Antāq, *Col. Perisyn. Bibl. Nat.*, anc. fond. ar. *No. 151 A.*, fol. 96); the translation by Freytag, *Z. D. M. G.*, xi, 212, has been corrected by Rosen, *Zapiski Imp. Akad. Nauk*, xlvii, 1853, p. 07-08, note d). The Byzantine writers who apparently did not know that Miṣrīs was the Arabic name of Hierapolis and sought to locate it in Palestine or near Himīs, wrongly make Nicetor take Manbijī in 968 and carry off the brick and some hairs from the head of John the Baptist (which was only done
by his successor) (Leo Diaconos, Bonn, iv. 10, p. 71; John Skylitzes, ii. 364; Zonaras, xvi. 25, p. 503; Glykas, Bonn, p. 569 etc) but this statement cannot be reconciled either with the route given for his campaign of 968 (cf. v. Dobschutz, op. cit., p. 172, note 1; Schluumberger, Niceph. Phocas, p. 704—706, note 5), nor with the bounds of his conquests given by Kamal al-Din (in Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 323). It was his successor John Tzinimes, who first took the fortress (Φρούριον) of Manbij in 974, and found there Christ's sandals and some still bleeding, hairs of John the Baptist, which he brought to reside to Byzantium (Leo Diaconos, x. 4, p. 165).

In the year 1025 the Mirdasid Šêlih took the town (J. J. Muller, Historia Meridiorum ex Hathebianis Compendiante annalibus excerpta, Bonn 1819; Rosen, op. cit., p. 68). By the treaties between Maḥmûd and 'Aṭīya (cf. Ḥalâr, ii. 345) Manbij passed in 456—457 to 'Aṭīya (Muller, op. cit., p. 56 sq.). In 472 (1079—1080) Tâḍj al-Dawla Tutush occupied the town (Muller, p. 88). The emperor Romanus IV Diogenes took it on his Syrian campaign in 1068 and strengthened the defences of the citadel (John Skylitzes, Bonn, ii. 673, 675, 685; Michael Attaliates, Bonn, p. 168 sq., ii. 116; Zonaras, xvii. 11, 26, Bonn, iii. 691; Michael Sysrus, ii. 168; Mattheos of Uḥray, transl. Dulanier, p. 162; Weil, iii. 112; Kamal al-Din, transl. Muller, op. cit., p. 63 sq., where it is wrongly stated that Manbij remained Greek for 70 years). It was not till 479 (1086) that Malik-Šâh deprived the Greeks of Manbij and al-Ruḥâ, and gave the rule over Halâb. Hamâ, Manbijdi and al-Ladikhta to Al-Shonkor (Ibn al-Aṭhir, x. 98; Weil, iii. 131).

In 504 (1110—1111) the Franks conquered Manbijdi, occupied and plundered the town and advanced as far as Bilis which they burned (Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusalem, p. 88; Weil, iii. 193, according to Michael Sysrus, ii. 215, probably wrongly, in the year 502). But they lost Manbijdi again in the same year (504) (Abu 'l-Fadl, Annal. Mamluk., ed. Keske, iii. 370). Baldwin II in 513 (1119) invaded the lands east of Halâb as far as Manbijdi and al-Nuẓrâ and Joscelin, in the following year, on the pretext that one of his followers had been imprisoned in Manbijdi and that no compensation had been given to him for it, plundered the lands of al-Nuẓrâ and al-Ąljâz (Recueil hist. or. crent., iii. 623, 625). When Nur al-Dawla Balag enticed the amir of Manbijdi, Hassân al-Ąlabalkanni, within his power and then imprisoned him in Pailu, Hassân's brother 'Īsa seized the citadel of Manbijdi, which Balag then attacked with siege artillery (1124). 'Īsa then appealed for help to Joscelin and had him proclaimed lord of Manbijdi, but Joscelin suffered a severe defeat before the walls of the town. On the next day, however, Balag was mortally wounded by an arrow shot by an unknown hand (according to Kamal al-Din, by 'Īsa himself; according to Mattheos of Edessa, by a sun-nor-lippet). In 518 (1124) Hassân was liberated and returned to Manbijdi (Ibn al-Ąhr, x. 436; Michael Sysrus, ii. 111; Mattheos of Edessa, transl. Dulanier, p. 311 sq.; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 161). The Crusaders never again took the town after the brief occupation in 504. Although we know of Frankish archbishops of the town (cf. William of Tyre, xiii. iii. xv. 14: xvii. 17) one of whom Francesco, took part in the Council of An-
on Manbidj, the inhabitants of which retired behind its walls and barricaded the place where the walls were no longer standing. The town was stormed on the 21st Rabii' II 658, numerous inhabitants put to death, the houses destroyed and rich booty taken; the enemy even entered the mosque where many women had taken refuge and violated them (R. O. L., vi. 6). After the Khwarizmians had been driven back, al-Malik al-Mansur re-entered Manbidj (R. O. L., vi. 17). In the treaty between Sulṭān Ka’ātun and Leo of Armenia of the 1st Rabii' II 658 (June 6, 1258), Manbidj is mentioned among the Egyptian towns (Maṭrīt, ed. Quatremère, Hist. des Sultans Manlouk, vii. 168, transl., p. 205).

According to Ibn al-Shihāb (Baburīt 1909, p. 228), Manbidj which previously, excluding its suburbs, had paid annually 510,000 dirhams to the Sulṭān’s Dīwān, was destroyed by the Tatars (who invaded Syria several times between the end of 699 [1200] and 702 [1302])—perhaps there is here a confusion with the Khwarizmians. According to Abu ‘l-Fidā’, the fortifications and the town were for the most part in ruins in his time: Khall al-Zāhīrī does not mention it at all.

After the Russo-Turkish War (1879) Cossacks were settled in Manbidj, since that date the few remains of antiquity noticed by earlier travellers have almost completely disappeared.

The ruins of Bumbidj, as the name of the place is now pronounced by the natives with a marked echo of the ancient Bambyke (Latin in M. Hartmann, Zerstörte d. Geschicht. Alterth., Berlin, xxix, 525; Littmann, Amer. Arch. Expedit. to Syria, i. 171, note 3), have been visited by Maundrell (1699), Pococke (1737), Drummond (1747), Sachau (1879), Cumont (1907) and Hogarth (1908). The old town walls, surrounded by a broad ditch which were several times restored in the middle ages, still survive almost in their entirety (Ainsworth, A Personal Narrative of the Euphrates Expedition, i. 1888, p. 238).

pasturages in the desert which stretched between the Indus and Kāmhul. According to Idrisi (548 = 1154), transl. Jaubert, i. 163, the Mand dwelt on the borders of the desert of Sind. They pastured their flocks up to the borders of Māmahal (Kāmhul). They were numerous and owned many horses and camels; their raids extended as far as Dūr (read Rūr; cf. LUL) and sometimes even to Mākrān. This last detail is curious for it indicates an extension of the Mand towards Persia, but the text is not certain: perhaps we should read Mulsān. After this the name Mand disappears from Muslim literature.

The town of “Kāmhul”, the site of which is important to fix the limit of the habitations of the Mand, is sometimes located in Hind (Iṣṭahkšā, p. 176), sometimes between Sind and Hind (Idrisī). The form of the name is uncertain (Fāmhāl, Māmahal, Amhul). Elliot, i. 363, identified it with Anbalwār; cf. al-Birunī, p. 100. This last town (Anhilwār, Nahrwār, founded in 746 A.D.) is identical with the modern Fātan (on the Saraswati in northern Baroda; cf. Imp. Gazett. of India, 1908, vol. xx.; Cunningham, op. cit., p. 290, places “Māmahul” in “Amhul”). In any case Kāmhul must mark the limit of the pasturages of the Mand to the S. E. of al-Mansūra (= Haidarābād, on the Indus; cf. Elliot, i. 370).

Among the Muslim sources a special place is occupied by the Mudjīmil al-Tawālidh, written in Persian in 520 (1126). This work gives extracts from a book which was composed first in an Indian language, then translated into Arabic by Abu Šallīḥ b. Shu’aib b. Dīmī (in 417 = 1028) and finally translated from Arabic into Persian by Abu ’l-Ḥasan ‘Ali b. Muḥammad al-Halabī, librarian in Dūrādān. This source which is a very inaccurate resumé of the Māḥākbūrat, begins with a chapter on the Ma’dī and the Zuṭtī, two peoples in the land of Sind, descendants of Cham (Ham), son of Noah. The Ma’dī had conquered the Zuṭtī, who withdrew to the banks of the river Pāh (or Bahr) and from there attacked the Ma’dī by water. Finally tired of fighting, the two peoples agreed to approach king Dahrān b. Dahrān (Duryodhana, son of Dhrīṭarāṣṭra) to ask him to appoint a king over them. Dahrān sent them his sister Dusul (Duvulālī), married to Bījādrīt (Jayadrathā) who became a powerful king. At the request of Dusul, Dahrān sent 30,000 Brahmins to people Sind. One part of the country was given to the Zuṭtī, who were given as a ruler Dūjādrīt (Yuḥyihshīra, eldest son of Dhrīṭarāṣṭra).

The Ma’didīya (Madīya) also were given a special area; cf. Reinaud, Fragments arabes et fragments relatifs à l’Inde, 1845, p. 3—25.

Here we have an attempt to connect the history of the Ma’dī and Zuṭtī with Indian tradition by quoting a passage in the Māḥākbūrat which says that Duvulālī was given in marriage to Jayadrathā, “king of the lands watered by the Indus” (transl. Fauche, Paris 1853, i. 290, glosa 2742). Indian tradition however contains nothing definite of value about the Mand. In the Bharat-Sāmhitā, transl. Kern, J. R. A. S., 1871, p. 81—86 which is one of the sources for the enumeration of the peoples of India in al-Birûnî (ed. Sachau, p. 150—157, transl. 209—393), we find a Ma’dīya people (located in the centre, north or northwest of India). The derivation of the Arabic Mand from some such name may be suspected (cf. the name of the
modern town on the coast of Kăthīwār; Māndvi). On the other hand in Central India along side of the Māndwāya the Medha are mentioned (al-Birūnī: Maidha, the final a being only indicated by means of a fatha).

The question of the Maid/Mand has been discussed by Elliot and A. Cunningham; the former (Hist. of India [1867], i. 519—531) says that the Meds still exist on the borders of Sind and Jodhpūr, as well as to the west in the little harbours of Mārkān (the clans of Gazbar, Hor, Mānl, Djalār-za‘ī, Celmār-za‘ī). The name *Mād* has even undergone a phonetic change to Mer (which we find in the mountains of Aرفāl and in Kāthīwār). Elliot also thinks it possible that the Meds or one of their branches bore the name Mand of which traces can be found in place-names (Mandar, Mānd-bro, etc.). Cunningham in his report 1862—1863 connected the Zut and the *Māyād* or Mand with the Jutti and Mandrueni whom Pliny (Nat. Hist., vi, ch. xviii.) mentions near the Oxus and calls the *Mād* or Mer the first Indo-Scythic invaders of the Pandāb. In The Ancient Geography of India, 1871, p. 290—294, Cunningham finds a variant of the name Maid in the name of the town Marāvāqya of the Periplus mar. Erythr. (cf. Pollemey, vi/1, § 63: Maravqya to the east of Indo-Scythia), which would be "the town of the Scythians, Min = Manjābari (Mandābari) of the Arabs = Thatha, etc."

The question of the Mand evidently deserves a new special study. Was there only one, or two peoples *Mād* and *Mand*? The statements of the Muslim authors seem to refer to a single people. The toponymy of the land south of the Indus reveals the presence of an old element *Mand*; cf. Pollemey, vi/1, § 7: Mandagara. When its origins have been studied, it will be interesting to compare its possible connection with the oldest name of the Aryans, Mānda, found in the cuneiform inscriptions of the third millennium B.C. according to E. Förster, Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Elam-Reiches, Z.D.M.G., lxvi, 1922, p. 247. According to E. Meyer, Die Volksstämme Kleinasiens, Stein. d. Volksst., Brühl, 1925, p. 244—261 (cf. Goetz, d. Altertumsw., vol. ii, sect. ind.) note 3, the name "Mandā" meant the Scythians who in the seventh century B.C. had invaded nearer Asia and was sometimes transferred to the Medes along side of whom the Scythians were settled. A di metrically opposite process would be to compare *Mand* with the name of the Mundā language (of the Mon-Khmer family); cf. in this connection: Prayulski, Un ancien peuple du Penjāb, Les Udumbars, T.A., 1920, N°. 1, p. 53; where a theory is advanced which, before the arrival of the Indo-Aryans the valley of the Indus was peopled by "Austro-Asiatics" from the Himalayan zone to the sea. The influence of the Austro-Asiatic substratum, i.e., languages of the Mundā type, would also explain the preservation in Sanskrit of the aspirated sonants.

(V. Minorsky)

MĀND (Mānd, Mund), the longest river in Fars (Nushat al-Kūlāb: 50 farsakhs; E. C. Ross: over 300 miles in length).

The name. As a rule in Persia, sections of a river are called after the districts through which they flow. Mānd is the name of the last stretch near its mouth. The name seems to appear for the first time in the Fārs-nāma (before 510 = 1105) but only in the composite Māndistān (cf. below).

The old name of the river is usually transcribed in Arabic characters Sakkān (Iṣākhārī, p. 126; Ibn Hawkal, p. 191; Idrīs, tr. Jaubert, i. 401) but the orthography varies: Thakān, Fārs-nāma, C. M. S., p. 152; Nushat al-Kūlāb, p. 134; Zak- kān or Zakkan, Nushat al-Kūlāb, p. 217; Sittā- gān, Dīkhan-nāma, p. 247; cf. also Sāhhān in Ḥasan Fāsānī.

The identification of the Sakkān with the Sīrāzē mentioned in the Periplus of Nearcchus (Arrian, Indica, xxxviii. 8) is generally recognised. The identity of Sitakos with the Sittakan (Sittoganus) mentioned by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 26 is also usually admitted (Weisbach 1927), but Herseb (1907) relying on the evidence of the Šāhīdān (Sittoganus), has suggested doubts about the identification of the Sitakos with the Sittoganus. Now, according to Iṣākhārī, p. 119, the Šāhīkān flows into the Persian Gulf at Dāšt al-Dustākān (north of Bāshārī). This Šāhīkān must be identified with the river Shāpūr. The Fārs-nāma, ed. Le Strange, p. 163, mentions Rūd-hāl-i Sittakan ("the banks of the S.") as a station on the road from Shārza to Tawwaj; from this fact and especially from the name, Sittagān seems to be applied to the left bank tributary of the Shāpūr. Pliny, who follows Onesicritus, adds that by the Sittoganus one reaches Pasargades in 17 days (quo Pasargades septem die navigat). Whatever be the identity of the Sittoganus, the exaggeration in this statement is evident (especially in the direction of the sea to Pasargades) and the waters of Pasargades (Māshād-i-Murgab) do not flow into the Persian Gulf. But there is nothing to prove the absolute impossibility of using the Sakkān as a subsidiary means of transport in the season of floods (the winter). According to Arrian, Nearcchus found at the mouth of the Sitakos large quantities of corn which Alexander had brought there for the army. Iṣākhārī, p. 99 places the Sakkān among the rivers of Fārs which are navigable at need (al-ašwar al-awlati taḥīn al-salaf al-fardhun idīriyat ji-kān).

Another question is the phonetical identity of the names Sitakos (Sittoganus) and Sakkān. According to C. F. Andrieus, Sīrāzē is a nominative restored from a supposed genitive *Sīrāzān (Sita- kān); Sīttagan-us is a mistake for Sittagan-us; lastly the peculiarity of the Arabic script could explain the change of Sittakán to Sakkán. Here we may add that Ḥasan Fāsānī gives one of the stretches of the river the strangely written form Sakhān ("Sīkān"). Iṣākhārī however derives the name of the river from that of the village of Sakk (Nushat al-Kūlāb: Zakkan) in the district of Karzan considerably below the Šāhīkān stretch of the river. To sum up the identification of the Sitakos with the Sittoganus does not seem sufficiently established.

The course of the river. The Sakkān (Mānd) describes a great curve. At first it runs in the direction N.W.—S.E., to the northern base of the Kūh-i Marra-yi Shīkāh, which separates it from the valley of the river Shāpūr. It follows this direction (c. 100 miles) to the end of Aṣmāngird mountains around which it makes a bend and turns south (70 miles). It then meets the parallel ranges which run along the Persian Gulf and continues its winding course to the sea in a westerly direction (140 miles).

The Sakkān (Mānd) and its tributaries drain and irrigate a considerable area. Iṣākhārī says that
its waters contribute the largest share to the fertility of Fârs (ṣāḥāra-ʿīnārām). The sources of the river (Kān-i Zaid, Chīl-e Gūzeshmān and Surk-khārg) rise in the mountains of Khūz-i Nār and Kūh-i Naqīrī-Sīhkaft on the N.W. and W. of Shīrāz. These streams unite before Khān-i Zīnyān in the district of Māsārīn on the great Shīrāz-Kāzrīn-Būshār road. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 120, places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Shāhdārī (in the district of Ruṣvāqīn). In the same author, p. 130, Khān-al-Asād on the Sakkān corresponds to the modern Khān-i Zīnyān. The Fārs-nāma (and the Nuz̄at al-Kulūb) places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Cārīṭā (v.). Under the Turki name of Karāqūz, i.e. “the river of the elm”, the combined stream flow through the districts of Māsārīn (= Kūh-i Maqna-ye Sīhkaft), Sīyāh (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 120: Sīyāh) and Kawār. In this last district, Rivādeneyrā, in Sā, going from Shīrāz to Fīrūzābād crossed the river by a “substantial bridge”. It is in the district of Kawār that Ḥasan Fasṭī gives the river the name of Sīlaḵān. In Kawār (Ḥasan Fasṭī) there used to be the barrage of Bāndi Bāhman, where by a subterranean channel (kanār) part of the water was led into reservoirs (gār) and then to the fields. In the buluk of Khāf (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 105: Khārū), which must be distinguished from the district of the same name in the kīna of Iṣṭakhrī, the river turns south. Acher-Luži, who crossed the river on the road from Fīrūzābād to Ḥārān (Ṣawārum) calls it “Tengu-Tachka” (= Taqī-qaṣqāh-kā) and speaks of its “beautiful valley” Rivādeneyrā continuing his journey from Fīrūzābād to Dārāb crossed the river by a ford between the villages of Tāvdān and “A-nī-Dačerdi” (Asmanqārī). He also admires the pleasant and flourishing aspect of Khāf. Below the latter, the river enters the buluk of ʿIngān where, near the village of Šārāḵ, it receives on its left bank, the brackish (ṣāhba) river of Ṣawārum, and then flows through the ravine of Kāzrīn, and waters the buluk of Kīr-wā-Kāzrīn. Abbott coming from Fīrūzābād crossed the river by a ford between ʿAṧālīd and Ṣawārum (cf. the name of the stream of Kurds in Fārs-al-Palvātān, Iṣṭakhrī, p. 113), where it was 100 yards wide and the water rose up to the horse’s belly. Farther down below the ford, Stack, going from Kīr to ʿIrāqīyān crossed the river. Here 60 yards broad, by the bridge of ʿArūs, built in a zigzag and in two stories (“the queerest structure in the way of a bridge”). Near the village of Nīm-ū, the river enters the buluk of Afzar. Having arrived wound around the fort of Kāf-āyā Shāhrūyār the river receives (near the place called Čam-i Kalbāg) the name of Bāz and then irrigates the buluk of Khundū (cf. Ibn Bīrūnī, n. 245: Khundū was Khundū + Bāz). In the district of Dīghār of the buluk of Gâlā-bāt the river has two tributaries near the village of Câbīr, the Dar al-Mīzān, and two farsakh lower, that of Dūhrām. The Dār al-Mīzān comes from the left (east) side of the buluk of Asūr. The Dūhrām much more important comes from the right side after watering the historic district of Fīrūzābād (the ancient Gūr, capital of Ardāshīr-Khura: cf. the details in Le Strange, p. 256). Iṣṭakhrī, p. 121 makes this tributary come from Dīghār (of Sīyāh) and water first Khunāghīfār and then Gūr in place of the name of the river Tirza, Iṣṭakhrī, p. 99, 121, one should probably read Barāzā: cf. the Fārs-nāma, p. 151, Nuz̄at al-Kulūb, p. 117—118: Ḥakim Būrtz was the sage who dried up the Lake of Gūr).

After Dīghār, the river enters the district of Sanāa-ḵᵛāb-Sumbā of the buluk of Dāhšt, and near the village of Bīghān receives on the right bank the river ʿAnzū which comes from the district of Tāṣṭīdī-ʾAḏsī. Finally near the village of Dīmānū the river enters the coast district of Māndīstān and receives the name of Mānd. It flows into the sea near the village of Zīyrāt, halfway between the old harbours of Nāḏjīrān (to the north) and Sīrā (to the south).

Māndīstān. The district forms part of the buluk of Dāhšt (which is to be distinguished from Dāštīn to the north of Dāhšt up to Būšī). Dāhšt (36 × 18 farsakh) is composed of 4 districts: 1. Bārdīstān, the part of the coast which is the port of Dāyīr. 2. Māndīstān on the coast to the north of Bārdīstān and the two banks of the river Mānd. 3. Sanā and Sumbā on the river above Māndīstān. 4. Tāṣṭīdī-ʾAḏsī, a very narrow valley (11 × ½ farsakh), watered by the ʿAnzū and separating Sanā and Sumbā from the buluk Arbaʿa (on the lower course of the river of Fīrūzābād).

The whole of the buluk belongs to the torrid zone (garmazīr) of Fārs. Māndīstān (12 × 5 farsakh) includes lands so flat that the current of the river is imperceptible and the water cannot be used for irrigation. Agriculture (wheat, barley, palm-trees) is dependent on the winter floods. The district has 40 villages. The capital of the district and of the buluk is Kākī. There used to be two rival families in Māndīstān: the Shākī-ya and the Ḥāddījīyān. During the disturbances under Afghān rule (1722—1729) the Ḥāddījī Raʿīs Ljāmāl exterminated the Shākī-ya and founded a little dynasty of hereditary governors who were able to annex the district of Bārdīstān through matrimonial alliances. One of his descendants, Muḥammad Khān (d. at Būšī in 1299 = 1881), was noted as a poet under the pen-name of Dāštī.

Ḥasan Fasṭī explains the name Māndīstān by a popular etymology: “the place where the water flows slowly (ḵᵛāndūbādas).” Names in -e-ān are common in Fārs (Lārštān, Dāštān) but even if such a formation was possible in a river-name, the element Mānd would still be a puzzle. It is curious that Ḥasan Fasṭī sometimes writes it Mānd (read Mānt) and sometimes Mund (read: Mōnd). It might be suggested as a pure hypothesis that there is a connection with the people M N D (cf. MAND), of which there might have been a colony in Māndīstān.


(V. Minorsky)

MANDINGO, a people of the Western Sudan whose country of origin was on the Upper Niger stretching from Bamako to bigurru inclusive. This region includes the gold-bearing district of Boure, Bute, or Bito as well as the provinces of Lower Faleme and of Bambuk which also produce gold. At the present time the Mandingo have spread into the mountainous country in which the two branches of the Senegal arise; they occupy Sangaran, Gangaran, Bambuk, and the valley of the Gambia to the South while to the North they extend as far as the Western Sahara. In the 17th century, they colonised a part of the modern Mauretania and, according to the Arab authors of this period, who mention them under the name of Gangara (Sing. Gangar) or Wangara — a word which seems to be a corruption of the name of their country of origin: Gangaran, Gangaran or Gangara — they were to be met with in Hadh. In our time the first of these names has been kept by the Moors and the Sarakole, the second by the Songhay, the Ful of Massina and the Hausa.

The country of these natives is called according to the different dialects: Manding, Mandi, Mani, Mandeng, Maneng, Mande, Mane. The inhabitants are called by the names of Mandinka, Maninka, Mansa, Mandenka, Mansaka or Manenga in the dialects of the Centre and of the East and Mandinko or Mandingo, in those of the North, South and West. This last name is considered by the British possessions of Gambia and Sierra Leone to have been adopted by the English while the French keep the form Manding or Mandingue.

The name of the country corrupted by the Ful has become in the language of these natives Mali, Mahli, Malli, Melli, and that of the inhabitants has become Mallinke or Malinke. This last word has now come to stand for the South-Western portion of this people or for their dialect.

Ethnography. The Mandingo group constitutes a well-marked ethnological group, but it does not form a homogeneous people under one rule. Three chief divisions can be distinguished, and these can again be subdivided into many sections. They are the Malinke, the Bambak, or Bamana, and the Diula or Gula.

A Sudanese historian of the xvith century, Maimud Koti, who wrote the Turikh al-Fattah in Arabic, distinguished in his time between the Malinke and the Wangara, regarding the former as warriors and the latter as merchants and traders. The Malinke are the least advanced of the Mandingoes from the social point of view, many of them remaining faithful to the matrarchal system and are still cultivators of the soil, hunters and gold-diggers.

An attempt has been made to derive their name from that of the hippopotamus: mali or mali, and thus "malinka" would signify the "people of the hippopotamus." This explanation is erroneous, the suffix "ka," signifying the nationality, can only be joined to the name of a country or of a tribe and never to that of an animal. It is possible however, that the name of the country which was the cradle of their race, could come from ma, mother, and dieg or dieg, child; this word then would signify "child of the mother," in allusion to the descent by the female line which is customary amongst them.

The Bambara inhabit the valleys of the Niger and of the Bani as far as Lake Debo, they are numerous in the Sahel. They are more advanced agriculturists than the Malinke and they recognize descent by the male line. An attempt has been wrongly made to derive their name from that of the crocodile: bama or bama. Some authors, on the other hand, have held that their name signifies "refusal to obey a master" (ban. refusal, ma: master, ma: mother, ma or ra: to). The Diula or Giula inhabiting some fairly important centres are chiefly merchants and traders. They are met with in small colonies, settled amongst the indigenous peoples to the East of Bani as far as the Upper Volta and the Gold Coast. Having been converted at an early date to Muslimadami, they have remained fervent Muslims and there are amongst them quite a large number of learned men.

Their name is said to signify "from the foundation, from the stock" (dina). According to their own account, it was given to them because their ancestors belonged to families of noble birth.

At the basis of Mandingo society is an extended family (jana or gwa) comprising all the living descendants of an ancestor, sufficiently near in place and in time for all the ties of relationship and duty. This extended family covers four generations: the patriarch, his brothers and cousins, their children, the children and grand-children of the latter, and an equal number of generations of slaves. Persons of the same generation placed on the same level are called by the same name: father, brother, son, without distinguishing the fathers from the uncles, the brothers from the cousins, the sons from the nephews, all are collectively sharers in the family property, which they have helped to acquire and to augment by their labours. This family property consists of crops, of animals, arms, surplus clothes as well as treasure in gold, silver or cowries gathered together by the founder of the family. It is administered by the patriarch who cannot dispose of it without the consent of the majority of the other members. Each of those, man or woman, possesses in addition a private store of which he has the free use.

The chief exercises a political, domestic and religious authority. In this capacity he is charged with making sacrifices and offerings to their ancestors and to the patron deities of the family. A number of families observing the same religious prohibitions and bearing the same name (dina) form a clan; the members, who form a clan are of the same origin, but so far removed by birth
that it is impossible to trace their descent back to a common origin.

The chief Mandingo clans are those of Keyta, Kante, Tarare, the Dembele, the Konate, the Kuku, the Koru, the Diara, the Samake, the Mareko, the Kamara, the Bakayoko etc. None of them is either organised or under a single ruler.

There exists between persons of different clans a particular tie called senabuya, without doubt the remains of an ancient phylogeny which obliges them to assist one another and to exchange presents on certain occasions; the same persons can also quarrel among themselves or fight with one another without involving any serious consequences.

The organisation, which is lacking in the clan and in the tribe shows itself on the contrary in each inhabited centre in the form of the hierarchial brotherhoods, which combine all the young people and the men of the same age who have together submitted to circumcision and to the tests of successive initiation. The first is that of ntonko, grouping together the boys from the ages of 7 to 14 years; then there come the so-called secret societies, such as those of the kono or of the nama which consist of politico-religious groups within the village.

The village or dugu is the administrative unit, the union of a number of villages and the lands which surround it forming a district or kafo; a number of districts constitute a province or a kingdom, dimana, at the head of which there was in former times the Mansa or Massa. The latter was surrounded by different ministers and assisted by a treasurer.

Although Islamism has long penetrated amongst the noble families of the Mandingo, the greater portion of the population has remained faithful to the worship of natural forces and of protecting deities, dugu la sire, gama and bol. The great religious festivals are the agrarian feasts and the most important correspond to the periods of seed-time and harvest.

The Language. The Mandingo properly speaking are in number about 2,500,000 of whom 770,000 are in Senegal; 1,000,000 in French Sudan; 200,000 in the Upper Volta; 2,500 in Nigeria; 290,000 on the Ivory Coast; 550,000 in French Guinea; more than 680,000 live in Gambia, Sierra Leone, Portuguese Guinea and the Republic of Liberia.

In addition to these natives, whose mother tongue is Mandingo, more than 2,000,000 other people speak this idiom; for this reason it is often spoken of as a language that is still spreading.

The Mandingo belongs to the African Negro language and more especially to the group which M. Tichelasse calls Negro-Senegalese; D. Westermann; Mandingo, and A. Drexel: Nko-Nke: it is closely allied to Susu. Foreign idioms seem to have had little influence, although it has borrowed certain abstract and religious terms from the Arabic; from Phoenician or Arabic it has borrowed expressions relative to horsemanship and cotton; from Berber about a dozen words, and finally during the space of the last fifty years it has further borrowed from several European languages.

The roots are monosyllabic or disyllabic and many of them can be traced to an ancient African Negro origin. For example: far, the action of killing or being dead, seems to come from a root far or far; cf. in Susu fak: Hausa: fa: Moli: far; Fang: war; Pul: war (de); Masgu: fa:u.

Congo: faru; Swahili: wa and ma; Ancient Egyptian: f散布。The nominal class does not exist in this language.

Mandingo uses derivative suffixes which are used to form distinct substantives used as substantives only; for example: ka, na, or nga, the suffix for nationality: Mandenka: la or ra, the instrumental suffix: tege to cut; toge-la, the instrument for cutting, axe. It employs also adjective suffixes; for example: ma or ma indicating the possession of the thing mentioned: gyi, water; gyi-ma, “full of water”; fa indicating on the contrary the lack of the thing expressed: gyi n-fa, “without water”. Certain suffixes, joined to a simple or derived root, indicate the possession of a quality or of a state; for example: bu-suru, “short, little”; suru, “shortness” and also “to shorten or to approach”; Suffixes also exist, indicating determination or relationship.

The Mandingo conjugation employs prefixes denoting the perfect, the aorist, the injunctive. Certain auxiliary prefixes serve to indicate time. It has a considerable number of verbal forms, affirmative as well as negative.

This language does not possess any trace of a system of syntax of agreement; the relations between one element of a sentence and another are entirely determined by the respective position of the two elements and their grammatical function is often determined only by the place which they occupy in the sentence.

In the syntax of this language, the complement of a noun, pronoun or verb always precedes the noun, pronoun or verb in question; the adjective qualifying or determining a noun always follows this noun; the noun of number always the noun of the thing numbered; an adverb modifying a word follows it. The order of the words in the sentence is subject, prefix or auxiliary of conjugation, direct complement of the verb, verb root or derivative, indirect complement of the verb, adverb modifying the statement.

Mandingo is divided into a fairly large number of dialects revealing differences more or less marked. We distinguish the Bambara or Bamana dialects, the Diula dialects and lastly the Malinke dialects, which divide themselves divided into the Malinke of the East, of the North (sometimes Khashonke), of the West and of the South.

History. The wide diffusion of this language is due to certain historical circumstances, and to the rise of the Mandingo hegemony which extended over almost all the Western Sudan from the year 1250 to 1500.

According to local tradition, the Mandingo sovereigns bore the title of Mansa or Massa; they belonged to the Keyta and married into that of the Konde or Kone. In the beginning, they owed their influence to their knowledge of sorcery and magical practices and little by little they emerged from obscurity. Ibn Khaldun has transmitted to us the name of the first of them, Baramandana, who about the year 1050, was converted to Islam, in order to obtain, according to al-Bakri, the end of a drought, which was cruelly trying the country of Mande; thereafter he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. Native tradition has kept the name of two of the descendants of this prince, Hamana and Dyggu-Blili. The son of the latter, Musa, called Aliyak, reigned from the year 1200 to 1218. Four times he made a pilgrimage to Mecca,
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and he extended the power of his dynasty. On the other hand, his son Nare Famaga (1218–1230) suffered a great reverse and was defeated by his neighbour, the king of Sósó, Sumanguru Kante, who annexed Mandingo in 1224 and put to death eleven out of the twelve sons of the conquered monarch. The last son, Sósó Diata or Mari Diata (1250–1255), who was weak and delicate suddenly recovered his health and strength after touching his father's sceptre. Little by little he got together a powerful army, with the help of which he conquered a part of Futa Djallon, the country situated between the Niger and Bani, in the region of kita and that of Beledugu. In 1235 he attacked his enemy Sumanguru Kante and defeated him at Kinka, not far from the Niger. After having subdued shortly afterwards the whole of the Sósó, he advanced in 1240 as far as the celebrated city of Ghana which he plundered. During the following years, Sun Diata took possession of Baggaram and of the gold-bearing district of Bambuk without neglecting the good administration of his lands in which he encouraged agriculture and extended the cultivation of the cotton plant. Towards the year 1240 he abandoned the ancient capital of the Mandingo, Djeriba, and transferred it to Niani, wrongly called Mali or Melli by the Arab historians. He died in 1255 in the vicinity of this town. One of his sons succeeded Sun Diata, whose name only is handed down to us, namely Mansa Ule or the Red King (1255–1270). After him reigned the princes Walt, Khalifa and Abu Bakari between the years 1270 and 1285 about whom we possess no information. After the death of the latter, the power passed into the hands of a slave of the Keyta called Sakara or Sahakara, who kept it from the year 1285 to 1300. Then the Keyta regained the throne and under Gani, Mamadu, and Abu Bakari they held it from 1300 to 1307. At the end of this undistinguished period, Kankan Musa, also called Gongo Músá (1307–1332), the son of the last of these sovereigns, seems to have raised to its zenith the power of his dynasty. We owe to Ibn Khaldun some details about his person and the events of his reign. He was an ascetic prince and full of piety, and he made a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1325 and on his return he brought back with him to the Sudán, al-Mamun, a descendent of the founder of the dynasty of the Almohads, as well as the Arab poet al-Shibli. When he was still in the Sahara, Kankan Musa learnt that his troops had seized Gao, Tombakuta, Walata and the kingdom of Songhoy. He decided to visit the first two of these towns, and on the advice of the strangers who accompanied him, he built in each of them a mosque and a palace, thus introducing Arab architecture into the country. When he died in 1322, his authority extended from the valley of the Bani to that of the Falame, and from the Sahara as far as the thick forest, and he had entered into relations with the Sultan of Fez.

His son and successor Maghan (1332–1336) was not able to keep intact the kingdom bequeathed to him by his father. During the reign of this prince the Mossi pillaged Tombakuta, and Songhoy cast off the Mandingo yoke.

On his death, Sulaimán (1336–1359), the brother of Kankan Musa, ascended the throne. According to Ibn Khaldun, the first care of the new sovereign was to assert his authority in his possessions in the North. He was not successful in regaining Songhoy, but he established peace and security in his kingdom, which he reorganised. The traveller Ibn Battîta, who passed through Mandingo in the year 1351–1352, furnishes us with valuable information on the country, the administration, justice and the court.

Kamba, the son of Sulaimán, succeeded his father but was deposed at the end of a few months by Mari-Diata, the son of Maghan who kept his power until 1374. He died of sleeping sickness and is remembered as a cruel, debauched and extravagant prince.

His successors Músá II (1374–1387), Maghan II, Sandigui Maghan III, Músá III and Músá Ule II reigned until the beginning of the 14th century. From this time onwards exact information ceases, as our authority, the historian Ibn Khaldun, died in the year 1406.

The decline of the Mandingo empire was hastened during the 14th century by the attacks of the Tureig, the Songhoy, the Mossi and the king of Tâkrur. In the year 1418 Mansa Mamadu feeling himself to be in danger, approached the Turks who were established on the coast of Africa and sought their protection. This move and others similar which followed it influenced the king John II and John III in sending to the court of the king of the Mandingo two ambassadors, the one in 1433, the other in 1534, but without leading any military aid.

In the year 1545 the Askia Dâd of Gao came and plundered the Mandingo capital. The Moroccans who had come from Tumbuktu some months before, joined in the year 1551 the enemies who surrounded the kingdom. The period from 1600–1670 marks the last stage of Mandingo power. But two new principalities were formed on its ruins at Segu and in Kaarta.

According to the legend, the Bambara under the guidance of two brothers, Baramangolo and Nangolo, were flying before their enemies. They were on the point of perishing under the blows of their enemies, since a river barred their route when they were saved by a miraculous fish which carried them to the opposite bank. After this miracle they took the name of "Kulu bail", that is to say the men "without boats".

In the middle of the 18th century the descendants of Baramangolo had spread into the valley of the Niger and of the Bari but they paid tribute to the inhabitants of Djenné and to the Moroccans of Tumbukuta; their capital was Segu. Biton Kulubali (1660–1710) liberate them from this army and tutelage. Having collected a powerful army and fortified Segu, he made war first against the sovereign of the Mandingo, then seized the right bank of the Niger and finally Massuma and even Tumbukuta. He died of tetanus after organising his kingdom and dividing it into sixty districts.

His son Denkoro (1711–1736), a cruel and debauched prince, was assassinated; Ali, the brother of Denkoro, only reigned a few days and was deposed by the army of the Tondon or government troops. The period 1736–1750 was troubled by internal disorders, and in the year 1750 the power passed to the family of the Iliara, who kept it until 1861. At this time the conquering al-Hadjidji 'Omar seized Segu and put Ali, the last king of the dynasty, to death.

The descendants of Nangolo Kulubali are cal-
led "Massasi", that is to say "royal race". At the end of the xvith century they occupied all the province of Kaarta itself and they were the rivals of the Bambara of Segu. In the middle of the xvith century, Massa Bakari succeeded in bringing under his authority Kaarta, Kingai, Bakrun, Gudiunne and Diafunu. One of his successors, Bessekoro, received the explorer Mungo Park at Guemu in the year 1796. In the year 1854 the last sovereign of the line of the Massasi, called Kandan, was reigning at Nioro when al-Hiiiddi Oman seized the village and executed all members of the royal family.

After these events the Mandingoes remained divided and until the year 1860 only played a modest part in history. In this year, there arose in the vicinity of Kankan, in the district of Wassulu, Samori Ture, at first the leader of a band and then the sovereign of the province of Bissandugu. This new conqueror, although he was quite illiterate, seized in a short time the whole of Wassulu and took the title of "Almami". Crossing the Niger he extended his warlike expeditions into Sankaran and advanced within 80 miles of Kita, a post recently founded by the French. The latter fought against Samori first from the years 1881 to 1886 and in the next year imposed upon him the treaty of Bissandugu, which he respected for only a few months. From 1888 to 1891 Almami attacked Ticha, the king of Sikasso, without any success; thereafter he resumed hostilities against the French, who at the end of the year 1893 occupied Wassulu. Samori then fled into the Upper Ivory Coast, which he ravaged from the year 1894 to 1895 and he destroyed O. Danjou, the town of Bana. In front of this town, a detachment commanded by Captain Braulot was exterminated in the year 1897 by the warriors of Sarantee Mori, his son and his lieutenant. France thereupon determined to settle with Almami against whom a combined force was sent. It resulted in the capture of Samori and of his army on 29th Sept. 1898 at Guelu on the Upper Ivory Coast. Samori was deported with his family to Gabon where he died in 1900; he was about 65 years old. Since the dismemberment of his warriors, no event of importance has disturbed the peace of Mandingo.


(Ch. Labouret)

**Mândû**, a fortress now in ruins, was formerly the capital of Målwa [q.v.], and stands in 22° 21' N. and 75° 26' E. It has probably been a stronghold from time immemorial, but little is known of its history until the fortifications were erected in their present form by Dîlavar Khan Chùri (1392—1405), the first independent Muslim king of Målwa, and his successors. His son, Hîshang Shâh, made it his capital, and it remained the capital of the kingdom and province of Målwa throughout the period of Muslim rule, and has stood many sieges. Its streets ran with the blood of 10,000 Râjîjîs, slain by Mûhammad II of Målwa when he recovered his capital from his rebellious troops.

Of the ten gates of the fortress (two on the south, two on the west, one on the east, and five on the north), the Tarâpir Gate was built by Dîlavar Khan, the Dîjâhângîrî Gate by the emperor Dîjâhângîr, and the Âlamîrî Gate by an officer of the emperor Awrangzeb in A.D. 1668. The Bâghwânî Gate was built in 1517 in the reign of Mûhammad Khâdîjî II, and the Songârî Gate is an old gate rebuilt early in the nineteenth century by Maîn Bâi, the great Râîn of Dhâr. The Lawânî, Râmîpî, Dhîlî, and Bânî Gâtî Gates are old, but bear no inscriptions. The last has
is name from the legend that a sweeper was tortured alive on the completion of the gateway. The Gāqi or Carriage Gate bears no inscription and its age is unknown.

The principal buildings in the fortress are the mosques of Dilāvar Khān (1405), Malik Muḥbīth (1432), and Ḥāshang (1454), the last being one of the finest specimens of Ṭāḥān architecture in India; the Hindola Mahall with the Nhāh Nhār Khān, the Tweli and Nhār Mahalls, the palaces of Nāṣir al-Dīn (1509) and Cishti Khān, the Campa Khāl or Well, Rūmnīt’s pavilion, the tombs of Ḥāshang Shīh and Dāryā Khān, the Hāṭhi-khana (actually a tomb), and the Tower of Victory of Māhmūd Khādījī I. These buildings are now carefully conserved by the Archaeological Department of the Government of India.


MĀNDAR.[See Sharfā] MANF, or, according to Abu ‘l-Fadlī (p. 116), Mināf, the ancient Egyptian capital Memphis, on the left bank of the Nile, not far from Cairo, is well known in Arabic literature as a very old town. The geographers cite, among the ārā’s of Egypt, that of Manf and Wāsīm (cf. e.g. Ibn Khordaḥībī, p. 81), but the town was already ruined in Muhammadan times (al-ʿAṣqābī, ʿĀlī, al-Buldūn, p. 331) — by ‘Amar b. ʿAl-Kidā, according to Abu ‘l-Fadlī (loc. cit.) — and was no more than a village in the time of Ibn Hāwkb (p. 106).

Most Arab writers speak of the ancient traditions connected with Manf, often together with ʿĀin Shams [q.v.]. It is said to have been the first town inhabited in Egypt after the Flood, founded by Bāṣṣar b. Hām b. Nūḥ (Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, ʿAbī Ṣafī, ed. Torrey, p. 9) or Mīsāyīm b. Bāṣṣar (al-Maʿṣīrī, ed. Wiet, i. 73); the name is said to mean thirty (māfā, sc. the Coptic mād), because the first inhabitants were thirty in number. Further it is said to have been the town, where the Qur’ānic stories of Mūsā and Yūsuf took place (Yāqūt, iv. 667); namely the Madīnī Fīrawn, which possessed 70 gates and from which flowed the four great rivers of the earth (Ibn Khordaḥībī, p. 81). The temple (ḥrab) of Manf was built under the queen Dallīka by herself or by the sorceress called al-ʿAddīlīda, and had magical properties. Manf had also a tradition as a Christian town; the ruins of the monastery Dār ʿHirmīs are still to be seen, and the Arab authors know of some churches in the place (e.g. Kāfīṣat al-Uṣuf; cf. Yāqūt, loc. cit.), which reminded them of the ancient eponymous prosperity of the town.


MĀNGIR, the general name for copper coin under the early Ottomans, corresponding to alṭum (gold) and aqīṣ (silver). As a particular denomination it was a copper coin struck in the reign of Sulaimān II during a period of financial stress. In 1699 (1687) it was resolved to issue temporarily a token coinage in copper to be withdrawn from currency when the finances of the state improved. 500 māngir were struck to the oke of copper and put into currency as half aspers. When the situation did not improve, the value was raised to one asper; the remedy proved worse than the disease for very soon the whole country was flooded with copper coins and gold and silver driven out of circulation.

Māngir is also the name given to imitations of sequins in brass or other cheap metal worn as ornaments.


MĀNGISHLAK, a mountainous peninsula on the eastern shores of the caspian Sea, first mentioned under the Persian name Siyah-Koh (‘Black Mountain’; cf. B. C. G. A., i. 218); the same name was given to the hills west of the Sea of Aral (op. cit., vii. 92; see MANGISHLAGH). According to Iṣṭakhrī (op. cit., l. 219), the peninsula used to be uninhabited; it was only shortly before his time (or that of his predecessor al-Balḥī) that Turks, who had quarrelled with the Ghurī (q.v.), i.e. with their own kin, had come there and found springs and pastures for their flocks. Ships which were wrecked on the cliffs of the peninsula used to be plundered by these Turks. Muḥādīrī (or Maḥdis) mentions the mountain of Bīnsīshlān as marking the frontier between the land of the Khūzars and Dījrān (q.v.) (cf. B. C. G. A., iii. 355).

In the form Mankīshlagh (vocalised Mankasīghlagh) by Yaḵūt the name first appears in documents of the viib (xivth) century (W. Barthold, Turkestän, l. 54, 44 and 79) and in Yaḵūt (iv. 670). According to Yaḵūt, this name was borne by a strong fortress near the sea between Khuwārīm (q.v.), Sāksīn (q.v.) and the land of the Khūzars and Dījrān (q.v.) and in the land of the Khūzars and Dījrān (q.v.). The peninsula was evincially no longer, as it had once been, a place held in terror not only for its natural conditions but also for its inhabitants; via Mangīshlāk there ran, as later almost into modern times, an important trade route from the Volga territory to Khwārim; goods were unloaded in the bay near Cape Tob-Kaşagar and taken to Khwārim by caravans. Before its conquest between 1127-1128 and 1138 by the Khwānaqa Khwājas (q.v.), Mangīshlāk was a separate and practically independent principality on the frontiers of the Muslim world (it was of course regarded as within the empire of the Seldīlīs; q.v.). As the verse quoted shows, the conquest resulted in the destruction of the town. No permanent settlement is again mentioned on the peninsula until its occupation by the Russians, in spite of its importance for commerce.

For the last few centuries (perhaps even earlier) the peninsula has been inhabited by Turkomans. Towards the beginning of the xth (xvth) these were the Salurs (q.v.); on the coast lived the “inner Salurs” (iqī Salurs), on the road from Khwārim to the coast (about 500 miles; it took 20 days to traverse) lived “the outer (tāhkh) Salurs” (Zap., xv. 205). Abu ʿl-ʿGhārī (ed. Des-maisons, p. 267) gives the Ersans for the Salurs; towards the end of this century, this trade was almost completely driven out by the Mangīt (q.v.) i.e. by the Nurghāt; later we find the Kalmyks (q.v.)
conquering here. On their rule in Mangystan, cf. Abu'l-Ghasi, p. 316; the name of the peninsula is written by Abu'l-Ghasi (see Index). Mangystan, Manggishlak and Mangishlak. In addition to the regular traffic by sea with Astrakhan [q.v.], frequently mentioned in Russian sources, there was also a connection with Shirwan mentioned by Abu'l-Ghasi (p. 257 and 273) and other sources. Three Turkomans tribes, the Cadowur, the Igdir and the Sonadji, were deported by the Kalmucks under Ayuka (1670—1724), according to others as early as the reign of Punstuk-Mongak (1667—70) from Mangystan to the northern part of the Caucasus, but a section of the Cadowur continued to dwell in Mangystan. When, under Russian rule, the land of the Turkomans was organised as the "Trans-Caspian territory" (Zaksipjiskaya oblast), the "district of Mangystan" was included in it; the capital was the little settlement founded in 1839 as "Novo-Petrovskoye ukreplenye" and known from 1859 as "Fort Aleksandrowsk" (now: Fort Urkogod). In the sixteenth century the Turkomans were gradually driven out of Mangystan by the Kazak [cf. King]; therefore after the Revolution the district of Mangystan was separated from the land of the Turkomans and now belongs to the republic of Kazakistán.

After the western shore of the Caspian Sea had passed under Russian rule, it was recognised that the Gulf of Balkhan [q.v.] formed a better gateway to Central Asia than Mangystan. In 1859 the ambas-sador Maruyew proposed to the Khan of Khyva, Muhammad Kahn, that the caravan route from the Caspian Sea to Khyva should no longer start from Mangystan but from the port of Krasnovodsk on the Gulf of Balkhan. The Khan replied: "It is true, the road via Mangystan is much longer than the road via Krasnovodsk but the people in Mangystan are my subjects, whereas the Yomut as far as Astara already belong to the most part to the Kajüt" [q.v.] (N. Maruyew, Putjescestviye v Turkmeny i Khiwwe, Moscow 1822, p. 134). It was only after Russian rule was firmly established in Central Asia that this question could be settled in favour of the Gulf of Balkhan. Since Krasnovodsk became the starting point for the Central Asiatic railway, Mangystan has lost any importance it had in favour of the Gulf of Balkhan. According to the census of 1897, the population of Krasnovodsk was 6,322 and of Fort Aleksandrowsk only 895.

Bibliography: given in the article.

Descriptions of the district of Mangystan will be found in all works on Turkestan, e.g. V. Masalskiy, Turketskisby Krasi. St. Petersburg 1915, p. 621 sq. (W. Barthold)

Mangit, the name of a tribe and a people. In the time of Cingiz-Khan [q.v.] the word Mangit appears as the name of a Mongol people in Rashid al-Din (Trzuri Vost. Otd. Arch. Obh., vii. 283 sq.): Manghit. From the Mongol period onwards the name Mangit (written Manghit, Manghit, Manghit, Manghit and Manghit) like many other Mongol names (Naiman, Kungrat etc.) appears as the tribal name of Turkish or Turkised peoples. According to the Zemfl- unma (Ind. ed., i. 277) the Mangit were a tribe (bùmek) of the Golden Horde, which produced the celebrated Amir Edq (in Russian sources Vedegel), the contemporary and opponent of Timur and Tokhtaniş. The people called nogai in Rus-

sian sources is always called Mangit by Abu'l-Ghasi (see Index) and other Oriental sources of the same period. Now Nogai alone is used as the name of the people. The statement that the Mangit tribe makes up about 90%/ of them wants more careful investigation (M. Trushpaev, Materialy k istorii Kirghiz-Kazakskogo naroda, Tashkent 1925, p. 28); the name Mangit is said to be also found as the name of a family among the Yaksuts. In the Bahr al-Asrir of Mahmud b. Wali (MS. Ind. Off., No. 575, f. 359) the tribe (ului) of the Mangit and the tribe (i) of the Kungrat are mentioned as the two most important branches of the Ouzbeks. The Mangit tribe was of some political importance for the political life of Bukhara and Kharism. In the fighting with other tribes the Mangits of Bukhara were supported by their brethren in Khiva and vice versa but it was only in Bukhara that they became supreme. On the dynasty of the Mangit see the article Bughur (there written Mangit); the dynasty was overthrown in the revolution of 1920. In Khiva the Mangits combined with the NukR to form a double tribe (the other double tribes were the Ugur-Naiman, Kithi-Kipëk and Kiyat-Kungrat).

The place called Mangit on modern maps was only founded in Radjab 1215 (Nov.—Dec. 1800) by members of the tribe who had been driven by the Turkoman Yomut to the east (History of Khiva, MS. of the Asiatic Museum, p. 590 supra, f. 73b). At the present day the Mangit number 99,200 in Bukhara (of whom 44,000 are in Bukhara itself and 31,000 in Karshi; q.v.) and only 10,300 in Khiva.

Bibliography: Vambéry, Das Türkenvolk in seinen ethnologischen und ethnographischen Beziehungen, Leipzig 1885, p. 349 sqq. (among the Ouzbeks), 546, 554 and 557 (among the Nogai); Radioff, Ais Steritien 1. Leipzig 1893, i. 227; Aristow, Zametki ob etnografii sovremennyh turkiskih plemen, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 149 sqq.; Materiali po rayonirovaniyu Srednich Asia. Territorii i naseleniy Bukhara i Khorezm, Tashkent 1926. Caft I, Bukhara, p. 185 sqq.; Cafi II, Khorezm, p. 98. (W. Barthold)

Mangu. [See Mongke.]

Mangu-Timur, so on his coins, Mongol Mongke-Timur, as in the article Berke [q.v.], written Mongkë (e.g. Rashid al-Din, ed. Blochet, p. 109), in the Russian annals Mengtum and Mengtumer, Khan of the Golden Horde (1266—1280), grandson of the Khan Batu [q.v.], son of Tülekan. According to Egyptian sources, the death of his predecessor Berke took place in 665 (Oct. 1266—Sept. 1267); in Safar 666 (Oct.—Nov. 1267) an embassy left Cairo which was to bring the new Khan an expression of sympathy and congratulations from Sultan Baibars I [q.v.]. In 667 (Sept. 1268—Aug. 1269) an embassy from the Khan arrived in Egypt. The exchange of embassies was maintained throughout the whole of the Khan's reign. When in 670 (1271—72) an embassy on the way to Egypt was captured by a Frankish ship from Marseilles, the ambassadors and all their goods had to be released on the Sultan's demand. When in 680 (April 1281—1282) an Egyptian embassy left for the Golden Horde nothing was yet known of the death of the Khan. Only later did they learn that he was no more, having died in Kafih I 679 in the district of Aśyik (apparently nowhere else mentioned);
his death is said to have been caused by the unkinil removal of a boil on the neck. In Rashid al-Din (ed. Blochet, p. 124) the date of Mangû-Timur's death is given as 681 (Apr. 1282–March 1283); there are coins of his brother and succes-
sor Tâdâ-Mangû struck in this year.

The Egyptian government tried to induce the khan to resume the war on the Persian Mongols begun by his predecessor Berke; but soon after his accession Mangû-Timur concluded peace with Ahiâk and never again attacked Persia. Rashid al-Din by an oversight attributes to Mangû-Timur the campaign against Arghûn of the year 689 = 1290 (in Blochet's edition in p. 40, we have 890 instead for 880; d'Osslon (Hist. des Mongols 1, 42) and Barthold (article Ahiâk) have been misled by this.

On Mangû-Timur's participation in events in Central Asia down to the Kûralûtâ of 697 (1269) (sending an army of 50,000 men under Berkedjâr, a brother of Bâtû and Berke) see the article Kûralûtâ. Accounts of this are found in the still unprinted parts of the Çîmîr al-Tâwarîkh of Rashid al-Din (reign of Arghûn, cf. d'Osslon, op. cit., iii. 428). The alliance between Mangû-Timur and Kâîî, whom he was then supporting, is also mentioned later; when in 1277 two sons of the emperor Kûribâlî Kâîî were taken prisoners in the war with Kâîî, the latter had the princes sent to the court of Mangû-Timur, from which they were later sent back to their father (Rashid al-Din, ed. Blochet, p. 8; d'Osslon, op. cit., iii. 452 sq.).

Russian rulers appealed to Mangû-Timur for support as they had done to his predecessors and successors. Lev of Galicz received assistance from him against the Lithuanians but the Tatar auxiliaries proved a great burden not only to his enemies but also to their protegé. In 1277, a Russian army was fighting in the Caucasus against the Alans under the Khan's orders. From Mangû-Timur dates the earliest extant edict of a Khan of the Golden Horde on the privileges of the Greek orthodox church. This edict is dated in the year of the Horde (probably 1269). The Bishop of Sarai, Theoktistos, was sent by Mangû-Timur as an ambassador to Constantinople. In contrast to the last two decades of the thirteenth century the Golden Horde under Mangû-Timur was a much more powerful state, free from internal troubles. Coins were still struck only in the old commercial city of Bulghâr [q. v.] but, unlike those of his predecessors, in his own name not in that of the Great Khan. On his coins, the seal of the Golden Horde appears for the first time.

Bibliography: (so far as not already given): Howorth, History of the Mongols, ii. 125 sqq.; Hammer-Fugstall, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde, Pesth 1840, p. 248 sqq. — The Egyptian references in W. Tiesenhausen, Slawen materialen, etna arshikyâna k iistorii Zebaloi Ord, part i., St-Petersburg 1884. (W. Barthold)

MANI (See ZINDIK.)

MANI is the name given in Ottoman Turkish to popular songs in quatrains. The name is a corruption of the Arabic word 만녀, meaning "thought, idea", and is by no means found throughout the whole area where Ottoman Turkish is spoken. In many districts isolated quatrains, like songs of several verses, are simply called tanım. Songs in quatrains are known among almost all Turkish peoples: they must therefore be considered to have been known to the original Turkish stock.

The rhythm of the mani is, as in Turkish popular poetry generally, sometimes purely syllabic (a definite number of syllables without a fixed caesura), and sometimes depends on the accented syllables (with a fixed caesura and therefore with the order of weak and strong syllables to some degree fixed). The lines show as a rule 7 syllables (4–3, 3–4, rarely 2–3–2). Quatrains with all four lines alike are rare, the third line usually differs from the others (3–4, 3–4, 4–3, 3–4, or 4–3, 4–3, 3–4 and so on). The original arrangement of the rhyme in Turkish quatrains is αβαβ (two lines rhyming) which clearly shows the quatrain was originally a distich. In the Ottoman mani we have a development of this form also, with three rhyming lines (αααβ). The rhyme however which connects the second and fourth lines is often fuller and more distinct than that which connects the first and second lines. Alliteration, which is highly developed among many Turks, especially in the north, is only found sporadically in the mani; it is found both as line alliteration (similarity in the initial letters of the words of a line, e.g. kara koyun kesenemeli, belime benzeme baks, etc.) and as verse alliteration (similarity of the initial letters of the lines in a verse, e.g. râz gulaq perinde, senin sevec nişaste, senin vedek yorunye, moni gâjîl worsendi).

As regards matter, the majority of the mani fall into two distinct parts, an introduction dealing with nature, and a concluding part of a personal character. Originally the two-part must have been very closely connected. It would however be a mistake to find such a connection in all the manis, because the singers very often only improvise new conclusions ready made introductions taken from older poems, without troubling in the least about the train of thought. The great majority of mani are tinged with eroticism, but we also find satirical ones, also soldiers' and robbers' songs in the form of quatrains. The quatrains composed on the Anatolian brigand Çakîdyly have been much admired by European scholars. Isolated, originally independent mani are now often strung together to form ballads of some length. It would therefore be wrong to regard mani and mânî as two fundamentally different classes of songs.

The number of mani current among the people is enormous. They are sung at all kinds of festivals and ceremonies, and by people over their work in the house in the long winter nights. On Hadicles, St. George's Day (April 23), they are used as oracles by young girls.

Very popular also among the Ottoman Turks are the so-called ëmînsî manî: punman manî. These are quatrains, the rhyme of which are identical syllables but have each a different meaning.

Bibliography: I. Kunos in the introduction of Ottoman Turkish popular songs, especially in the second volume of the Ozmen-torçu nifeti-tişt jynyn, Budapest 1859 and in the third vol. of the Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme, ed. v. Raiföll, St. Petersburg 1899, G. Jacob, Türkische Volksliteratur, Berlin 1901, p. 23 sq.; T. Kowalski, Że studiów nad formu lêp ci ludzie turczych, Krakow 1922, p. 65 sq., 72 sq. — Collections of mani's are also found in the following works: Kunos, Türkische Volkslieder, W. Z. K. M., iv. (1890),
Christomathia Taurica, Budapest 1899; E. Littmann, Tschakdykhis, ein Rührerhauptmann der Gegenwart, Berlin 1915; T. Towalski, Piosenki ludowe analfabetyczne o rozbójniku Czakdydog, Rozmówki Oryginalistyki, i. 337—355; W. Heffinger, Türkische Volkslieder, in H., xii. 236—267; W. Girdlewsky, Olehcz osmanskiego nastragano towietrzes, Moscow 1916; M. Kasanen, Eine Sammlung von Man-Liedern aus Anatolien, Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrande, xii. (1926) (a collection of 309 mani mainly from N.E.-Anatolia); Säul el-Din Nazhet and Mehmed Ferid, Konul, Illyatı'yı Khalid: Böyüş, Harbiyye, Konya 1926, p. 155—177 (a collection of 375 mani from the Villayet of Konya); Anatolica Türklerin Halkı Edebiyati, i Mantor (collection of texts with a very full introduction by Kopulul-Zade Mehmed Fuad is to be shortly published by the Turkological Institute in Constantinople); cf. also the Bii. to the article TURKU . (T Kowalski).

AL-MANTI, one of Allah's names. [See also AL-AHMAD.]

MANISA, MACHNHA (מאניזה), in Arabic Maghniya, capital of the district of Sarukhan in western Anatolia.

Maghniya is two hours' journey distant on the south from the river Gediz or Gedas (the ancient Hermon); on its course, cf. Tschakdykhis, Asie Minor., ii. (1866), p. 232) on the northern slope of Mount Maghniya-dagh or Vamvlar (the ancient Sipylus) which separates it from Smyrna (the distance between the two towns by the Sabuncü-bell pass is only 20 miles; by railway 40 miles).

In ancient times the town ("Magnesia ad Sipylum") was mainly noted for the victory won in its vicinity by the two Scipios over Antiochus the Great of Syria (190 B.C.). The town was then incorporated in the Roman empire. It flourished until the fifth century as its coins show. Magnesia is also often mentioned in Byzantine history; after the taking of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204 John Ducas returnd to Magnesia where he held out till 1225.

The Turkoman chief Saru-Khan [q. v.] who had formed a principality for himself on the ruins of the Saljuk kingdom of Konya, took Magnesia in 1313 and the town was the capital of his dynasty for 78 years. It was in the reign of Saru-Khan that Il'n Bat'a (ii. 312) visited the town where he stayed in a zajübo of the brotherhood of the Şeytan. The town was large and beautiful, rich in gardens and with a plentiful supply of water. On the buildings erected by the Saru-Khan dynasty see the article on them.

After the battle of Angora (805 A.H.) Timur ordered his grandson Sultan Muhammad to lay waste (sizlan) the district between Brussa and Magnesia and to take up his winter quarters in the latter town. The author of the Gafur-numa, ii. 466—497, 498, calls it "Maghniya in the Saruhan-eli" [cf. Tschakdykhis, p. 322; Saru-khan] and comments on the excellence and abundance of its water-supply and the pleasantness of its climate. According to Turkoman sources (cf. Urduni, Taouihch'i i, ii. "Othman", ed. Babangir, p. 34—35; Aşık-pasha, p. 70; Munedji-dajm-bahi, i, 33); Timur restored the fiefs of Anatolia to their old holders (hecli-beki) but by 513 (1410) Sultan Muhammad I had retaken the region of Saru-Khan [q. v.].

Maghniya became the residence (Djihân-numa, p. 635 dâr al-abâman) of the Ottoman princes but for a time (1405—1425) its district was within the sphere of influence of the rebel Djineid (son of the Ottoman governor of al-Aydin; von Hammer, op. cit., p. 271—327). Murâd II having abdicated the throne in 1444 chose Magnesia as his place of retirement. The Hungarian offensive drew him out of it but after the victory of Warna (Nov. 10, 1444) he returned to Magnesia (v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 351, 357) where the remains of his palace and gardens can still be seen. Murad III (1574—1595) and his wife also contributed to beautifying the town; cf. Dijhân-numa, p. 653. Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor, p. 1775; p. 207—210. and 266—268 speaks of the palace and pretty magnificent remains of Murad (III?) and of his foundation (tekye—college of arwishes, lunatic asylums etc.).

In 1633 in the reign of Murad IV, the governors of Sarasli ([q. v.] Ilyas Pasha rebelled and laid siege to Magnesia which was taken and plundered for three days. Ilyas was taken prisoner and the Sultan in ordering him to be beheaded reproached him with having devastated "the residence of his ancestors" (i.e., iii. 113—114).

In the xvmth century Magnesia became the capital of the powerful family of the Kara Othman-Oglu who extended his authority over the Mæander to the Propontid. It was not till 1814 that these hereditary chiefs, whose administration is praised by Keppel, Narrative of a Journey across the Balkans, London 1831, ii. 294—301, were replaced by a regular Turkish governor.

With the introduction of the system of wilayets, Magnesia became the capital of the sandjak of Sarukhan in the vilayet of Aydin (Smyrna). Sarni-bey, hâmâs al-Alûm, Constantinople 1898, vi. 434 estimated the population of the town at 32,523 of whom 21,000 were Muslims, 10,400 Greeks, 200 Armenians etc. Magnesia which is divided up by streams into 3 quarters had 25 djamâ, 38 mosques, 25 medreses, 18 tekyes etc. The kaâd of Magnesia had 4 niâye: Amlük, Yont-daghî Palamut and Belek. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, i., 1894, p. 523—534 gives the following as the niâye of the sandjak: Maghniya, Soma, Kirk-Anâr, Aḵ-İhsâr, Kasaba, Gurdûs, Demirdjî, Şât-îli, Kule, Ala-šeher, Egmâ. After the reform of 1924 Saru-khan became a vilayet with 11 kaâds (the old niâyes). The population of the new vilayet is 302,752 souls and of the kaâd Magnesia, 75,021 souls; cf. the Türkiye Djihân-vetelînî Sarûkûnûsevi, 1926—1927, p. 926—933. In view of the movements of the population the ethnic composition of the sandjak must have undergone profound modifications.

(V. Menorky)

MANSHUR (a.) means literally "spread out" (as in the Kur'an xvii. 14 and lii. 31; opposite mašût "folded"), or not sealed (opposite mašlûm) hence means a c<rtificate, an edict, a diploma of appointment, and particularly a patent granting an appanage.

In Egypt in the early Arab period manshur seems to have been a name for the passes which the government compelled the fe'lsûlîn to have in order to check the flight of colonists from the land, which threatened to become overwhelming (Zulîya, c. above, ii., p. 148 and 998). In any case in the Furscher durch die Ausstellung (Zeugniss Ersterer Rainer), N. 631 (cf. also N. 601—602) such a certificate of the year 180 (796) is called a manshur and in Makrizi, Kiftat, ii. 493, we are told
of the period of the financial controller Usāma b. Ẓād al-Tanūkhī (104 = 722—723) that Christians who were found without identification papers (manṣūh) had to pay 10 dinars fine (cf. Becker, Beiträge zu Geschichte Ägyptens, p. 104). In the texts of such pos-ports themselves (cf. Becker, Papyr. Schett. Arch. 2, 109, i) however, we have, so far as I see, not the word manṣūh but only ʾkilāb.

Manṣūr seems also to have a quite general meaning of place when we read in Kalkashndi, ʿĀbd al-ʿĀdī, xiii. 142, that it was written on an ʿAbbasid grant of a fief dating from the year 573 (983—984) that no one could demand for the holder that he should show a ḥududja or a tavābī or a manṣūr.

The Egyptian Fātimids usually called all state documents, appointments, etc. by the general term ʿaǧūlī, but they had also special terms for particular diplomas of appointment, including manṣūr. Thus among the examples of Fātimid documents given by Kalkashndi, x. 452—466 there are several which in their texts are described as manṣūhūn. Among these are for example, appointments to the supervisory and tax-collecting offices (musharafat al-mašrufat al-qarāwī), to the postmasters (katibat al-khaṣrāy), to a professorship (ʾadrīr) etc. A grant of an appanage could also be called manṣūr at this time, so Kalkashndi, xiii. 131 sq. from the lost Fātimid Mawwād al-Bayān of ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-ʿĀdī and the regulation that the manṣūhūn must not have an address (ʿirrāsān) and that in place of this the head of the Dīwān must write the date with his own hand seems to be first found in Ibn al-Sairāfī, Kāhin Dinwān al-Rašīdlī, p. 113 sq. = Kalkashndi, vi. 198.

Under the ʿAbīyūdīs also, manṣūr had quite a general meaning. Thus in Kalkashndi, xiv. 49 sq. a "noble marshall" (naqib al-ʿaṣrāfī) is appointed by a manṣūrūn and in 51 sq. governors (wustālī) of different provinces. In the text of it the name manṣūrūn is given to the edict on the equation of taxation and lunar years (tawāl al-ṣānīn) which is quoted from the Mutābdīddīr of the Kādī al-Faḍlī for the year 507 (1117—1117) in Makrizi, i. 251, ed. Wiet, iv. 292 (cf. also Kalkashndi, xiii. 71 sqq.), and according to a further quotation, for the year 584 (Makrizi, i. 269 = Wiet, iv. 248) the so-called "lord of the new year" (ʿamir al-nawrūz) issued his manṣūrūn.

The term manṣūrūn became limited and specialised in the Mamlūk period, for which we have very full sources. The increasingly complicated system of the administration brought about a minute distinction between and special names for the various diplomas of appointment, edicts, etc. and the term manṣūrūn was henceforth used exclusively of the grants of appanages. These manṣūrūn were always written in Cairo in the chancellory (dīwān al-ʿināh) in the name of the sultan, only in exceptional cases they might be in the name of the nāṣir kāfīr (see Kalkashndi, iv. 16; xiii. 157).

According to the very full description in Kalkashndi, xiii. 153 sqq. and Makrizi, ii. 211, the procedure in granting a fief was as follows: if a fief became vacant (maḥtūl) in a provincial town, e.g. in Damasc, the governor there (maḥdī) proposed a new holder and had a document (sūqqa, also called ʿaṣrī or murābbāh) drawn up about his proposal by the inspector of the army (nāṣir al-ʿaṣrī; cf. Kalkashndi, iv. 190; xiii. 97) in the military Dīwān (dīwān al-ʿaṣrī) of his town. This document was then sent by courier (būrid) or pigeon post (talāʿa ṣafīṣat al-ḥamṣîn) to Cairo to the government (al-ʿabnūh al-ṣārīfīa). Here it was received by the postmaster (lāwārī), later by the private secretary (kādī al-mūjir = ʿāshāh dīwān al-ʿināh), who placed it before the sultan in audience (dīnūs fi dār al-ʾaḍ), for approval, to receive the sultans, signature (ḥaṣṣ ʿaṣrī) and the note yuṭāla ("let it be written out"); see Kalkashndi, iv. 51. The document then went to the Military Dīwān in Cairo (dīwān al-ʿaṣrī) occasionally also called dīwān al-īlāhī, where it was filed, after what was called the murābbāh’s had been made. After the latter was sent to the dīwān al-ʿaṣrī and the private secretary, the head of this Dīwān, wrote his requisition (taʿān) for the ʿaṣrī connection and now finally the patent of the appanage (manṣūrūn) proper could be made out in the dīwān al-ʿināh in Cairo, while the murābbāh’s of the army Dīwān remained filled in the dīwān al-ʿaṣrī as ʿaṣrī (proof) (cf. Kalkashndi, vi. 201).

Full particulars are given of the formulæ used in these manṣūrūn and of their outward form in Makrizi, i. 200 sqq. and Fourmestre, Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de l’Egypte, i. 200 sq., note 82. There are many variants of format (鹘, q.v.) and script according to the military rank of the recipient. Thus manṣūrūn for the Makhdummīn ʿl-ʿaṣrī were written on ʾl-ʿaṣrī, the ʿināhīn, for the Umbūrī al-Tublīshanī on ʾl-ʿaṣrī, for the ʿUmarī al-ʿAṣhārāt on ʾl-ʿaṣrī and the ʿAmīrī al-ṣultānīya and Mahdaddīmīn ʿl-ʿaṣrīs and the sultānīya. Many rules were laid down for the wording to be used, the text is to be shorter and less florid than in the other appointments and there are none of the usual rules about service (mawṣaʾī). An original "virgin" (muṭṭakarat al-ʿināh) is recommended as the finest form of a manṣūrūn. Special formulæ are further required for grants of appanages which were concerned in renewal (tawālīd), addition (tawālīd) or substitution (tawālīd). A regular signatory of the sultan, such as is usual on appointments as confirmation (mustānad), is not found on the manṣūrūn; instead of this the sultan writes formulæ like: God is my hope (Allāhu mawāli), God is my Protector (Allāhu waṣir), God is sufficient for me (Allāhu sālih). To God belongs the rule (al-Malahi lī ʿašrī), or: God alone has grace (al-Mūmūna li ʿašrī waṣirah).

Occasionally the manṣūrūn for the highest ranks (Mukhdummīn ʿl-ʿaṣrīs and Mahdaddīmīn ʿl-ʿaṣrīyān) had a ṣāfī ṣūqqa [q.v.] at the top. The ʿaṣrīs were prepared by a special official beforehand and ginned on to the finished diplomas. In Kalkashndi, viii. 165 sqq. the ʿaṣrīs of Nāṣir Muṣḥammad b. ʿAṣkān (693—741 with interruptions) and Asḥaf Shābān b. Husain (764—776) are reproduced and described; they differ considerably from the better known form of the ʿaṣrīs of the Ottoman Sultanīs. After Asḥaf Shābān the ʿaṣrīs were no longer used on the manṣūrūn; these were only used for purposes of display on letters to infidel rulers.

The completed manṣūrūn was then again taken back by a courier from Cairo to the town concerned, e.g. Damasc and handed over to the tenant of the appanage. The inspector of the army there (nāṣir al-ʿaṣrī) however first entered it in his register for he had to keep a roll of the holders of fiefs in his province. Kalkashndi, xiii. 167—199 gives as examples of manṣūrūn no fewer
than 26 texts, beginning with one drawn up by
Muḥyi 'l-Dīn b. ʿAbbād Al-Ẓāhirī in the reign of
Kalāūn for the latter's son Nāṣir Muḥammad,
which for its remarkable beauty he calls a regular
ṣūṣūn al-manāsīr. The other texts are for the
above mentioned military ranks, as well as for
sons of emirs (waqīd al-manāsīr) and for emirs
of the Abbasid, Turkmans and Kirds.

The term manāsīr was also used for patents of
appointment in the Ottoman empire, but it
does not seem to have been used so definitely or
exclusively in this sense; there are however man-
āsīr for visiers, generals, and governors (waqīd
montūr, waqīd mushīr, caṣṣīl muntūr, and
in the treaties of peace made after the Balkan
War in 1913, it is still provided that the chief
munīs to be appointed in Bulgaria and Greece
are to receive their munīs from the Shāhīl al-
Islam in Stambul and they also have to put
forward for approval the manāsīr of the ordinary
munīs subordinate to them (cf. e.g. Karl Strupp,
Altpostmalexakte zur orient-
lichen Frage, Gotha 1916, p. 295, 308).

The name manāsīr was also applied to the
pastoral letters and epistles of the Christian
patricarchs and bishops. In conclusion it may be
mentioned that manāsīr in mathematical language
means "prism" (varieties e.g. M. mādīb oblique
prism, M. kām straight prism, M. mulāwātī
diagonal prism, M. muntāzam regular prism, M. mulāwātī trapezoidal prism, M. mādī truncated
prism), and that in the language of the Persian
poets the nightingales are called "the menshūr-
writers of the garden" (menṣūrūn nasī′āt-i kāshī
diagram). In addition to the passages quoted
of Ibn Šāhīl, Manṣūr al-Kūshī, p. 431;
100, 102; Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à
l'époque des Mamelouks, Index; W. Björkman,
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskünste im
islamischen Ägypten, Index 1.

(W. Björkman)

MANSŪR. [See NĀṢĪR.

AL-MANSŪR, ʿAbbād Dīvār ʿAbbālāh, Muḥammad, the second ʿAbbāsīd caliph. His
mother was a Berber slave girl called Saffāna, his
brother the caliph Abū ʿAbbād al-Saffāh (q. v.). In
the fighting against the Omayyads he distinguished
himself and took part in the siege of Wāṣ, which
had been fortified by Ibn Abīhūra (q. v.), the last
important supporter of Masāwī. The treacherous
murder of Ibn Abīhūra, to whom the two ʿAbbāsīds
had expressly promised a pardon, is however not
out of keeping with Abū Dīvār's character. His
brother gave him the governorship of Armenia,
Aḏharbāḏjan and Mesopotamia, which he ad-
mistened till his accession. On the way back from
the pilgrimage, he learned that Abū ʿAbbās had
been put to death in Dhu ʿl-Hijjah 136 (June 754)
and that he himself had been proclaimed caliph. His
uncle ʿAbbād ʿAlī (q. v.) wished to dispute the
Aḏharbāḏjan and Media was defeated by Abū Muṣīm
(q. v.). Soon afterwards the Caliph had the latter
put out of the way, which led to a rising in
Khurāsān. The leader of this was a Persian named
Sunbāh; he advanced far into Media but was
defeated between Aḏharbāḏjan and Kāyβ by the
caliph's troops led by Dīwār b. Mārārī and soon
afterwards slain. When Dīwār also cast off his
allegiance to the caliph, the latter sent an army
under Muḥammad b. Aḏhāṭī against him (138 =
755—756). Dīwār was defeated and fled to
Abūlabbās, where he was put to death. About
the same time the Khārājīs rebelled in Mesopotamia
under Muḥammad b. Ḥarmān al-Ṭabībīn who in-
flicted severe reverses on al-Mansūr's armies, until
the rebellion was finally suppressed by Khānīm
al-Kūshī b. Dīwār in 138 and Muḥammad ibn
Ḥāshimiya also there was a rising (probably in
141 = 756—759). A body of the so-called Rāwandi
(q. v.) who identified the caliph with God himself,
went to the capital and when al-Mansūr had some
of them arrested, they were forcibly rescued by
their friends. But for the valiant Mān b. Zālīa
(q. v.) it would hardly have been possible for the
caliph to dispose of these mad fanatics. A few
years later, the Alīids also rebelled under their
leader Abū ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Ḥasan (q. v.). In the autumn
of 145 (762), a rebellion broke out in al-Medina,
and Muḥammad son of Abū ʿAlī was proclaimed
caliph there, but in Kārāf in the same year
(Dec. 762) defeated by the caliph's nephew ʿAbd
Maḥmūd. The latter attacked Muhammad's brother Ḥār-
him, who had risen in Bārša and severely defeated
him at Bākḥamūr (q. v.) where the latter was slain
(Dhu l-Kaʿdā 145 = Feb. 763). In Spain the Omayyād
Abū al-Raḥmān b. Muʿāwiyā had founded an
independent kingdom in 138 (756) and in
Africa there was fighting for several years with
the Berbers and Khārājīs. It was only after the
Abādī Abū Ḥāṭīm (q. v.) had been defeated by the
Caliph's troops under Ṭāhir b. Ḥāṭīm in Rābū I, 155 (March 772) and killed that order
was restored there. Yazīd remained in Kairawān
as governor till his death in 170 (780—781).
In Khurāsān a new rebellion broke out in 149 (766—
767) or 150. The leader Ummūdīshīs declared himself
a prophet and gathered numerous followers around
him but was defeated by Khāzīm b. Kūshāma,
who wrought a fearful massacre among the rebels.

The frontiers also resounded with the noise of
battle. The war against the Byzantines was con-
tinued under al-Ḥāshimiya, but was confined mainly
to raids or the destruction of individual strongholds.
Al-Mansūr devoted special attention to protecting
the frontier by building fortresses, and the two
towns of Mālātīya (Melitene) and al-Maṣṣāra
(Mopsuestia) were rebuilt in his reign. Several
expeditions were sent against Dālam and Ṭabarīnān
in the early years of al-Mansūr's reign and after
the extinction of the old line of Ṣaḥābiids of the
Banū Dālimān (q. v.) in Ṭabarīnān, this province
took received Arab governors. In 147 (766—759) the
Khazars invaded Armenia, seized the town of Ṭīfīs
and defeated the caliph's troops but retired again.
There were also encounters with the people beyond
the Ouxus and in India; but these were of minor
importance. At first al-Mansūr lived at al-
Ḥāshimiya near Kūfā, as did his predecessor; he later decided to
build a new capital and in 145 (762) the foundation
stone of Bāghdād (q. v.) was laid. Khālid b. Barmāk
is said to have been his adviser in this matter;
he played an important part in other respects in
al-Mansūr's reign [cf. Barmače]. Al-Mansūr
devoted himself with the greatest energy to
his duties as a ruler but troubled little about the
means he used and never hesitated to act in
the most faithless manner if he could only attain
his aim. He was always kept very well informed of
everything that went on in the different parts of
his wide empire, and devoted special attention to
the improvement of the finances of the State in
order to leave his successor a full treasury. He took an active interest in literature and was a brilliant speaker; on the other hand he did not tolerate music and song at his court and in general led a very simple life. His nephew Isā b. Mūsā [q.v.] had been destined by al-Saffāh to succeed al-Manṣūr but was induced by the latter to withdraw his claims on condition that he should succeed after al-Mahdī [q.v.]. Al-Manṣūr died in 
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AL-MANṢŪR B. ILMĀH AL-KĀSIM, the name of two Zādī imāms of the Yemen. I. AL-KĀSIM B. 'AlI AL-AIYNI (? according to others al-Ilāyī). His genealogy goes back through a certain 'Abd Allāh and a Muḥammad ad al-Kāsim b. Idrīsh Ṭāḥabā (d. 246 = 860), the spiritual founder of Zādism in the Yemen; he is however not a descendant of the latter's grandson, al-Ḥādi Yaḥyā b. al-Husayn, the creator of the secular power of the Zādīs in the Yemen. The latter was succeeded in the imamate by his two sons: the weak Muḥammad ad al-Muṭtadī and the more capable Aḥmad ad-Nāṣir. With his death in the year 322 (934) the imāmate came to an end for a time. Although in 345 (956) al-Kāsim al-Mukhtar, a son of al-Nāṣir, seized the capital Ṣanʿā', he was soon defeated by al-Dāḥkish, the chief of the tribe of Ḥamādan, who put Ṣanʿā' under the suzerainty of the Ziyādīs of Ṣabīṭ; the hostile tribe of Bahrānīn however played it (352 = 965) into the hands of the Yafūrid ʿAbd Allāh b. Kaḥīf. In the midst of this civil strife, a nephew of the defeated Muhkhtar, Yūsuf b. Yaḥyā b. al-Nāṣir succeeded for a short time in gaining power and being recognised by the Zādīs at least as a dāʾī. Driven out by the Yafūrids, his power became limited to the old Zādī stronghold of Ṣaḍa in the north. Al-Kāsim b. 'Alī, with the support of the Bannī Ḥamādan, rose against him, claiming the imamate with the title al-Kāsim b. Manṣūr b. Ibhī in 380 (992); he occupied Ṣaḍa', forced his way through the Wādī Shūwābā and al-Bawān southwards to the highlands in the N.W. of Ṣaḥāra and from there forced the capital to recognise him. His career however was brief and his power unenduring: for when in 393 (1003) he died, his governor in Ṣaḥāra had already gone over to Yūsuf al-Dāʾī. He was however the first since al-Nāṣir Aḥmad, and the fourth in all to be entered — although not by everyone — in the lists of Imām of Yemen (but cf. on the above claimants: Manalihjumahzā, in Sahā, Ein Viertausend year-though for a period founded a special sect, the "Isa'ainyya" in the name of this concealed imām. Some years later another son of al-Kāsim, Ibhī fa't, began a struggle full of vicissitudes with the other ʿArid claimants to the imamate, which was complicated by a party grouping of the tribes of the country: about 453 (1061) Ṣanʿā' fell to the Ismāʿīlīs of Surah and then to Ḥudnīms. Only in 545 (1150) Aḥmad b. Sulaimān al-Muṭāwakkil, whose genealogy also goes back to al-Nāṣir Aḥmad b. al-Hādi but neither through al-Kāsim al-Mukhtar nor Yūsuf al-Dāʾī, succeeded in restoring the imamate for a long and brilliant period. For the history of the following centuries, which were full of incidents and individual imāmas of importance cf. the article AL-MĀḤDI DAWEĐ 1 a and b. The family of Yūsuf al-Dāʾī remained victorious in the end. His descendant in the twelfth (14th) generation: II. AL-MANṢŪR AL-KĀSIM B. MUḤAMMAD (cf. supra, p. 1192), was the founder of the modern Yemeni dynasty. At the end of 1005 (1597) he appeared in the field and held his own against five Turkish governors. Not only did he find opponents and people he could not trust among his own Zādīs, who went over to the Turks but among the latter the change of governor frequently led to war and even to mutiny; the tribes were an inexactable element; the Turks were often able to call to their help the Ismāʿīls (Karrāṇān), always hostile to the Zādīs. The lack of equipment was a great hardship to the imām; for example in one battle he is said to have mustered only 20 riders against the Turks' 2,400. It is very difficult to get a clear idea of this minor war but the following are the main facts that emerge: After the proclamation of the holy war at Čečen al-Šāīk in the northern district of Shām al-Shār at the end of Muhammad 1006 (Sep. 1597), al-Kāsim conquered the highlands of Ḥamādan and Ḥudnīm, the latter with the fortress of the same name, which had been a bulwark of the Zādīs for 300 years with occasional interruptions; turning to the southeast he established himself in the mountains of Ḥāṣūr al-Šākhī (also called Ḥāṣūr Banū Ād); cf. the article Ḥāṣūr) in the important Thall (see THALL) in the N.W. of Ṣanʿā'; his followers rose throughout the land and for some time even cut off the Turkish communications with the sea. But after two years, the collapse began before General Šīnān: by the end of 1010 or beginning of 1011 (1602) he had to flee from Ḥudnīm. But in 1014 (1605) again he rebelled against Šīnān in the district of Ḥudnīm who had been appointed governor this time from Čečen; he also took Ṣaḍa'. Al-Manṣūr al-Paša was recalled, al-Kāsim was able to induce his successor Ḥāda Paša to make a truce, which
was observed for about ten years with a few
interusions especially on the arrival of new
rulers in 1022 and 1025. After renewed fight-
ing a formal peace in 1028 the imam in pos-
session of the four separate areas: around Shahār, around Khaṣbah in the east, around Ša'da in the
north, and lastly in the S.W. of San's around
Ḥaima [q.v.], the inhabitants were however for the
most part not Zaidīs but Shī'īs. Al-Kāsim died in Rās'il in 1029 (Feb. 1629). In the middle of 1038 (beg. of 1629) Ḥaidar Ṣagha to evacuate San's before his son and successor al-
Mu'aiyād Muhammad.

Al-Kāsim b. Muḥammad was a conscientious
Zaidī; as a youth when a fugitive before the Turks
he had studied with many spiritual authorities; he
composed numerous appeals for the rebellions;
work of a legal and dogmatic nature by him
still exist.

den, Abh. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, xxi., 1884,
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(K. STROTHMANN)

AL-MANSÜR, the sixth ruler of the
Hammadid dynasty, succeeded his father al-
Nāṣir in the year 481 (1088). The latter had
witnessed the rise to the height of its power of
the dynasty of somewhat artificial development
of Khal Ban Hammad [q.v.], a result of the
destruction of Kairawān by the Arabs. Two years
after the accession of al-Mansūr, the Arabs, who
had advanced towards the west and who had
spread over all the region adjoining the Kal'a,
braved to make existence there difficult. The prince
moved his capital from Kal'a to Bougie which he
considered less accessible to the nomads; it should
be mentioned that his father al-Nāṣir had already
made preparations for the exodus by transforming
a little fishing port into a regular town, which
he called al-Nāṣirya and which was to become
Bougie. While on the other hand, the Kal'a was
not completely abandoned by al-Mansūr and he
ever embellished it with a number of palaces. The
Hammadid kingdom had therefore at this time two
capitals joined by a royal road.

After taking up his quarters at Bougie, al-Mansūr
had in the first place to quell the revolt of one
of his uncles, Belhar, the governor of Constantine.
He sent against the rebel another Hammadid Emir,
Abā Yakin. The latter after his victory was given
the governorship of Constantine but shortly after
he in his turn as well as his brother, who had been
given the governorship of Béni, rebelled. These
risings over which al-Mansūr, thanks to his energy,
was triumphant, brought to the side of the rebel-
one of the Hammadid family the Zirids of al-Mahdiya,
who wished to get back some power in Barbary,
the Almoravids of the Magrib, who wished to
extend towards the East and the Arabs who were
always ready to join in the feuds of their powerful
neighbours.

Al-Mansūr was, on the other hand, led to oppose
the advance of the Almoravids who were curiously
allied with the traditional opposition of the Zenātī
[q.v.]. With the probable object of disarming the
opposition al-Nāṣir and al-Mansūr had married
two sisters of Māhkūkh, the chief of the Bani
Wānānī, at that time the most powerful of the
Zenātī group. This alliance did not hinder the
time-honoured feud from breaking out again. It
became more acute when al-Mansūr murdered his
wife, the sister of his enemy. The latter then
asked for support from the Almoravids.

From Tlemcen, where they had been installed
for more than twenty years, the Almoravids had
after many attempts, endeavoured to expand towards
the East at the expense of their brethren of the
same race, the Sanhāja b. Hammad. Al-Mansūr
had twice reduced them to impotence. It was at
this time that the murder of the sister of Māhkūkh
by al-Mansūr drove the Wānānī chief into an
alliance with the Almoravids of Tlemcen. The
alliance formed in this way was a great blow to the
Hammadid kingdom. Algiers was besieged for
two days; ʿAsīr was taken.

The fall of the latter fortress, the oldest stronghold
of the family, was bitterly resented by al-Mansūr.
He got together an army of 20,000 men, com-
posed of the Sanhāja, the Arabs and even the
Zenātī; he marched against Tlemcen, met the
 governor Tāshīn b. Tīnammer to the North-East
of the town and put him to flight. Tlemcen was
not spared even at the suppression of Tāshīn's
wife, who invoked the ties of relationship uniting
them with the Sanhāja (496 — 1102).

After the defeat of the Almoravids, al-Mansūr
severely punished the Zenātī and the rebel tribes
of the Bougie district, whom he forced to flee
into the mountains of Kabylia.

Thus al-Mansūr seems on the eve of his death
(498 — 1104) to have thoroughly re-established
the power of the Hammadids. According to a
tradition, which is not above suspicion, recorded
by Ibn Khaldūn, the two capitals owed very
important buildings to him: Bougie, the Palace
of the Star and the Palace of Salvation; the Kal'a,
the government palace and the Ka'ver al-Mansūr
the beautiful donation of which is still in part extant.
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(GEORGES MARÇAIS)

AL-MANSÜR, Ahmad b. Muḥammad, born in
1449, seventh ruler of the Saʿdiān dynasty
of Morocco, son of Sultan Muḥammad al-Mahdi
and Shaḥīb al-Raḥmānīya. His victories and his
wealth earned him the epithets al-Mansūr and
al-Dhabahī.
he was still a child when on the accession of his eldest brother 'Abd Allâh (1557) he accompanied into exile his other brothers 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd al-Mu'min, who went for safety from Sûdûmân to Tlemcen. The fugitives were potential claimants to the throne of the Sharîfians, by virtue of an agreement concluded in the life-time of their father by which the one to inherit the power was not the Sultan's heir but the eldest of the family. 'Abd al-Mu'min was assassinated at the instigation of his nephew Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allâh called al-Mutawakkîl and Aḥmad retired to Algiers to join 'Abd al-Malik who was already there. He was henceforth always a loyal lieutenant of his brother whose ability he fully realised. The death of 'Abd Allâh in 1574 gave the exiles the opportunity to assert their rights. Pretenders and rebels could always rely on the support of the natural enemies of every reigning sharîf: Spain and Turkey. Philip II had remained deaf to the repeated appeals of 'Abd al-Malik, who appealed to the Grand Turk and in 1574 went to Constantinople where his marriage with the daughter of the renegade al-Fâji'il Moratto assured him of patrons. In Algiers Aḥmad concluded successful negotiations with certain Moroccan notables, mainly in Fès. It was perhaps he who gave the signal when an expedition appeared to have some chances of success. He was at his brother's side when the latter entered Morocco in 1576 with a Turkish army led by Ramadân Phâsha and helped him to raise troops in the region of Tlemcen. We do not know exactly what part he played in the battles of al-Rûk and al-Sharrâr which gave Morocco to 'Abd al-Malik but we know that he was given the task of pursuing the dethroned sultan on his flight to Marrâkûsh.

One of 'Abd al-Malik's first acts was to recognise his brother as his heir. It seems, however, that he did not show the latter as much esteem as affection and he had left in Constantinople, with his wife, his son Isma'il. But he was bound by his policy. In these circumstances Aḥmad naturally had the vice-royalty of Fès.

He did not stay there long, for he was recalled to save Marrâkûsh from a return of al-Mutawakkîl. Taking command of one of the three armies charged with pursuing the vanquished sultan in al-Sâs and the Atlas, he does not seem to have found an opportunity for a decisive military success: he returned to his governorship while Muhammad had been driven to seek refuge behind the walls of Ceuta.

In June 1578, 'Abd al-Malik summoned him with all his forces to Kaṣr al-Kabîr (Alcazarquivir, q.v.) to stop the advance of the King of Portugal's army. The latter had foolishly sought to realise the dream of conquering Morocco cherished by John III. When Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allâh after vainly appealing for help to Philip II, turned to Sebastián, he at once received a favourable reply. A large army with about 20,000 effective fighters left Portugal in June, landed at Tânger, then went to Azîlila, which 'Abd al-Karîm b. Tûda had just relieved, and proceeded by land towards Larache. The Moroccan forces coming from Marrâkûsh and Fès met them at al-Kaṣr. Aḥmad found his brother seriously ill, poisoned by the kâids of his staff, it is said. The battle was fought a few miles from al-Kaṣr on Aug. 4. Sebastián's men, absurdly led, having exhausted all their provisions, fought with their backs to the river of the Wâdi 'I-Makkâzîn. The sharîf arranged his army in a crescent. In about 5 hours the Christians were annihilated by the Moorish cavalry. 'Abd al-Malik died in his litter during the battle, Sebastián was killed or committed suicide and al-Mutawakkîl was drowned. That evening, Aḥmad henceforth known as Aḥmad al-Mansûr was proclaimed emperor.

Elegant, cultivated, very learned in religious matters, mora a man of the counsel-chamber than of the camp, he was succeeding a popular and fearless ruler, of exceptional energy, who having acquired a taste for innovations in Turkey had begun to introduce them, perhaps too eagerly, into Morocco. Designated as his successor by 'Abd al-Malik, and benefiting by the great reputation left by his father, Aḥmad al-Mansûr was rapidly able to overcome the difficulties which awaited him, as they did every sovereign of Morocco on his accession: mutinies of the troops, demands from allied tribes and the Zâwiyas, and agitations among the Berbers. While in Spain it was feared that the Christian garrison would be attacked and swept away, al-Mansûr had to hurry to Fès to make himself recognised as ruler there, to put down unrest and behold a few notables. He edited the people by displaying the skin of Muḥammad al-Maṣûkîsh staffed with straw in the regions of al-Sâs and the Atlas, where the influence of the former sultan had survived for a brief space his tenure of the throne.

Aḥmad al-Mansûr very soon sought means of enriching himself. The booty taken in the field of al-Kaṣr, the work done by the prisoners reduced to slavery, the ransoms extorted from the gentlemen gave the sharîf and his people enormous sums. The Sultan kept the nobles for himself, so were soon brought to him and he set about bargaining about them. In a little time, less than a year, the ransoms had been arranged.

The haste displayed by foreign courts to congratulate the Moor on his triumph was remarkable. Ambassadors thronged to Marrâkûsh, those of Spain and Portugal bringing magnificent gifts. Aḥmad al-Mansûr had the sense to understand that these presents were the most he was likely to get from European action. For its neighbours, Morocco was a weak and troublesome state. The simplicity of its neighbours was its best protection.

Many reasons urged the Turks to obtain a footing there: the capricity of the beglerbegs of Algiers ambitious of extending their powers to the west; the naval basis of Mazaga of al-Maṣûr and of Larache; the formal promises that had been given by 'Abd al-Malik, when he was begging assistance, and there was always the trouble-some question of spiritual supremacy, as the Turkish Sultan did not admit that the Moorish sharîf had an authority in religious matters as great as his. To extirpate himself, al-Mansûr played the usual game, following the example of his brother, who had made advances to the kings of Spain, Portugal and France, to the Queen of England and to the Grand Duke of Tuscany; he turned without ceremony from the Grand Turk and threw himself into the arms of Philip II, overwhelming the Catholic King with demonstrations of friendship, of which the most significant was the return without ransom of the body of Sebastián; he was even promised Larache. The quarrel with Turkey was soon to come to a head. 'Ali, Beglerbeg of Algiers, exerted all his influence to get war declared. Aḥmad al-Mansûr
as a last resort had to send in 1581 an embassy laden with presents to Constantinople where the enemies of ‘Alī al-Mansūr were conducting an effective campaign against the Beglerbeg. The relations between the two Muslims resumed the appearance of cordiality which they usually had. In 1587, the death of ‘Alī al-Mansūr put an end to the régime of the Beglerbegs and the weakening of Turkish power in Algiers freed Morocco from a threat, which had long weighed heavily upon it. There were still periods of tension: when al-Mansūr ceased to send what he considered gracious gifts and what the Grand Turk received as tribute; when the conquest of the Sudan seemed to be about to threaten Ottoman interests, spiritual and material; and lastly in the period of friendship with Spain. But there was never again a real crisis; even in spite of the efforts of Hassan who had married ‘Abd al-Malik’s widow, the Turk did nothing really serious to sustain the claim of Ismail.

When al-Mansūr had peace on the Turkish side he showed Philip what negotiations meant: yielding money, breaking off nothing; playing enemies off one another. It was no longer a question of handing over Larache but of an exchange and the pourparlers dragged along for four years with a decreasing seriousness of purpose. The Duke of Meliana-Sidon, supported by Philip II, to deal with Moroccan affairs was played with by the Moor who was able to reap considerable advantage from his hesitation on several occasions. The Sharif seems to have summed up very skilfully the character of the Catholic king and the needs of his policy. Spain, faced with a crisis at home and abroad, could not think of risking anything important in Africa. It was his interest that Morocco should remain weak, that is to say Moroccans, and especially that it should not fall under the influence of the Turks or of the English. Corsairs sheltered in the Atlantic ports, on the route to India. The garrisons, weak and badly provisioned, were periodically blockaded sometimes threatened, by the natural movements of tribes around them rather than by deliberate hostilities on the part of the Sharif. The policy of the two Philip, one of distrust and fear, tried to limit the evil and to obtain by subtle means a neutrality as little malevolent as possible, by awaiting the favourable moment of the anarchy, which history showed to recur in Morocco with an inexorable regularity. The Spanish court did not attempt to make capital out of the pre-eminence in Spain of two pretenders, al-Nāṣir and al-Mansūr, the brother and the son of al-Mutawakkil which disturbed al-Mansūr; in 1589, Arzila was evacuated without a quid pro quo. The fear of seeing Moors and Moroccans draw closer to one another kept Spain from unfolding a liberal economic policy, the only one capable of affecting the Sharif in a sensitive part.

The latter by nature very cautious and far-seeing was not inclined to take risks. He had also to reckon with a public opinion, already irritated by the influence wielded by Jews and renegades: anti-foreign feeling definitely increased in the course of the reign; the fact that he had compromised himself with the Christians weakened the prestige of the sultan, while the wealth and power of the Marabouts and brotherhoods increased to a dangerous degree. The splendid-loving ruler of a covetous people, al-Mansūr did not think of concealing the sympathy he had for traders. With the Grand Duke, who freely received Moors in Tuscany and did all he could to develop commerce between the two countries, with Elizabeth, with the English, French and Dutch traders, relations were close. Sugar was exported from the South and Morocco also supplied corn in good years, gold from the Sudan, saltpetre, copper and hides. It imported principally cloth and for al-Mansūr himself, the materials for his buildings. From the Sharifian court there went undefinable envoys, at once ambassadors, spies, procurers of jewels and of women. But contraband especially interested the Sharif, contraband of war and the sale, advantageous for every one, of the cargoes and slaves brought in by the corsairs. The English were the most punctilious contrabandists and the trade with Morocco developed so well that in 1585 the Barby Company was founded with a monopoly and a regular constitution. But Ahmad al-Mansūr was not too fond of regular traders. The many Christians settled in Morocco must be considered to have been adventurers. Quasi-prisoners of the Sharif and his people, they were able to realise precarious fortunes, always liable to extortion. In 1585 bankruptcies were numerous in Morocco and the loyal company could not survive. The caprices of the sovereign drove off many other foreign traders.

These economic relations gradually developed into political ones. It was to exercise pressure on Spain that Ahmad al-Mansūr pretended to submit to the wishes of a combination of Dutch and English. After the destruction of the Armada in 1588, he entered without hesitation into the English camp; he received at his court Don Christoph, son of the Portuguese pretender Don Antonio, and agreed to a loan to Elizabeth. Then he drew back again. The taking of Cadiz in 1596 again influenced his feelings; he spoke of an alliance and made definite offers. Nothing resulted from these demonstrations, except a painful impression left after deception. So long as Elizabeth was alive, relations were friendly, for the two rulers had kindly feelings for one another, but James I, on his accession, at once showed a much less benevolent attitude towards the Sharifian court.

It was in the direction of the Sudan that Ahmad al-Mansūr gave reign to his desire for glory and conquest. His troops had had some experience in the Sahara. In 1581, the oases of Tuft and Tiguida, which had long been free from the Sharifian yoke had been conquered brilliantly. In 1584 an unsuccessful expedition had ended in the disappearance in the desert of a large army which had not even reached Teghaza. In 1599, having sought a quarrel with the askia Isâkh over the ownership of the salt mines of Teghaza, al-Mansūr persuaded his Council to go to war; a little army under the Pasha Djuawbar crossed the desert and destroyed the Sudanese empire. The occupation of the conquered country was nothing but systematic plunder and massacre. The Sharif collected great wealth there; he received the congratulations of the Powers and gained a prestige which still survives; his lieutenants also enriched themselves. With remarkable regularity, almost every year, reinforcements set out for Gago and very often reached it; caravans brought gold, wealth and slaves back to Marrakesh. The most famous of the prisoners was the legist Ahmad Bābā [q.v.] for whom Marrakesh was a gilded prison where he taught quite freely. The
Towards the end of his life al-Manṣūr was thinking of creating a new Marrākush on the model of Fās.

Aḥmad al-Manṣūr at first ruled as an autocrat. His orders were clear, his decisions rapid and sometimes, as might be expected, drastic to cruelty. His intimates, the qāḏi Ruhū, a Jew, whom we only know from European sources and ʿAṣṣūz, seem to have been his secretaries, like al-Fīḍṭālī, his biographer and poet-laureate whose works have not survived. The Paḥa Kīḏwān, very powerful at the beginning of the reign, acquired such influence that the Sharif had him beheaded in 1581. In time the notables acquired a great deal of independence and the Sultan hardly dared check their abuse of their power; two factors caused him much anxiety, the anti-foreign and anti-Christian al-Nāṣir's advent. As he was unable to combat his son Abū Fāris, by a concubine, al-Ḵaizūrin, al-Manṣūr had two sons, al-Shākh and Abū Fāris, and by his wife Lallā ʿArīfa al-Shāblānīya, Zaidān. His favourite son Abū ʿl-Haṣan was killed in 1594. In 1579 he had designated as his heir al-Shākh, called al-Muḥānī who held the vice-royalty of Fās. The remainder of Morocco was divided into governor-ships under other princes. These were several times rearranged; Abū Fāris, having considered everything, remained at Marrākush near his father to be ready in case of his death. In Fās, al-Manṣūr, supported by his favourite Mūṣafā, conducted himself like an independent ruler. He had displayed his gifts of energy, leadership and bravery on the occasion of al-Nāṣir's escape in 1595; living in great pomp, beloved by his troops, he was undoubtedly a cause of anxiety. His father allowed himself to be led by Abū Fāris. The conflict broke out in 1598. Forcibly to sacrifice his favourite, thrown into prison and then half pardoned, al-Manṣūr had to renounce all hope of winning in the struggle against Zaidān who was supported by Abū Fāris. After 1600 he sought support from Spain and Algiers.

Under Aḥmad al-Manṣūr, the dynasty attained its zenith. But it is hardly correct to say that the decline of the ʿṢāliḵīs only dates from the death of the great Sultan. After the conquest of the Ṣūḏān, the anarchy reigning in Algiers, the weakness of Spain in Europe, the death of al-Nāṣir, the conversion to Christianity of another pretender, al-Shāihī, Morocco was rich, seemed powerful and the Sharīṭīn throne stable. Aḥmad al-Manṣūr, by not being able to arrange for his own successor, nor even to keep his son in obedience, gave his country the chance to destroy itself. This process began under his own eyes. He had gone to Fās to try to reconcile his children and put through the appointment of Abū Fāris as heir apparent when the plague carried him off in 1603. Civil war broke out over his dead body. He had passed the last few years of his life wandering about living in a tent, shifting his camp every ten days, driven from Marrākush by the plague, which had begun to rage in Morocco in 1598.


**European sources:** H. de Castries, *Les sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc*, 1ère série;
dynastic saadienne. Paris, in course of publication; H. de Castries, La conquête du Soudan par el-Mansur, in Hespéris, 1923, p. 433—
1579; Consettaggio, Dell’unione del regno di L’oggetto alla corona di Castiglia, Genoa 1585; Guadalajara y Xavier, Producción y destierro de los Moriscos de Castilla, Pamplona 1614; Fr. Juan Bautista, Cronica de la vida y admirables hechos del muy alto y muy poderoso señor Muley Abd el-Melib, s.l., 1577; Mendoca, Jornada de Africa, Lisbon 1607.

(C. Funcck-Brentano)

AL-MANȘÜR Ibn Abî ‘Amîr, a famous ḥādjīb of al-Andalus in the tenth century A.H., the Al-
nanot of the Christian chroniclers of medieval Spain. His father was Abî ‘Amîr Muhammad b.
Abûl Allâh b. Muhammad Ibn Abî Amîr. He belonged to an Arab family which had settled in the
Iberian peninsula at an early date: one of his ancestors, Abû al-Malik al-Ma’ṣrî, had landed there with Târîk [q. v.] and settled at Torrox in the province of Algeciras where he had founded a family. Al-Manṣûr’s father, Abî Ḥâfiz Abî Allâh, was a jurist noted for his knowledge and pety
who died on his way back from the pilgrimage to Tripoli in Barbary at the end of the reign of the
Caliph Abû al-Râḥmân III al-Nâṣir (cf. Ibn al-

When a young man, Muhammad Ibn Abî ‘Amîr conceived great political ambitions: they were to dominate his whole career. After
studying in Cordova and holding a minor office with the kâṣī of the capital, Muhammad b. al-
Sâlim, he entered the service of the Omeyyad court in 356 (967) as superintendent of the estates of a prince of Basque origin, Subh, the wife of the Caliph al-Hakam II and her son Abû al-Râḥmân, who had just been born. Ibn Abî ‘Amîr was not long, thanks to his tact and courtesy and ability, in making himself persona grata with this princess and it was without doubt on the intervention of the latter that the young superintendent found himself within two years the holder of the new offices of superintendent of the mint, treasurer and administrator of intestate estates. A few years later in 358 (969), he was appointed kâdi of the district of Seville and Niebla. In 361 (972) the Caliph al-Hakam II gave him command of a section of his police corps (ṣhârta).

All these offices, combined in the person of Ibn Abî ‘Amîr assured him a considerable income and soon enabled him to lead a very luxurious
life in Cordova. He built himself a palace in the aristocratic quarter of Ruḥâfa and his generosity, courtly disposition and his splendour soon placed him in the forefront of the dignitaries of the Omeyyad court. In a few years he had filled the
first part of his programme: to become popular and indispensable, to make numerous friends, ready to support him on the day on which he would begin his attempt on the throne of the caliph.

Ibn Abî ‘Amîr very soon realised that it was not sufficient to be popular in Cordova but that he had also to create reliable friends among the generals of the Caliph’s armies. The circumstances of the time were peculiarly in his favour. Al-
Hakam II, following the example of his predecessor Abû al-Râḥmân III, had his North African policy and his armies were busy suppressing a Maghribi revolt which had broken out as a result of an expedition of reprisal sent against the petty Idrïd dynasty of Tangier, Hâsan b. Gannûn. The Omeyyad troops, under the orders of the general Ghabûl, were sent to dethrone all the petty Idrïd rulers of Morocco who were more or less vassals of the Fâtimids. This expedition was crowned with success and Hâsan b. Gannûn was obliged to take refuge in a fortress of the Rif, Hâḏrat al-Nâṣr, in which Ghabûl besieged him. But the Spanish army in Africa was a heavy burden on the treasury of the Caliph. Ghabûl had distributed money recklessly among the chiefs of the Berber tribes of the North of Morocco in order to buy them over. Al-Hakam II decided to send over a controller-general of finance and he chose Ibn Abî ‘Amîr who set off with the title of chief kâṣir (kâṣir, l-kâṣir) and exact
instructions. He carried out his very delicate task with unusual tact. He returned to Cordova at the same time as the army. When al-Hakam II died, leaving the throne to his young son Hîshâm in 366 (976), the new Caliph at the same time as he appointed kâṣir the favourite vizier of his father, Abu l-Hâsan Dja’far b. Othmân al-Mushâfi, appointed Ibn Abî ‘Amîr as the latter’s vizier.

The ambitious minister now worked unceasingly to get rid of his chief, al-Mushâfi. In the first place he was able to reduce to nothing the considerable power which the Slavs (Sâlidâ, q. v.) had in the Caliph’s entourage. In Cordova they formed a body of mercenaries who guarded the royal palace, and at this time their leaders were two of their number, Fârik al-Nîjâm, grand master of the wardrobe, and Dja’wîl, grand goldsmith and chief falconer. On the death of al-Hakam they had attempted to oppose the proclamation of Hîshâm who was still a child and to put on the throne of Cordova his uncle al-Mughîra. The latter was slain at the instigation of al-Mushâfi and it seems likely that Ibn Abî ‘Amîr played an active part in the plot which ended in this murder. In any case very soon after the accession of Hîshâm II as a result of the rigorous measures taken against them, the Slavs lost all influence at the Omeyyad court to the great satisfaction of the people of Cordova who had long suffered from their abuses. Ibn Abî ‘Amîr also gained in popularity, still further increased when he displayed for the first time the possession of military talents which had not been suspected.

A little later he succeeded in getting the command of an expedition against the Christians of the North who had taken up arms against Islam as soon as al-Hakam II had fallen ill. Setting out from Cordova in Rajab 366 (Feb. 977) he laid siege to the fortress of los Baños in Galicia and returned to the capital with considerable spoil. He then cultivated the friendship of the aged and
distinguished general Ghalib, governor of Madinat al-Zahrāʾ (Medina, q.v.), and obtained his help in the fall of the ḥāḍir al-Muṣṭafī. Ghalib on the intervention of Ibn Abī ʿAmīr received the much coveted title of ḥāḍir al-Sawrān and the command of the forces on the frontier in the expeditions against the Christians. This friendship was strengthened in a new campaign in which Ibn Abī ʿAmīr commanded the troops from the capital alongside of Ghalīb. This expedition was again crowned with success and earned Ibn Abī ʿAmīr a new and honourable office, that of commandant of Cordova in place of the son of al-Muṣṭafī who was dismissed. Al-Muṣṭafī, conscious of the danger which threatened him, then tried to play off Ghalīb against Ibn Abī ʿAmīr but the latter was labour lost. The young minister even became son-in-law of Ghalīb who gave him the hand of his daughter Asmāʾ. A few months later, al-Muṣṭafī and the members of his family, who had held offices at the court, were dismissed and their property confiscated. On the same day Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was appointed ḥāḍir. With his father-in-law, Ghalīb, he was at the head of the administration of the empire.

It was not only the plots he had woven with success for his personal ability that had enabled Ibn Abī ʿAmīr to advance so rapidly in his career. It seems very probable that the princess Suhb, widow of al-Fakām II and mother of the reigning Caliph, was the mistress of the former superintendence of her son’s estates. This liaison was not unknown to the CORDOVANS AND produced bitter criticisms of the princess and her lover. Public opinion, which had at first been so favourable to the ḥāḍir, began to be hostile to him. A plot to overthrow Ḥišām II and put in his place another grandson of Abī al-Raḥmān III was prepared but nipped in the bud. The Cordovans at once spread the rumour that Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was devoted to philosophy and that his orthodoxy therefore was quite nominal. He proved them wrong. Ibn Abī ʿAmīr did not hesitate to burn from the splendid library formed by the cultured al-Fakām II all the books dealing with branch of knowledge prohibited by the Ġalāmāʾ. He conciliated them by this act of vandalism the gravity of which can hardly have escaped him. But with his unparalleled ambition nothing which might prevent him attaining his object was allowed to deter him.

But the young Caliph Ḥišām II was now growing up. He had to be prevented from taking an active part in the conduct of affairs. Business was then conducted in the Caliph’s palace in Cordova in order to set aside the ruler finally Ibn Abī ʿAmīr in 968 (978) decided to build near the capital a regular town for administrative purposes. This was al-Madinat al-Zahrāʾ (q.v.) which in a few years became an important city at the very gates of Cordova. As to Ḥišām, he then began the life of a recluse, either at Cordova or at Madinat al-Zahrāʾ, which was to last throughout his reign. At the same time as he settled the problem of the possible intervention of the ruling prince in the affairs of state in a manner as energetic as it was unscrupulous, Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was reorganising the army and inaugurating a new policy in the country. The Omayyad army, in the form in which it was then constituted, was recruited in the country itself and the permanent bodies of mercenaries were not large. Ibn Abī ʿAmīr required new ones: this is why from now on till the end of his life, he appealed for Berber volunteers from the north of Morocco and Irāq. At the same time he realised that the occupation of certain parts of the country by the Omayyads was only a source of expense to the Caliph’s treasury and that any plan of territorial expansion in that direction would be disastrous to the ruler of Cordova. He therefore abandoned all these possessions, retaining in Africa only one of the keys of the Strait of Gibraltar, the citadel of Ceuta. The administration of the rest of the country he handed over to petty local dynasties under the nominal suzerainty of Cordova. Along with the Berber troops in his pay, Ibn Abī ʿAmīr formed other corps by recruiting Christian mercenaries from the north of Spain, from Leon, Castile and Navarre. He was able by his generosity and attentions to secure the complete devotion of his new soldiers.

Having thus a strong and veteran army at his disposal, Ibn Abī ʿAmīr renewed with ardour the old feud against the Christians on the frontiers of the empire. He first of all got rid of his father-in-law Ghalīb, whom he had displeased by the manner in which he had upset the old military organisation of the country; then he undertook in 371 (981) an expedition on a grand scale against the kingdom of Leon. He took and plundered Zamora, where he took 4,000 prisoners. The King of Leon, Ramiro III, then made an alliance with García Fernandez, Count of Castile, and the King of Navarre. But all three were defeated by the Muslim general at Rueda to the south-west of Smanacar and this town itself was taken by him. Ibn Abī ʿAmīr continued his advance on the town of Leon and inflicted another defeat on Ramiro III. The return of the ḥāḍir to Cordova was a regular triumph and it was on this occasion that he took the honorific lakāb of al-Mansūr bīl-Mīlāḥ, “the victorious in God”.

All powerful at Cordova and a successful general, al-Mansūr Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was to devote the rest of his life to an unceasing war on the Christian frontiers and to increasing considerably the territory ruled by the Muslims in the Peninsula. After his defeat, the nobles of Leon had deposed Ramiro III and proclaimed his place of Bernuy II. The latter finally found himself forced to seek al-Mansūr’s help and to recognise him as suzerain. Al-Mansūr then decided to make an expedition into Catalonia in 374 (985); he defeated Count Borrel and stormed Barcelona, which he sacked. According to Ibn al-ʿAbbār, it was the Amirid’s twenty-third campaign.

Ibn Gannūn, the petty Idrīsid dynasty in the north of Morocco having again rebelled against Cordova, al-Mansūr sent his cousin Ibn ʿAskalādja to subdue him. Ibn Gannūn surrendered on being promised his life. But al-Mansūr had him executed along with Ibn ʿAskalādja whom he accused of having plotted against him. This breach of faith and brutal execution having produced a reaction of feeling in the capital, al-Mansūr to rehabilitate himself undertook a pious work: in 377 (987) he extended the cathedral mosque of Cordova which had become too small. Eight new naves were built on the east and the western wall of the hall of prayer and of the ṣahn was moved out 150 feet. The Arab historians say that al-Mansūr made gangs of Christian prisoners do this work, for the greater glory of Isrāʾ.
In the same year the war against the kingdom of Leon was resumed. The Muslim troops, that al-Mansur had sent there, had oppressed the country and Bermuda II had finally driven them out. Al-Mansur punished his boldness with the greatest rigour. In two campaigns several months apart, he took Coimbra, which he laid waste, Leon which he left completely in ruins, and Zamora. The Counts of Leon had then to lay down their arms and submit to al-Mansur and Bermuda II was only left possessions very much reduced in extent.

The campaign that followed was again directed against the N.-W. of the Peninsula. The best known is that of St. Jago de Compostella in 387 (997). This famous sanctuary of western Christianity [cf. the article šiānt vīkṭir] was taken by the Muslim troops on the 2nd Shawal (10th August) and only the tomb of the apostle was spared, by orders of al-Mansur.

The last expedition against the Christians dates from the year 1002. Its objective was Castile. Al-Mansur took Cordova and destroyed the convent of San Millán de la Cogolla. But on his return from the expedition, he fell ill and died at Medinaqel on the 27th Ramadán 392 (Aug. 10, 1002). He was buried in this town.

The last years of the life of al-Mansur in spite of his successful career and victorious expeditions had been marked by events which might have been fatal to him if he had not once again displayed an iron will and extreme violence in the suppression of plots hatched against him. The few attempts made on behalf of Hadi ibn Hadi to regain for him the power, which had been seized by his first minister were in vain. In 391 (997) al-Mansur gave up his title of Hadi in favour of his son 'Abd al-Malik. Five years later he assumed with an audacity worthy of him the princely title of mālik karim “noble King” and reserved for himself the title saiyid “lord”. The only thing that he did not dare to do or could not do was to annex the overthrow of the Omayyad caliphate and the constitution of an Amīrīd caliphate in its stead. He arranged however for the power to pass to his heirs after him, and it was his son 'Abd al-Malik al-Mu'azzafar, who succeeded him on his death to control for a few more years the destinies of the Muslim empire in Spain.

Various judgments have been passed on al-Mansur. His lack of scruples has been emphasised and the often criminal means which he used to attain his ends. His career is nevertheless an extraordinary one. This dictator was undoubtedly one of the greatest men of affairs that Islam has ever produced and under his “reign” Muslim Spain remained the great nation, which in the caliphate of 'Abd al-Rahmān III had shown itself one of the most remarkable centres of culture and civilisation in the mediaeval west.


MANSUR b. NUH, the name of two Sūmānī rulers:

1. MANSUR b. NUH I (Abu Šīlīh), ruler of Khorāsān and Transoxiana (350–366 = 961–976), succeeded his brother 'Abd al-Malik b. Nuh I [q.v.]. Ibn Ḥawkal is able to describe the internal conditions of the Sūmānī kingdom under Manṣūr as an eye-witness; cf. especially B. G. A., ii. 344: fi wakātin ḥādīth; p. 344 sqq.: on the character of Manṣūr “the justest king among our contemporaries, in spite of his physical weakness and the slightness of his frame”. On the vizier, Bāṣan, see Rastani where also information is given about the Persian version of Tabari’s history composed in 352 (963) by or by orders of this vizier. On the rebellion of the commander of the Sūmānī bodyguard, Al-Tegnī, and the independent kingdom founded by him in Gharna and on the establishment of Sūmānī rule there in the reign of Manṣūr and the son and successor of Al-Tegnī, Iṣḥāk (or Abu Ḥādīr Ibrahim) see AL-TEGNĪ and GHANNA; in Barītī, Turkestan, G. M. S., New Series v., p. 251, note 4; Abu Ḥādīr Ibrahim should be read for Iṣḥāk b. Ibrahim (this passage is misunderstood in the Russian original). In other directions also in this reign the Sūmānī kingdom prospered in its foreign affairs: the fighting with the Būyids [q.v.] and Ziyārids was as a rule victorious.

2. MANSUR b. NUH II (Abu 'l-Hārith), ruler of Transoxiana (387–390 = 997–999). His father Nuh b. Manṣūr, to whom out of all the Sūmānī empire only a portion of Transoxiana was left, died Friday 14th Rajab 387 (July 23, 997) but it was not till Dhu ’l-Ka‘bah (November) that hommage was paid to Manṣūr as his successor. Bālā'ī (ed. Morley, p. 803) talks highly of his courage and eloquence; on the other hand he is said to have been feared by every one for his extraordinary severity. During his brief and impotent reign he was hardly able to instil terror into any one. The last Sūmānīs were quite helpless against the kings and generals who were quartering over the inheritance of the dying dynasty. One of these generals, Fākī, succeeded even in taking Bukhārā at the head of only 3,000 horsemen: Manṣūr had to fly to Amul [q.v.] but was called back by Fākī. The last months of his reign were devoted to fruitless efforts to settle peacefully the question of the governorship of Khorāsān, which
was claimed by various parties; but before the problem had been settled by force of arms, Manṣūr was deposed on Wednesday, 12th Safar 389 (Feb. 1, 999) by his generals Fātīkh and Bēgūṭūn, blinded a week later and sent to Būkhārā.

Bibliography: cf. Sāmānī, and add:—


AL-MANṢŪR ISMĀ‘IL, Abu ʿĀlāʾ or Abu ʿĀlāʾ ibn al-ʿĀlāʾ, third Fāṭimid caliph, was 32 when he succeeded his father Abu ʿl-Kāsim al-Kāsimī in Shāmuwāl 334 (May 946) under particularly difficult conditions: Abu Yazīd, the Kāhirī alīgātī supported by many Berber tribes and by the people of Khairāwān had failed before al-Mahdiyya, but was still besieging Shīā. Al-Manṣūr, however, having returned to Khairāwān and pardoned the inhabitants who had supported the agitator, had to prepare to meet a new attack. Abu Yazīd was not long in reappearing; repulsed he came again to the attack. Al-Manṣūr tried to make terms with him and gave him back his women captured in Khairāwān but Abu Yazīd, in spite of his promise, attacked him again and was completely defeated in a pitched battle (Aug. 946). He was then pursued to the west. After a delay caused by the illness of Al-Manṣūr, Abu Yazīd mortally wounded was taken prisoner at Djiel Kiyāna, north of Mīlla, in Muḥarram 336 (Aug. 947).

This success established al-Manṣūr securely. A section of the tribes of the Central Mağrib who had embraced the cause of Abu Yazīd made their submission, like the Mağhrabīya under Muhammad b. al-Khaṭīr. Taking advantage of the difficulties of the Fāṭimīds, the Omayyads of Spain had entrenched themselves more securely in western Bar- hāy. A former Fāṭimid officer, Ḥāmid b. Yesel, was ruling the Mağribīn in the name of the caliphs of Córdova and laid siege to Tāhirt. Al-Manṣūr relieved the town and appointed the Ibrāhīm Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad to rule it. He invested with considerable authority the chief of the Şānḫaṭa Zirī b. Manṣūr, who had proved a loyal auxiliary during his days of trial.

Returning to Khairāwān, al-Manṣūr had again to take the field against the son of Abu Yazīd who was trying to stir up a rebellion against the old regime. Besides taking these vigorous steps in Barhāy to put an end to the Kāhirī movement, al-Manṣūr developed the naval power of Ifrīkiya. His freedman Faḥūsh, supported by the governor of Sicily, won a striking victory over the Goths in the southern seas and came home laden with booty (340 = 951).

Lastly Al-Manṣūr holds a high place among the Fāṭimīds of Ifrīkiya for his buildings. The capital of al-Mahdiyya or Nor was it Khairāwān whose recent treachery he made it suspect. From 947 Sāḥra, also called al-Manṣūrīya from its founder, was the capital. The town built at the gates of Khairāwān was beautified by the palaces which he built and grew rich on the bazaars which he removed from the old city.

Al-Manṣūr was 39 and had ruled 7 years, when he died suddenly on a journey from a chill caught by taking a bath in cold weather (Shawwāl 29, 341 = March 953).


MANṢŪRA, founded by Manṣūr b. ʿĪjāmūhīr al-Kalbī, was from 255 (871) the capital of Siyās under the Arabs. Ḫaṭṭārī described it as more fertile and populous than Malikīn. Before the arrival of the Arabs, Brahmanābād (probably identical with the modern Ḫaḍraḥābīl) was the capital of Siyās, and its name was changed to Manṣūra after the Arab conquest. For notices of Manṣūra by early travellers to India, see Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, i, Part I, p. 506, 507, 511, 525.


(Andrey HOSAIN)

AL-MANṢŪRA, large town in Lower Egypt, on the right bank of the Damietta branch of the Nile, capital of the province al-Dīnārīyya. Another canal or branch of the Nile went from here to Asmūn in a north-eastern direction. It was originally a camping place for the army, founded in 616 (1219) by al-Malik al-Kāmil, when he tried to recapture Dimyāth, then occupied by the Crusader. In 1249 the Crusaders were defeated in the neighbourhood of al-Manṣūra by al-Sultan al-Maʿṣūrīzī Tūrnāshāh, on which occasion Lewis IX of France was taken prisoner. The town is now an important emporium for the cotton trade. In 1917 there were 49,238 inhabitants (Badecker). It possesses no remarkable buildings; a railway bridge crosses the Nile at this place.

There are still various other places in Egypt, called al-Manṣūra.

Bibliography: Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l’Égypte, Cairo 1909, p. 198 sqq. (where the geographical and historical sources are cited); ‘Alī Pasha Muharrām, al-Khāṭīb al-Dhahīdī, xx, 38 sqq.: Badecker, Ägypten, Leipzig 1929, p. 172—317. (J. H. KRAMERS)

AL-MANṢŪRA, the name of a town now in ruins built by the Sultān of Fās about 5 miles to the west of Tlemcān. The very precise account given by Ibn Khaldūn enables us to reconstruct with exactitude the history of this typical town-camp. In the year 698 (1299) the Marmid Abu Yaḥyā Yaḥyūsī, who had come to lay siege to the capital of the Banū ‘Abīl-Wād,
which he had closely surrounded with entrenchments, set up his camp on the plain which stretches to the west. As it was a long drawn out blockade he built a few dwellings for himself and the leaders of his army and laid the foundation of a mosque. In the year 702 (1302) the “Victorious Camp”, al-Muhallab al-Mansūra, was given the form of a regular town by the construction of a rampart. Besides the mosque, the dwellings of the chiefs, the store-houses for munitions and the shelters for the army, there were baths and caravanserais. As Tlemcen was inaccessible to caravans, al-Mansūra or New Tlemcen, as it was called, naturally attached itself to the building of the rampart of the town. After a siege of eight years and three months the Marinids withdrew from Tlemcen, and al-Mansūra was methodically evacuated under the direction of Ibn Thīām b. ʿAbd al-Djalīl, the vizier of the Sulṭān Abū Tahir. The people of Tlemcen were compelled, by the terms of the treaty made with the Marinids, to respect the town for some time. Some time after, when the entente between the two empires had been broken, they demolished its buildings and rendered uninhabitable the entrenchments left at their gate by their hereditary enemy.

Thirty years later, in the year 735 (1335), the Moorish army under Sulṭān Abū Hūsain was once more at the gates of Tlemcen. On this occasion the ʿAbd al-Wadīl camp was forced to surrender (27th Ramadan 737 = 1st May 1337). Al-Mansūra was rebuilt. It became the official capital of the Marinids during their occupation of the central Maghrib. It was in fact, during this time that the great mosque was built and that the “Palace of Victory” was erected (745).

After the retreat of the Marinids, al-Mansūra, once more abandoned, fell little by little into ruins. At the present day the rampart of terre pisé flanked by square towers is still comparatively intact; but the interior is land under cultivation and contains a French village. There still exists there, however, the ruins of a palace no longer distinct, a section of a paved street, and probably the surrounding wall in terre pisé of the Mosque with half of the great minaret in stone, which arose above the principal entrance. Although the infall ceramic work has almost entirely disappeared, the facade of the square tower, which is 120 feet high, is one of the most perfect pieces of the Maghribi art of the 8th century that survives. The columns and capitals in marble of the mosque are preserved in the Museums of Tlemcen and Algiers.


MANTIK (A.), Lógica. The logic of the Arab philosophers is that of Aristotle, here and there modified by the Stoic and Neo-Platonist tendencies of the Greek commentators. The Arab philosophers did not develop this logic but they gave reasons of it, reproduced it and wrote commentaries on it, often with success; they understood it very well and it is in logic that they came nearest to the authentic Aristotelianism. As to the matter, it was easier for them to grasp the exact sense of the logical writings of Aristotle than of his other works since the translation of the Logics had been made and remade with great care (cf. e.g. the two versions of the beginning of the Interpretation in J. Pollok, Die Hermeutik des Aristoteles in d. arab. Übers. d. Ḣalīlī b. Ḥusayn, Leipzig 1913). The translation was very defective and incomplete. The remark of the Ḣalīlī al-Ṣafāː — who evidently did not care much for the subject of logic — at the beginning of their little treatise on logic “the ancient sages have dealt with these subjects and their works are in the hands of the reader, but they are very diffuse, for the translators did not understand the exact meaning” is then not justified.

To the six works of Aristotle, the Categories, Hermeneutics, the Prior Analytics and Posterior Analytics, the Topics, and the Sophistics, the Arabs, like the latest Greek commentators — added the Rhetoric and the Politics (as to the Rhetoric Aristotle himself had regarded it [Kontis 1913, p. 322, as a lateral branch of the same, Dialektik und Politik]). They explained the order of these works in the manner of the later Greek commentator (cf. Eliae in Aristotelis Categor. Comment., ed. Bus. p. 116 sqq.). The most important of these treatises was the fourth, the Posterior Analytics, to which the three preceding are only the preparation and introduction; in the Posterior Analytics Aristotle was thought to have treated of the absolutely True, in the Poetics of the absolutely False and in the intermediate treatises, according as they approach the Poetics, the element of improbability begins to preponderate. Then, still in the name of the Greeks, they placed in front of these works the Logique de Porphyre which was called Περὶ τῶν Ἀραβῶν κατηγορίων, Kitāb Faryād al-Maʾrīsī, and Maghribi, shows, is an introduction to the logic of Aristotle.

Among the Greeks there were two further kinds of introduction to philosophy or — since the study of philosophy began with logic — to the logic of Aristotle. In the one which preceded the categories Προλογία τῶν κατηγορίων, ten questions were put (among them: Whence came the names of the different “philosophical schools”? What is the division of the works of Aristotle?) to which a brief reply was given. Among the Arabs, we have not yet found an introduction of this kind in a little work by al-Farābī, Kitāb Firmān, written in the 9th century, which was later grades. The first part definitions were dealt with, in the second divisions of philosophy. The Arabic treatises on the division of the sciences go back to this kind of introduction which they further developed. We still possess from the pens of the two of the greatest Arab philosophers, al-Farābī and Avicenna, such treatises on the division of the sciences. Avicenna's entitled Maṭbāṭ fi Taḥṣīṣ al-Hikma wa l-ʿUṣūm was printed at Constantinople
and 2. subjective existence of the soul. The intelligence may direct itself in an intuendo prima (πρώτη βία) towards the exterior world of which the highest kinds are the ten categories, but it can turn inwards upon itself in an intuendo secunda (αιτάρεια βία), upon its concepts, of which the highest kinds are the five "voices" of Porphyry. Everything has an existence, if not in the external world, at least in the soul. This theory gives rise to difficulties: in the first place the term "existence" becomes ambiguous; secondly, since the negation of each thing exists in the soul, "what is not in the soul" must exist in the soul. It is partly deduced from the Kalam (q.v.) notably among the Ash'aris and probably under the influence of Stone discussions on the existence or non-existence of the "not things" (οὐδεματί) that the existence of concepts like the impossible and the negative has been discussed. The Arab Aristotelians were very often content to admit a concept "thing" (δώροτ, the τό of the Stoics) more general than being, without paying too much attention to the fact that by this they were contradicting the thesis that everything is.

For the rest, in the Aristotelian philosophy the concept of existence or of being rise to grave difficulties; it was much discussed by al-Farabi, not only among the philosophers but also for the metaphysical questions connected with it among the theologians and the mystics. Aristotle had already affirmed (e.g. 1040, b 18) that existence or being is neither kind nor substance and the Arab philosophers al-Farabi, Avicenna, Ghazâli and Averroes supported this view with the stereotyped reasoning that existence cannot express the essence of things, since being man implies being animal, being a living body, being a body etc., but it does not at all imply that man is being. On the other hand being (τό ἔστι) and substance (ὁ ὄντα) are synonyms in Aristotelian philosophy. How are these two views to be reconciled? Avicenna says the theologians had already done before him, that only in God substance (being) and existence coincide: for the other substances, existence must be added to them as an accident. For Averroës on the other hand, as before him for the Ash'aris, being is always substance and never accident and he says that in judgments, in which being is predicated and thus apparently an accident, as when one says "substance is", "is" is an intuendo secunda.

As to the theory of ideas, the Arab logicians deny, with Aristotle and using his own arguments, the separate existence of the universals, but admit with Plato their supra-sensible existence. This is the theory very prevalent in the last period of philosophy (in the Middle-Platonism, Neo-lythagyrosism and Neo-Platonism) according to which ideas or universal forms exist from eternity in God. The intelligibility of things comes from this, that their cause is an intelligence; as the idea of the statue in the soul of the sculptor is the cause of the existence and intelligibility of the statue, so the intelligence of the creator of the world is the cause of the intelligibility of natural things. Avicenna expresses this theory by the formula that the Universe is ante multitudinem in multiplicitate (in things) and post multitudinem (in our soul). It is the second element in the formula "in multiplicitate" that offers a difficulty (a difficulty already found in Aristotle): how to conceive of the existence of universals in things which are themselves individuals? Often a conceptualist or nomi-
Aristotelian tendency is seen in the Arab Aristotelians; it is explicitly stated that the universal is only found in the mind and following Aphrodiasias the forms in matter, the ἐνοικηθέν, are regarded as individuals. But since in the system of Aristotle, forms are universals by definition, contradiction cannot be avoided, and the theories of the universals among the Arab philosophers are often very complicated and very obscure. Another nominalist or subjectivist tendency is found in their conception of the relation, which they call — with the Stoics — “what the mind puts into things”. But it is the theologians who under the influence of materialist, nominalist and sensualist Stoicism have developed a nominalist system which only admits atomic and individual facts without a connection, in which all relation is regarded as subjective or even non-existent.

The ambiguous manner in which he deals with the concepts “possible”, “impossible” and “necessary” gives rise in Aristotle as well as in the Arab logicians, who follow their master faithfully, to grave difficulties. Aristotle (Prior Analyst., 322, 18–23) — like the Arab logicians (cf. Avicenna, logik, ed. Forget, p. 34) — distinguishes two aspects of the concept of the possible; the possible is the negation at once of the impossible and of the necessary, but he does not always observe these two aspects and thus the necessary and the actual are considered as possible since what happens is not impossible. On the other hand, the actual is considered as the necessary, since what happens, happens necessarily; and although the definition of the possible is “what may or may not happen”, for Aristotle “possible” is also “what will happen” since what never happens is not possible. These contradictions are occasioned by the fact that the problem which is at the basis of all this, that is to say, the objectivity or subjectivity of the possible and of the necessary, is differently treated by Aristotle. Aristotle hesitates between determinism and indeterminism. Of two future events, he says in the Hemicautetica that one will be true, but which is not determined in advance. He says that necessity does not govern the celestial world and that only the sublunar world is the reign of contingency, he also says that God alone is absolutely necessary, that all the rest is hypothetically necessary, that is to say, contains an element of contingency. On the other hand, everything is caused, and goes back necessarily to a first cause. All these contradictions are found among the Arab Aristotelians. The Mutakallimun, who, like the Stoics, wish to exclude the possible from reality (but they sometimes regard, like certain Stoics, the “possible” and “necessary” as both subjective, thus affirming that everything is possible) have with justice declared that if there is a necessary cause, the effect of it must also be necessary and that there is therefore no contingency in the world. Averroes in his polemic against Ghazâlî seems to admit the justice of this argument but elsewhere he repeats all the theories of his master.

Although Ghazâlî confesses that theology, while opposed to the metaphysics of the philosophers cannot however deny the evidence of their logical technique, certain arguments of Greek scepticism against logic are sometimes repeated by the Mutakallimun. Definition is, they say, not possible, because by the particular one cannot reach the universal, and the syllogism is a petitio principii since the conclusion is already contained in the major premis. These arguments are justified against Aristotelianism, regarded as an empirical theory which sets out from the particular fact. There is however a rationalist tendency in Aristotle and the Arab logicians; they admit that the intelligence can at once know first principles and that without induction from particular facts it can grasp relations between universals. But when the Mutakallimun say that knowledge and the Universal cannot give the truth, since according to the definition of truth, agreement must exist between true knowledge and reality, and knowledge is universal and reality individual, they reveal by this argument one of the greatest contradictions in Aristotelianism. Averroes tried in vain to refute it.


Manûf, name of two towns, in the region of the two main Nile arms called al-Djariz, generally distinguished as Manûf al-ʿUlya and Manûf al-Sufî. The latter was situated on the right bank of the western Nile arm, while the former lay more to the east on a smaller canal. Both are described by the geographers as large towns, surrounded by fertile districts and inhabited by wealthy people, especially Manûf al-ʿUlya, where, according to Ibn Hawkas (p. 92), there resided a governor. The kūra of Manûf al-ʿUlya is often called the kūra of Damsis and Manûf, while the kūra of Manûf al-Sufî is designated as Ṭawwâ and Manûf (cf. e.g. al-Maqrî, ed. Wiet, i. 507). Both the ancient towns have decayed since the tenth century; Yûsûf only knew a village of that name. The name has survived, however, until our day, in the name of the province al-Manûfiyya; the capital of the nubilîya of his name is now Shibin al-Kawm, and the modern Manûf is a provincial town, situated to its southwest.

Manûf al-ʿUlya is known in Greek sources as Ὀσσείς ἢ κάτω, the Coptic name being Panouf Ris; the other Manûf is not mentioned in Greek documents and is called in Coptic Panouf Dîr.

Bibliography: Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l’Égypte, Cairo 1909, p. 200 sqq. (where the Arabic geographical authors are quoted); Ibn Abd al-Hakam, Futūḥ al-Miṣr, ed. Torrey, New Haven 1922, p. 141, 142; Alvâja Mubârak, al-Khûlaṭ al-Dârida, xvi. 47 sqq.; Baedecker, Afghyen, Leipzig 1928, p. 32. (J. H. KRAMERS)

Mâppillas (Mophlæs), a group of Muhammadans, of mixed Arab and Hindu descent, on the west coast of Southern India, numbering 1,099,453 according to the Census of 1921. Their name is said to be derived from the Malayalam mā ("great") and pilla ("child"), an honorary title originally bestowed upon all foreigners and
first applied to Christians, Jews and Muslims, but now confined to the last; this derivation, however, is disputed (Thornton, p. 460-461). They owe their origin to Arab merchants, who were attracted to this coast by the trade in spices, ivory, etc., settling in various commercial centres, they intermarried with the natives of the country and added to their numbers by proselytising; but fresh accessions of the Arab element having ceased long ago, the Mappillas now approximate to the aboriginal type and exhibit no signs of any admixture of foreign blood. The earliest date of their settlements is uncertain, and the legendary accounts given by the Mappillas themselves are of no historic value (Zain al-Din, p. 21-25).

The foreign traders appear to have been encouraged by the Hindu rajahs, who made use of them to man their fleets, and by the beginning of the xvii century the Mappillas were estimated to have formed one-fifth of the population of Malabar (Barboza, p. 310), but the arrival of the Portuguese in this part of India checked the growth of Muslim power and ruined the Arab trade. The Mappillas are still successful traders, especially on the coast; inland, many of them are agriculturists. There are both Sunnis and Shiites among them; the former belong to the Shafi school.

Their religious leaders are called Tangal (an honorific plural of the personal pronoun, commonly used in Arab countries) with profound respect; many of them receive their training in a college attached to the Dijamaat: mosque in Ponnani, the chief centre of their religious organisation; the Tangal of Ponnani is an Arab who claims descent from the Prophet; in accordance with local custom he inherits his sacred office in the female line i.e. his nephew and not his son succeeds him.

The history of the Mappillas is full of incidents of fanaticism and turbulence. In 1524 they attacked the Jews in Cranganur and massacred them without mercy, so that in 1565 the remnant of them fled to Cochin, where they founded the Jew settlement to the present day (Zain al-Din, p. 50-51; Francis Day, p. 351—352). The Mappillas also persuaded the Zamorin of Calicut to expel the Syrian Christians from his dominions (Francis Day, p. 367). Even their co-religionists found them to be turbulent subjects; they joined the Hindus in fighting Haidar Ali [q.v.] after he had extended his power over the Malabar coast, and they rose in rebellion against Tipu Sultan [q.v.] in 1785, and frequently plundered his territories (Francis Day, p. 368). During the last hundred years as many as 51 fanatical outbreaks have taken place among them, especially in the Nettur sub-division of the district of Malabar. Some Mappillas generally begin by murdering a Hindu landlord and then seek martyrdom by slaying kiths; others join them, after divorcing their wives, and clad in the white robes of the martyr (izahid, q.v.) go out to die fighting against the infidel, with a complete contempt for death. They desecrate and burn Hindu temples, and forcibly circumcise such Hindus as they do not murder. Some of these outbreaks appear to have been stimulated by agrarian discontent at the oppressive action of Hindu landlords, but the last (1921) was entirely political in character and was excited by the Khilafat movement; it differed from all preceding ones in its wide extent and clear evidence of systematic preparation and organisation; the outrages committed upon Hindus were of a specially revolting character.

The Mappillas of South Malabar generally observe Muhammadan law; those of North Malabar follow the local Marumakkathayam system of inheritance, according to which the sons of a man's sister inherit his property, and his wife is not regarded as a member of the husband's family but resides in her mother's home and only receives periodic visits from her husband. On the other hand, a man's self-acquisitions usually descend to his wife and family in accordance with Muhammadan law.

The Mappillas speak the Malayalam language, but use a modified form of the Arabic script in writing it. The majority of them are illiterate, and few only can read and write. Their literature is mainly composed of songs descriptive of religious war, and they are fond of singing them in order to stir up fanatical zeal. Their mosques are quite unlike those of other Muhammadans, having no minarets and often consisting of several stories, with two or more roofs; they often resemble Hindu temples in style, and in fact many Mappilla mosques were once Hindu temples.

Mappillas are also found in the Laccadive Islands, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, and Burma.

Bibliography: Zain al-Din, Tabbata b. Mundhukin; Historia des Portugues no Malabar por Zainul, publlicado e traduzido por David Lopes, Lisbon 1898; The Tekfutul Muhyideen, translated by M. J. Rowlandson, London 1833; Odoardo Barboza (who called them Mappuloes) in Ramusio, Navigationi et Viaggi, Venice 1563, l. 310 E; L. K. Ananthakrishna Iyer, Cochin Tribes and Castes, Madras 1912, ii., chap. xvi.; Kadir Husain Khan, South Indian Musalmans, Madras 1910; E. Thurston, Castes and Tribes of Southern India, Madras 1909, iv. 455 sqq.; C. A. Innes, Malabar (Madras District Gazetteer), Madras 1908, Bush—S., 1878, Travels in the District of South of the South (E. M. M., xlv. 65 sqq.); P. Holland-Puyor, Mappilas or Moppils, Calcutta 1904; F. Fawcett, A popular Moplah song (Indian Antiquary, xxxviii. p. 64-71), Bombay 1899; War Songs of the Moppilis of Malabar (ibid., xxx. p. 499-508), Bombay 1901; Correspondence on Moplah Outrages in Malabar, for the years 1899-1935, Madras 1903; Parliamentary Papers, East India (Moplah Rebellion), London 1921; J. J. Banning, The Moplah Rebellion of 1921 (The Modern World, xiii. 379 sqq.), New York 1923. (T. W. Arnold)

MARABUT. [See MARABUTS.

MARAGHA, the old capital of A'jarbaidjan

Position. The town lies at a height of 5,500 feet above sea-level on the southern slope of Mount Sahand (11,500 feet high) which separates it from Tabriz [q.v.] This explains the very considerable difference in climate between the two towns which are only 50 miles apart as the crow flies (by the high road 50 miles). The climate of Maraga is mild and rather moist (Hamid Allah and Mequenne, 1904) The plentiful water supply makes the vegetation rich. The fruit of Maraga is celebrated in Persia and a good deal of it is exported to Russia via Ardabil. The district is watered by the stream which comes down from the Sahand and then
turns west to Lake Urmia which is 20 miles from Maragha. The town is built on the left bank of the river Suq (Souq) which then passes Banah. A little distance to the east runs the parallel river Murdi-čai which waters the district to which Mequemen gives the name Pahindar (Bayandur); on the left bank rise the heights of Mandisar (= with head bound). The next stream is the Leilān which flows into the Daghshātu (cf. Sawat-Bulak). The rivers farther east (Karanghū and its sources which water the Hašarādād district) belong to the system of the Safid-rūd [q. v.], i.e. the basin of the Caspian Sea.

From the geographical point of view, Maragha is quite independent of Tabriz. It lies a little off the great road from Tabriz to Kirmānshāb which runs near Lake Urmia (via Bīnūb). The direct bridle-path Tabriz—Maragha by the passes of the Sahand is only practicable in summer. There is also a direct route along the Sahand on the south and southeast side, joining Maragha to Ardabil and Zandīān. This road has always been of importance whenever Maragha was the capital of Adharbājīān. The important place on the route was Kūstā (cf. below).

At the beginning of the sixth century, Maragha had 6,000 families (Bustān al-Siyāḥat), in 1308 it had 13,259 inhabitants of whom 6,865 were men and 6,394 women (H. Schindler). Mequemen (1904) gives Maragha 15—20,000 inhabitants.

At the present day the inhabitants speak Aḏar Türkīh but in the sixth century they still spoke "arabicised Paḫlāwī" (Nūḥat al-Kulāb: pahlav-yi mutavārā) which means an Iranian dialect of the northwestern group.

The walls of the town are in ruins. Its gates have the following names: Aḩmadī, Kūrd-Khānī, Aḏark, Pul-i Bādā (or Gāšāk) and Ḥaḏīḡānī. The quaters are: Aḡān-beg, Mālīn, Dar-wāz, Saḡān-Khānī.

Prefatory. The valley of the Murdi-čai is famous for its fossil deposits of vertebrates discovered by Khānūkh in 1852. Excavations have been conducted by Goebel (Russia), Straus, Reider, Pohlīg (Austria), Gunther (England) and Mequemen (France). On the Murdi-čai have been found remains of the hippopotamus, rhinoceros etc. dating from the period before the eruption of the volcano of Sahand. Cf. J. F. Brandt, Über die von A. Goebel, ... bei der Stadt Maragha gefundenen Gegenstände, Denkschr., d. Naturforsch.-Ver. zu Riga, 1870, and the bibliographic in Mequemen. Contribution à l'étude du gisement des restes de Maragha, Paris 1908.

The name. According to Baladjānī, the town was first called Aḏar-ḏūjī (Ibn al-Fahīm, p. 284: Aḥān-čāl; Vākātī, iv. 476: Afrasāb-čal). This name which means in the Persian the "river of Aḏar" recalls very much the name of the town Ḥakṣarā which Mark Antony besieged in this region on his campaign against the Parthians in 36 B.C. (Flutur, Tit. Ant. ch xlvii, 1864, p. 1113 and L-eud. Appiun. Pothica, ed. Swegman, Leipzig 1785, iii. 77. 99). It has long been supposed that the names Ḥakṣar in Strabo, ch. xiii. and Index, p. 935, Ḥakṣayā, Ptolomy, vi., ch. ii. v, Pāzwatn Dīr C, III. 25 are variants of the same name which was probably that of the ancient capital of Atropaten; cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, ix., p. 170. If the identification of Ḥakṣar (summa capital, Strabo) with Taktēh Subarān suggested by Rawlinson has been accepted (cf. Hoffmann, Anzüge aus syrischen Akten, p. 252; Marquart, Erzählungen, p. 108; William Jackson, Persia, Past and Present, p. 156), the identification of Ḥakṣar is still uncertain. On general principles it is improbable that a town like Maragha so advantageously situated by nature was not in existence in Roman times as the ancient name of Maragha increases the probability of the identification Ḥakṣar = Maragha (of course with a reservation as to the exact site of the ancient town).

A place-name Maragha is mentioned in Arabia (Yaḥūd) and a little town of the same name is in Egypt near Ṭamā. The etymology "place where an animal rolls" (from m-r-z) proposed itself to the Arabs here, but in Adharbājīān (cf. also the village of Maragha near Abarkūh, Nūḥat al-Kulāb, p. 122) the name is rather a popular Arab etymology of some local name. It is to be observed that Ptolomy, vi., ch. 2, calls Lake Urmia Margiane (margeni ʿπι; Μαργιανης Μεγας) and gives the same name to the country along the coast of Assyria. Lastly Marquart in Erzählungen, p. 143, 221, 313 retains the variant Ḥakṣar, but Ḥakṣar seems also to be based on a good tradition (cf. Ptolomy, ed. Wilberg, 1838, p. 391).

The Arabs. Maragha must have been among the towns of Adharbājīān conquered by Muḥār b. Shūb āl-Thakfī in the year 22 (Baladjānī, p. 325; Yaḥūbī, Kitāb al-Bulūdān, p. 271). Marwān b. Muḥammad returning from his expedition to Muṣṭan and Gīlān in 125 (740) (cf. Yaḥūbī, Historia, ii. 365) stopped here. As the place was full of dung (ṣirīqin ʿPers. ṣirīqīn) the old village (ģara) was given the name of Maragha (cf. above). Marwān did some building there. The town later passed to the daughters of Ḥartān al-Raghibī. On the rebellion of Waḏān b. Rawwād, lord of Tabriz [q. v.], Kūstāma b. Ḫāzīn who was appointed governor of Adharbājīān and Armanīyā by Muʿāwīyā (78; cf. Saṣmār, Khwarizmian nāmeh Aḵur Amīnīz: Zafı fatēla, 1927, p. 397), built walls round Maragha and put a garrison in it. When Bābāk rebelled in 201 the people sought refuge in Maragha. Maḏmūn sent men to restore the walls and the suburb (raḥāq) became inhabited again (Baladjānī, l.c.). In 221 Maragha is mentioned as the winter-quarters of Afšīān in his campaign against Bābāk (Tabarī, iii. 1186).

In 280 (893) the Saḏīd Muḥammad Afshīn b. Dīwādā seized Maragha from a certain Āb b. Ḫusain, b. Ḫusain, who was killed (Tabarī, iii. 2137; Maḏmūn, viii. 143). In 296 (908) the Saḏīḥīf conquered Yaḥūf b. Dīwād in possession of Maragha, and the whole of Adharbājīān. A dīwān is known of this year struck by Yaḥūf at Maragha (Saṣmār, O monteckh Saḥīḥē, Baku 1927, p. 14). According to Ibn Ḥawkal, p. 238, there was at Maragha a military camp (muʿākher), a governor's palace (vād al-qāmār), a treasury (khāṣa), and government offices (dirāṣat al-ṣubāhīya) but Yaḥūf razed the walls of Maragha and transferred the capital to Ardabil (cf. Ḫakṣarī, p. 181). Maragha is only mentioned as the place where the last Saḏīḥīf Abu l-Masāfīr al-Fathī was killed in 317 (929) (Arab. Tabari continuus, ed. de Goeje, p. 143).

The Dailamīs. In 322 (934) (during the rule
of the Dailami Musafiridis) the Russians (Bayr) had taken Bardha’a [q.v.]. Ibn Miskawash (G. M. S., vi. 100) speaks of the diseases which decimated them because they ate too much fruit in Maraga. This reference to Maraga is quite unexpected in the text and Margoliouth has strongly proposed to regard it as a corruption of اباد. A coin struck at Maraga in 337 by Muhammad b. Abd ar-Razzâk is a record of the brief conquest of Adharbajjân by the general of the Bâyûd Rukn al-Dawla (Vasmer, Zur Chronologie d. Gastûniden, Islamica, iii./2, 1927, p. 170). Of 347 we also have dirhams of Maraga in the names of the two sons of the Dailami Marzuban, Ibrahim and Djastân (ibid., p. 172).

The Rawâdi and the Safidjâks. After the disappearance of the Dailamis we find in Tabriz the family of Rawâdi Kurds who seem to have been related with the Musafiridis by marriage only. On the other hand, it is very likely that the Rawâdi are the descendants of the Arab Rawâdi al-Azdi, lord of Adharbajjân (Baladhurî, p. 331) who became assimilated by his neighbours in Adharbajjân. The best known of these Rawâdi was Wahshan b. Mamlâm [= Muhammed]; the change of d to t in Kurdish is common) who is mentioned between 420 and 446 (Ibn al-Athir, ix. 270–272). This incident shows that the district of Maraga was within the sphere of influence of Wahshân. In 446 Wahshân became a vassal of the Safidjâks, but Ibn al-Athir, ibid., p. 410 says nothing about the extent of his possessions around Sahand.

In 497 the peace between the sons of Malik-Shah, Darâyûk and Muhammad was signed near Maraga and in 498, Muhammad visited Maraga.

The Amâdail. In 505 we have for the first time mention of the Amir Amâdail b. Ibrahim b. Wahshân al-Rawâdi al-Kurdî, lord of Maraga and Kättab (Kîlûsār [Ibn al-Athir, x. 360]). He was a founder of a little local dynasty, which lasted till about 624. We know very little of the history of the Amâdail who has never been closely studied.

Amâdail was certainly the grandson of Wahshan b. Mamlân of Tabriz (cf. above) and this explains the insistence with which the atasheh of Maraga tried to retake Tabriz. Only intranscriptible hereditary rights can explain the strange fact of the presence of a Kurd among the amirs of the Safidjâks. The name Amâdail is a peculiar formation; the name of Amâdail, a village to the south of Maraga, belongs to the same category of diminutives. The Amâdail however very soon adopted Turkish names.

Amâdail with a large army took part in the Anti-Crusade of 505. During the siege of Tell Dahr, Joscelin came to terms with him (Gafara) and he withdrew from the town (Kâmil al-Din, Tarîkh Ihtalab, Rec. des hist. des croisades, iii. 599). Amâdail soon abandoned Syria entirely, for he coveted the lands of Sukmân Shâhi Arman who had just died. We know that Sukmân had extended his sway over Tabriz [q.v.] and the reference is probably to this town. According to Sibt b. al-Dawza, ibid., p. 556, Amâdail had 5,000 horsemen and the revenues from his fees amounted to 400,000 dinars a year. In 510 (or 508) Amâdail was stabbed in Baghdad by the Isma‘îlîs to whom he had done much injury (ibid., p. 556; Ibn al-Athir, x. 561).

Aq-Sunkur I. In 514 Malik Mas‘ûd, governor of Mavili and Adharbajjân, rebelled against his brother Mahâmâm and gave Maraga to his atâbeg Kašam al-Dawla al-Bârsûkî but the rebellion collapsed and in 516 Aq-Sunkur al-Ámâdail (chief of Amâdail), lord of Maraga, who was in Baghdad, was authorised by Sulîmân Mahâmâm to return to his seat. As the amir Kûn-tughîl, atâbeg of Malik Tughîl (lord of Arrân; Ibn al-Athir, x. 599), had died in 515, Aq-Sunkur expected to get his place with Tughîl. The latter ordered Aq-Sunkur to raise 10,000 men in Maraga and set out with him to conquer Ardabîl in which they failed. In the meanwhile Maraga was occupied by Hûnjûsh Beg, sent by Sulîmân Mahâmâm. The Georgian Chronicle (Bosset, i. 368) mentions under 516 (1123) the defeat of Aq-Sunkur (whom he calls “Aq-Sunkhthul, Atâbeg of Ram” = Arrân) during a demonstration against the Georgians carried out by Tughîl from Surwân. In 532 Aq-Sunkur took a part but not a very active one in the suppression of the intrigues of the Mavili Dala‘în. In 524 he was one of the promoters of the election of Ahmad al-Dawla to the throne of Dâwûd, whose atâbeg he was. In 526 Tughîl, uncle of Dâwûd, defeated the latter and occupied Maraga and Tabriz (al-Bundari, ed. Houtsma, p. 161). Dâwûd along with his uncle Mas‘ûd and Aq-Sunkur sought refuge in Baghdad. With the support of the Caliph and the assistance of Aq-Sunkur, Mas‘ûd reoccupied Adharbajjân. After the capture of Hamadân, Aq-Sunkur was killed there by the Isma‘îlîs (527) instigated by Tughîl’s vizier (al-Bundari, p. 169).

Aq-Sunkur II. The name of Aq-Sunkur’s son is transmitted in different forms. Ibn al-Athir, x. 165 and 277, calls him Aq-Sunkur (II); cf. also Muradî, ibid.-i Goznîda, p. 472. Al-Bundari, p. 231, calls him al-Amir Aq-Sunkur al-Bundarî; cf. also Houtsma, Lughat al-Vizier, p. 243. Nasar al-Dîn Ar-Rûfî (or al-Kâshchârî, Divân Ihtalab al-Turk, i. 56), gives him the name of Atâbeg Arslân Abu. Al-Bundarî treats him as an equal of the great amir Illûqz [q.v.] whose family finally triumphed over the lords of Maraga. Aq-Sunkur II’s adversary was the amir Kha‘bîk b. Bulang-eri (Kha‘bîk b. Bulang-eri) who was the favourite of Sulîmân Mas‘ûd and sought to establish himself in Arrân and Adharbajjân. This Kha‘bîk had besieged Maraga in 541 (al-Bundari, p. 217). In 545 Sulîmân Mas‘ûd took Maraga and destroyed its walls (Fara) but a reconciliation later took place between Kha‘bîk and Aq-Sunkur II under the walls of Rûsin-Iz (cf. below). The execution of Kha‘bîk in 547 (1153) by Sulîmân Mahâmâm alienated Illûqz and Aq-Sunkur II and they installed Sulaimân on the throne of Hamadân. Mahâmâm on his return to power sent an embassy to restore good relations with the two lords of Adharbajjân (Kha‘bîk, A.). Peace was concluded in 549 and the two great amirs shared Adharbajjân between them (al-Bundari, p. 213). On his deathbed (554) Mahâmâm entrusted his young son (Malik Dâwûd, cf. the genealogical tree in the Kîlûsât al-Safidjâk) to Aq-Sunkur. As Illûqz was furthering the interests
of his ward Sultân Arslân, Pahlawan b. Ildiguz advanced against Ak-Sunkûr II but the latter with the help of Sîhâbi Arman defeated him on the Sâfâl-rûd. In 556 Ak-Sunkûr sent 5,000 men to the help of the governor of Rayî, İnândî, who was fighting Ildiguz. The latter gained the upper hand and in 557 Ak-Sunkûr II took part in the expedition of Ildiguz against the Georgians (Ibn al-Âthîr, xi. 189). In 563 however, Ak-Sunkûr II obtained recognition for his ward from Bağhadîd. Pahlawan b. Ildiguz at once besieged Ak-Sunkûr in Marâğha (ibid., p. 218) but a peace put an end to hostilities.

In 564 the Amir of Rayî, İnândî, was killed (Ibn al-Âthîr, xi. 250). The Tâhi-i Gûzîda, p. 72, seems to suggest that the rebellion in Marâğha of Kutluq ( ), brother of Ak-Sunkûr (II), was due to İnândî's influence. He was punished by the Atâbeg Pahlawan b. Ildiguz and Marâgha was given to his brothers 'Alâ' al-Dîn and Kûnûk al-Dîn.

Under 570 Ibn al-Âthîr (xi. 280) mentions at Marâğha Fâlak al-Dîn, son of Ibn Ak-Sunkûr (i.e., son of Ak-Sunkûr II), to whom his father had bequeathed his estates. Pahlawan besieged the fortress of Rûyîn-dîz and Marâgha. On this occasion peace was concluded on thecession of Tabriz to the family of Ildiguz. This important detail shows that down to 570 the feif of the Ahmadiûd comprised all the country round mount Sahând including Tabriz [q.v.].

In 602 the lord of Marâgha 'Alâ' al-Dîn came to an agreement with the Atâbeg of Ardabîl Murâsîr al-Dîn Gûk-bûrî to deprive the Ildiguzid 'Abû Bakr of Âdharbâjîd on the pretext that he was incapable of ruling. From Marâgha they marched on Tabriz but 'Abû Bakr called to his aid the former slave of his family Ay-doghmîsh (cf. Defrémery, Recherches sur 4 princes d'Hezândan, 7, A., 1847, t. 100). Gûk-bûrî returned to his own lands and 'Abû Bakr with Ay-doghmîsh came to Marâgha. 'Alâ' al-Dîn had to surrender the fortress without losing the bone of contention but was given in compensation the towns of Urmiyâ and Ushân. In 604, 'Alâ' al-Dîn whom Ibn al-Âthîr, xii. 157, 152, here calls Kara-Sunkûr died and left one son, a minor. A brave servant of 'Alâ' al-Dîn assumed the guardianship of the child but the latter died in 605. 'Abû Bakr then took possession of all the lands of the Ahmadiûd except Rûyîn-dîz where the servant already mentioned had entrenched himself with his late master's treasures.

It is not clear if 'Alâ' al-Dîn Kara-Sunkûr is identical with the brother of Ak-Sunkûr II mentioned in 564. For the date of his accession and his issue there is no hint. According to the preface of the Hay'i, p. 181, the Java-î Khândîm b. Navâmî [?]., this poem (in-hand in 593) was composed at the request of 'Alâ' al-Dîn Kûbî's Arslân (Rûmûl the Rûm and the Rûs paid him tribute [Khândîm]; the Georgians suffered reverses as his hands). This name was definitely identified by Kiech, Crôstic, t., 507 and Supplement, 1895, p. 154 with 'Alâ' al-Dîn of Marâgha. Navâmî mentions two sons of 'Alâ' al-Dîn, Nûr-at-Dîn Muhammad and Ahmad, but to reconcile this with Ibn al-Âthîr we should have to suppose that both died before their father.

The family of the Ahmadiûd was continued for some time in the female line. In 618 the Mongols arrived before Marâgha and the town was stormed on the 4th Şâfar. The Mongols sacked and burned the town and massacred the inhabitants (ibid., xii. 246, 263) but the lady of Marâgha (daughter of 'Alâ' al-Dîn?), who lived in Rûyîn-dîz escaped the catastrophe.

Djalâl al-Dîn. In 622, the Khwârizmshâh Djalâl al-Dîn came to Marâgha via Daḵûkâ. He entered it without difficulty for the inhabitants were complaining of all kinds of oppressions and raids by the Georgians (Nasawi, Sirât Djalâl al-Dîn, ed. Houdas, p. 110). Djalâl al-Dîn tried to restore the prosperity of Marâgha; cf. Ibn al-Âthîr, xii. 250, 282.

In 624 (1227) while Djalâl al-Dîn was in the Persian Trâk, his vizier Sharâf al-Mûlîk was forced to reconquer Âdharbâjîd. In the course of his campaign he besieged Rûyîn-dîz, the lady of which was a grand-daughter (min lâsûtar) of the Atâbeg 'Alâ' al-Dîn Karâbâ ( ) (Nasawi, p. 129). This princess was married to the deaf-mute Kâmûshû, son of some of the Elidiguzid Ozbek. The Atâbeg Nasuât al-Dîn, son of Kâmûshû, mentioned incidentally by Dâuânâ, G.M.S., ii. 242, must have been his son. As a way, she offered her hand to Sharâf al-Mûlîk. Djalâl al-Dîn suddenly arrived from the Trâk and married the princess himself. Rûyîn-dîz was given to a certain Sâd al-Dîn. The citadel contained some thousands of houses (înây min dûr) occupied by the former inhabitants of the town (kudamînâ); Sâd al-Dîn decided to evacuate them but as a result of his treachery the fortress closed its gates again (to Sâd?) (Nasawi, p. 126, 157). Ibn al-Âthîr, xii. 322 seems to deal with the course of these events. Under 627 he says that the troops of Djalâl al-Dîn besieged Rûyîn-dîz for some time. The fortress was about to capitulate when some malcontents summoned the assistance of a Turkoman Amir Sewînîd (Swûlî) of the tribe of Kûsh-yalwâ. The domination of this chief and his relatives who succeeded him only lasted two years.

Rûyîn-dîz. This fortress lay near Marâgha (Ibn al-Âthîr, xii. 342). According to Zakariya Kâznî who gives a very accurate description of Rûyîn-dîz, it was 3 farsâhâs from Marâgha. Its proverbially impregnable position (furûh bi lâsûtar al-mawdûd) suggests that it was built on the side of Sahând. The Russian map marks it on the Sofî-câi 10 miles (c. 3 farsâhâs) above Marâgha a place called Yay-shâhâr (in Turkish = 'summet-town') besides which two streams flowed into the Sofî-câi (on the left bank) and between them is written the corrupted name "Res or Erin". It is very probable that this is the site of the famous fortress on either side of which there was a stream (nakhr); for Res one should read Des i.e. Rûyîn-dîz. The date of the final destruction of Rûyîn-dîz is unknown. As late as 751 the Çobânîn Aşıfû imprisoned his vizier there (v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Iranâ, ii. 357) but the Nâsashi al-Külâbî, in 1349 (1459) only knows the other Rûyîn-dîz, that of Sâwâlî (there is still a Rûyîn-dîz 4 farsâhâs N.E. of Ardabîl).

Kâlîbârâ. Ibn al-Âthîr, x. 340, calls Ahmadûd "lord of Marâgha and of Kûtâb". This last name ( ) seems to be a corruption of Kûtârâ ( ) or Kûrsân, a little town well known to the Arab geographers on the Marâgha-Ardabîl road (10-12 farsâhâs, from Marâgha and 20-27 from Ardabîl); cf. Ibn Khürudjûbîh, p. 120; Kâ-
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of John the Baptist 2/3 of a farsakh north of Maragha. After the accession of Ghazan (1295) the persecution of the Christians began, instigated by the amir Nawriz. The mob plundered the residence of the patriarch and the church of St. George built by the monk Rabban Shawa (it had been furnished with articles from the portable church of Arhangeli's camp). The patriarch sought refuge in the suite of the Armenian king Hatzon. On his return to Maragha, Ghazan punished the fomenters of the troubles. In 1298 Yahbalagh was confirmed in his rights. In Sept. 1301 he finished the monastery of St. John. His biographer and contemporary gives an account of the beautiful buildings, the numerous relics and riches of the monastery (Chabot, ap. cit., p. 133). The village of Daili (?) to the east of Maragha was purchased to serve as a walk of the monastery (to the N.E. of the town there is still a village of Kilsakandali village of the church). Ghazan and his successor Uljayt visited the monastery. Yahbalagh died and was buried there in 1317.

On the south side of the hill of the observatory there are a few small caverns or the rock (3 rooms 12 feet high communicating with one another, and a corridor). Inside there are niches in the shape of altars. Local tradition sees a church in these (perhaps of the 8th-9th period); cf. Macdonald, Kinneir, II, Schindler, Lehmann-Haupt and Minorsky, Zaf., xxiv, 1917, p. 167.

After the Mongols. In 1337 (1337) the Djalayrind Shakh Hasan inflicted a defeat on Tughla-Qutlur [q.v.] near Maragha (or at Hashtabadi). The pretender Muhammad was buried at Maragha in 738 (Ma'asarat al-Adab, p. 315). Later the political struggles of the Turkmans had their principal arena in the northern part of Azharistan. In the same period the Kurdish elements of the districts south of Lake Urmia became consolidated and received reinforcements from the districts of Mawsil (Shafarabbana, i. 288). The Mulk Kurd amirs extended their influence over Maragha and even as far as Dih-Khursh. The Turks during their rule over Azharistan included Maragha with Tabriz and levied 15 kharvars of gold per annum on it which caused its inhabitants to go away (Ibbat, p. 291). In 1002 (1593) the name of the fortress of Saru-kurghan (demolished in 795 by Timur; cf. Zafar-nama, i, 628 and rebuilt by the Mulk) in the region of Maragha often occurs in the Shafarabbana, p. 294—296; this name recalls that of the Xiraz, the right bank tributary of the Djalaghut.

During the second Ottoman occupation (1725) Maragha was governed by Abd al-Aziz Pasha; this administrative unit consisted of 5 sandjaks, of which 2 were hereditary and 3 granted by the government (v. Hammer, iv. 225; according to Celebi-zaide). In 1142 (1729) Nadir defeated the Ottomans at Miyanduz on the Djalaghat and occupied Dundum, Sawiy-balak, Maragha and Dih-Khursh (Mahdi-Khan, Tahiri-khali Nadiir, Tabriz 1284, p. 66; transl. Jones, i. 164). According to the recently discovered history of Nadir, the monarch transported 3,000 inhabitants from Maragha to Kalat (Rasbok, in Zaf., xxv, p. 88).

The Muqaddam. As early as the time of Nadir the Turkish title of Muqaddam is mentioned as settled in the region of Maragha (Macdonald, Kinneir: 15,000 men). Ahmad Khan Mukaddam played a considerable part in the affairs of Azhar-baidjan. Jaubert, Voyage, p. 160 knew him in 1805 as beglerbegi of Azharbaidjan under prince Abbas Mirza. In 1810 he exterminated the Bilibads whom he had invited to Maragha [cf. Sawdy-balak]. According to Morier, Second Journey, p. 293, this patriarch was aged 90 in 1815 (cf. Bryges, History of the Jazzars, p. 90). The governor of Maragha Sayned Khán, a partisan of Muhammad Ali Shah who besieged Tabriz in 1909, was of the family of Ahmed Khán. At the present day the Mukaddams are concentrated round Miyanduz.

In 1828 Maragha was occupied by Russian troops. In 1851, the Kurd invasion by Shaikh 'Ubaidallah reached the gates of Maragha. The town was not taken but the whole country round was in ruins when H. Schindler visited it in 1882. During the war of 1914—1918, Maragha was within the zone of the Russo-Turkish operations [cf. Taraz].

Bibliography: In addition to the native sources quoted in the text: Samani, Kitab al-Anadil, G.M.S., xx, fol. 519 (he also derived the name Maraghi from the clan al-Maraghi of the tribe of al-Azif); Hadji KHALifa, Djihak-nanum, p. 389; Ewliya-Celebi, Shih-bat-nya, iv, 333 (confused and of doubtful value); Zain al-Abdin, Rusun al-Siyah, p. 555.


(V. MINORSKY)

MARAND (1), a town in the Persian province of Azharbaidjan.

Position. The town lies about 40 miles N. of Tabriz, halfway between it and the Araxes (it is 42 miles from Marand to Djulfu). The road
from Tabriz to Khoi also branches off at Marand. A shorter road from Tabriz to Khoi follows the north bank of Lake Urmia and crosses the Mishowdagh range by the pass between Tussud [q.v.] and Djiyâ al-Dîn. Marand, which is surrounded by many gardens, occupies the eastern corner of a part of Marand and is enclosed by a fine plain, about ten miles broad and sloping softly. The Mishowdagh range (western continuation of the Sawânûn), separates it from the plain of Tabriz and from Lake Urmia. The pass to the south of Marand often mentioned by historians is known as Fam (Mongol = post-station). The pass between the plain of Marand and Tussud [q.v.] takes its name from the village of Valdiyân. To the east of Marand lies the wild and mountainous region of Karâgadagh (capital: Ahar). To the north, the plain of Marand is separated from the Araxes by a range, a continuation of the central heights of the Karâgadagh, which is crossed by the defile of the Dardiz. The plain of Marand is watered by the river of Zumir, the southern arm of which called Zilbir ruddi. The combination of watered land of Zumir and Zilbir flows into the Khotr-taí (an important right bank tributary of the Araxes) about 20 miles N.E. of Khoi. The length of the Zumir is about 40 miles (Ham Allâh Mustawfi: 8 farsaks). History. A lofty tell which rises beside the town is evidence of the great antiquity of this as an inhabited site; it must have existed in the time of the Vanni (Khâlî) and Assyrian kings. Its Greek name Messôvâh is perhaps connected with the people Mazdaštâr who, according to Ptolemy VI. 2, occupied the lands as far as Lake Urmia. A legend of Armenian origin based on the popular etymology mazr and "mater ilî" locates in Marand the tomb of Noah's wife (Hulchschm. *Die alterothischen Ortsnamen*, 1904, p. 346 and 451; Ker Porter, *Travels*, i. 217). Moses of Chorene places Marand in the district of Bakurakert. There was another Marand mentioned by the Armenian historian Orbelian (c. 1300) in the province of Sùnnîk (north of the Araxes) and a village of Marand still exists east of Tîgîhâ in the khâmate of Mâkh [q.v.].

Ibn Ba’th. After the Arab conquest a certain Hâlbas of the tribe of Râkha took Marand. His son Ba’th, a soldier of fortune (*ṣul’îk*) in the service of Ibn al-Râwîd, fortified Marand. Muhammad b. Ba’th erected enceâles there (ṣul’tur) (Baladhuri, p. 330). This chief had acquired considerable notoriety. In 200 (815) he had taken from the family of Rawîd, the strongholds of Shâhî and Tabriz (Tabari, iii. 1171). In another passage (Tabari, iii. 1379, mentions Bakdûr [3] in place of Tabriz). Ibn Ba’th lived at Shâhî which stood in the centre of Lake Urmia (the peninsula of Shâhî, where at a later date Hâlçû Khân kept his treasure and where he was buried). Ibn Ba’th was at first on good terms with the Khurrami Bâbak, whose authority must have prevailed in the Karâgadagh in particular, in the north-eastern corner of which was his residence al-Bâbdh. Ibn Ba’th suddenly changed his tactics and seized by a râwe ṭum, one of Bâbak’s generals whom he sent to the caliph al-Muti’asim. In 221 Ibn Ba’th accompanied Bughâ on his expedition against al-Bâbdh (Tabari, iii. 1190). In 1193 he became the caliphate of Mutawakkil, Ibn Ba’th committed some crime (*khâfa*) and was imprisoned in Surman-râ’a. On the interference of Bughâ al-Shâhî, 30 people of repute became guarantors of Ibn al-Bâbdh’s good behaviour and he must have been allowed considerable liberty, for in 234 (848) he escaped to Marand. Ibn Khurâfâbihi, who wrote in 234, mentions Marand as being Ibn Ba’th’s seif. Tabari, iii. 1379–1380, gives a very graphic account of the expedition sent against this town. The wall which enclosed Marand and its gardens was 2 farsaks in circumference. There were springs within it. The dense forest outside was a further protection to the town. Ibn Ba’th collected 2,000 adventurers who were reinforced by a number of non-Arabs (璧庫î) armed with slings. They had ballistai constructed to repel the assailants. During the 8 months that the siege lasted, 100 individuals of note (*arâfî al-sulûm*) were killed and 400 wounded. When Bughâ al-Shâhî (Baladhuri, p. 330; Bughâ al-Sa’dîb) arrived he succeeded in detaching the men of the Râbha tribe from Ibn Ba’th. Ibn Ba’th and his relatives were seized and his house and those of his partisans plundered. In Shawkail of 235 Bughâ arrived with 180 prisoners at the caliph’s court, where he offered his house to be beheaded but the latter recited verses in Arabic and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gifts (*muwâdha bâ-tâhâb*) and gave him his life. Ibn Ba’th died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenary (al-shâriyâ). According to one of Tabari’s authorities (iii. 1388), the shâhiyâ of Marâgha who praised the bravery and literary ability (adâb) of Ibn Ba’th also quoted his Persian verses (bi l’sarîsita) This important passage already quoted by Fârîdî, *Ruell. Schrifl. Oriental Studies*, vol. ii. Pt. iv., 1925, p. 836–838, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persia in the N.W. of Iran at the beginning of the ninth century. Ibn Ba’th must have been transcribed to a considerable extent, and, as has been mentioned, he relied for support on the non-Arab element in his rustaks (*-nilâd i ta’âshî). Later History. The Arab geographers of the tenth century (I-yakin, p. 182: Ibn Hâwâl, p. 239) mention Marand among the little towns of Ashâ背叛江ën where the material called *tlik* was manufactured. Mujaddadi, p. 51. 374, 377, puts Marand under Dabl and notes its gardens, its flourishing suburb and a cathedral-mosque in the centre of the market. The same author (p. 382) mentions a direct road from Marand to Marâgha (via Nûn [2], somewhere west of Tabriz). Later, Marand must have shared the fate of Tabriz [q.v.]. According to Yâkîn, in 503, the town had begun to decline after it was plundered by the Georgians (Kurds) who carried off its inhabitants. This is valuable confirmation of the Georgian expedition to Persia, a detailed account of which is given in the Georgic Chronicle for 1208–1210 (605–607) (cf. Tâ’âzî and Tibîk). Among the theologians, born in Marand, Yâ’âsit mentions one who died in 216 and another who had studied in Dâm-sus in 433. In 624 (1226) Marand which had not sufficient defence, was occupied by the ‘alî of al-Shâ’ârsh on of Khâitâ. Sharaf al-Mulk, governor for the Khâizârîmshah, retook the town and wrought great slaughter in it (Nasawi. ed. Houdas, p. 166). The only historical mention in Marand is the old mosque now in ruins with a mihrâb in situ bearing the date of rebuilding 731 (1331) (reign of the Ilkhan Abî Sâ’d). Cf. Sarre, *Denkmâler pers. Baudgen*, Berlin 1910, p. 24–25 and pl. xix.
and the observations by Herzfeld. Die Gumbad-i 'Ali-şirvân, in the Volume... presented to E. G. Brown, 1922, p. 194–195. In the same period (1916) Hedjâta al-Misir, [in:] Nechev al-Kûthî, G. S. xii., p. 58, counted 60 villages in the district of Marand. The walls (kârân) of the town were 8,000 paces (pārân) around but the town only occupied half the area.

Marand is several times mentioned in connection with the Turco-Persian wars. According to Ediyâ Celebi (in 1647), Siyâhat-nâma, i. 424, Marand was a hunting-ground of the Timurid Shahrukh. In spite of the damage done by the invasion of Sultan Murâd, the town looked prosperous and had 3,000 houses. Ediyâ enumerates a number of celebrated theologians hallowed north of Marand.

In the autumn of 1724 'Abd Allah Pasha Kaprul sent the Kurî Khan of Dâsh Muhammad 'Abd to occupy Marand the inhabitants of which had fled. Resistance centred round the town of Zani (10 miles N. of Marand) which had 7,000 (2) houses and a castle called Diza by the Persians. To dispose of the threat to their flank, the Janissaires before advancing on Tabriz, fought a battle here in May 1725 with the Persians of whom a large number were slain. Diza was taken and dismantled (cf. von Hammer, G. O. R., iv., p. 226, following Celebi-sâde).

Marand has often been mentioned by European travellers such as Chardin (1811 edition, p. 318), cf. the notices by Ker Porter, Jaubert, Morier, Ouseley and Montet of which a résumé is given in Ritter, Erdkunde, ix., p. 907. Marand has recently gained in importance since it lies on the modern high road from Tabriz to Hulaf built by the Russians in 1906 and replaced by a railway in 1915.

(2.) A town in the district of Khuttâl, to the north of the Oxus; cf. Mukaddesi, p. 49, 290–291.

(V. MINORSKY)

MARÂSH, a town in Syria near the Asia Minor frontier (al-Thu'ûr al-Shâmiyya). It lies about 2,000 feet above sea-level on the northern edge of the hollow (Amk of Marâsh; now Ca¿al Owa and south of it Sheker Owa or Marâsh Owa) which lies east of the Taurus and is watered by its tributary, the Nahâr Hûri (Ak-Sî). As a result of its situation at the intersection of the roads which run to Amk-Shaîlya, to 'Ain Zarba and al-Majdil, to Albusanî (Abul-balana) and Yarçâ, via Goksan (Kokussos) to Kañariya, via Behesht (Bahasa) to Sumasalî, and via al-Hadâth and Zîbatra to Malatya, Marâsh was from the earliest times one of the most important centres of traffic in the Syrian frontier region. It is repeatedly mentioned as early a Assyrian texts as Marşal, capital of the kingdom of Gurgum [cf. the artide MARÊŠA, and several Hittite monuments have been found there (cf. Unger, Marşalâ, in Ebert's Kallistik, d. Vor., viii., 1927, p. 48).

In the Roman imperial period it was called Germaniké in honour of Caligua (on the coins under Germaniké; cf. Geroire, Rev. d'Insc. publ. par Ber., ii., 1908, p. 217 sqq.). The identity of Germaniké and Marâsh is certain from numerous literary and Syriac references, the Armenians probably knew it, but probably from learned tradition only, the name Gârmân (Kermank in Vahram; cf. Math. of Edessa, d. Dulaureix, p. 487 infra; St. Martin, Mém. sur l'Arm., i. 200). In the statement in a description of the district of Halab (Paris MS. Amb., No. 1683, fol. 72a) that the Armenian name of the town was Nâkhûk (Blochet, R.O.L., p. 555 sqq., note 6) is wrong: this is a mistake for Gârmân, name later given to the neighbouring al-Hadâth (q.v.). The Emperor Heraclius passed the town in 626 (Theoeph, Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 313; Ramsay, Class. Review, x. 140; Gerland, Byz. Zeit. Schriften, ii., 1894, p. 362). The Emperor Leo III came from Marâsh (Germanikeia); later authors (like Theoph., op. cit., p. 394) wrongly called him the "Isaurian" (a confusion with Germanikopolis; cf. K. Schenk, Byz. Zeit. Schriften, v., 1896, p. 296–298).

In the year 16 Abî 'Ubayd sent Kâhîl b. al-Walîd from Manbij against Marâsh and the Greek garrison surrendered the fortress on being granted permission to withdraw un molested; Kâhîl then destroyed it (Caætani, Annali dell' Islam, iii., 1910, p. 794, 806). Sulaymân b. 'Awf al-Mâshûd in 1088–1089 set out from Marâsh against the Byzantines. Marâsh was retaken and settled soldiers in this "Arab Cayenne" (as Lammens, M. F. O. B., vi., 1913, p. 437 calls it). After 'Azm's death the attacks of the Greeks on the town became so severe that the inhabitants abandoned it.

After Muhammad b. Marwân in 74 (693–694) had broken the truce concluded by 'Abd al-Malik with the Greeks, in Dîjmâd I of the following year the Greeks set out from Marâsh against al-Amîk (= Amîk of Antîkia; cf. Le Strange, Palestine etc., p. 391) but were again driven back in the Amk of Marâsh. Marâsh was restored by al-'Âbâs, son of al-Walîd I, and fortified and repopulated; a large mosque was also built there. The people of Khinnasîn (i.e. probably of the Khâmis) had sent troops every year to Marâsh. During Marwân II's fighting against Hûs, the Emperor Constantine again besieged Marâsh, which had finally capitulated (746) and was destroyed (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 189; Theophanes, Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 422; Georg. Kedrenos, ed. Bonn, ii. 7). The inhabitants emigrated to Mesopotamia and the Dîjmâd of Khinnasîn. After the capture of Hûs, Marwân sent troops to Marâsh, who rebuilt the town in 130 (747); the castle in the centre of the town was henceforth called al-Marwânî after him (Yûbî, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 498 sq.). But by 137 (754) the Greeks again sacked the town. Al-Ma'sûrî then had it rebuilt by 'Abî al-Dî (150 = 767) and gave it a garrison which al-Mahdi strengthened and supplied with ample munitions (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 159; Theoph., Chron. il., p. 445: 6 ܦܐܪܟܐ ... ܡܡܠܐܐܢܐ ܓܝܘܪܐܢܐ ܒܐܡܘܢܐܝܢܐ ܕܐܢܐ ܚܙܐܐ). The Arabs in 769 (1080) entered the 'Amk of Marâsh and depopulated the inhabitants of the region who were caught on espionage on behalf of the Byzantines, to al-Ramî (Michael Syrus, Chron., ed. Chabot, ii. 526). According to the Syriac inscription of 'Enedî on the Ephrathas, in 776–777 A.D. (1088 Sel.) the people of the hollow (Amk) of Marâsh invaded Asia Minor (Bîth Rûmâyây) to plunder (Chabot, J., i., ser. ix., xi., 1900, p. 286 sqq.; Pognon, Inschr. imit. de la Syrie et de la Mesopotamie, p. 148–150, No. 84). A Greek army of 100,000 men in 161–162 (778–779) under Michael Lachandonarakos besieged Marâsh which was defended by 'Isâ b. 'Ali (Tabrizî in Theoph., op. cit., p. 451), grand-uncle of the Caliph al-Mahdi, destroyed al-Hadâth and laid waste the Syrian frontier (Wool, Gesch. d.}
Danishmand built the town of al-Hārinīyya near Marâşh (al-
Baladhuri, op. cit., p. 171; Yāhuti, iv. 498, wrongly
calls it a suburb of Marâşh); he also raised the
prosperity of Marâşh and al-Maṣṣāra (al-Maṣṣūdi, 
Muṣâbīd al-Dhahab, ed. Barbier de Meynard, viii., 
295). The amir Abû Ša'îd Muhammad b. Yūsuf in 
841 invaded Asia Minor; the Greeks drove him
back however and took al-Ḫudârat, Marâşh and
the district of Malâya (Michael Syrus, iii. 102; 
Weil, Gesch. d. Chaliph., ii., p. 215, note 1; 
considers this story unhistorical). The emperor 
Basil I in 877 passed via Ḫusaynâ (Gusān) and
the Taurus passes (στέγα πάνω) against Marâşh (Σαραντάπεδον) 
better could not take it and had to be
content with burning and plundering the suburbs;
the same thing happened at al-Ḫudârat (Ἄλτεξ; 
Georg. Kedrenos [Bonn], li. 214; Theophan.
continued, ed. Bonn, p. 280). According to the περὶ 
παραμερίας πολέμου (de victitiatione bellica, Migne, 
Patrol. Gracc., cxvii. 1000) shortly before the
attack on Germanikeia he crossed the Ἱππαθίωνος
ποταμοῦ (cf. Pliny, Nat. Hist., v. 93: one of the
'Sinus fluminis' of biblical probably the Alûš, 
Arabic Alûš, Latin Almus or Alimus, perhaps by 
Tomarchek, S. P. R. Wien, cxvii., 1891, Alth.
66, is therefore presumably wrong). The
Byzantine Andronicus in 292 (904—905) invaded
the region of Marâşh, defeated the garrisons of 
Târûs and Myass and destroyed Kūrûs (Im Ab-
Alîtir, ed. Tornberg, vii. 378; al-Ḏalârsî, iii. 2298:
Well, op. cit., p. 533; Vasilev, Visintyna i Arabi,
i., 1902, p. 154). The Armenian Mlekh (Arab. Malîh)
plundered Marâşh in 916; 50,000 prisoners were
withdrawn from it and Târûs (Well, op. cit., ii.
634; Vasilev, op. cit., p. 203 sq.). In the fighting
against Saif al-Dawla, the Greeks under John 
Kurkûas took Marâşh in the spring of 377 (949)
(Kamâl al-Dîn in Freytag, Z. D. M. G., ii. 187;
Well, op. cit., iii. 14, note 1; Vasilev, op. cit., 
p. 268). In 943 (1592) the Hamânî defeated the
Domestikos at Marâşh and in June rebuilt the
defences of the town (Freytag, op. cit., p. 191; 
Vasilev, op. cit., p. 291). When the Hamânî 
Abû l-Qâdir in 956 was taken a prisoner by
the Byzantines, his father-in-law Abû Firas followed
as far as Marâşh in the attempt to rescue him
but could not outtake his captors (Dâvûkâ, Abû Fâris, 
Leyden 1895, p. 31; Vasilev, op. cit., p. 297).
Nicephoros Phocas in Rabî I 1351 (Aug. 962)
occupied Marâşh, Dulûk and Ra'bîn (Freytag, 
op. cit., p. 199; Rosen, Zaptuki Imp. Akad. Nauk, 
xiv. 152, note 100). Bandâtkîtik in 382 (992)
carried out a raid on Marâşh and came back
with prisoners and great booty (Freytag, op. cit.,
p. 295; Rosen, p. 263). The Armenian Philaretos 
Brachamios (Filarðûs al-Rumî) who in the second half
of the xii. century, as a leader of a robber
band and ally of the Byzantine emperor, conquered
a little kingdom for himself on the Syrian frontier,
belonged to the village of Şirîbâz in the district of
Marâşh (Michael Syrus, iii. 173, 174 note —).
After the Franks under Godfrey de Bouillon
had taken Marâşh in 490 (1097), they installed
a bishop there (Michael Syrus, iii. 191). Bohemund
of Antioch was taken prisoner in June 1100 in the
same of Marâşh in the village of Gâna (Michael 
Syrus, iii. 188) on his campaign against Malâya
by Gümüştegin b. Dânishmand (Recueil des hist. 
or. des crois., iii. 589; Rohricht, Gesch. des Konig. 
Jevurs., p. 9; Well, op. cit., iii. 179). The emperor
Alexius later sent the general Butumites against
Marâşh (to Mârûşta) who took the town, fortified
the surrounding small towns and villages and gave
them garrisons and left Monastir there as 52 "κατάτα
(Anna Commena, Αλλαγές κα. ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 132, 
114; F. Chalandon, Les Comman., i, Paris 1900, 
p. 234). The town of Marâşh was placed under
the Armenian prince Thathul, who had distinguished
himself in its defence against Bohemund (Matthiæos 
Urhoææ, ed. Dulsurier, ch. cxxi., p. 239 sq.; 
Chalandon, Les Commin., ii. 104 sq.). But by 1104
he had to abandon it and surrender it to Joscelin 
de Courtenay, lord of Tell Bashir (Matthiæos, op. 
cit., p. 257, ch. clxxvi; Raoul of Caen, ch. 148;
Rohricht, op. cit., p. 49, note 8; p. 52, note 4). 
This Thathul is perhaps the same Armenian as
had given his daughter in marriage to Godfrey's 
brother Baldwin (in William of Tyre, x. 1. He is called 
Ταφαζ in Albert of Aix, iii. 31; v. 18: 
Taphraz; cf. Chalandon, op. cit., p. 105). By 1105 
Tancred of Antioch seems to have been in 
pursession of Marâşh (Rohricht, p. 56) to whom it was
allotted in the treaty of Nea. 1105 (Γενικοὺς ἡμερὰς, 
Anna Commena, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 171; Rohricht, 
p. 66). In 1114 the widow of the recently deceased
Armenian prince Kogh Vasil (= "kull the thief")
of Marâsh submitted to Abû Songkar of Maw-sîl
(Weil, op. cit., iii. 199); on the 25th Hûmâdd 
(Nov. 27) of the same year, Marâsh was devastated
by a disastrous earthquake in which 40,000 lost
their lives (Michael Syrus, transl. Chabos, ii. 200; 
Recueil hist. or. crois., ii. 607; Matthiæos Urohææ,
p. 289, ch. cxxvii.). King Baldwin granted a monk
named Godfrey (Gōdfrèius Monachus) a hief
consisting of Marâsh, Kaşûn and Ra'bîn (Michael 
Syrus, iii. 211; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 161); in 
1124 Godfrey was killed at the siege of Tarambil
in the train of Joscelin of Edessa. The Dêmâ-
mandî Muhammad b. Amr Gûzî in 1136-1137
laid waste the villages and monasteries near Marâsh
and Kaşûn (Matthiæos, p. 320, ch. cxxii.). The 
Sultan sulṭân Maṣûd in 1138 advanced as far as
Marâsh, plundering the country as he went (Michael 
Syrus, ii. 246) as did Maẓûk Muhammad of Malâya in 1141 
(Michael Syrus, iii. 249) and Kûlidj Arslân II in 1147 
(Michael Syrus, iii. 275). The town then belonged to 
Rudâned, son-in-law of Joscelin II of Edessa, who fell in 
1149 at Inanû (Rohricht, op. cit., p. 260). On Sept. 11, 
1149, Kûlidj Arslân and his father Maṣûd set out from 
Albâstân against Marâsh, plundered the 
country around and besieged the town. The Frankish 
garrison capitulated on being promised a safe 
retreat to Antâkîya; but the sulṭân sent a body 
of Turks after them, who fell upon them on the 
road and slew them. On this occasion all the 
treasures of the churches of Marâsh was lost, which 
the prie-ts who had rebelled against the bishop 
had appropriat (Michael Syrus, iii. 290; Matthiæos 
Urohææ, i. 330, ch. cclx.; Chalandon, op. cit., 
p. 421; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 263). After the 
capture of Joscelin, Nûr al-Dîn al-Ḫalib in 151 
(1151-1152) took a large part of the country 
of Edessa including the town of Marâsh (Tell Bandîr, 
Aštâb, Dûlûk, Kûrûs etc. (Recueil hist. or. des crois., 
p. 29, 481, i. 154; Well, op. cit., iii. 194; Rohricht, 
op. cit., p. 265, note 5). The district was then 
divided: the sulṭân received Marâsh, Barzamân, 
Ra'bîn, Kaşûn and Bânahâr; the Urtakiâ Kara 
Arsân of Ḫirân Ziyâd got Bûbûk, Gargar, Kâkkhâ
and Ḥyūn Mansūr; Nūr al-Dīn kept the rest (Michael Syrus, iii. 297; Wilūd of Tyre, xii. 156).
When Marāsh’s son Khīlīd Arslān, lord of Marāsh (Michael Syrus, iii. 318), attacked an Armenian village, the Armenians under Stephan, brother of the prince Thūrus, in 1156 revenged themselves by setting Marāsh on fire and carried off the whole population into captivity, during the absence of the Sulṭān and his Turks (Michael Syrus, iii. 314 [expanded from Barhebraeus, Chron. syr.], differently in Abī Shāhīb, Rec. hist. or. croiz., p. 92; F. Chalandon, Le Commiss., ii. [1912], p. 424).
Among those carried off was the bishop Dionysios bar Sullū, who escaped to the monastery of Kāfūr (according to Chabol, loc. cit., the kāfūr Kāfūr of Anna Comnena, ed. Reifsneider, i. 219) and wrote three memoirs about the devastation of his former diocese of Marāsh (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.; Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Litt., p. 298). Thūrus of Little Armenia in 1165 plundered Marāsh (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Begān, p. 331; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 319, note 8; Chalandon, op. cit., ii. 531, note 1). Nūr al-Dīn again took Marāsh from Khīlīd Arslān II when he was on a campaign against the Dānemādshāh Marāsh (Michael Syrus, iii. 213) in the beginning of Dhu ’l-Ka‘a 568 (June 14, 1173) and Bāhānā in Dhu ’l-Hijājja (Rec. hist. or. croiz., i. 43, 592; iv. 158; Mattheos U’hayyi, ed. Dulaüer, p. 360; Abu ’l-Fid’ā, Annal. Murt., ed. Reiske, iv. 4; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 303, who is followed by Chalandon, Les Commiss., i. 465, wrongly puts these events as early as 1159).
Nūr al-Dīn perhaps handed Marāsh over to his ally Mleiḥ of Little Armenia. When the dānemād raised the district of Ra’fān, al-Malik al-Ẓahīr in 592 (1195-1196) took the field against him, whereupon the lord of Marāsh sought forgiveness and recognised his suzerainty (Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Blochet, R. O. L., iv. 212). The Armenian ruler Rūpān III took Bāhūmess III of Anṭākiyya prisoner in 1185 and forced him to cede the territory from the Dījāhūn up to Kāstān (Michael Syrus, iii. 396 sq.; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 493, note 7, 661). (tiḥyāṭ al-Dīn) Inalīkhwās, son of Khīlīd Arslān II, in 605 (1208), when on a campaign against Little Armenia took Marāsh (Abu ’l-Fid’ā, Annal. Murt., ed. Reiske, iv. 232) and made Ḥuṣnān al-Dīn Iḥṣān governor of the town. He was succeeded in this office by his son Ibrahim, who in turn was succeeded by his son Nūrān al-Dīn, who ruled Marāsh for 50 years. The long reign of his son Mūsāfār al-Dīn was followed by that of his brother ’Īsāf al-Dīn who however in 656 (1259) abandoned the town which was much harassed by the Armenians and Georgians, after failing to find support either from ’Īsāf al-Dīn Kādī-Kabūs of Rūm or al-Malik al-Ṣālih of Egypt. The town then surrendered to the Armenians (Ibn al-Shima, Bahrūt 1009, p. 192).
Marāsh did not escape during the great Mongol invasion of Asia Minor. Barbars I of Egypt in his campaign against them in 670 (1271) sent from Ḥalāf a division under Ḥanbars al-Wāzīri and Ḥa’b b. Mullīn to Marāsh, who at once deserted the Tartars from there and slew them (Rec. hist. or. croiz., ii. 245; Maqrīzī, ed. Quatremère, Hist. de Sult. Murt., i. 101). In the wars with the rulers of Little Armenia troops from Ḥalāf went as far as Marāsh in 673 and destroyed the gates of the outer town (Weil, Geth., d. Chal., iv. 77). In the next few years Barbars negotiated with envoys from Sīs, from whom he demanded the surrender of Marāsh and Bahānā; but he was satisfied instead with a considerable sum of money (Maqrīzī, ed. Quatremere, op. cit., ii. 123 [year 673 = 1274]; iv. 104 [688 = 1289]). It was not till 692 (1292) that Sulṭān Ḥālib by a treaty received Bahānā, Marāsh and Tell Ḥamānā (Muṣṭafādī b. Abī ’l-Ḥājīa, Hist. des Sultans Murtūn, ed. Blochet, in Patrol. Orient., xiv. 557; Weil, op. cit., iv. 186); S. Lane-Poole, Hist. of Egypt in the Middle Ages, London 1901, p. 287). But the Armenians must have retained the two last named towns not long afterwards (Weil, iv. 213, note 1), for in 697 (1297) Marāsh was again taken by the emir Bībān Tabakhī, Nāṭib of Ḥalāf, for Lāḏīn. A treaty was then concluded with the ruler of Little Armenia by which the Dījāhūn was to be the frontier between the two countries; Ḥamīs, Tell Ḥamānā, Kunbārā, al-Nukār (on its position cf. L. Alīshān, Sīrānī, p. 493-496), Ḥādir Shuhghād, Sīrāndāk and Marāsh thus passed to Egypt (Maqrīzī, op. cit., i. 411, 63; Abu ’l-Fid’ā, Annal. Murt., v. 140).
In the second half of the viith (xivth) century Zain al-Dīn Karadjā and his son Khālid, the founders of the house of the Dhu ’l-Kadrogūn, conquered the lands along the Egyptian Asian Minor frontier with Malatyā, Albeṭisān, Bahānā and Kārphūt [cf. Dhu ’l-Kadrib]. In the mosque of Marāsh one of his successors, Malik Arslān, was murdered in 870 (1465-1466); his portrait with the inscription “Sulṭān Arslān” and that of his sister Sitti Khādīn with the legend “hūṣūy Yā rā” are painted in the Codex Venetus 516 of the Geography of Ptolomy, which he apparently intended to dedicate to his father-in-law Mehmed II (Olschanzen, in Hermes, xv, 1880, p. 417-424).
Conquered by Selīm I, Marāsh became Ottoman; on his campaign against the Dhu ’l-Kadriya in 1515 he encamped on his way back before Marāsh and then returned via Kaš Marāsh (now Kaš Bāzār or Kaš Dhu ’l-Kadriya) and Goksun to Kāsānīya (cf. Tsaeschner, Türk. Bild., xxiii, p. 36, note 4).
From 1532 belonging to Egypt, Marāsh passed finally in 1540 back to the Turks. The town was occupied by the French from 1913-1920; after its evacuation it was the scene of massacres of Armenians (F. Tournéhède, in Dict. d’hist. et de géogr. eccl., iv., Paris 1925, col. 360-362).
Marāsh is now the capital of a wilayet which in 1928 had about 150,000 inhabitants; the town itself has about 50,000 inhabitants.
The extent of the territory belonging to Marāsh was liable to vary considerably with the vicissitudes of the town in the middle ages. The following places are mentioned as belonging to the territory of the town:
Gardebāla (= Gerbolissa, Itin. Anton., ed. Parthey, p. 85; Kleyn, Jacobus Baradacius, p. 191; corrupted in Michael Syrus, ii. 256 to Arbīdīs, in Barhebraeus, Chron. Syr., p. 370 to Gerbīd), 28 Roman miles; all the Name of Tātar alone is 15 from Doliche (Tell Dūlāk near Ainīfūn).
Bebedīn “which is now destroyed” was the
birthplace of Nestorius near Marash (Patrol. Orient., xi. 16 sq.).

Shiraz, the birthplace of Philaretos (see above).

The monastery of Mar Shaño (Michael Syrus, iii. 148).

Kharshina, probably the Kharšìana of the Syrian writers, is described by Matthew Ughayce's (transl. Dulauriere, p. 259) as adjoining the territory of Marash. Dulauriere (op. cit., p. 445) locates it not far from the Eufrates; but in the Marāḍiāl al-Ḫiṣā'ī, ed. Juynboll, iii. 347, the reference is rather to Xarışan and in Barhebræus (Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjian, p. 319; cf. Michael Syrus, iii. 307), the correct reading is "Forêshina". We should rather identify it with Chabot (Michael Syrus, index, p. 437) with Kersten on the Nahe Aflun (cf. M. Hartmann, Zeit. Archäol. Gesch. f. Erdk. Berlin, xxix. 1854, p. 522, No. 47; Lammens, M. F. O. Beyrouth, ii. p. 353, note 2; in the Sâlûnâie of Ḫalab of 1236 [1869—1870]: Kersten). The modern vilâyet (formerly sandjâq) of Marash consists of four kázas:

Zaitún, north of Marash; scene of the Armenian rising against Turkey in 1804—1805, noted for its rich iron-mines (Aghassî, Zeitoun, Paris 1897: Anatolico Latino, Gli Armîni e Zaitun, Florence 1897).

Abîstân [q. v.], also north of Marash;

Andarûn, west of the town, and the ìlbîn (not to be confounded with Andar and the Syrian steppe); the capital of the kâza is Kheîn (Arm. Ghalân);

the capital of Leo of Little Armenia.

Pâzarjîk, between Marash and 'Aintâb; the capital is Bagdîn.


MARÂSH — MARÂTHA

See SHARI.AT.

MARÂTHA, commonly misspelt in Hindî and in Indian Persian Marâthâ, is the name of a people of Western India inhabiting Mahârâṣṭra, the country lying to the east of the Western Ghâts between the seventeenth and the twenty-first parallels of north latitude and extending at one point as far east as the seventy-ninth degree of east longitude. The Marâthâ caste is an agricultural caste, of common origin and nearly identical with the great Kûshâ caste, but sometimes claiming a Khaṭhirya descent. The Marâthâs served in the armies of the Muslim kingdoms of Southern India, and there gained military experience, but their opportunity came with the decline of the power of the Mughal Empire in the seventeenth century, when their national hero, Shivaji Bhonsla, converted the peasant population of Mahârâṣṭra into a military nation. Shivaji was born at Shiwner, near Dürnberg, in 1627 and while his father was conquering a great part of the Carnatic for Bûjâpûr, obtained possession of the new fort in the Western Ghâts. The Sultan of Bûjâpûr was unable to subdue him, and in 1659 he slew Afgal Khân, commander of the army of Bûjâpûr, at a friendly conference. In 1664 he sacked the city of Sûrat, and was obliged to contend with an imperial army sent by Awrangzib to punish him. In 1666 he was induced to pay homage to the emperor at Dûhî, but was so disgusted by his reception that he escaped and, returning to the Deccan, extended his authority there until, in 1674, he assumed the title of Râdji, and was enthroned at Raygâr. He gained possession of the grants of lands in Carnatic province, and when his father died, he became the ruler of the Marâthâs, now a nation. On the death of Awrangzib in 1707 Shâh was liberated, and mounted the throne of his grandfather, but was never more than a puppet-king, and left all business of state to his Dârâman minister, or Pîshâwâ, Bâldîjî Wishwâvash, who reduced his sovereign to the condition of a state prisoner and founded the dynasty of the Pîshâwâs. He led an army to Dûhî and extorted from the Marâthâs a great recognition of the Marâthâ state and the right to levy iâmah, or one quarter of the revenue, throughout the Deccan. In the time of his two successors, Bâldîjî Rûh I (1720—1740), and Bâldîjî Rûh II (1740—1761), the Marâthâs conquered Gudjârât, Malwa, Berâr, Gondwâna, and Uûrâîa, and raided the Carnatic, Bengal, and the Pàngâjû. They seemed to be on the point of superseding the Mughal power in India when Ahmad Shâh Abdâb or Dûrânnî [q. v.] crushed them at the battle of Pàmpàtâ in 1761. The Marâthâ power survived, however, in the lands of the Pîshâwâs' generals, Sindhyâ in Gâwllâr, Bhonsla in Dûhî, Chandôla in Indi, and Bûjâpûr in Gudjârât. The dynasty of the Pîshâwâs survived at Pûnâ, and a disputed succession in 1775 tempted the Bombay Government to intervene. In 1778 the Marâthâs surrounded the Bombay army near Pûnâ and compelled its leader to sign a humiliating convention, but an army sent from Bengal by Warren Hastings humbled Gâwllâr and the Pîshâwâ, and another force defeated Sindhyâ and captured Gâwllâr. Peace was restored on terms favourable to the Marâthâs, but their hegemony was much weakened. In 1802 Bâldîjî Rûh II, who had fled from Pûnâ, took refuge with the Government of Bombay and entered into a subsidiary alliance with the Government of India. He was reinstated in Pûnâ by
Major General Arthur Wellesley, but Sindhya, Bhonsla and Holkar, resenting the Pishwa's subjection to the British, took up arms, and the third Marathā War began. In the Deccan Arthur Wellesley captured Ahmadnagar, won the decisive victories of Assaye and Argān, and stormed the strong fortress of Gāwīl. In Hindustān General Lake defeated Sindhya's army at Laswārī, and occupied Dehī. Bhonsla lost Ėrisa and Bērār, Sindhya his possessions in the Dībāk and his guardianship of the emperor, and Holkar was humbled, but after the peace the freebooters known as the Fīndārs, whom the Marathās had employed, continued to ravage states under British protection, and even territories w'hen in 1853 the Marquess of Hastings concentrated troops to deal with these marauders, the Pishwā, Bhonsla, and Holkar rose against the British Residents at their courts. The first was defeated at Khīki, and the second at Sitalalād, and the army of the third was destroyed at Mahīdpūr. The dominions of the Pishwā were forfeited and annexed to the Bombay Presidency, and Holkar and Bhonsla lost much territory. Bhonsla died in 1853, and his dominions lapsed, in default of male issue, to the British Government. The dethroned Pishwā also lived until 1853, and his adopted son, Dholānt, was the Nāṣ al-Jāhī of the Indian Mutiny. Three great Marathā states remain to this day: those of Sindhya in Gāwīlāb, Holkar in Indīrā, and Gīkewīr in Gudjarāt, but not one of them is in Mahārāṣṭāra.


MARDAITES. These are the Dārājāmīs [g.v.] singular Dārjumānī, of the Arabs, they are sometimes confused with the Dārāmīkā, singular Dārmakūr, so called from the name of their town Dārājāmī. They occupied the rugged regions of the Amanus and of the Taurus, separating Syria from Cilicia, as well as the marshy districts of Antiochene [see ṬIŠKA]. They enjoyed a semi-independence nominally under the Byzantines to whom they furnished recruits and irregular troops. When the Arabs seized Antioch the Mardaites agreed to serve them as auxiliaries and scouts and in this capacity to watch the passes, the "doors of Syria in the mountains on the heights beside the defiles, commanding, the entrance to or the exit from Syria, they, in conjunction with the Arabs, supplied the garrisons, Exempt from the poll-tax, they obtained the right to spoil on the field of battle. They were in every sense of the word irregulars, living by war and by raids and asking only to fight for whoever paid for their services: half-nomads, they came and went again like a flash. Very lukewarm Christian Monothelites or Monophysites — we do not know exactly — their loyalty either to the Byzantines or to the Muslims was quite intermittent. Sometimes," says Baladhuri, "they obeyed our officials, at other times they betrayed us for the benefit of the Greeks". The precarious nature of the Arab conquest in the North of Syria — a varying frontier region continually devastated by the Muslims and by the Byzantines — and the difficulty of gaining access to the land of the Mardaites, made it impossible to chastise such fickle allies.

Towards the year 46 (666) the Greek Emperor succeeded in sending them against Syria. This was not a raid of the type usual to the mountaineers of the Amanus, but a regular invasion supported by a few squadrons of cavalry and led by officers of the Imperial army; their bands penetrated into the heart of the Lebanon and occupied its chief strategical points as far as Palestine. The natives, discontented with Arab rule and also the thousands of slaves whom the Muslim conquests on land and on sea had collected in Syria, hastened in a body to take refuge with the invaders. The highlanders of this country, who had kept their independence, also threw in their lot with the Mardaites. At all costs the Omayyad government had put an end to this dangerous movement, limit the extent of the invasion and to make sure at once of the neutrality of Byzantium who had let loose this hurricane. Not for a moment did Mu'awiyah hesitate to subscribe to the onerous terms of the Emperor — an annual tribute of 3,000 pieces of gold, the liberation of 8,000 prisoners, the delivery of 50 thorough-bred horses. In return the Emperor agreed to withdraw from the Mardaites his support in men, arms and money. There is however, no evidence that these adventurers definitely evacuated from that time their strong positions in the heart of the Syrian mountains. The neutrality of the Empire, the partial checks sustained by them and finally the establishment on the border of the Mardaites territory of a strong colony of Żūl [q.v.] reduced for the moment to inaction the Dārājāmīs, abandoned by the Byzantines.

A quarter of a century later, they once more attracted attention. This was under 'Abd al-Malik, who was engaged in an interminable war with the anti-Caliph Ibn al-Zabīd and was taken by surprise by the sudden rising of the Genoese 'Amr as-Asbāq [q.v.] in the year 68 (688—689). The Emperor Justinian II took advantage of these difficulties to let the Mardaites once more lose against Syria. The result was a repetition of the movement in the reign of Mu'awiyah I. Byzantium furnished them with subsidies and with arms. At the same time he sent the army of Anatolias to advance and support the irregulars. In the same manner as in the first invasion their ranks were swollen by the accession of thousands of slaves, fugitives and malcontents, amongst whom one could probably reckon the Maronites [cf. LAM]. Taken unawares, 'Abd al-Malik at once followed the policy of Mu'awiyah. The Emperor increased his demands. In addition to the conditions previously agreed to by the Sufyānid Caliph, the Arabs were forced to abandon to the Byzantines half the tribute of Cyprus, of Armenia and of Iberia. In return for this, Justinian agreed to withdraw the Mardaites. The majority of the invaders agreed to evacuate Syria. One of their chiefs, who persisted in continuing the war on his own account in the mountainous massif in the districts of Honīd and of Damascus, perished, treacherously assassinated by a partisan of the Caliph. A few Mardaites bands remained in the country, where we find them again still feared
and handled carefully in the caliphate of Walid I. Encouraged by the good results of the Emirate in 719, the height of the Arab expansion, the Djarradjima lived in practical independence of the Caliphate. They chose their masters and their rulers at their own convenience. At the same time some of them were quite ready to put their swords at the service of the Arabs. Amongst these must be named a leader of a band called Maitima or Mainim. He had his contingent (about a thousand men, probably all Mardaites like himself) perished at the siege of Tyane. His compatriots in the Amanus seem to have wished to profit by the death of 'Abd al-Malik to renew their raids upon the Syrian provinces. Maslama, the son of the Caliph, resolved to put an end to these rebels. He penetrated into their country, laid siege to their capital Djarradjima, and forced it to capitulate. Thousands of Mardaites perished in this campaign. To the remaining he granted the right to retain their Christian faith, to serve in the Muslim armies, if in fact he gave them the same terms as were obtained by their ancestors at the beginning of the Arab conquest. After this severe lesson the Mardaites perished, which had been the cause of incessant trouble during the reign of the preceding caliphs, was practically at an end. The people of Antiochene saw emigration begin to thin their ranks, many of them having decided to emigrate to Anatolia or to enter the service of the Emperor. This resolution, however, did not prevent the Mardaites, who remained in Syria, from fighting under the flag of the Caliph. We shall speak of the reign of Yazid II when they co-operated with the Antiochenes in the suppression of the troubles in the 'Iraq.

Bibliography: Mas'tdi, Mur'udj, ed. B. de Meynard, v. 224, 225; Ibn al-Athir, Kitab, ed. Cairo, i. 128; Tabarti, Anfis, i. 796; Baladhurl, Fulth', ed. de Goeje, p. 159—167; Suyuthi, Tarikh al-Kalafa', p. 87 (where Djurr-djuma is to be read for Djurr-djuma); Ibn al-Fakih, B.G.A., p. 35; Ahvaz, i. 158; xvi. 76; Michael Syrus, Chronique, ed. Chabot, ii. 479; Theophanes, Chronograph, Bonn, A.M. 6499; Wellhausen, Das arabis. Reich, p. 116, and Die Kämpfe mit den Römern in der Zeit der Umayyaden, p. 16—18, 24; H. Lammens, Études sur le regne du calife omeyyade Moustama, i. 14—22; Van Gelder, Mo'dafar al-dawla fig:j preschool, Leyden 1888, p. 99—99; Ibn al-Athir, Nilaihaj fi Charib al-hadith, Bâliâk, i. 153, 214. (H. Lammens)

MARDWIDJ. B. Ziyak, AHI-'L-HaJDJDJ, the founder of the Ziyarih dynasty, was descended on his father's side from the rulers of Gilân and on his mother's side from the Ispahbads of Kuyân. He had taken service under the 'Aliid rulers of Tabaristan and was a captain in the army under Asfar b. Shashidh. In 316 (928) Mardwijd al-Dîn, brother of Abu Muhammad Hasan, became a soldier and, shortly after that, rebelled against Asfar, made himself independent at Zandjan which he held in Qâdir and captured Kazwin. He then defeated Asfar, forced him to fly to Tabas in Kuhistan and put him to death in 319 when he was attempting to reach the castle of Alamut. Mardwijd thus became master of Rayy and Tabaristan. He then defeated Mâkân [q.v.] and annexed Tabaristan. Mâkân attempted once more to capture Tabaristan, with the help of powerful allies, but Mardwijd defeated him on each occasion and forced him to take refuge in Kharâfan. At this time (319 = 931) 'Ali, Hasan and Ahmad, the three sons of Buwâlî, who were commanders of the army of Mâkân, deserted to Mardwijd who conferred on 'Ali the eldest the governorship of the province of Kârajj.

Having consolidated his power over Tabaristan and Gurgân, Mardwijd next turned his attention to Djibal, defeated Hârân b. Gharîb the governor, in the neighbourhood of Hamadân in 319 (931) and conquered the whole of Djibal up to the confines of Hulwân. In the following year Mu'atadîr, the Caliph, formally recognised him as ruler of the provinces which he had conquered on condition that he evacuated Isfâhan, but as Mu'atadîr was assassinated shortly after this Mardwijd evaded compliance. About this time 'Ali b. Buwâlî, the governor of Kârajj, rebelled and took possession of Isfâhan. Mardwijd sent his brother Wahshînur against 'Ali who abandoned Isfâhan and retired to Arradjan. To deal more efficiently with 'Ali, Mardwijd made an alliance of friendship with vakûl, governor of Shiraz, marched to Isfâhan and threatened to take the field against 'Ali. 'Ali now offered submission and, as a guarantee of good faith, sent his brother Hasan as a hostage to Mardwijd.

In 322 (934) the Caliph Kâhir confirmed Mardwijd in his government on the condition of his evacuating Isfâhan. Mardwijd obeyed and sent instructions to his brother Wahshûnûr, the governor of Isfâhan, to deliver the province to the Caliph's agent, Mu'asafar b. Yâkûb, but as Kâhir was opposed shortly after this in Lûjanî I of the same year (April—May 934 A.D.) Mardwijd again evaded compliance.

In Safar 323 (Jan. 935) Mardwijd was assassinated by his Turkish slaves at Isfâhan. He was loved by his soldiers, who, if it is stated, carried his coffin on their shoulders all the way to Rayy for burial. Mardwijd was a man of high ambition and had drawn up a plan for the conquest of Baghîd and the restoration of the Persian Empire in his own person, but he was murdered before he could carry out this scheme.


MARDIN (written Mardin in Arabic, in Syriac Marde), a town in upper Mesopotamia (Diyar Rab'sa').

Position. In Upper Mesopotamia, the watershed between the Tigris and Euphrates is formed by the heights which culminate in Karadagh (5,000 feet) S.W. of Omer, named Omer by the limestone chain known in ancient times as Masius and later as Izala ( Marines). The eastern part of this ridge forms the district of Djabal-Tur or Tur 'Abdin [q.v.] the capital of which is Midjat. From the southern slopes of the Masius descend numerous watercourses, the majority of which join one another before flowing between the mountains of 'Abd al-Arz (in the west) and Tell-Kawkab and Sindjdr (in the east); their combined waters form the river Khabûr [q.v.].
Mardin lies near the point where there is an easy pass through the Musius from the lands south of the Tigris [the rivers Goksu and Shaiqibin] to the lands round the sources of the Khābār [the stream called Zuwārak which rises north of Mardin], in other words Mardin commands the Dīyar-bakr-Nisibin road (which then turns towards Ḥuzura b. Omar and Mawṣīl). On the other side it straddles towards the west several (Ritter, xi. 356, gives three) direct roads connect Mardin via Urfa with Biredkı (on the Euphrates); to the S.W. a road runs from Mardin to Ra's al-Ain (there is now a railway) and to Harrān. The direct distances are as follows: Mardin-Dīyar-bakr 55 miles; Mardin-Nisibin 30 miles; Mardin-Sawur-Midyāt 75 miles; Mardin-Biredkı 160 miles; Mardin-Adana (by rail) 450 miles.

The advantage of this position at the intersection of important roads is enhanced by the very strong natural situation of the town, built at a height of 4,000 feet on an isolated eminence on the top of which is a fort 300 feet above the town (cf. the sketch in Cernek, pl. ii., No. 17). Buckingham compares its position with that of Quito in South America. All travellers (cf. Ibn Ḥawḳal, p. 152) have been struck by the unique spectacle of the vast Mesopotamian plain which from the height of the town is seen to stretch southwards as far as the eye can see. Only a hundred years ago Mardin was still considered impregnable, but the difficulty of access sensibly ailed its commerce. According to Cernek loaded camels could not ascend right up to the town. A branch line 15 miles in length now connects Mardin with the station of Darbaziya on the “Baghdād” railway, but the station for Mardin is five miles from the town.

Ancient History. It is noteworthy that in spite of its remarkable situation Mardin does not seem to have been mentioned in the cuneiform sources. Ammianus Marcellinus (viii. 9, 4) is the first to mention two fortresses, “Marīdā and Lorīne” between which the road passed from Amid (Dīyar-bakr) to Nisibin. Theophanes Simokatta (ii. 2, 19) mentions τοῖς Μάρδην ἔρεσι καὶ (v. 3, 17) τοῖς Μάρδην 3 param sosts from Dīyar. Procopius, De Aedificiis, (ii. 4) mentions Ερασίδης (or Εράσιδης) and Λαρέας and Georgius Cyprius, ed. Gelzer, 1826, p. 46: Μάρδης Λαρέας.

The name Mārīdā in Ptolemy, vi. 1, however, refers to another place in Assyria to the east of the Tigris.

Muslim Conquest. The Muslims under 'Ubayd b. Ghanm occupied the fortress of Mardin along with Tur 'Abdin and Darā in 19 (649) (Baladurhi, p. 176) In 133 Mardin is mentioned in connection with a rebellion in Upper Mesopotamia. The town formed part of the possessions of Burāzka chief of the Khaba' who was defeated by the 'Abbasid Abū Dā'llār (Tabari, n. 53). In 279, Ahmad b. Qas took Mardin from Muhammad b. 'Isak b. Kandilā (ibid., in 2134). Hamdan b. Hamdan after his accession in 260 (873) seized Mardin. In 281 the caliph Muzaffar marched on the town; Hamdan fled and left Mardin to his son. The latter surrendered the fortress which was dismantled (cf. d. in 2142). The “grey fortress” (al-ḥār al-ażīz) was later restored, for Ibn Hawkal (in 366) attributes its erection to the Hamdan b. al-Husayn Nāṣir-al-Dawla b. 'Abd Allāh b. Hamdan. On the death of his father in 358. Hamdan was dispossessed by his brother Fadl Allāh Abū Taghlīb. By the peace of 363, concluded between the Bayud Bahkhtiyar and Abū Taghlīb, Hamdan recovered his possessions with the exception of Mardin (Ibn Miskawan, ed. Amedroz, ii. 254 and 319).

The Arab geographers give few details about Mardin but they emphasise its importance. According to Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 132, 136, the khārā'ī of Mardin was equal to that of Muṣayyarān (865,000 dirhams). Iṣṭakhrī, p. 76k, says that it is a large town on the summit of a peak the ascent of which is a farāšā in length; Dunaisar [q. v.] was one of its dependencies. Ibn Ḥawḳal, p. 143, gives the ascent at two farāsaks. The quarter of Mardin itself was flourishing, thickly populated with large markets. The water supply was brought by subterranean canals from the springs to the town.

The rain-water was also collected in cisterns (gaḫāridā wa-bīrā'. Yaḵṣt, iv. 390 (cf. al-Ḳawmī, p. 172), speaks of the splendour of the quarters outside Mardin (i.e. below the town itself) and its many madāsas, ḥāmānakās etc.; as to the khāla there was nowhere in the world so strong a defence; its dwelling-houses rose in terraces one above the other.

The Marvānids and the Sāljuqs. It is probable that Mardin was within the sphere of influence of the Marwānids, for according to their historian (cf. Amedroz, J. R. A. S., 1904), their ancestor Bāgh (d. 850 = 990) had extended his power over Dīyar-Kabā' (Nisibin, Tūr 'Abdin). The Sāljuqs ruled there next. After the death of Wilkshīk, Turğū b. Abī Mūsā seized for a time all the lands as far as Nisibin. Under Barkiyaruq Mardin was given to his old bard (muqahān).

The Oritoḳids. At this time arose the dynasty whose fortunes are especially associated with Mardin. The son (or grandson?) of Orotok called Yāḵšt took by stratagem the fortress in which he had been imprisoned but it was taken from him by his brother Sukmān b. Orotok who died in 498. In 502 we find at Mardin Il-ghaṣī b. Orotok (Ibn al-Aḥtr. x. 289, 321) whose line reigned there till 811 (1405) (cf. the art. ortoḳids). On their coins struck at Mardin in 509, 600, 634, 637, 648, 655, 656 etc., cf. Ghīlīh Edhem, Catalogue des monnaies turcomanes, Constantineople 1894 and S. Lane Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. iii. and x. (Index, s. v. Marvānīn).

In 579 (1183) Saladin came to Harrām (6 miles S.W. of Mardin) but was unable to take the town. In 594 Malik 'Adil b. Ayūb seized the outer suburb which was pillaged but the siege of the town itself was abandoned in the following year. In 599, 'Adil sent against Mardin his son al-Ashraf who appointed governors (shahna) in its dependencies. The Ayūbid of Aleppo al-Zahir b. Salāh al-Dīn offered his good offices and 'Adil was content with an indemnity of 150,000 dinars and the acknowledgment of his suzerainty by the Orotokīd of Mardin (cf. Abu l-Faradj, ed. Poçoche, p. 412, 425, 427).

The Mongols. In 657 the Mongol Hulagu Khān demanded the homage of the prince of Mardin, Naqīm al-Dīn Qābir, Sa'id, who sent his son Muqaffar to him but maintained a neutral attitude. In 658 the town was besieged for 8 months by the troops of Yashmut, son of Hülagu. Famine and an epidemic raged in the town. Ac-
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cording to Rashid al-Din (ed. Quatremèere, p. 375). Muşafar killed his father in order to put an end to the suffering of the inhabitants (Abu l-Faraj and Wasif give different versions, cf. d’Ohsson, in. 308, 335). Muşafar was confirmed as lord of Mardin; his descendants also received from the Mongols the insignia of royalty (crown and parasol). In the reign of Şahî b. Munsar (769 = 1367) whose sister Denya Khatûn was the wife of the enchanter of Mardin. In the vicinity of Mardin. Dîjîhângir (848—857), son of 'Ali, was already master of the town. In the reign of Uzun Hâsan, Josephath Barbaro visited Mardin and was lodged in the hostel (ospedale) built by Dîjîhângir Beg (Zangi). We have coins struck at Mardin by Uzun Hâsan (875) and by his son Ya'qûb. After the death of Ya'qûb 'Ali b. Dawla, prince of the Ilk-Kadar Turkomans, seceded the land of Diyarbakr but, as the anonymous Venetian merchant shows, the Akgoyunlu retained Mardin. In 903 (1498) Abu l-Muşafar Kâsim b. Dîjîhângir dated his firman in the name of the prince of Egid from his capital (dâr al-sultanî) Mardin; cf. Baasâneg, Der älteste Firma von der Zungenwechs., Wissensch. Mitt. aus Bresl.-Vienna, vi., Vienna 1899, p. 497. The coins of Kâsim come down to 908. The takbiya of Kâsim-pahta which Niebuhr mentions must date from the same ruler.

Persian Conquest. In 913 (1507) all the lands as far as Malatya were conquered by Ṣâhil Isma'il who appointed his general Ustâdju Muhammad to it. It was left to the Venetians who travelled there in 1507 (op. cit., p. 149), Mardin was occupied without bloodshed. The same traveller mentions the fine palaces and mosques of the town; there were more Armenians and Jews in Mardin than Muslims. The battle of Çahiran (914) shook the power of the Persians. In place of Ustâdju Muhammad killed at Çahiran, his brother Kara Kâhan was appointed and established his headquarters at Mardin. Soon the Ottomans occupied Diyarbakr and then the town of Mardin, but the Persians who never lost the fortress restored the status quo.

Ottoman conquest. Finally in 922 (1516) Kara Kâhan was defeated and slain in battle at Karghan-dede near the old town of Koçhisar, 10 miles S.W. of Mardin. Persian domination in Upper Mesopotamia thus collapsed, but the fortress of Mardin still remained in the hands of Selim Khan, brother of Kara Kâhan. The siege lasted a year and not till Ṣâhil Muhammad Pâsha arrived from Syria with reinforcements was it stormed and its valiant defenders put to the sword (see C. Navarre, p. 24, 32; this Persian source mentions Olangi Yûrâk [?] in place of Koçhisar (s. Hammer, G. O. R. ii. 1757—40, quoting Abu l-Fadl. al-Sultani of Hazim Isrâi and continuator of his Hâjişeddin). In the Baghdad campaign of 941, Mardin was created a sanjak and included in the eyalat of Diyarbekr. Ewliya Celebi, iv. 59 gives Mardin 36 ciömets and 465 timânos; Mardin could put in the field 1,060 armed men (cf. also). In the xviiith century Mardin became a dependency of the Pâsha of Baghâd: Otter (1757) found at Mardin a recôte anchored by Ahmad Pâsha. As late as the time of Kinneir (1810), Mardin was the frontier town of the pashalik of Baghâd and was governed by a mandarin sent from Baghâd. The reforms of Mahommed were badly received in Upper Mesopotamia. In 1532 (Amshireh) Mardin rebelled. Power in Mardin had passed to the Kurd bey, 'Osâdîneghe (1816) speaks of a here-ditary (lit.) family who ruled in Mardin. The two brothers of the ruling bey seized the power and refused to recognise the authority of the Porte. (It may be asked if these boys were not of the Mili tribe: on their chiefs cf. Buckingham, op. cit. p. 156) Râshîd Pâsha, the paître of Kûrdschan, besieged the town and blew up the great mosque
(Ainsworth). Order was temporarily restored. Considerable works were undertaken to improve the road giving access to the town. Rashid Pasha died in January 1837 (Posjoulat). When the Egyptians invaded Syria, their partisan Timawi b. Ayoub of the Milli tribe seized Mardin (Sir Mark Sykes, *The Caliph’s Last Heritage*, London 1915, p. 320) but was killed. The defeat of the Ottomans at Nizib (June 1839) brought matters to a head. The Porte entrusted Mardin to Sa‘d Allah Pasha of Dijabarik, but the inhabitants preferred to submit to Hürdim Pasha of Mawsil who was opposed to the tausimah. This Pasha appointed a governor to Mardin but the rebels still held the citadel (Ainsworth 1840) and the governor soon perished in a rising.

By the “wilâyet law” of 1287 (1870) Mardin became a sanjâq of the wilâyet of Dijabarik. It had 5 kağas: Mardin, Nishîn, Dijaira, Midiyat and Avîne. The area of the sanjâq was 7,750 square miles and the number of towns and villages 1,062. The sanjâq was mainly agricultural. The town of Mardin produced a small quantity of silk, wool and cotton, leather, shawls, etc., but in spite of the excellence of the work these articles were mainly used for local consumption (Cuinet). By the reforms of 1921 Mardin formed a wilâyet with 6 kağas, 1,018 towns and villages, and 123,899 inhabitants (*Turkiyâ Dânîkî-i Hûyâtî, 1925–1926 Sâlî-nâméi*). The Sâlî-nâmé of 1926–1927 made a number of changes. There are now 8 kağas. The area is 6,000 square miles with 6½ million *dounm* of arable land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kağas</th>
<th>Number of towns</th>
<th>Corresponding villages</th>
<th>Nâlijyas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Kêbişşar</td>
<td>Nûlijyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawur (Awniya)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Omorâgân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishîn</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Halâb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midiyat</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Alîyân (Dirân)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerîn</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Kerîbûrân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka’s al-Aîn</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Mahalîlî Matînân (Šâmarîkî)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dîre</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Slûbi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ker-djûs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The wilâyet now marches with the zone of the French mandate.

Population. Niebuhr (1766) counted 3,000 houses in Mardin (of which 1,000 were Christian) with 60,000 inhabitants. Dupré (1805) estimated the population at 27,000 of whom 20,000 were Turks (i.e. Muslims), 3,200 Jacobites, 2,000 Armenians, and 500 Shamînî. The statement of other travellers are as follows: Kinnair (1814): 11,000 of whom 1,500 were Armenians; Southgate (1837): 3,000 of whom 1,750 were Muslims, 500 Armenian Catholics, 400 Jacobites, 250 Syrian Catholics, 100 Chaldaean: Muhlbock (1838): 12–15,000 inhabitants; Sachau (1879): 20,000; Cuinet (1891): 25,000 of whom 15,700 are Muslims.


Among the religion sects of Mardin the Shamsiya would merit a special study. In the time of Niebuhr (1766) there were about a hundred families in the town, and Buckingham (cf. *cit.*, p. 192) and Southgate (1837) also mention them. The Shamsiya probably represent the last survivors of a local pagan cult. Towards the middle of the xviii. century they were led to declare themselves Jacobite Christians but only formally (cf. Ritter, *x.*, p. 303–305).

Christianity at Mardin. The district of Mardin has played an exceptionally important part in the development of Eastern Christianity. A brilliant period of the Nestorian church which begins in 755 is closely associated with Mardin. Towards the end of the eighth century numerous monasteries were established round the town by the bishop John of Mardin. In 1171 the Jacobite patriarca was transferred from Dijabarik (Amîl) to Mardin. In 1207 it was moved to Deir-Zaftar, an hour’s journey from Mardin, to return to Mardin in 1555 (Asseman, *Bibli. Orient.*, Vol. 1). Wright, in *A Syriac Literature*, 1891 [Index] On the position of the Christians before 1914 cf. the works of Southgate, Parry, Cuinet etc.

Antiquities. According to Niebuhr, there are many Arabic inscriptions at Mardin. Those of the Ortokids have been studied by ‘Ali Emiri Efendi who also examined the *wâdi* documents relating to the principal buildings of this dynasty at Mardin (cf. Kâtîb Ferdi, *Mardin Multûki Usulât-i Muršid-i Türkî, ed. and annot. by ‘Ali Emiri, Stambul 1884*). For the list of buildings cf. the article ORTOKIDS. The monuments of Mardin which must be of considerable artistic interest have never been described in detail. Buckingham (p. 191) gives a few details about the minaret of the “great mosque” (a cylinder decorated with carved arches, on a square base, etc.; a stone gallery with a pointed roof on the top) i.e. the Mosque of Naqdim al-Din Alpi built in 568–572; but the buildings have never been studied. We do not know if the *madrasa* of Kâsin Pâdqshâh Aq-Koyunlu (Niebuhr) is still in existence. The domes of the mosques of Mardin are ribbed and guttered*, their vertical ribs radiating from the summit.


The Travels of *Jusafâ*, Barbare (1431) and The Travels of a merchant in Persia (1517), in the vol. of the *Hâkînî Society*, publ. in 1873: I. della Valle, *Viaggi*, Bârâyîn, 1845, i. 515 (the traveller’s wife was a native of Mardin); Tavernier (1641), *Les six voyages*, 1662, i. 1875; Niebuhr (1766), *Reisebeschreibung*, Copenhagen 1778, ii, p. 391–398, and plate xlvii; Olivier (1795), *Voyage*, Paris 12 (3 plates) 242; Dupré (1808), *Voyage*, i. 77–82; Kinnair, *A geogr. Memoir of the Persian Empire*, 1815, p. 264–265; Kinnair (1814), *Journey through Asia Minor*, London 1818, p. 433; Buckingham, *Travels in Mesopotamia, London* 1827, p. 188–194 (with a general view of the

**MARDJ DABIJK, a battlefield near DabiJK [q. v.] on the Nahr al-Kuwait in northern Syria. On the history of the town of DabiJK, which was known to the Assyrians as Dabug (Sachau, Z. A., xii. 47) and is called Daiýa by theophanes (Uhrn., ed. de Door, p. 432, 451 sq.) cf. above vol. i., DabiJK.


When in 491 (998) the Franks conquered Anjakiya, Kerbghâ of Mawslî assembled a large army on DabiJK, with which he sallied west to Anjakiya (Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, x. 185; Abu ‘l-Fida’, Kamal al-Din et al., in Rec. hist. or. crois., i. 3, 194; iii. 380). In the spring of 513 (1119) Highazi on his campaign against the Franks crossed the Euphrates at Baddäya (now Beldia on Sachau’s map) and Sandja and advanced via Tell Bâshir (q.v.), Tell Khalid, Mardiýa DabiJK and Musliamiy against Khanrasin (Kamal al-Din, in Rec. hist. or. crois., i. 560). In the beginning of September 1124 DabiJK b. Sadak was defeated by Husn al-Din Timurtash on the field of DabiJK (Rec. hist. or. crois., v. 645.) On his campaign against Leo II of Little Armenia, al-Malik al-Zahir encamped in 602 (1305–1306) on Mardiýa DabiJK (Rec. hist. or. crois., v. 155). On Saif al-din Tunguz’s campaign against the Tatars to Malatya [q. v.] in which Abu ‘l-Fida’ of Hamt took part, a halt was made on the way back on the field of DabiJK from the 3rd Safar to the 2nd Rabi’ II 715 (May 9–July 6, 1315) (Abu ‘l-Fida’, Rec. hist. or. crois., p. 32).

On the 25th Radjab 922 (Aug. 24, 1516) was fought at Mardiýa DabiJK the battle which gave Selim I a decisive victory by which Syria passed for the next four centuries under Ottoman rule (H. Jansky, Mitteil. a. osm. Geschicht., ii., 1923–1926, p. 214–224).


**MARDJ RABIIT, the name of a plain near Damascus.** On leaving Damascus in the direction of Homs, just before crossing the pass of the Eagle, al-’Ukhb, one reaches the village of Marjd ‘Athrã. To the east of this place stretches the plain, Marjd Rabiit, which extends as far as the desert. It is here and not in the "Hochelmen Quattara" (v. Moritz) that the site of the Omayyads after the death of Mu’awiyah II was settled. This decisive battle since it was fought in the neighbourhood of Marjd ‘Athrã was named by the poet al-Râfi after this place. With greater exactitude the contemporary poet al-Aghâli, who was more consonant with Omayyad history, places this battle between the ‘Ukhb and Rabiit" namely in "the vast plain of Marjd" mentioned by the poets (Aghâni, xvii. 112).

During the discussions of the congress of Djâbiya [q. v.] the concentration of the Kâisi forces was taking place under the command of Dabak b. Kais [q. v.] supported by the Yemen contingent and the Kaisis’ malcontents to the south of Damascus. Their total—which has probably been exaggerated—has been placed at 30,000. Marwan b. al-Jakam had at his command eight or ten thousand and combats, the majority of whom were Kubîs. The Kaisis seem to have taken up their position first at Marjd al-Suffar [q. v.] to the north of Djâbiya. After an engagement in this place had ended to their disadvantage, they were forced to double back to the north. In the meantime a sudden attack launched against Damascus was defeated. Troops were delivered into the hands of the Omayyad supporters the treasury and the arsenals of this town. The Kaisis were forced to avoid being caught between the capital and the Kubîs army advancing from Djâbiya, while harassed at close-quarters by their adversaries. These engagements occupied nearly twenty days. On arriving on the heights of Marjd Rabiit, trapped between the defiles of ‘Ukhb and the desert, they accepted battle. One must ask how the Kalbîs succeeded in making up for their glaring inferiority in numbers. Mas’udî, without explaining further, speaks of a stratagem devised by Marwan. This stratagem, which is mentioned by the author of
the Ikār al-farādī should be described not as a cause of war but as a crime. After the advantage gained at Marjd al-Suffar, the Umayyads had had the time, and without doubt made use of it, to detach from the Kaisis their temporary allies, the Yemenis and the Kufāris. The treasure of the state seized during the Umayyads and the large amount of wealth brought from the Irāk by the family of Ziyād b. Abīti may have been of assistance in doing this. The Syrian Arabs, not at ease in the camp of Dāhēk, no doubt understood how much the triumph of Ibn al-Zubair would be prejudicial to their hitherto privileged position and to the hegemony wielded since the days of the Sufyānids by the Syrian tribes. Their defection must, we think, have determined the issue of the engagement at Marjd Rāhiṭ and hastened the triumph of the Umayyad arms.

Whatever was the cause this victory was decisive (the middle of July 684). 3,000 Kaisis are said to have been killed. The death of Dāhēk seems to have been the signal of defeat, which became a regular disaster, in which the principal chiefs of Kātib perished. Flight alone saved the most prominent among them, Zubār b. Ḥalid [q.v.]

The memory of Marjd Rāhiṭ was deeply impressed upon the Kaisi. It detached them en bloc from the Omayyad cause. Under the first two Marwānid caliphs, their battle-cry became "Vengeance for the victims of Rāhiṭ". From this time a axle is said never to have appeared on the Continent of the surviving chiefs. Between them and their ancient rivals of Kalb the split became much deeper. The latter's songs of victory answered the cries of rage of the Kaisis. In celebrating the battle of Rāhiṭ the Kalbī poets give more emphasis to their triumph than to that of the Omayyads. Their compositions complemently develop this theme without regard to the Marwānids, their debtors rather than their sovereigns. This great victory afforded the aggl. Marwan the opportunity of proclaiming himself as Caliph of Damascus before beginning the conquest of the old Sufyānid lands now under the authority of Ibn al-Zubair. In the bosom of the Caliphate, it nourished the most dangerous rebellion; it inaugurated a savage war of extermination between Kalb and Kais. The tribes of Kuṭa'ā first, then the Yemenis and lastly the Taghlibi saw themselves in turn fatally involved. These internal feuds in which the members of the Marwānī family had the impudence to take part, to the satisfaction of their maternal connections, precipitated the fall of the Omayyad dynasty by destroying the agreement and the unity amongst the Arab tribes, which had been but imperfectly realized in the Marwānid Caliphate.


**MARDJ AL-SUFFAR,** a plain situated 20 miles south of Damascus near the modern Tell Shaḡah; a stream called the "Wādi Arrām" runs through it. The place plays a part in the military history of the first century A.H.; first in the accounts of the Arab conquest of Syria, and later at the beginning of the Marwānid dynasty. The name has been sometimes confused with that of Marjd Rāhiṭ [q.v.]. For the history of the Syria in the first century A.H. we are exclusively dependent upon the Ṣūfān annalists. Forgetting that the name "Marj" abounds in the toponymy of the Damascus region, writers have confused two distinct battles and made them one and referred them to Marjd Rāhiṭ, a name which occurs frequently in the poets of the Marwānī period.

At the close of the year 13 A.H. the Arabs, victorious at Fīhl, endeavoured to reach Damascus by cutting across the Ḍjālān. One of their bands, under the command of the Omayyad Ḥalid b. Sa’d, encamped at Marjd al-Suffar and allowed themselves to be taken by surprise by the Byzantine troops. The Arab leader was killed and his presence enabled to the roll of Muslim reinforcements enabled them to regain the advantage. The Greeks then proceeded to shut themselves in Damascus to which the Arabs at once laid siege.

In the month of May 684 (64), supporters of the Omayyads joined with Ḍiḥbiya [q.v.] in order to elect a successor to Mu’tawiyah II. Dāhēk b. Kāsī [q.v.], the leader of the rival section of the Zubairis and the governor of Damascus, was invited to the conference. He promised to come to the conclave and marched out of Damascus at the head of imposing forces. But, having gone about half way on the road to Ḍiḥbiya, on the heights of Marjd al-Suffar, he determined to await events there. The presence of water and of forage made it suitable for the encampment of an army. An excellent point of observation, the site not only commanded the congress of Diḥbiya, but also commanded the road leading to Damascus. Dāhēk brought about at this point the concentration of the Kais of Syria, who were in revolt against the Omayyads. At Diḥbiya after 40 days' deliberation, the Kalbīs and the Omayyad partisans elected Marwān b. al-Jakam [q.v.] to be Caliph. Then in their advance upon Damascus, they attacked Dāhēk and the Kaisi encamped at Marjd al-Suffar and succeeded in defeating them.

Of this campaign the Irāk annalists and their copyists have only recorded and have only desired to record the decisive battle, namely that of Marjd Rāhiṭ, to the north of Damascus. For a quarter of a century no mention is made of any battle between the Kaisi and the Kalbī but Marjd Rāhiṭ. The extraordinary prominence given to this latter battle by the poets of both sides helped to throw into oblivion the preceding engagements commencing with that of Marjd al-Suffar. Certain texts have however preserved its memory. Yākūt (Madīqam, iii. 400) locates in this place "a battle celebrated in the history and poetry of the Marwānī period". Otherwise there is no reference to Marjd al-Suffar in the military history of the younger branch of the Omayyads. As regards poetry it has kept for us the testament of the Ṣūfān poet al-Aḫbatī (Dīwān, ed. Salani, p. 224, v. i.). This contemporary poet, who was a habitant of the Omayyad court while praising the glorious deeds of his
tribe, claims for it "many victories even before Marjd al-Suffar". As we know that the Taghlibis fought in the ranks of the Omayyads, for whom they showed themselves at all times strong partisans, the reference must be to this battle. Moreover the manner in which al-Aghtal praises this victory suggests that he was not dealing with a small skirmish.

In the meanwhile an Omayyad partisan residing at Damascus had seized the capital. The position became untenable at Marjd al-Suffar for the Kaisis. It was to avoid being caught between Damascus and the victorious Kalibs that Dalghakh fell back precipitously to Marjd Rabi', where he was defeated and killed. On the 22nd June 684, the election of Marwan b. al-Hakam was proclaimed at Dhibiya. It is probable then that the battle of Marjd al-Suffar must be located in the early days of July.


MAREA. [See MAREK.]

MARGHELAN, originally Margghânâ, a town in Farghâna (q.v.), where also the minor importance of the town in the 4th (9th) century (B. G. A., ii. 272, 19; faghi7a) and its rise in the centuries following are discussed (Samâna, K. al-Anbâb, G.A.S., x., f. 523 a; min maghâr al-Ilâb: Ëaâb, iv. 500 a; min ašhtar ašhrâbâd). The town does not seem to have been of political importance during this period, although coins were occasionally struck here under the dynasty of the Ilek-Khâns (q.v.). (A. Markow, Inventar'siyi Katalog musul'manskikh monet Imp. Ermitazaia, p. 260, 265 and 272). Bâbar (fac,s. ed. Beveridge, f. 3 sq.) gives a brief description of the town; the population at that time consisted of Sârs (q.v.) i.e., according to the linguistic usage of the time, of Taghâk (q.v.); since then the Taghâk have been driven by the Ozbek here as everywhere else out of the plain. The more recent, probably Ozbek form Marghâlân is found for example in Abd al-Karim Bokhârî (ed. Schefer, p. 94) whence the Russian Margelan; the river on which the town stands is called Margelan-Sai. In literature the old form Marghânîn or Marghânîn is still frequently used e.g. in the Tarikh Shahrâbî, ed. Pantusov, p. 195.

Marghelan was occupied without resistance by the Russians on the 8/20th Sept. 1875; New Margelân founded as the capital of Farqhan in 1877 by the Russians about 7 miles from Marghelan was called Skobelev from 1907 (since the Revolution: Fegana). The original Marghelan was mainly noted for its silk industry; according to the census of 1897, the population was 36,490, in 1911 46,780 of whom only 144 were Russians. A building which is certainly not ancient is called Iskander Pasha and said to be the tomb of Alexander the Great (W. Masalâskî, Turkestanîski Kraj, Peters burg 1913, p. 705 sq.).

Bibliography: given in the text. (W. BARTHOLOM)

AL-MARGHÎNÂNî, the name of two families of Ḥanâfî lawyers, nizâb from their native town and the scene of their activities Marghînânî in Farghânâ.

I. 1. The most important was Burhân al-Dîn Abu 'l-Hâsân 'Ali b. Abî Bakr b. 'Abd al-Ḍâ'il al-Farghânî al-Marghînânî, the author of the celebrated Ḥidâya. He acquired his knowledge on his travels, then still the usual way of studying in Islam. His principal teachers were Nadhm al-Dîn Abî Hâfîz 'Umar b. Muhammad b. Alâm al-Nasâ'î († 537 = 1142—1143), al-Sârîr al-Shâhid Ḥusâm al-Dîn 'Omar b. 'Abî l-'Abî'âd b. 'Omar b. Mâzâl († 536 = 1141—1142) and Abû 'Ilâm Othman b. 'Abî al-Bakordi († 1552 = 1157), a pupil of al-Sârîr. He studied Tirmidhî's work on Tradition under 'Ilâm al-Dîn Abî Muhammad 'Sadî b. 'Abd with the inâdî given in Kârâtsh, i. 259, No. 679 and also with al-Hâsân b. 'Ali al-Marghînânî (Kârâtsh, i. 198, N°. 497). He himself as was often done at this time, wrote a record of his studies, which do not appear to have survived. He far surpassed his teachers and won recognition in his native town also where he died in 593 (1197). Of his works the following are known, some surviving in manuscript and others only known from literary references: 1. Ye'âr al-Muhâkhab (Kur., in Ḥâdîsh Khâtfa, N°. 13750 probably wrongly: al-Mashâhî); 2. K. Manâsh al-Hâdil (Kur., N°. 12943); 3. K. Fi' Fârâbî (Kur., also called Farîd al-ʿOqîmînî (Kur., N°. 8989); 4. two collections of fawsâ: K. al-Tâdlim wa al-Madh (Kur., ii., K. Kh., N°. 2457; MSS. in Brockelmann) and K. Muḥdâ'at al-Nurâzî (Kur.; in Kur., also called K. Makhzûr al-Nurâzî and in ii., Kh., N°. 11586 called: Muḥdâ'at al-Futârawâ: MSS. in Brockelmann); 6. Murîd fi Fârîd al-Hâfîfâsî (Kur., N°. 11828; identical with No. 4); 7. a commentary on Shaîbânî's al-Qâdir al-Kabîr (Kur., ii. 567); 8. his principal work is the legal compendium K. Bâdîyat al-Mubâdî (MSS. in Brockelmann), based on Kârâtsh's Mûsârâr and Shaîbânî's al-Qâdir al-Ṣâlih. On this work he himself wrote a large commentary in 8 volumes: the Kifâyaat al-Muštâhâb. But before he had completed it, he thought it was much too diffuse and decided to write a second commentary, the celebrated Ḥidâya which later writers repeatedly edited and annotated. The most important commentaries and synopses are given in the table on p. 280. For the manuscripts and printed texts of these commentaries and synopses and many supercommentaries and glosses see Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 376; a printed edition of the Ḥidâya recently appeared in 4 vols., Cairo 1326. Bibliographical: al-Kurâtsh, al-Jâzâ'irât al-Mutāf, Hâdîsh Khâtfa, 1322, N°. 1059; 'Abd al-Hâfîz al-Laknawî, al-Fârâbî al-Hâfîz N°. 867, Cairo 1324, p. 141 sq. (synops of the Tadhâbi of Kâfawî); Ibn Ḥûtubâghî, Târîh al-Târîqânî, ed. Hugel, Leipzig 1852. No. 124; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 376 and the literature there given. His sons and pupils were: 2. ʿIMĀD AL-DÎN AL-FARGHÂNî; cf. Luknawî, i. 376.
II. Another family of ḫanafī lawyers goes back to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Rażāk b. Ṣaqr b. Ǧaʿfar b. Sulaymān al-Marghīnānī, who died in 477 (1084—1085) in Marghīnān at the age of 68. Of his six sons who attained fame as mujtahids we may mention ʿAbd al-Ḥasan Zāhir al-Dīn ʿAṣim († 506 = 1112—1113). His son and pupil was Zāhir al-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. ʿAṣim b. ʿAṣim al-Marghīnānī, four works by him are recorded: ʿAbdāyi, Faḍāṭiṣ, Faḍāyiṭ al-Marghīnānī. ʿAbd al-Majīnī, the last of which survives in manuscript. He was the teacher of the famous Fakhr al-Dīn Kāhilīkhān († 592 = 1196) and of Burūsh al-Dīn al-Marghīnānī [q.v.].

Bibliography: Samānī, K. al-ʿĀṣīb, fol. 522; Kurāshī, N., 487, 850, 1010; Laknawī, p. 62, 97, 121; Flügel, Classen d. haufige Richtungsleitern, Leipzig 1860, p. 309; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 379. (HeFIRIEN)

MARĪB (Mārib), a town in the south-west of Arabia, formerly the capital of the Sabaeans and now the capital of the amirate of the same name.

The ancient town of Marīb, which so far has only been visited by three European travellers, Mediterraneans (Gaza-Ghazare) and which ran from Shahwāt-Sabata via Thammān-Tnunna near Darb Kamb in the Wādī Balīn through Wādī Ḥarīb via Marīb into the Mineaean Dja‘af, to Nadīrjan and from there via Thirmāla, Abā al-Khdar, Ḥalqāl, Jalīt, Djielī, Bēdī, Wādī l-Hāṣib, Wādī l-Bahr, Wādī l-Ǧabīr, Wādī l-Farīd, Huruz, Kotba, Banāt Ḥarb, Djiurash, Tebālā, Kān al-Manṣūrīl, Mekka, Yathrib, al-Medīna, Fadak, Khābar, al-ʿOla, Taimā, Ḡrā, Tabīb, Ḥuruz, Mahān, al-Ḥāl, Ḥām, Ashurī to Petra and thence to Gaza while Marīb was also connected with the ʿEmāmah, the coast of the Persian Gulf and Babylonia, via Neqūr and via the route which followed the Wādī l-Dawāṣir (cf. A. Grohmann, Historisch-geographische Bemerkungen zu d. G. 418, 419, 1000, a. 16, p. 116). It still forms an important junction and has good connections with Ḥadramawt, Rurād, Veraq, ʿArād, al-Djaf, Ṣaṣā, Neqūr and the Wādī l-Dawāṣir (E. Glaser, Reise nach Marīb, p. 20).

The ancient city wall, 3 feet thick, enables us still to recognise with more or less certainty 8 gates — not only 2, as Th. Arnaud (Plan de la cite et de la ville de Marīb, in ʿJ. A., ser. viii, 

Th. J. Arnaud (1843), J. Halévy (1869) and E. Glaser (1888), is situated in the plateau of Sabā, 3,900 feet above sea-level, which runs east of the Balāq range and is traversed by the Wādī Djenne (Adhāna) which in the course of millennia has deposited a thick layer of silt and thus made a luxuriant vegetation possible. The modern village of the same name stands on a large mound of ancient rubble within the old city walls and is situated about exactly in 15° 26'/ N. Lat. and 45° 16'/ East. Long., about 10 days' journey from the Red Sea and the same from the Gulf of ʿAden. This favourable situation predestined Marīb to be the centre of the Sabean kingdom, the heart of which was the southwestern corner of the Arabian Peninsula and which, at times also included the eastern hinterland of the Gulf of ʿAden including Ḥadramawt and Mahra (E. Glaser, Reise nach Marīb, p. 18, 185). Marīb also lay on the important caravan-route which connects the lands which produced frankincense with the

Bidāya

author's own commentary

Hidāya

comm. by al-Sighnākī: Nihāya
(written in 700 = 1300)

comm. by al-Bābirti: Indiya
(† 786 = 1384):

comm. by al-Kuršānī:
(vii/b = xivth century):
Kifāya

synopsis by Maḥmūd b. Ṣadr al-Shāfir a I
(vi/b = xith century):
Wiṭāya

comm. by Ṣadr al-Shāfir a II
(† 747 = 1346):
Shāfir al-Wiṭāya
(written in 743)

synopsis by Ṣadr al-Shāfir a II:
Nihāya

comm. by al-Kūhīstānī:
(† 950 = 1543):
Liṭtim al-Rūmūs

3. ʿOmar Nīẓām al-Dīn al-Farghānī. Two works by him are recorded: i. Fawālʿ (I. Kh., N. 9, 930); 2. Ḥaddżawīrid al-Fīrhh, which he compiled from the Muqlīṣar of Taḥwīl and other works (I. Kh., N. 421; MSS. in Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 376, note 2, where the mark of interrogation should be deleted; cf. Kurāshī, ii. 394; Laknawī, p. 149).


He wrote on legal procedure in civil cases entitled al-Fīrhl al-Sīmādīya, which he completed in Shaʿbān 651 (Oct. 1253) in Samarqand. Cf. H. Kh., N. 5094; Lak., p. 93; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 382, where the MSS. are given.
The old town which occupied an area of about 1,000 yards square, a calculation by E. Glaser, which agrees with Th. Arnaud's plan of the town (J. A., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 11) [Glaser gives the distance between the two opposite gates as 1/4 hour], is built entirely on the left bank of the Wadi Dhenne. It seems, to conclude from the remains of the 3 feet thick wall around it, which has only survived in places, to have practically formed an oblique angled parallelogram the longer sides of which follow the line of the Wadi Dhenne while the eastern and western sides (breadth) run practically due north and south. The southern wall which runs parallel to the river bank turns from north to east at an angle of 60° and runs almost E.N.E. This fact is clear not only from E. Glaser's description of his *Reise nach Mārib* (p. 36 sq., 45) and the Mārib *Tagbuch* but also from Glaser's *Skizzen* (Nº. 51) upon which is based the appended plan of Mārib and vicinity. It is a striking contrast to Th. J. Arnaud's description and map (J. A., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 11) [a map of the Mārib district with a circle and also to Glaser's earlier sketches in his large *Kartenbuch*, p. 8 sq. and the map drawn up after investigations in the year 1888, which forms fol. 4 of E. Glaser's collection I. The foundation of the wall consists of cement blocks 5 feet long, 15 inches high and 2 feet thick. On the top of 8 -- 10 layers of these blocks are placed regularly hewn blocks of marble of the same size. The wall which unfortunately is almost completely destroyed does not run in a straight line but at regular intervals there are rectangular projections, as is clearly shown in E. Glaser's already mentioned sketch Nº. 51 and in that of his *Tagbuch*, xi. p. 125, which moreover gives the plan of the town as a rectangle — Glaser notes here "the city wall was apparently built as a quadrilateral" —, while Nº. 51 shows rather a trapezium the base of which lies away from the river while the shorter side parallel runs along the river. The rectangular projections found at regular intervals were probably towers, which strengthened the defences and stood out at regular intervals in the style we know from Assyrian fortifications (cf. the similar quadrangular plan of a fortress with gates near the corner and towers covered by steplike battlements in B. Meissner, *Babyloniaca* and Assyrien, i., *Kulturgesch. Biblioth.* v. 3, Heidelberg 1920). That the city walls of Mārib had towers is also evident from the great inscription (Glaser 418--419) which is older than the great Sīrāwā inscription Gl. 1000. In this we are told in line 4 that the unknown ruler built "the two gates of Mārib (ميْرِب) and built towers for Mārib of Baklā stone" (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, *Attalosische Texte*, i. 6 sq.).

Rhodokanakis suggests, presumably rightly, that this king was continuing the work of the unnamed son of the Sabaean mukarrab Sumuhū-'Alaya Vanaš (سَمْعُوحَةُ-اللَايْاُ-يْاَنَاف) who, according to the inscriptions Glaser 412 = Arnaud 41, 413 = Arnaud 42, 414, 437, 445, 500, 510, 537, 589, 600, 634 and perhaps also 751, "built a wall around Mārib".
by command of and with the help of 'Aliyar'. Whether the son of Sumuhu-'alaya Yanaf was the builder of Mā'rib seems uncertain; in any case he is the oldest builder of the town whom we know from the inscriptions.

Nur is it known who founded Mā'rib. That it was Saba', son of Yathj'ub, as the Arab genealogists think, is of course quite an unfounded supposition (cf. Yaqqūt, Muṣḥārik, p. 239; Abu 'l-Fidā', Historia antiaramica, p. 114 sq.; A. v. Kremer, Über die sudarabische Sage, p. 26 sq.; E. Osander, Z. D. M. G., x. 68).

That the city wall was frequently restored is evident from the fact that inscribed blocks of the earliest period of Sabaean history were used as building material in any order without heeding the context of the inscription (cf. Glaser, Reise nach Mā'rib, p. 45 sq., 51, 74) which is the case e.g. in the texts Glaser 699—707, and as there were no inscriptions of a later period in the lower strata the renovation must have begun after the reigns of the three Sabaean mukarribis Yid'il-Iluy Bayin, Sumuhu-'alaya Yanaf and Yid'il-'amara Watar. To the same period as these inscriptions must belong the old Sabaean boustrophedon text, Glaser 926 = 1350 + 1531 = 1736, which comes from al-Meshžāf, not far east of Sīrūḵ, as the first, as N. Rhodokanakis has pointed out, is identical with Yid'il-'amara Watar, Yid'il-Iluy Bayin, the conqueror of Nashk, while Sumuhu-'alaya is perhaps the same as Sumuhu-'alaya Yanaf, in whose reign the inscription Glaser 926 was set up. Glaser must also be right in assuming (Stitzer, i. 68) that the town of Mā'rib is considerably older than the wall and a number of decades must have passed away before the town attained the extent indicated by the oldest remains of walls. This is also evident from the mention of independent kings of Mā'rib in the inscription Glaser 502 which is older than Glaser 411. A memory of this earliest period in Sabaean history seems to be preserved by the poet 'Alkama Dāl Djdan, who mentions kings of Mā'rib along with kings of Sīrūḵ (cf. D. H. Muller, Sabaische Denkmaler, p. 99).

According to al-Hamdānī (ktūb, viii., in D. H. Muller, Burgen u. Schlosser, ii. 959 sq., 1038 sq.), there were in Mā'rib the three citadels Sāḥiḥa, al-Kāšib and al-Hādjar. For the former which is expressly stated to have been the royal capital and palace of Bilḵis, cf. the article Sāḥiḥa. The question where this castle is to be located in Mā'rib has been very variously answered. D. H. Muller, Burgen u. Schlosser, ii. 968 thinks that Sāḥiḥa was on the site of the modern village of Mā'rib, which, as Arnaud has already suggested, has been occupied by an old citadel (? J. A., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 12). Glaser (Reise nach Mā'rib, p. 73) on the other hand identifies Sāḥiḥa with the colossal building the foundations of which lie south of the Mātādān. In connection with Sāḥiḥa, al-Hamdānī also mentions the lower pillars of the throne (of Bilḵis) — so D. H. Muller translates 'ārṣ — which became celebrated in the Muslim world through Kurān xxvii. 23 and were still standing in his time and so firmly rooted in the ground that they could not be overthrown. Glaser, Reise nach Mā'rib, p. 139 however assumes that the reference here is to the Haram of Bilḵis with its pillars but admits the possibility that a citadel of the town proper is being described, since Sāḥiḥa is talked of immediately afterwards. Djirjīl Żāīdān, Kīṯāb al-'Arab ḵabīl al- lhām, p. 143 also assumes that the palace of Sāḥiḥa is referred to. Spranger, Post- u. Reisenreiten, p. 140 also tells of this thron e of Bilḵis that it stood on stone pillars 29 ells high which were still intact and the foundations were as deep as its height (this statement is erroneously attributed by Spranger to Bakti but presumably comes from Ibn al-Madījānī). The Dīǰān-nūnāmā also (cf. Jomard in F. Mengin, Histoire de l'Égypte, p. 344) says that the throne of Bilḵis was built on columns 29 ells high in Sāḥiḥa (= Mā'rib). This sounds very improbable if we should really understand by 'ārṣ a throne, which according to Nasḫānī al-Himīyāri, p. 50, stood in the palace of Bilḵis in Mā'rib. When however we are told by Nasḫānī, p. 70, that 'ārṣ is a castle which was built on columns of stone and the verse of Asād 'Ṭubba' quoted gives the name 'ārṣ to the palace of Bilḵis, we may then in the above passages take it to mean a citadel rather than a throne and with Glaser, Reise nach Mā'rib, p. 73, look for it in the S.E. corner of the old town. Legend has associated the name 'Arṣ Bilḵis with other localities also. According to Abu 'l-Rabī' Sulṭānīn b. al-Raḵīn in Yaḳūt, Muǧam, iii. 640, it is the name of a place a day's journey from Ḍāmār, on which stand six great marble columns and the principal group of pillars of the old ruins of Sīrūḵ still bears this name (J. Halévy, Rapport, J. A., ser. vi., xix. [1872], p. 67 sq.; Glaser, Reise nach Mā'rib, p. 179). On the other hand, it is an open question where the two other citadels al-Kašib and al-Hadjar mentioned by al-Hamdānī and Bakrī (Muǧam, ii. 502) are to be located. According to Yaḳūt, Muǧam, iv. 104, al-Kašib was built by order of king Sharāḥīl b. Yaḥṣūb, who put up on it a copper plate inscribed "They who built this castle are Thawbāl and Šaḥār; its building was entrusted to them by Sharāḥīl b. Yaḥṣūb, the king of Sāḥiḥa and of the Thāma and of the Arabs". D. H. Muller in Burgen u. Schlosser, i. 1039, note 1 has already identified Sharāḥīl b. Yaḥṣūb with king 'Iltimārah Yaḥṣūb of the Sabaean inscriptions (Glaser, No. 424, 220; Bibl. Nat., No. 2) and for Thawbāl compared the Sabaean Thawbāl and for Šaḥār (so to be read, not ṣwaw) the similar Sabaean name. If the inscription given by Yaḳūt really goes back to a genuine munād inscription, Kašib must have been built about the first century A. D. If the Sabaean king here mentioned whose epitaph in the Himyarī kasīda (verse 109) publ. by A. v. Kremer is to be read Ḍāshīb, in the Sabaean inscription Bibl. Nat., No. 32 [cf. N. al-Hamdānī] speaks expressly of Sāḥiḥa, Ghudāna and Ši[rw]āh only and does not mention al-Kašib, this is itself a proof that Yaḳūt's foundation inscription is not genuine. The building might easily be later than the inscription Bibl. Nat., No. 2. A difficulty however is raised by the fact that al-Hamdānī (in Muller, Burgen und Schlosser, ii. 1039) and Nasḫānī al-
Himyari (quoted ibid., note 1) give al-Kashbih b. Dhi Hazfar as the builder. Glaser, *Reise nach Marib*, p. 139, goes so far to say that the name Kashbih is derived from the verb *kab* or *kabsh*, which occurs in dedicatory inscriptions, and the form of the king’s titles points to the last period of Himyarite rule, and the king is to be identified with Sharaabiyl Yafar; indeed it must be conceded that the style and titles is quite unusual for a king of Saba’ or Dhi Raddan and for this reason the *muṣānad* inscription must be regarded as a forgery. This does not mean that al-Hamdani’s note is to be rejected as worthless. F. Hommel (*Ethnologie u. Geographic d. alteren Orienten*, p. 666 and note 2) has shown the possibility that the castle of Hadjar (the name means the town”) was perhaps the principal city, on the ruins of which the modern village of Marib was planted and the older and more celebrated Salṭn was a smaller castle. If we remember the meaning new* given in Yāṣib, iv. 104 and Nashwān, p. 86 s.v. *kasbih*, al-Kashbih might also be an epithet of the citadel as the *new* which came to be erroneously differentiated from al-Hadjar as the name of a third castle. Al-Bakri, *Maqāmāt*, ii. 502, 754 explains the difficulty by saying that al-Kashbih was the last of the castles to be built in Marib and therefore called the *new*.

The *Masjud Sulaimān* lies to the west, just below the village which is built on a great mound of rubble. This Masjud Sulaimān b. Dhi’ād, now the principal mosque of Marib, according to Arnaud (cf. A., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 13) an obviously modern building, square with a flat roof and built of hewn stones, is of interest because, according to E. Glaser (*Reise nach Marib*, p. 41, 73 sq.), its north side is built against 7 or 8 colossal columns (monoliths) which correspond exactly to those of the Ḥaram Bilqis and the *Amād* to be discussed below. Glaser suggests that there was once a temple here similar to the *Ḥaram Bilqis*. F. Hommel, *Ethnologie u. Geographic d. alteren Orienten*, p. 44, suggests that the *Masjud Sulaimān* was the temple of the chief deity. This principal temple in his opinion formed a group with the second temple, which lay on the south side of the *Masjud*—according to Arnaud (plan of Marib) local tradition thinks this was the site of an ancient temple. The length (2,000 yards), suggested by F. Hommel (op. cit., p. 666) for the distance of this second temple from the *Masjud Sulaimān*, is however too high, as both Glaser and Arnaud put the distance between the two opposite city walls at only 1,000 yards. J. Halévy’s figure (Rappor. *J. A.*, ser. vi., xix. [1873], p. 96) which puts the diameter of the *Masjud* at about 500 yards, would give a much shorter distance but the estimate is certainly a very casual one and hardly to be taken seriously.

In the south and west outside the old town walls lies an old cemetery with a number of tombs, some vertical and some horizontal, the latter of which has a small opening at the top. It is now called Mejlennat (or Diḥbat) Gharrā. It is probably from here that there come a number of old Sabaean tombstones (Glaser, N°. 456, 574, 575, 581, 582, 605, 662, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 748, 759, 773, 792) with rectangular niches sometimes rounded below or peaked at the top, in which is placed the bust of the deceased with an inscription below. On two of those tombstones (Glaser N°. 684, 745), Glaser found the bust let into the stone still in its place (cf. *Reise nach Marib*, p. 75, 92; Tagtebuch, xi. 59). We may probably find the models for these tombstones in the steles of Assur. Stone sarcophagi are also sometimes found. One is still in use before the great well of Marib as a drinking-trough for animals (*Reise nach Marib*, p. 74).

In the southwestern part of the old town outside the city walls, Glaser found a remarkable building still partly preserved (G on the plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Maryah) which was probably used for distributing the water and has on its north side the inscription Glaser 474 = 1671. It consists of two huge stretches of wall running due east and west in one line with a gap in the centre. The two corners of the northern entrance of this passage are angular while at the south side the two are rounded. The inscription, which is placed on the north side of the eastern wall states that Dimiri-alya Water, Makkariib of Saba’, son of Kariba’il-ju. built a ʿalā ḫīṣ (jīṣ) opposite (or in front) of the sanctuary of ʿAthtar. Glaser actually found some 300 paces N.W. or W.N.W. of this building, also outside of the old city walls but quite close to them, a ruin unfortunately reduced to a heap of rubble, which from its plan suggests a sanctuary, since on the N.E. side (the right stretch of wall) the niches for an idol can still be seen (*Reise nach Marib*, p. 45; Tagtebuch, xi. 47; H on the plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Maryah).

S.S.E. of the modern village of Marib (d) at a distance of about 3 miles between the Wadi Dheene and Wadi ‘Al-Feldah is the Ḥaram Bilqis (D) which was visited by Th. J. Arnaud on July 20, 1845 and by E. Glaser on March 25, 1888 (cf. J. A., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 14 sq.; Glaser, *Reise nach Mit. b.*, p. 41, 42 sq., 73, 137, 141); the latter corrects Arnaud on a number of essential points. The Haram is a large building, elliptical in form, the larger axis is 306 feet long runs S.W. to N.E. The shorter axis runs N.E. to S.W. and is 250 feet in length. It is built of regularly hewn square blocks which are placed one above the other in 31 layers up to the frieze so that the height of the wall is 31 feet. This wall is finished off with a double cornice at the top which consists of two rows of blocks which follow one another at short intervals and look like dice on the top of the wall, the result being a mural column-like frieze which recalls the relief found by Th. Bent in Jēhā in Abyssinia (cf. Th. Bent, *The Sacred City of the Ethiopians*, London 1893, p. 141) and the top of the Sabean relief by D. Nielsen, *Handb. des alt. äthiopischen Altertumskunde* (p. 157, fig. 44). The row of blocks below the lower cornice form a simple and effective decoration by placing the blocks four to six inches apart so as to leave little gaps. A similar kind of mural decoration is known from the Sabean temple of Jēhā (cf. Deutsche Akademie-Expedition, ii. 80, fig. 165). The frieze is still quite intact in place, especially on the east side. There is no trace of a roof. But it cannot be asserted definitely that there never was one; the windowless building could have been lit by sky-lights. There are two doors in the wall, the larger (a) at the northern end of the shorter axis and the smaller (b) at the N.W. end of the building at the end of the larger axis.
Exactly N.E. of the centre of the building there are four other monolithic pillars in the wall itself. Originally there were a larger number here so that the main gateway (a) had a pillared way leading to it. N.E. of these at a distance of 32 paces are 8 columns which are also erected in a line running from S.E. to N.W. (E). They are rectangular prisms, smooth, 15 feet high without capitals and terminate in dice-shaped tops 4 inches long on which stood the architrave. On the S.S.E. side of the Haram just outside the wall, four small pillars form a little square the sides of which lie W. to E. and S. to N. (c). Perhaps we have here the pillars for the canopy of a throne which was probably similar in appearance to the Aksumite king's throne illustrated in *Deutsche Aksum-Expedition*, ii. 63, fig. 139. The floor of the building never seems to have been levelled, as a natural rock rises almost in the middle. Unfortunately in the interior the walls are nowhere clear, so that Glaser could form no deductions as to what it must have looked like inside. He expressly states however that he could discover no chambers in the walls as he had expected. On the other hand, the fine inscriptions on the outside of the walls give us information as to the purpose of the building — it is a temple of the Sabean moon-god Almahah — as well as the history of its erection. Arnaud was only able to copy 3 of these inscriptions, two others whose existence he established were covered by sand, which has since made further progress, so that he could not copy them. The oldest in-

Plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Maryab.

A the modern village of Marib, B Umm al-Ka', C Masjid Sulaiman, D Haram Bilquis, E Amazil, F Pillars E.S.E. of al-Merwath, G Old Building, H not given a definite name, I Temple, J-K Old city-wall of Maryab, L Wadi Dhenne.
and in other Sabaean inscriptions was this very temple. From it the god Almakah is called "lord of 'Awm" (א"מ). The completion of this temple which was begun by Yid'il-ili Dharib, by Tilibarsha, son of Samuhi-alaya Dharib, king of Saba', is recorded in the inscription Glaser, 425 = Arnaud 55, which is on the west side of the Haram on the 14th layer of stones (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii. 12 sqq.) Glaser 481 = Arnaud 56, which is on the 13th and 14th layer on the north side records the completion of the wall from the inscription to the top by Tubakarib a prominent official and general of three Sabaean kings (N. Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii. 15 sqq.). Connected with this are two inscriptions of similar content, Glaser 482 = Arnaud 54 on the south side of the 15th layer and Glaser 483 = Arnaud 54 on the east side at the same height. They record the restoration of a ruined part of the wall (presumably of the part of the temple) under King Kariluha Water Yahan'm of Saba' and Dhul Ra'idān, the son of Dhimri'-alaya Bayin, and his son Hālik'amara. Whether this history of the building of the Haram seems doubtful since, according to Glaser, *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 46, inscriptions may still be concealed under the sand on the north and west sides also.

The orientation of the building is of interest. The little door of the Haram (h) faces that temple of the old town of Mārib on the site of which now stands the Masjid Sulaiman. On the prolongation of the shorter axis to the N. E. lies the ruin called al-Mikrāb, and Glaser has, perhaps rightly, suggested from this arrangement of the two buildings that there was some connection between their purposes. Both buildings are moreover oriented by the course of the Wādī Dhenna. On the south side of the old city wall may still be seen the remains of a bridge which was built almost exactly in the direction of the Haram and, according to the local tradition, once reached to it. Even if this is an exaggeration it is nevertheless probable that a bridge was built over the river Dhenna, and in the rainy season the streams certainly have inundated the fields; the continuation of this bridge to the Haram was probably only a dam of which no trace now remains.

However unusual the elliptical form for the plan of a temple may appear, this is certainly not an isolated example in Southern Arabia. F. Fresnel (*J. A.*, ser. iv., vol. vii., p. 223) mentions the great ruins of Kharib (Sirwāth) which cover an even greater area than those of the Haram Bālīk and include a semi-elliptic and long rows of pillars still in position. According to Arnaud, this elliptical plan has also been found by Halēvy (*J. A.*, ser. vi., vol. xix., p. 67 sq.); cf. also Glaser, *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 113 (Shīza, i. 67 sq.). According to the inscription Glaser, 590 = 903, its builder was the Sabaean mukarrn Yid'il-ili Dharib, who also built the temple of 'Awm and the round temple of al-Masjadīdīj. F. Hommel (*Einhornologie*, p. 664 sq.) has endeavoured to show how this temple came to have its modern name of Haram Bālīk. In analogy to the Assyrian and Babylonian temples extra muros which were always dedicated to the wife of the chief deity and in which in the month of the new year his wedding ceremony took place, Hommel sees in the Haram Bālīk the wedding house of Almakah, the sanctuary of his wife Harimat and seems to assume that the name is also connected with this. D. H. Muller (*Burgen und Schlösser*, ii. 972 sq.) has shown how the Arab archaeologists transformed the god Almakah into Yalma'ah and then gave this name to the legendary Bālīk and also made a haram (women's apartments) out of the sanctuary of the god. F. Fresnel's reasoning moves on similar lines (*J. A.*, ser. iv., vol. vi., p. 226 sq., 234 sq.). He assumed that Bālīk was not the correct name of the queen of Saba' but rather Bālkmah (so Ibn 'Abd Rabbih in the *Iṣb al-Farīd* and Ibn al-Djawi in the *Mīrād al-Zamān*) which was formed from Almakah. The queen of Saba' was in this way deified by the Sabaeanos and became the Isal of the Arabs.

In the S. S. E. of Mārib and according to Arnaud 1/4 hour E. S. E. of the Haram Bālīk—is the latter, according to Glaser, *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 41, always due east barely 1/4 hour from the five pillars—there stand on the opposite bank of the Wādī Dhenna, 1/2 hour or 11/2 miles (according to Glaser, *Skizze*, No. 51) from the town, the pillars called 'A'mā'id. Five are still upright; these are 25-30 feet high, 32 inches broad and 24 deep, prismate, rectangular monoliths which were erected perpendicular to the direction of the Wādī Dhenna. Two which have been overthrown lie beside them on the ground. The pillars had no capitals and were just like the other pillars (at the Haram Bālīk and other ruins outside the town). On the fragments of the two fallen pillars Glaser discovered inscriptions on each (Glaser 479 and 480 = Arnaud 53) from which it appears that a sanctuary Barā'īn (א"רמ) dedicated to the god Almakah or some such sanctuary stood here. This name occurs not only in this inscription but is mentioned in Ootton, Mus., No. 17 (*Z. D. M. G.*, xxxii., 486, No. 1, 3) where J. H. Mordtmann reads [נה"רמ] and the name of this place is also found in Halēvy, No. 43, 49, 4 (ם"רמ) and 534 (ם"רמ). To the west just beside the pillars lies a mound of ruins, which perhaps represents the remains of this sanctuary. Arnaud (*J. A.*, ser. vii., ii. [1874], p. 15) describes these pillars as pilasters of the Haram Bālīk and puts their height at 28 spans. In contradiction to Glaser, Arnaud says they have square capitals. His illustration under the plan of the Haram Bālīk shows a pillar with a stepped capital like those from Aksūn and Kohat in Abyssinia (*Deutsche Aksum-Expedition*, ii., ed. by D. Krencker, Berlin 1913, p. 102, fig. 224 and p. 155, fig. 319b). Which of the two explications is right, it is difficult to say as Glaser is usually very accurate in his observations. On the other hand, Arnaud cannot possibly have invented this rather unusual but nevertheless typical form for ancient South Arabia and made his drawing accordingly. The only way out of the difficulty is to suppose that in Glaser's time the capitals—of which Arnaud says he cannot say definitely that they belonged to the pillars—had been broken off. According to Arnaud, the pillars stand close together at intervals corresponding to their thickness. That the pieces of stone on the ground near the row of pillars once belonged to the pillars noticed by Arnaud (p. 16) although he copied one of the inscriptions on them (Arnaud 53 = Glaser, No. 480) (cf. E. Glaser, *Reise im Mārib*, p. 401, 141).
The numerous separate finds made by Glaser in the neighbourhood of Mârib, sacrificial altars, masons’ workshops etc. cannot be discussed here. On the other hand, there is one erection which demands a rather thorough discussion as it surpasses all these already mentioned in magnitude and preserved the fame of Mârib down to the late Islamic period, namely the dam and works connected with it, known in Muslim tradition as Sudd Mârib or Sudd al-’Arim.

The Wâdî Dhjennâ in the course of time had cut a way through the Balaq hills here and divided the two parts Balaq and Balaq al-Awsâj. The Sabaëans had built a dam of earth across the gap some 770 paces long behind which the water was collected. The dam, which Glaser (Reise nach Mârib, p. 58 sqq., 173 sq.) describes minutely, rises some 20—25 feet above the present level of the Wâdî and is simply a mound of earth the section of which is an isosceles triangle the angle at the top of which is quite sharp. The angle of inclination of the two surfaces to the base is about 450 and the breadth of the base about 50 feet. The proper base and the height of the dam cannot be accurately ascertained as the mud has accumulated to the depth of many feet. But it can be assumed that the dam rested on a foundation of rock as the narrow passage between the two Balaq hills has a rocky foundation which comes up very nearly to the surface. But for this firm foundation of rock it would have been impossible to build the dam at all. The side of the dam which met the water (the western) is covered with small sharp unshewn stones, held together so strongly by mortar that it is impossible to detach one of them. The dam, which is 1 1/2 hours from Mârib, is flanked in the north and south by two great sluices, the southern one of which is known as Mârib al-’Arim. Here on the site of the the dam a great rock (A) 95 paces long and 15 in width, at the narrow passage of which — 10 has become detached from the Djelhel Balaq al-Awsâj; it runs to the N.E. with a slight tendency to E.N.E.

The main body of the rock, the northern wall, of which runs eastwards forms with this isolated rock a pair of lines converging towards the S.W. end of the latter. The two rocky walls do not meet here but are separated by a gap spanned by a wall six paces long and 12 feet high (C). In the opening of the angle but within the eastern ends of the two walls is another detached block of rock (D) the north side of which runs parallel to the first mentioned detached rock and the south side parallel to the main rock (C) but quite close to the latter. All three rocks, particularly the main body (C) and the loose block (E), have steep sides, not however over 12 feet high. On the north side the great isolated rock (A) is very irregular in shape. It almost looks as if we had an artificial cleavage here; but Glaser does not think this possible because an earthquake is quite sufficient to account for the remarkable cleavage of the rocks. In any case it looks as if human hands had worked a good deal on the natural lines of fracture. The great block of rock (A) rises 20—25 feet above the present level of the river bed and has two inscriptions engraved on its south side (Glaser, Nô. 515, 523).

On all three rocks there are or were great buildings of hewn stone. The large block of rock (A) seems to have supported the main building. Its masonry consisting entirely of finely hewn blocks of stone, arranged in pairs one above the other and held together by melted lead poured into corresponding cavities; it follows closely, especially on the south side, the rock which forms the foundation so that it does not form a straight line, as Arnaud (F. A., ser. vii., vol. iii., in p. 64, Digue de Mârib) has represented it. The whole length of this wall is about 200 feet, its average breadth 15 feet, the height at the S. W. end about 12 feet, rather more at the N.E. end, as the rock is not high enough here. In general the top is horizontal but with slight differences of level where it rises and falls. The S. W. corner of the masonry consists of round towers (a) facing S. W. which stands about 3 feet above the level of the rest of the walls. The whole building and the tower have perpendicular sides and do not slope at all. The dam which runs N.N.W. seems to have joined the wall 25 feet from the towers on the N.W. On the side facing the Wâdî at the N.E. end of the rock, steps have been hewn out of the rock which led from the bottom of the river bed (in S.S.W. direction) to the walls. Almost exactly south of the already mentioned tower which has also very steep steps cut in a perpendicular passage hewn out of the rock, there stands on the main mass of the rock (C) a second tower (d) of the same height, round on the west, and only 10 on the other sides. Between the two towers, is the already mentioned wall linking up the two rocks. As already mentioned, the top of this wall is 20—25 feet above the level of the river so that the towers are 35 to 40 feet above it. The dam seems to have been not much higher than the connecting wall. The out-flow of the water must have taken place over the connecting wall as well as through openings under the wall, probably now filled up with rubble, into the Jâbabîd canal, and under or rather through the rock on which this great piece of masonry stands, into the Rahbît canal. Indeed we can still see quite clearly that the great isolated rock is connected with the rock by a ridge of rock (e), only the rounded top of which is visible, with the smaller block, so that the two channels were separated from one another. It is also possible that in ancient times the outflow went below and only later, when the water-level was raised by silting, over the wall. Grooves for boulders are still recognisable. The smaller block of rock, steep and high on the western side, slopes to the east down to the level and has step-like cavities in it everywhere with stones still perpendicular on its, as if it had had a balustrade, especially above the steep wall in the west. At its eastern end where it joins the level ground, it shows regularly hewn cavities of prismatic stones, which look like watering-troughs for the cattle or like stone graves. The main rock shows the same features. The step-like cavities were perhaps not only used for climbing, but also to measure the level of the water to regulate the outflow.

Both towers and the other buildings in connection with the sluices, except such walls or railings as may have existed of the smaller block, are preserved intact. The hewn stones are so arranged that long stones are every now and then laid crosswise which give the otherwise parallel layers great cohesion. This is particularly the case with the inner filling of the wall, as can be observed in all very large buildings a section of
which comes to be exposed. The square blocks in the dam are also held together by little blocks of lead about 10 cm. high and about 10 cm.\(^2\) in the section. These little rods of lead were placed in holes specially made for them about 4-5 cm. deep and the next block above was placed over with the corresponding cavity filled with the top half of the little rod. The Sabaeans only used mortar in the stone work of the dam as a top covering to prevent damage being done by the rain-water.

The northern system of sluices consists of three walls of which the northern and largest a kind of railing of masonry. The whole wall is coped with excellent cement.

Almost exactly S.E. about 11 paces from the S.W. end of the part, 114 paces long already described (b) runs to the S.E. a wall 38 paces long and 21 broad at its N.W. end, the S.E. end of which is narrow and rounded. This wall is exactly the height of the long wall. At the present there is on it a modern ħanīf (stone-house) built by the amir 'Abd al-Rahmān which probably existed in Arnaud's time and certainly in Halevy's.

Between the two walls, four paces from either,

**Marbat el-Dimm**
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0 Places where inscriptions are engraved on the rocks: 1 Gl. 513; 2 Gl. 514; 3 Gl. 523; 4 Gl. 525.

a Tower with staircase, of the same height as d and the highest part of the whole building.
b Staircase.
c Barrier between the tower and southwestern rocks.
d Tower exactly similar to a.

(a, b) with one end built against the rocks of Balak al-Kibli runs northeast, a little towards E.N.E. This wall, which is in all 184 paces long and 15 thick at the broadest point, although the average is about 11 and 15—20 feet high consists of two parts: The southwestern part 70 paces long (c) is somewhat lower (quite low beside the Balak rocks, about 16 feet high at the point where it joins the N.E. part) and quite flat on the top. The N.E. part (b) 114 paces long and somewhat damaged towards its west end is not quite flat on the top and towards the south side the top shows stands a north wall only 18 paces long, 3 broad and of the same height as the others, the base of which forms a perfect rectangle. This wall somewhat damaged on the north side and now joined to the S.E. wall by two modern slight walls, which the Beduins use as a stable, stands back a little at its S.W. end as compared with the two neighbouring walls and like the S.E. wall shows a prism-shaped cutting about a yard from the west end, now filled in about 2 feet broad and deep which was intended to take the boards. On the northern side this groove is no longer to be seen. The three
walls thus formed, like the three rocks on the south form two channels of exit, both of which however, it is worth noting, flow into one and the same main channel, which runs almost exactly east for about 1,000 yards to a large building for distributing water. This canal ran between two parallel dams of the same style and construction as the dam proper but the bed, which is paved with cemented stones, runs above the plain, especially on the south side some 20-25 feet. The dam proper, barely higher than the two walls of this canal, joins the east side of the most southern wall, 38 paces long.

Similar distributing works existed throughout the whole plain of Ma'rib. Glaser saw traces of aqueducts (with double dams) at different places. In the bed of the Dhenne not far below the dam he saw a remarkable erection of stone not unlike a weir. Unfortunately the inscription on it which might have given us definite information had been removed some years before. Canals seem to have led the water from the great distributing centres to the smaller ones (manāṣīḥ) from which it was taken direct to the palm gardens and fields. The most of the manāṣīḥ are in the form of cubes or shallow prisms and are rarely more than 6 feet high and 12 to 15 feet long. As a rule a canal leads out of them from the centre, usually walled on one side. Nothing is left of the canals which connected the manāṣīḥ with the larger distributing centres and on the other side with the fields. Deep furrows torn out of the ground by the periodic deluges of rain and, like the greater part of the plain, becoming gradually filled with desert sand are now the characteristic feature of the once flourishing plain of Saba'.

The great barrier of the dam between the two Balak mountains seems however not to have succumbed for the strain upon it. A second dam called Ma'ānāl Hashradj was therefore built N.N.E.
of the dam and west of Mā'rib which seems to have been intended to regulate the water of the Wādī 'l-Sā'īla (cf. Glaser, *Reise nach Mā'rib*, p. 49 sq.), which carried the waters of the north Balāk hill, the Djabal Hailān and the Khashab hills into the plain of Mā'rib and joined the Wādī Dhenne below the village of Mā'rib. This barrage consists of three walls of black porous stones, running very irregularly which are held together by mortar and arranged in three strata which perhaps point to three periods of building. The first of these walls (A) which dammed the river-bed begins just on the right bank of the Sā'īla and runs 240 paces E.N.E. where it joins a prism-shaped erection (a) 7 paces broad, 12 long and about 15 feet high, which lies N.W. to S.E. 7 feet N.E. stands a second similar building (b) parallel to the first and continued to the S.E. in a narrower wall (c) 36 paces in length. The space between these two buildings must have been an outlet. With a very small space between, the second mortared wall (d) runs N.W. from the second building (b) and with many windings turns N. and N.W. where it joins the rocks. Its length is 268 paces, the space between it and the second building 10 paces (d). 21 paces N.E. of the second building are two others (d, e) which give an outlet to the N.E. The southern of the two is only partly preserved. It points to the S.E. end of the 36 paces long wall (c); perhaps the two were once connected or there was a sluice between. From the building (d) which forms the northern boundary of the second outlet two walls run: the one (third) wall (C) runs with many windings almost parallel to the second great wall (B) and like it runs up to the northern hills; it is 182 paces long. The other building (f) runs in a curve to the north, 50 paces in length, to a third outlet exactly opposite the second, which however consists of buildings (g, h) 8 paces from each other, with the ground between them covered by a layer of stone masonry. The outlet is to the N.E. On the S.E. is a wall 12 feet long now partly collapsed. Glaser copied 10 Sabaean texts at al-Hashrāj which came from other ruins and show that these works belong to a later period, like the late tombstone built into the wall here (Glaser, N°. 509).

The various constructions date, as we learn from the inscriptions, from different periods. The southern system of sluices was erected as early as the Mukarrib period. Sumuha-alaya Yansī, son of Dhimma-alaya, Mukarrib of Sā'īla, according to the inscription Glaser, N°. 513—514, made here an outlet in the barrage at Raḥāb, which was extended two generations later by the unknown author of the inscription Glaser, N°. 418—419 (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, *Attisabische Texte*, i. 7; Studien, ii. 97, 99 sq.; Glaser, *Skizze*, i. 70 sq.; *Reise nach Mā'rib*, p. 59 sq.; Hommel, *Ethnologie*, p. 666). Where the barrage at Raḥāb was is not certain. Perhaps we should assume with Rhodokanakis, *Studien*, ii. 100 sq. that it was built on the rib of rock (e) between d and B. About a generation later than the Raḥāb barrage is the similar con-
walls thus formed, like the three rocks on the south form two channels of exit, both of which however, it is worth noting, flow into one and the same main channel, which runs almost exactly east for about 1,000 yards to a large building for distributing water. This canal ran between two parallel dams of the same style and construction as the dam proper but the bed, which is paved with cemented stones, runs above the plain, especially on the south side some 20—25 feet. The dam proper, barely higher than the two walls of this canal, joins the east side of the most southern wall, 38 paces long. Similar distributing works existed throughout the whole plain of Marib. Glaser saw traces of aqueducts (with double dams) at different places. In the bed of the Dhenne not far below the dam he saw a remarkable erection of stone not unlike a weir. Unfortunately the inscription on it which might have given us definite information had been removed some years before. Canals seem to have led the water from the great distributing centres to the smaller ones (manāšh) from which it was taken direct to the palm gardens and fields. The most of the manāšh are in the form of cubes or shallow prisms and are rarely more than 6 feet high and 12 to 15 feet long. As a rule a canal leads out of them from the centre, usually walled on one side. Nothing is left of the canals which connected the manāšh with the larger distributing centres and on the other side with the fields. Deep furrows torn out of the ground by the periodic deluges of rain and, like the greater part of the plain, becoming gradually filled with desert sand are now the characteristic feature of the once flourishing plain of Saba'.

The Great Barrier of the dam between the two Balak mountains seems however not to have suffered for the strain upon it. A second dam called Mabnā al-Hashra ḫūr was therefore built N.N.E.

Places with especially important inscriptions: 1 Gl. 554, 618; 2 Gl. 551; 3 Gl. 541.

Places with inscriptions:

a. a little lower than b.

The canal, which led the water to the lower manāš, about 1,000 yards away, comes up to a and c.

d. a large intervening wall standing by itself.

S. S. W. of Mabnā al-Hashra ḫūr (see below) lies Ḥuṣn al-Asfāl, a later building erected on the remains of old water-works, which formed the end of the main channel, already mentioned in connection with the northern sluices. It lies at about exactly the same level as the dam and several yards above the surrounding country. It consists of several walls, some of hewn stone and some of ordinary stones and cement, which sent the water out in eight different directions. The aqueduct runs practically westwards up to the northern sluices of the dam. Although perfectly preserved the bed of the canal has been in many places filled up with blown sand.
of the dam and west of Mārib which seems to have been intended to regulate the water of the Wadi 'l-Sā‘īla (cf. Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 49 ff.), which carried the waters of the north Balṣāk hill, the Djabal Hailān and the Khashāb hills into the plain of Mārib and joined the Wadi Ḥassen below the village of Mārib. This barrage consists of three walls of black porous stones, running very irregularly which are held together by mortar and arranged in 3 strata which perhaps point to 3 periods of building. The first of these walls (A) which dammed the river-bed begins just on the right bank of the Sā‘īla and runs 240 paces E. N. E. where it joins a prism-shaped erection (a) 7 paces broad, 12 long and about 15 feet high, which lies N. W. to S. E. 7 feet N. E. stands a second similar building (b) parallel to the first and continued to the S. E. in a narrower wall (c) 36 paces in length. The space between these two buildings must have been an outlet. With a very small space between, the second mortared wall (B) runs N. W. from the second building (b) and with many windings turns N. and N. W. where it joins the rocks. Its length is 265 paces, the space between it and the second building 10 paces (b). 21 paces N. E. of the second building are two others (d, e) which give an outlet to the N. E. The southern of the two is only partly preserved. It points to the S. E. end of the 36 paces long (c); perhaps the two were once connected or there was a sluice between. From the building (d) which forms the northern boundary of the second outlet two walls run: the one (third) wall (C) runs with many windings almost parallel to the second great wall (B) and like it runs up to the northern hills; it is 182 paces long. The other building (f) runs in a curve to the north, 50 paces in length, to a third outlet exactly opposite the second, which however consists of buildings (g, h) 8 paces from each other, with the ground between them covered by a layer of stone masonry. The outlet is to the N. E. On the S. E. is a wall 12 feet long now partly collapsed. Glaser copied 10 Sabaean texts at al-Hashradj which came from other ruins and show that these works belong to a later period, like the late tombstone built into the wall here (Glaser, No. 509).

**Mebnā el-Hashradj**

The various constructions date, as we learn from the inscriptions, from different periods. The southern system of sluices was erected as early as the Mukarrīb period. Sunahu-‘alaya Yānāf, son of Dhimrī-‘alaya, Mukarrīb of Saba', according to the inscription Glaser, No. 513–514, made here an outlet in the barrage at Rahāb, which was extended two generations later by the unknown author of the inscription Glaser, No. 418–419 (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Alteriatische Texte, i. 7; Studien, ii. 97. 99 sq.; Glaser, Skizze, i. 70 sq.; Reise nach Mārib, p. 59 sq.; Hummel, Ethnologie, p. 666). Where the barrage at Rahāb was is not certain. Perhaps we should assume with Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii. 100 sq. that it was built on the rib of rock (f) between A and B. About a generation later than the Rahāb barrage is the similar con-

**The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.**
traction at Ḥabāḥūd, which was probably built at the junction (r.) of the Marābih al-Dimm. The Makārī: Yūḥān ibn Ṣamūḥ, son of Sumuḥu-adalafil Ṣimāḥ, built a water-course for it, as his father had done for the Khābi‘ū (according to Glaser, No. 523, 525 = Arnaud, No. 12, 13 = Halévy, No. 678; cf. Khodokanakis, Studien, n. 102 sq.; Glaser, eg., cit.). The northern sluice-works are much later, according to Glaser (Rosse nach Mārib, p. 66–68), they did not get their present form till the time of king Shamar Yūḥān (c. 300 A.D.) and may perhaps even be not older than the fifth century A.D. The oldest parts of the works are put by Glaser (p. 68) to the period 1000–700 B.C. which is probably rather too early.

The great system of dams did not long exist in this form. Thus we know from two great prismatic monoliths, which are inscribed on all four sides and tell us of the later history of the dam. The one with the inscription Glaser, No. 554 is 7 feet long, 50 miles broad, and a foot thick, the second, even larger, bears the inscription Glaser, No. 618. Both lay close beside the junction of the northern wall of the Dīr al-Balāt. According to Glaser, No. 554, king Shāhārūl Yūḥūr in 449 A.D. had a thorough renovation of the works carried out. But these lasted barely a year, for in 450 A.D. the waters broke through the dam so that the works had again to be completely restored. But the collapse of the great system was not to be prevented. From Glaser, No. 618 we learn that under the rule of the Abyssinian viceroy Abrūrāh (542 A.D.) another breach occurred in the dam. Once more restoration work on a large scale was attempted. This threatened the danger, but the final catastrophe must have occurred not long afterwards, which transformed the fertile plain of Saba‘ into a barren desert, alluded to in the Kurān (Surah xxiv. 14 sq.; cf. Glaser, Zweifelthufern über den Dammerbruch von Mārib, p. 13 sqq.; Rosse nach Mārib, p. 10, 64, 144 147). Its cause is seen by Glaser in the action of wind and rain which gradually wore down and weakened the east side. Another main cause of destruction must have been the silt which filled the reservoir in course of decades that the water flowed over the dam. A mention of the bursting of the dam in the Kurān (sūrat al-Hāji‘ān) and the importance of this event for the town of Mārib and the country round has resulted in Muslim tradition devoting attention to this catastrophe and its consequences, so that all sorts of scraps of information about the dams were collected. Nevertheless it is remarkable how little even authorities on South Arabia like al-Hamdānī (Sīra, p. 80 and 1037, viii., in D. H. Muller, Provenzalisch und Sabaesisch, n. 958 sq., 1036, 1038; cf. N. Khodokanakis, Studien, n. 105 sq.; al-Bakri, Masa‘īl, n. 502) really know about the dam. Al-Hamdānī only says that the dam was built against a wall which was built on the side-wall of the reservoirs, of great blocks of stone linked together with iron. The arrangement for distributing the water from the farms were still there as if their builders had only finished yesterday. Al-Hamdānī saw the building which had survived on one of the two sides (i.e. on one bank) namely the one which rose out of the water intact (i.e. the sluices). The breach had only affected the barrage but even of this a portion remained intact which was added by the gardens on the left and was 15 ells in breadth at the base.

How we are to interpret these statements of al-Hamdānī, we learn from the description of the reservoir of Kohaito in Abyssinia (Deutsche Akademie-Expedition, ii, 150 and pl. 23). There a central wall is flanked by two side walls, one of which is at right angles to a third. That the stones were bound together by iron is evident from Glaser's description. When Yākūt (Mu‘jam, iv. 353) paid only little attention to the dam itself, tells us that it lies among three hills, the reference is probably to the massif of the Dīr el-Balāt split into the three hills of the Wādīs al-Adhānā and Masila. He also mentions that the blocks are bound together with lead and says that the water accumulated behind the dam is led as required to the fields by strong sluices and cunningly contrived arrangements. According to al-Ma‘ṣūdī (Murūj al-Dhahab, iii, 368 sq.), the barrage was one parasang in length and breadth and contained 30 round openings, each of 1 cell in diameter through which the water was led to the fields.


The importance of the dam for the prosperity of the country is evident from the descriptions of the Arab historians and geographers, who in this connection usually quote the reference in the Kurān to the two gardens of the Sabaean, while, according to al-Hamdānī, this irrigated area included not only the plain of Saba‘ but stretched to the borders of the desert of Ṣa‘īḥād; Glaser (Rosse nach Mārib, p. 52) held the view that the water accumulated by the dam would suffice to irrigate amply all the land on the borders of the desert as far as Ḥaǧrāmūt, and transform it into a vast garden. It is therefore perhaps not to be regarded as an exaggeration when al-Ma‘ṣūdī (Murūj al-Dhahab, p. 366 sq.) describes the land of Saba‘ with its wealth of gardens and fields, broad meadows and extensive irrigation system as the most fertile part of Yemen, the beauty of which had become proverbial throughout the world. According to him, a man on horseback would take more than a month to cross the rich cultivated country and any one travelling on foot or on horse need not fear the sun from one end of the land to the other, as he could always travel in the shade, so rich was the vegetation (cf. A. v. Kremer, Sager, p. 10, note 1). According to Ibn Rosta, p. 114, who also waxes eloquent over the fertility of the land of Saba‘, a basket on the head of a man walking between the fruit trees would very soon have filled itself with fruit without one pulling or gathering them.

Under such circumstances it was natural that the catastrophe of the bursting of the dam, known as al-lā‘arima throughout the Muslim world, should have the most far-reaching effects. The migration of Himyar tribes to the north is con-
connected with the catastrophe and the Banū Ḥassān took this event as the starting point of an era of their own (Ṣam al-sail; al-Maṣūdī, Kitāb al-Tanbih, p. 202). There is hardly any historical event of pre-Islamic history, that has become embellished with so much that is fanciful and related in so many different versions, as the history of the bursting of the dam. Al-Maṣūdī alone (Muḥammad al-Dāhāh, iii. 370 sq.) dared attribute it to natural causes; he thought that the water had worn away the foundations of the dam and dared it without being noticed. When the masonry of the dam and the barrage had become so weakened that they could no longer resist the force of the water, the waters when unusually big broke through and flooded the plain. But even Al-Maṣūdī sees in the catastrophe a punishment for the arrogance of the Sabaeans and gives a good deal of space in his history to the legendary version of this event (cf. cit., p. 373 sqq.), which in the main agrees with that of Yākūṭ, Muṣfīm, iv. 48). The name of the king according to Sonnerey, Post-und Reisereiten, p. 153 sq.) tells the history of the destruction of the dam in quite a different way from the older historians. According to al-Maṣūdī the story is briefly as follows: the king ‘Amr b. Ṭāriḥ who lived in Marib was warned of the imminent catastrophe by his brother ‘Imrān, who was a soothsayer and by his wife Ṣafīyāt al-‘Aṣfār, also skilled in prophecy. ‘Imrān foresaw that his people would be scattered in different directions and told this to his brother. Žarīf on the other hand dreamed of a great cloud which covered her country and sent forth thunder and lightning. It burst and burned up everything upon which it fell. All this pointed to a terrible inundation and Žarīf was confirmed in her idea by other signs that the catastrophe was imminent. She warned ‘Amr and urged him to see to the dam. If he saw a mouse there tearing out holes with its forepaws and throwing out big stones with his hind feet, the misfortune was inevitable and imminent. ‘Amr went to the dam and actually saw a mouse which turned over with its feet a stone which 50 men could not have moved from the position. ‘Amr himself then dreamed of an inundation by the dam and now decided to realise his possessions and leave the country with his family which he was able to do surreptitiously without arousing suspicions. Soon afterwards the collapse came, which destroyed the whole country, even high lying fields and places a considerable distance off. While there are considerable differences in detail in the different versions of the story—the collapse took place for example, according to Yākūṭ not under ‘Amr but under his brother ‘Imrān—but there is still greater disagreement about the date. Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, for example, puts it 400 years before Islām, i.e. in the third century A.D. Accordingly to Ibn Khalidūn, the catastrophe took place under Ḥassān b. Tibbān Asad, who (with A. v. Kremer, Soge, p. 120 sq. and note 4) is to be identified with Abū Karīb Asad and according to Glaser (Skizze, i. 542) reigned from 385–420. Among European scholars Gosselini goes farthest back in putting the date at 374 B.C. while Reiske thinks it took place 30–40 B.C. and Schultens puts it at 30–40 A.D., Perrin 553 years before Muhammad and Silvestre de Sacy 210 or 170 A.D. Yākūṭ, iv. 383 comes nearest the truth; he says it took place in the period of Abyssinian rule. As the terminus post quem is 542 A.D., according to the inscription Glaser, No. 618, we may put the last disastrous breach in the dam as occurring between 542 and 570 A.D. An exact date unfortunately cannot be obtained as the necessary data are lacking. Besides the name of the bursting of the dam in Maṣūdī, p. 393 sqq. and Ibn Rosta, p. 114 sq. which speak of the land being twice devastated by the waters of the dam, may contain a memory of the actual course of events, and the final collapse of the dam may have taken place after the catastrophe of 542 A.D. when the dam was carried away for the first time.

The various attempts to explain the etymology of Marīb are not satisfactory. When, for example, Yākūṭ, Muṣfīm, iv. 382 sees in Marīb, a place-name from Arāb min ‘uẓbāʿ or from arība or aruba, this clearly shows what difficulties the explanation of this name gave the philologists. His further statement however that Marīb was the kingdom of the Sabaeans Kings is worthy of note (cf. H. Fleischer, Abilīsādā hitst, anticislamica, p. 114), especially as in Naṣawān al-Himyarī, a gloss is preserved according to which Marīb in Himyarīne means ‘lourd’ (cf. Blau in Z. D. M. G., xxv. 591, note 7). Ḫirdī Ṣadvīn, Kīṭāb al-Arab khāb al-ʾIslām, p. 142 explains Marīb as a loan-word from the Aramaic, a compound of māḥ and ṣabb. E. Osiander, Z. D. M. G., xix. 162 takes Marīb to be connected with the root of the Sabaean proper name Min to which Ṣayyīb and Ṣībā correspond in Arabic. J. H. Mordtmann, who deals in Z. D. M. G., xxx. 322 sq. at length with the etymology of Marība, points to the Min and Min of the inscriptions which he connects with the Arabic raʾūbān, ‘dominus crassus, magus gentis’.

D. H. Muller does not accept this derivation (Burgen und Schlosser, ii. 968 sqq.). Al-Bakri, Muṣfīm, ii. 502 says, following al-Ḥamdānī, that Marīb was the name of a tribe of the ʾAd according to which the town is called and in fact al-Ḥamdānī in Ikhlīs, viii. (Muller, Burgen und Schlosser, ii. 960, 1040) says that Marīb and Marīb are the names of two Arab tribes. In the older Sabaean inscriptions the town is called ʾalīd to which the Greeks added a ζ to give it a Greek form. Eratosthenes and Artemidorus (Strabo, xvi. 768, 778) call the town Maṣūba. The later inscriptions mention it under the name Baḥr in which we have, with Rhodokanakis, to see a later contracted form, from which comes the Sabean name of Muslim tradition. The Sabean capital is however known to the classical authors and Arab geographers by another name, viz. ʾalīs (Agatharchides, p. 100 in Geogr. Gr. min., i. 188 and in Steph. Byz. s. ʾalāḥis and Ṣawwā; cf. Tekā in the Art. Sabaʾ, No. 1, K. E., iii, A., col. 1516), and Sāḥba Tekā (col. 1391 sq) sees in contrast to J. H. Mordtmann (Sabische Denkmaler, p. 3, note 1), E. Glaser (Skizze, ii. 15, Sudarabische Streiffragen, p. 10) and A. Sprenger (Die alte Geographie Arabiens, p. 159, 162) in this double name of the Sabean capital not an error but believes that Sāḥba, while not the usual, was not a wrong name for the capital.

Against this Glaser, Skizze, ii. 15, rightly emphasised that the capital of the Sabean kingdom Maryāb or Marīb was never known as Sāḥba. Sāḥba was—so far as the inscriptions are con-
ceined — never anything but the name of the land or kingdom and of the tribe which had the hegemony in this land, to which the name Saba' has remained attached to the present day. This is quite clear from the inscriptions. Thus, in the first place of the old Sabaean inscriptions Glaser, No. 418—419, 1000 A and 1000 B (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Altsabäische Texte, I. 29 sq.; 79); Al-Majkah (the principal deity of Saba') and saba' is the formula by which the Sabaen, first a theocratic and then monarchical, state is known. That the predominant tribe Saba' is however never described as a tribe in the older period is clear evidence of its hegemony as Rhodokanakis points out (Handbuch der altaraubischen Altertumskunde, I. 121). It was different in the later period; for example, in the inscription Glaser, No. 542, set up by king Shammar Yuharib, king of Saba' and Yhdi Radian, of the tribe of Saba', the reference is always to the "lords of the town of Mārib and its valleys." 

The earliest history of the town is unfortunately wrapped in obscurity. The mention of kings of Mārib in the comparatively late inscription, Glaser, No. 302, 7, shows, it is true, that the town was still independent in the time of the older Sabaean Mukarris — for these "kings of Mārib" are their contemporaries — but gives no clue to the date of its foundation. It probably arose about the same time as the old royal city of Sirwāl. The great inscription Glaser, No. 418—419, shows Mārib already in possession of the Sabaean Mukarris and not long afterwards it became their capital; this at least seems to be from the inscription Glaser, No. 481, where we are told that the founder of the inscription "brought as far as Maryab the peace between Saba' and Katabān." This we can only interpret with Rhodokanakis (Studien, ii. 24) as meaning that the general (he is called Tubā'-kariha, son of Dhamaryeda' of the clan of Madhiram) returned to the capital of Saba' after the conclusion of peace. Not long after the foundation of the great Sabaean kingdom, of which the inscription Glaser, No. 1000 A B relates, it must have replaced Sirwāl, the oldest capital of the Sabaean kingdom; indeed there seems to be evidence that this had already taken place in the reign of the king who set up the two great Sirwāl inscriptions Glaser, No. 1000 A B, Kariba-di Watar, founder of the great Sabaean kingdom. For when we are told in Glaser, No. 1000 B, i. 5 and ii. 6 that he had built the upper part of his palace Sidd (𬭬( which is probably identical with the famous citadel Salhum at Mārib, it may be assumed that this Mukarrab resided here. The great barrage which went back to the older generation of Sabaean Mukarris, must have then transformed Mārib and the country round it into the flourishing oasis which made the town the centre of a great kingdom. The Mukarris Samuhu'ala Ya'naf and his father Wadi-di Dharīt as well as Yithi'amara Baṣan also did much for the development of the town and the country around it.

We do not know exactly when Mārib ceased to be the capital of the Sabaean kingdom. Glaser (Zwei Inschriften über den Dammbruch von Mārib, 3) supposes that the capital was removed to Zafār (near Yarim) at latest towards the end of the third century A.D., but probably as early as the first century A.D., since the Periplus mari Erythraei, § 25 already knows Zafār as the capital. Indeed the evidence of the Periplus which is supplemented by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 104, who knows Saphpar as a royal residence, can hardly be interpreted otherwise than meaning that Zafār was already the residence of the Sabaean kings about 60 A.D. With the transfer of the capital to Zafār, the cause of which Glaser finds in the attacks of the Axumites on the independence of the Sabaean kingdom, while M. Hartmann (Die arabische Frage,
p. 469) supposes this reason to have been the victory of the Huanadids over Himyar (cf. C.J.H., iii. 347 and M. Hartmann, op cit., p. 146 sq.), Märib's glory had passed away: the decline probably did not set in at once but Glaser must be right in assuming that Märib was now neglected and this is how the dam, so important for the cultivation of the land, fell into disrepair. Isolated references in Muslim sources show that the town had however not yet lost all its importance. Al-Bakri, Mu'jam, i. 308 (cf. A. v. Kremer, Sage, p. 138) knows Märib as one of the treasuries of the Himyars, and according to the Himyar-kašda, verse 56 (A. v. Kremer, Sage, p. xii, note 1 and p. 60), Shammar Yūrib (c. 281 a. d.) kept his prisoners in Märib. The two breaches in the dam which took place in 450 a. d. and under Abyssinian rule in 542 a. d., must have done grave injury to the prosperity of the town. In this last period of its brilliant history Märib was for a short time (certainly in 542 a. d.) the capital of the governor of the Ethiopian king Ramsu Zahmiqan, Abraha, and even had a Christian church (cf. Glaser, Zwei Inschriften über den Dambruch von Märib, p. 47). The final catastrophe sealed the fate of the town. Its inhabitants left the sore tried town and migrated to the Hijaz.

Märib was resettled in the Muslim period. The favourable situation of the place and perhaps the rich deposits of salt in the neighbourhood (3 days' journey east of Märib at Säfr, mentioned in the time of the Prophet, who appointed Abī Musa al-Asfār governor of Märib; E. Glaser, Reise nach Märib, p. 26; al-Bakri, Mu'jam, ii. 501; al-Hamdāni, Sīfa, p. 87, 103, 155; al-Sprenger, Post- und Reisereisen, p. 139) also kept the place from being quite forgotten. Ibn Khuradhdhib (B.G.A., vi. 138) and al-Mu'addasi (B.G.A., iii. 89) mention the village of Märib; al-Hamdāni, Sīfa, p. 199 says the sesame of Märib is a specialty of the Yemen. Al-Iṣṭīfa, Geographie, p. 149 calls Märib a burūj; according to Ibn al-Mudjawi (in A. Sprenger, Post- und Reisereisen, p. 140), Märib (c. 630 a. h.) had a market and a mosque and was of some importance as a resting-place for the night and fruit could be obtained there at any time of the year. Since Yākūt, Mu'jam, iv. 436, also says, the district of Märib is rich in palms, it seems to have in part at least regained its old fertility.

to doubt the essential correctness of this story, as there is no particular bias in it and it contains all sorts of details which do not look like inventions, so that it is exaggerated scepticism when Lammens supposes that the "mother of Ibrahim", after whom the maghara was called, was some Jewess. On the other hand, in view of the fact that all the marriages of Muhammad after the Hijra were childless, it would have been surprising if evil-minded people had not cast suspicions on the paternity of Ibrahim, and that this conjecturally happened is evident from some traditions the object of which is to defend Mariya from this suspicion.

On the other hand, it is not so easy to justify the part which Kur'anic exegesis makes Mariya play in the exposition of Sura lxxvi. In this Sura, the Prophet speaks in a very indignant tone against one of his wives, because she has betrayed a secret to another, which he had imparted to her under a promise of the strictest secrecy. At the same time Allah blames him, because in order to please his wives, he has bound himself by oath to refrain from something which is not definitely stated and because he does not use the right granted him by Allah to release himself from his oath. In addition, there is a word of warning to the two women who had disobeyed him and a threat to all his wives that he might divorce them in order to marry more pious ones (cf. xxxiii. 28 sq.). According to the usual explanation, the two wives are Hafsa and A'isha and the revelation is said to have been provoked by the fact that Hafsa, on returning unexpectedly to her house, found Mariya and the Prophet in an intimate tête-à-tête and that on a day which by rotation belonged to her (or A'isha). In his embarrassment he pledged himself by oath to have no more intercourse with the Copt girl. But after Hafsa's breach of faith, Allah tells him to release himself from his oath. This explanation fits very well in some respects and that the promise of continence is connected with marital complications is illuminating. That there are hadiths, which explain his quarrel with his wives quite differently, does not mean very much, for they are doubtless invented to drive out of currency the popular, less edifying version. But, on closer examination, there is one flaw which makes the latter uncertain, for it does not answer the question how Muhammad could call the situation in which Hafsa caught him and Mariya a secret that he trusted to her.


**Al-Markab** (the Margat, Merghatum of the Crusaders), a fortress near Baniyas on the coast of Syria. According to the chronicle of Abu Ghlib Humam b. Al-Fadl Al-Muhadhdhab Al-Mabari (quoted in Yākū, Mushqir, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 500) and the Tārikh al-Khulafaʾ wa-l-Hājān u l-Sanāʾa b. Munakb (in Abu l-Fadl’s, ed. Reinard and de lange, p. 255), it was built by the Muslims in 454 (1062). Al-Dimashqī (ed. Menen, p. 208) wrongly attributes its foundation to Harun al-
Raqhid (van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 304, note 7 where the reference to Raqhid [rather Raqhul] al-Din in Le Strange, *Palestine* is shown to be wrong); his statement seems to be correct, however, that the citadel was built out of material from ancient ruins. The Byzantines occupied al-Markab and other fortresses in the vicinity under the general Kantukzenos in 1104 (Anna Commena, *Alexiad*, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 138: το το ἀργυρώδιον [= ἑσώθη] τα καλύπτον αἱμαρχία [= al-Markab], τα Τάβαλα [Ταβάλα] καὶ ἅλλα τάκα]. When in 511 (1117-1118) the Crusaders approached the fortress, its lord Ibn Nuhri surrendered it on condition that he and his family were allowed to remain in it; but after a few days the Franks expelled him and allotted al-Maniqa to him in exchange for al-Markab; Franks and Armenians were settled in the latter. The first recorded lord of the fortress was Rainald Mansur, the constable of the prince of Antioch. After the earthquake of 1170, from which the fortress must have suffered damage, Bertrand of al-Markab, perhaps out of fear of Saladin’s threats, handed it over on Feb. 1, 1186 to the Knights of St. John. In July 1186 Saladin passed below the watch tower (now Burj al-Sabib), which from ancient times had commanded the road along the coast (cf. Dussaud, *Topogr.*, p. 127, note 5) below the fortress and was connected with it by a wall which protected a subterranean passage, but did not dare to attack Markab any more than Tarusī (q.v.). Prince Isaac of Cyrus, a descendant of the Comnenos (not the Emperor Isaac Comnenos as van Berchem, op. cit., p. 298 sq., note 298) was taken prisoner by Richard Coeur-de-Lion on May 31, 1191, and imprisoned in Markab till his death (Neophyts, in *Recueil hist. crois., hist. grecs, iv.*, 562 with note, ii. 480: ἐν κατάλληλα καλυμμένω Μαρκαπτία). Sulṭān al-Malik al-Zahir Ghifīr al-Halāf whose lands adjoined those of the Knights of St. John sent in 601 (1204—1205) troops against the fortress, who are said to have just succeeded in destroying the towers of the walls when their leader fell and they again retired without accomplishing their object. In 628 (1231) and 638 (1240—1241) the Knights were again at war with Yusuf, Sulṭān of Halab. From this period (1212) dates the very full description of the fortress by Wilbrand of Oldenburg. Built on a high hill and surrounded by a double wall and many towers, it was regarded in the period when the power of the Crusaders was beginning to decline, as maximum totius terrae illius solacium; the bishop of Valenia (Bānīyās) had moved into the fortress by 1212 out of fear of the Muslims. King Andreas of Hungary in 1217—1218 gave funds for the maintenance of the fortress which had given him an honourable reception (Rohricht, *Regesta Hierosolym.*, p. 245, No. 908). The straits to which the humiliating treaties with Baibars had reduced the Knightsly Orders is lamented by the Grand Master Hugo Revel in 1268 in a letter in which he says that the possession of its last two fortresses, Gratum and Margatun (Ḥṣn al-Akrād and al-Markab), was only granted the Order on payment of oppressive taxes (Rohricht, *Regesta Hierosolym., Additamenta*, p. 541, No. 1355a). After the loss of Ḥṣn al-Akrād, the Templars and the Knights of St. John in 669 (1271) by a treaty which they concluded in ‘Arkā with Saif al-Din Balabān al-Dawāddar (“the secretary”) al-Rūmī, the Sulṭān’s plenipotentiary, had to cede half of the coastal land (jāḥil) of Ḥamarsūs, al-Markab and Bānīyās and bind themselves not to build any new defences (Mufaddal b. Abī ‘l-Fadl al-Osra, *Regesten d. Maumlakensultane*, ed. Blocher, in *Patrol. Orient.*, xii. 536). After a raid by the Franks (Oct. 1279) the Emir Saif al-Din Balabān al-Tābilākhī, the governor of Ḥṣn al-Akrād for Kālātun, in the beginning of 1281 sent troops against al-Markab, but they were driven back with heavy losses (Mufaddal, op. cit., xiv. 484, and the sources quoted in van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 301, note 5).

In the treaty between Kālātun and the Templars of 681 (1252) al-Markab is mentioned among the districts half of which were to be ceded (Mufaddal, op. cit., xiv. 445; van Berchem, op. cit., p. 302, note 2). The pilgrim Burchardus de Monte Sion in 1283 mentions the *Castrum Margath fratrum hospitalis sancti Johannis*; it was still at this date the see of the bishop of Valencia (Peregrinatores, ed. Laurent, p. 30, 170).

On 10th Šafar 684 (April 17, 1285) Kālātun appeared before al-Markab and began the attack as soon as the siege artillery arrived. On the 19th Rabī‘ I (May 25) the Emir Fakhr al-Din Makri received the surrender of the fortress. On account of its strategic value for defence against possible attacks from the sea, it was not destroyed but included in the “royal province of the fortunate conquests”; the capital of which till 688, when Tarabulus was taken, was the Castle of the Kurds, still governed by Saif al-Din Balabān al-Tābilākhī al-Manṣūrī. Kālātun in 684 ordered him to repair the defences of the citadel as an inscription found in situ shows (van Berchem, *Inscriptiones de Syria*, p. 71 sq.). Among those present at the capture of the fortress were the 12 years old Abu ‘l-Fidā‘ī, who was then on his first campaign with his father, and the historian Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥim, the continuator of Ibn Wāsīl’s chronicle. The best account of the taking of al-Markab is in Kālātun’s biography entitled Ṭaḥfir al-Ḥiyām wa lq. ʿUṯr bi-Sirat al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-Manṣūrī (Paris, MS. ar., No. 1704, fol. 149 sqq., ed. and transl. in van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 310—326).

In the viith (sixth) century al-Markab belonged to the province of Tarābulus (*Unari, Tarīf*, transl. by R. Hartmann, *Z. D. M. G.*, lxx. (1916), p. 36; Khalīl al-Zāhirī, *Zebdāt Khālid al-Munāsīk*, ed. Ravaisse, p. 48; Khalīṣāndī, *Suhk al-Fudhī*, ed. Cairo, iv. 145 sqq.); at this time it was used as a state prison (van Berchem, p. 305, note 2). Its harbour is mentioned in documents of 1193 and 1299 (van Berchem, p. 309, note 3); it was presumably at the mouth of the Wādī ʿAin al-Khraibe (in Walpole: al-Mina). As al-Markab lies on the outer spurs of the Ansariye range it has often wrongly been included among the fortresses of the Îmārāt (Kīlī al-Dawīya) (so *Carmi, op. cit.*, in the Berlin and Gotth Ms. but not in the others: Hartmann, *Z. D. M. G.*, lxx., 36, note 7). So far as we can judge from the brief notes by visitors, it was not till about the year 1643 that it began to fall into ruins. About 1885 at the request of the ka’amīmaṣm of the kaḍa of al-Markab the seat of the government was transferred from the ruined Kaṭal al-Markab to Bānīyās (M. Hartmann, *Z. D. P. V.*, xxii. p. 163, No. 27).


MARRAKESH (Vr. MABRUKSH, popular pronunciation Maârûch), a town in Morocco, and one of the residences of the Sultan.

The town Marrakesh, adopted by the administration of the protectorate, is of recent origin in French. Down to about 1890 the town was always known as Marræch (Morocco) in French. The kingdom of Morocco, distinct from the ancient of Fas and the 1860s finally gave its name to all the State. At one time it only consisted of the country south of the wâdi Umm Rakî as far as the range of the Great Atlas.

Marrakesh is situated in 3° 37' 35" N. Lat. and 7° 50' 42" E. Long. (Greenw.). Its mean height above sea-level is almost 1,510 feet. The town is 150 miles south of Casablanca. It is a centre of the desert which lies between the two great Sand-storms. The town has been built on a rocky spur which is called the castle of the town, and its harbour which is the end of the eight century most of the trade between Marrakesh and Europe passed.

Although Marrakesh is only 235 miles from Fas as the crow flies, it is over 330 by Casablanca—Rabat-Meknes which is the only road that has been used for over a century, the direct road by the Tâdã having been rendered impracticable by the traditional in-efficiency of the country.

The temperature which is very mild in winter is very hot in summer. The average maxima of 39°6 in the month of August 1927 have nothing unusual and imply extreme temperatures reaching or passing 50° on certain days. Rainfall is low (284.5 mm.). In 1927, against 706.5 in Rabat and 1,007.5 in Tangier). But water fed by the snows of the Atlas is found at no great depth. It is collected by a system of low subterranean galleries (kaâfara, piut. khoâfîr) which bring it to the surface by taking advantage of the very slight slope of the surface. This method of obtaining water, which is described in the 13th century by Idrisi, has enabled the large gardens which surround the town to be created. The Almohads and the dynasties which succeeded them also built aqueducts and reservoirs to supply the town with water from the springs and streams of the mountains.

Contrary to what was until quite recently believed, Marrakesh is by far the most thickly populated town of the empire. The census of March 7, 1926 gives 149,263 as the total population, 3,652 Europeans, 132,893 Muslims, 12,718 Jews. The probable growth of the population is not sufficient to explain the difference between the present day figures and the old estimates, almost all far below the truth and varying greatly among themselves: from 20,000 (given by Diego de Torres in 1585 and Host in 1768), 25,000 (Saint Olov, 1603), 30,000 (Ali Bey el-Abbassi, 1804), 40 to 50,000 (Gatell, 1864 and Eug. Aubin, 1902), 50,000 (Lambert, 1868), 60,000 (Beaumier, 1868), 80 to 100,000 (Washington, 1830) up to the obviously exaggerated figure of 270,000 given by Jackson in 1811.

About 40 miles N. of the Atlas, the vast silhouette of which, covered by snow for eight months of the year fills the background, Marrakesh is built in a vast plain called the Hass which slopes very gently towards the wâdi Tânisf, which runs 3 miles north of the town. The extreme uniformity of the plain is broken only in the N. W. by two rocky hills called Gillils (1,700 feet) and Kudayl al-Abid. In 1912 at the time of the French occupation, there was built a fort which commands Marrakesh. The modern European town called the Guéliz lies between this hill and the walls of the old town.

The wâdi Isâl, a left bank tributary of the Tânisf, a stream often dried up but transformed into a rather wide river, runs along the walls of the town on the east. To the north of Marrakesh as far as the Tânisf and to the east stretches a great forest of palm-trees, the only one in Morocco north of the Atlas. It covers an area of 13,000 hectares and possesses over 100,000 palm-trees but the dates there only ripen very imperfectly.

The town is very large. The walls which run all round it measure at least 7 miles in length. The town in the strict sense does not occupy the whole of this vast area. The part built upon forms a long strip which starting from the zawiya of Sidi el 'Abbâs in the north runs towards the kasba which stands at the southern end of the town. On the two sides lie great gardens and estates among which we find in the neighbourhood of the chief gates inside the walls, isolated quarters grouped like so many villages around their sük and their mosque.

The town consists mainly of little low houses of reddish clay, often in ruins, among which are scattered huge and magnificent dwellings without particularly imposing exteriors built either by the winners of the old mahzen (e. g. the Bâliya, now
the Résidence Générale, the old palace of the Bā Ḫmād, vizier of Mawli al-Ḥasan) or by the great kāʿids, chiefs of the tribes of the country round. The narrow and overhung streets in the central area broaden towards the outskirts into sunny and dusty squares and crossroads. The colour, the picturesque architecture, the palm-trees, the branches of which appear over the walls of the gardens, the presence of a large negro population, all combine to give the town the appearance of a Saharan āshār of vast dimensions.

The centre of the life of the city is the Dījāma al-Fnā, a vast, irregular, ill defined open space, surrounded until quite recently by wretched buildings and reed huts, overshadowed by the high minaret of the Kutubiya Mosque. Its name comes, according to the author of the Tarīkh al-Sudān, from the ruins of a mosque which Aḥmad al-Mansūr had undertaken to build there: "As he had planned it on a wonderful scale, it had been given the name of mosque of prosperity (al-hanā); but his plans being upset by a series of unfortunate events, the prince was unable to finish the building before his death and it was therefore given the name of mosque of the ruin (dījāma al-fnāmī)." This origin having been forgotten; an attempt was later made to explain the name of the square from the fact that the heads of rebels used to be exposed there (mosque or place of assembly of ruin, of death). It was there also that executions took place. Lying on the western edge of the principal agglomeration of buildings at its most thickly populated part, close to the sūk, connected with the principal gates by direct and comparatively quiet roads, Dījāma al-Fnā is the point of convergence of the roads. At all hours swarming with people, it is occupied in the morning with a market of small traders: barbers, cobblers, vendors of fruit and vegetables, of medicines, of fried grasshoppers, of tea and of soup (harīra); in the evening, it is filled with acrobats and jugglers (Awdāl Sādi Ḥmād Ṭīsā of Taṣerwālī), sorcerers, story-tellers, fire-eaters, snake-charmers and dhīḥah dancers. The audience consists mainly of people from the country who have come into town on business and want to enjoy the distractions of the town for a few hours before going home. These visitors are always very numerous in Marrakesh. Besides the regular inhabitants there is a floating population the number of which has been put at 20,000 to 25,000. For Marrakesh is the great market for supplying not only the Ḥmaw but also the mountain country, the Sīfs and especially the extreme south, Ḍādes, Darā (Dra) and the Anti-Atlas. A portion of this traffic will probably be diverted via Agadir when this port is opened to trade. Marrakesh used to be the starting-point for caravans going through the Sahara to trade with Timbuktu. They brought back chiefly Sudanese slaves for whom Marrakesh was an important market. The conquest of the Sudan by France has put an end to this traffic.

To the north of the Dījāma al-Fnā begin the sīks which are very large. As in Fās and in the other large towns, the traders and artisans are grouped by trades under the authority of the nukāwsh, a kind of provost of the merchants. The most important sīks are those of the cloth merchants (ḥāṣāviya), of the sellers of slippers, of pottery, of basket work, of the embroiderers of harness, of the dyers and of the smiths. An important Thursday sīk (al-ḥamānis) is held outside and inside the walls around the old gate of Fās which has taken the name of the market (Bāb al-Ḥamānis). This sīk was already in existence in the xviiiith century.

There is no industry to speak of in Marrakesh. The most important is the making of leather (tanning). The manufacture of slippers occupies 1,500 workmen who produce over 2,000 pairs each working day. There are the only articles manufactured in the town that are exported. They are sold as far away as Egypt and West Africa. The war interrupted communications and did great damage to this industry. For the rest, Marrakesh is mainly an agricultural market. The whole town is a vast fondaṭ in which are warehoused the products of the country, almonds, caraway seeds, goat-skins, oils, barley, wool, to be exchanged either for imported goods (sugar, tea, cloth) or for other agricultural produce (wheat, oil, which the tribes of the mountains and of the extreme south for example do not have).

The town is divided into 32 quarters: Zāwiyā 'Abbāsiyya, Sādi Ben Slimān, Aswāl, Rīyāḍ al-ʿArūs, Sādi Abī ʿAmr, Bāb Dukkālā (divided into two quarters), Sādi Abī al-ʿAzīz, Raḥbāt Ābdī, Daḥbālī, Kānānīyya, Rīyāḍ al-Zūṭīn al-jīdād, Dījān bīn Ṣogra, Kaʿūr, Mwāsīn, Rīyāḍ al-Zūṭīn al-kādīm, ʿArṣa Māwlā Mīṣā Khīrī, ʿArṣa Māwlā Mīṣā Ṣghīrī, Bāb Ḥallānā, Sādi Mīmīn, Bīn Sādīh, Sādi Ayūb, Bāb Zakār, Kāṭāt bīn Mūṣrāf, Bāb al-Dabābīg, Ḥārat al-Sūrā, Mawūfī, Arḥātīn, the kāštā containing the royal palaces (again subdivided into several sections), Jakāb al-Wālīs, Bīrīmā, Bāb ʿĀḥmār, Muskānī Sādi ʿAmāra and the mellāk or Jewish quarter. We may further mention outside the walls near the Bāb Dukkālā, a quarter called al-Ḥārā where the lepers live. Until recent years the gates of the town were closed during the night. The superintendents of the quarters (mukānādān) have watchmen (ṣūkīn) under their orders. The old custom still survives for hiring a salvo at midnight on the Dījāma al-Fnā as a curfew.

Marrakesh being an imperial town, the suljān who only stays there at long intervals is represented in his absence by a khalīfī, a prince of the imperial family (usually the son or brother of the sovereign). The role of this khalīfī is purely representative. His main duty is to preside at the ceremonies during the ritual celebrations. The governor of the town is a pāṭha, assisted by a delegate (māʾīlı) and several khalīfās. One of the latter supervises the prisons and the administration of justice. Another has the title of pāṭha of the kāṣba. He governs the southern part of the town which includes the imperial palace and the Jewish quarter. Formerly the pāṭha of the kāṣba was dependent of the pāṭha of the town and served to counterbalance the power of the latter. He commanded the gīṣ (a mounted contingent furnished by the warlike tribes (Cīṣāya, As Ḥimmūr etc.) settled in the vicinity of the town by the suljān on the domain lands. At the present day the gīṣ is under the control of the pāṭha of the town and the pāṭha of the kāṣba only retains of his former powers certain rights of precedence and honorary privileges.

Muslim law is administered in Marrakesh by three kādīs: one is established at the mosque of Ibn Yūsuf; the other at the mosque of al-Mwāsīn and the third at the mosque of the kāṣba. The latter's competence does not extend beyond the limits of
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his quarter. That of the others extends over the whole town and even over the tribes of the area governed from it who have no local kādi.

Marrakesh is not numbered like Rabat and Tétouan among the jaghîfina towns. i.e. it has not, like them, an old established citizen population, not of rural origin, with a bourgeoisie whose tone is given by the descendants of the Moors driven from Spain.

In the xviith century however, Marrakesh did receive a colony of Murerescoe large enough to give one quarter the name of Orgha, a town of Andalusia. The foundation of the population consists of people of the tribes for the most part Berber or Arabs strongly mixed with Berber blood. Shi'ah is much spoken in Marrakesh although the language of the tribes around the town (Raghâma, Ħiliya) is Arabic. The movements of the tribes, the coming and going of caravans, the importation of slaves from the Sudan have resulted in a constant process of mixing in the population and the old Maṣṣā‘idian race which was mixed with Immorants, has been the primitive population of Marrakesh is only preserved in combination with amounts difficult to measure of Arab, Saharan and negro blood. Even to-day this process is going on: the newcomers come less from the valleys of the Atlas than from the Sus, the Dra‘ and the Anti-Atlas, from the extreme south which is poor and overpopulated. The greater number of these immigrants soon become merged in the population of the town, but the Enquiry sur les corporations marchandes, conducted by L. Masson in 1923-1924 (1129-1130 A.H. 1915) yielded some very curious information about the survival in Marrakesh of vigorous groups of provincials, specialising in particular trades: the makers of silver jewellery (at least those who are not Jews) owe their name of al-ṣimṭayn to the fact that they originally came from Tâmmût in Sus; the Mesfaw are charcoal-burners and greengrocers, the Ḥighiyâh, saltiers, the people of the Toghâna, gteeners of dates and Fas, who make wells, who specialise in water-channels (kāšar); those of Tâfīlt, porters and paviors; those of Wârâsét, water-carriers and of Tatta‘ (Anti-Atlas), restaurateurs; of the Dra‘, water-carriers and al-ṣinṭayn, etc. .

This division is not the result of specialisation in their original home nor of privilege granted by the civic authorities but arises from the fact that artisans once settled in Marrakesh have sent for their competitors when they required assistance. This groups grew up, sometimes, quite considerable. The loss of the corporations of Marrakesh gives a total of about 10,000 artisans. These corporations have lost much of their power under the pressure of the MaqĀren. Some of them however still retain a certain social importance: in the first place that of the she-maekers which is the largest (1,500 members): then come the tanners (430), the cloth (237) and silk (100) merchants: the fārid wholesalers: then some groups of skilled artisans, highly esteemed out of leamience, embroiderers of saddles, makers of mosaics, carpenters, sculptors, plaster etc.

Religious and intellectual life. Mosques are numerous in Marrakesh. Some of them will be the subjects of brief archaeological studies. Those which play the most important part in the religious life of the city are the mosque of al-Mawasîn, the mosque of ‘Ali b. ʿĪṣâf, both close to the siq, that of Sîdî bel ‘Abbâs and that of the kaba. Then come the Kutubiya, the mosque of the Bab Dukāla, of the Bab Atlan, of Berrima, and the Djâma‘ Ibn Šâlah. There are also many little mosques in the various faubourgs. But although it can claim illustrious men of learning, Marrakesh is not like Fâs, a centre of learning and of teaching. The Almohads built schools and libraries there, brought the most illustrious scholars, philosophers and physicians from Spain, like Ibn Ṭafâlî, Abû Marwān Ibn Zahr (Avenzoar) and Abu l-Walâd Ibn Rûṣîd (Averroes) who died at Marrakesh in 595 (1199).

These great traditions did not survive the dynasty.

In the beginning of the xviith century, in the time of Leo Africanus, the library of the Almohad palace was used as a poultry house and the madrasa built by the Marinids was in ruins. At the present day in the town of the Kutubiya there is not a single bookseller. A certain number of fâšî still live in the madrasas (Ibn Yusuf, Ibn Šâlah, Sîdî belʿAbbâs, Berrima, Kašâba) but the teaching in Marrakesh has neither the prestige nor the traditions which still give some lustre to the teaching at al-Karaouyin in Fâs, much decayed as it is and which they attempt to keep up and call the fâšî the famous "festival of the sunkûn", etc. every spring) the students are far from holding in Marrakesh the position their comrades enjoy in Fâs.

The devotion of the people of Marrakesh expends itself particularly on the cult of saints, not at all orthodox but dear to the Berbers. Their town has always been famous for the great number of fâšî who are buried in its cemeteries and who justify the saying: "Marrakesh, tomb of the saints".

But in the time of Mawâli Isma‘îl, the Shaikh Abî ‘Ali al-Ḥasan al-Thâbî, by order of the prince, organised, in imitation of the old established cult of the Sab‘atu Rûṣîl (the seven saints of the Râgrâga, around the Djalal al-Hâdîd, among the Shayâma), a pilgrimage to the Sab‘atu Rûṣîl of Marrakesh including visits to seven sanctuaries and various demonstrations of piety. The following are the names of the seven saints in the order in which they are to be visited: 1) Sîdî ʿĪṣâf b. Ṭâlî al-Nahdî, a leper, d. 595 (1196–1197), buried outside the Bab Al-Mûn on the spot where he had lived; 2) the kâfâl ‘Iyad, 476–544 (1083–1154); 480, kâfâl of Ceuta, then of Granada, a learned theologian, author of the Shâb, a celebrated collection of traditions, buried beside the Bab Al-Mûn; 3) Sîdî belʿAbbâs al-Sabî, patron saint of Marrakesh and the most venerated of the saints of the region 524—601 (1130–1204). He came to Marrakesh when the town was being besieged by the Almohads and settled there, at first in a hermitage on the Djalal Gūlīs where a kâfâla dedicated to him can still be seen. But the principal pilgrimage is to his tomb at the northern end of the town over which Abî Fâris b. Ahmad al-Manṣûr built a zâwiya and an important mosque at the beginning of the xviith century; 4) Sîdî Muḥammad b. Sîlām al-Djârî, d. in 870 (1465) at Arûghal among the Shayâma, a celebrated Shâb, founder of the Djâzîlî brotherhood. His body was brought to Marrakesh in 930 (1523) by Ahmad al-Nâḍî the Sabîdân; 5) Sîdî ‘Abî al-ʿAzîz al-Tabâhi, a pupil of the Djalalî, d. in 914 (1508); 6) Sîdî ‘Abî ʿAlîb b. Ghâzîwân, popularly called Mawâl al-Kâfûr, d. in 915 (1508); 7) Sîdî ʿAbî al-Râhîmân al-Suhâli, called the Imâm al-Suhâli, a native of the district of Malaga, d. 581 (1185) and buried outside the Bab al-Rabb.
It is quite an arbitrary choice that these seven individuals have been chosen as the Sab'atu Rīḍāf. Others could equally well have been chosen, as the town of Marrakesh and the countries which stretch before it, contain a very large number of other venerated tombs. The principal are mentioned in the article by H. de Castries, *Les Sept Patrons de Marrakesh* (Heidelberg, 1924). Legend of course plays a great part in the cults of the various saints. We may mention for example the sayings and songs which perpetuate the memory of Lulū' ʿUḍa, mother of the Sulṭān Ahmad al-Manṣūr, a real personage much transformed by the popular imagination. The various trade corporations have chosen patron saints. Thus Sidi Yaʾkub is the patron of the tanners, Sidi ʿAbd Abū Sūdah of the soap-makers and lacemakers, Sidi Maṣʿūd ʿslave of Sidi Muhammad b. Shīmān is the patron of the masons, Sidi ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Tabbāḥ of the dyers, etc. The majority of the artisans are also affiliated to the religious brotherhoods. In Massignon's investigation will be found details of the attraction which some of the latter have for certain trades.

The Jews. At the foundation of Marrakesh, the Jews had no permission to settle in the town. They came there to trade from Aghmāt Ailān where they lived. Al-Idrīsī relates that under ʿAlī b. Yūsuf they had not even the right to spend the night in Marrakesh and that those, who were caught within the walls after sunset, were in great danger of losing their property. They settled there at a later date. At the beginning of the xvith century there was, according to Marmol, in Marrakesh a ghetto of over 3,000 houses. It lay near the sūk on the site now occupied by the mosque of al-Mawṣīn. When this mosque was built by Sulṭān ʿAbd Ailān al-Ghālib, the more scrupulous refused to pray there for some time on the pretext that it occupied the site of a Jewish cemetery. It was ʿAbd Ailān al-Ghālib who, about 1560, settled the Jews on the site they still occupy, along the wall of the kaṣba to the east, where the stables of the palace had been. In the beginning of the xvith century, there was here, according to the French traveller Mocquet, "like rural character spent between the wall and having only one gate guarded by the Moors; here live the Jews who are over 4,000 in number and pay tribute". A century later, there were about 6,000 Jews and many synagogues. The Jewish quarter, called mellāḥ after the example of the Jewish quarter of Fās (the name mellāḥ is attested for Marrakesh as early as the end of the xvith century), has 12,000 inhabitants at the present day. As regards policing, it is under the authority of the pāsha of the kaṣba but otherwise is administered by an elected Jewish committee. Questions of personal law are judged by a rabbinical tribunal of six members nominated and paid by the Maghāzen. The Jews of Marrakesh are beginning to leave the bounds of the mellāḥ. For the most part they wear the ritual costume: gaberdine, skull-cap and black slippers, but the younger generation shows a tendency to emancipate itself from this dress. They have little influence on the corporations of Marrakesh and are not allowed to settle in the sūks. They are limited to certain trades (jewellers, tinsmiths and embroiderers of slippers) and share with the people of Fās the wholesale trade. They trade particularly with the Shīlūh of the mountains.

History. The Roman occupation never extended so far as the region of Marrakesh. It is quite without probability that some writers, following the Spanish historian Marmol, have sought at Aghmāt or at Marrakesh the site of Bīsānten Emerium (Biskra, Bishāṭ, Bishāṭ, Bishāṭ, Bishāṭ, Bishāṭ). The earliest historians agree that the place where Marrakesh was built by the Almohads was a bare marshy plain where only a few bushes grew. The name Marrakesh gives no clue to the origin of the town. The etymologies given by the Arab authors are quite fanciful: according to al-Marrākushi, it was the name of a negro slave who escaped and set up as a brigand there. Another writer explains it by a punning interpretation: "the meaning of the name in the language of the Masmūḍa is "go away quickly"! The place was actually a place of ambush for brigands". It was, it appears, in 449 (1057–1058) that the Almohads advanced from Sūs north of the Atlas and took Aghmāt Waraka. It was there that they settled at first. But after the campaign of 452 (1060) in the course of which they conquered the country of Fāzā, Meknes and of the Lawāṭa near Fās, they wanted to make their position more permanent and independent by creating a kind of camp, which could be used as a base for their further campaigns and would threaten the Maṣmūḍa of the mountains and could be used as a connecting link between the south from which they came and the kingdom of Fās. ʿAbd b. Tadhīf therefore purchased from its owner an estate on the frontier between two Masmūḍa tribes, the Hālāna and the Hāzim, and pitched his camp there. So far was he from thinking of founding a great capital, a thing for which this Saharan nomad felt no need, that at first he lived in a tent here, beside which he built a mosque to pray in and a little kaṣba in which to keep his treasures and his weapons; but he did not build a surrounding wall. The native Masmūḍa built themselves dwellings surrounded by palisades of branches beside the Almoravid camp. The town grew rapidly to a considerable size. If it is true, that in the reign of ʿAlī b. Yūsuf it had at least 100,000 hearths, but it did not lose its rural character. There was there the threat of the Almohad movement revived by him forced ʿAlī b. Yūsuf to defend his town and surround it by a rampart which was built in eight months, probably in 520 (1126). Some historians give the date 526 (1132) but it is certain that the walls were already built in 524 (1130) when the Almohads attacked Marrakesh for the first time. Marrakesh, the creation and capital of the Almoravids, was to be the last of their strongholds to yield. When Ibn Tūmār had established his power over the tribes of the mountains he tried to attack Marrakesh; he then sent an Almohad army under the command of Shālah al-Bāshīr. When, after defeating the Almoravids in the vicinity of Aghmāt, pursued them to the gates of Marrakesh. The Almohads could not enter the town but established themselves before its walls. After 40 days' siege, ʿAlī b. Yūsuf received reinforcements and made a successful sortie which forced the attackers to retreat. This was the battle of al-Buhaira (524 = May 1130) from the name of a large garden, Buhairat al-Raḡīrīḥ, near which it was fought. It lay to the east of the town before the Bāb Dabbagh and the Bāb Ailān. Al-Bāshīr was slain and Marrakesh repulsed by the troops for 17 years. Ibn Tūmār died a few months
later. It is hardly likely that 'Abd al-Mu'min should have made soon after his accession, as the *Kifras* says, a new attempt to take Marrakesh. The memoirs of al-Badhdak which give such full details of all the events of this period make no mention of it. They show on the contrary the Almohad armies, based at first in conquering the country before occupying the capital, taking Tadla, Safe, Taza, Diran, Tlemcen and Fas and only returning to lay siege to Marrakesh after the whole country had been occupied and the capital alone held out as the last stronghold of the doomed dynasty. It was in the summer of 1146 that 'Abd al-Mu'min had siege to Marrakesh. He made his headquarters at Gillaiz and, seeing that the siege would be a long one, at once had houses built in which to install himself and his army. The siege lasted eleven months. An unsuccessful sortie by the Almohad vassals seems to have hastened the fall of the town. Disgusted by lack of success and by famine, a number of chiefs of the besieged went over to the enemy. Abd al-Mu'min had scaling-ladders made and distributed them among the tribes. The assault was made and, according to Ibn al-Adhir, the defence of the Christian soldiers facilitated its success. The Almoravid Sultan, 'Abd al-Mu'tal, a young boy who had sought refuge in the fortress, was slain, along with a large number of the Almohads. This event took place in 541 in the month of Shawwal March 6—April 3, 1147, according to the majority of the historians.

The Almohad dynasty which came from the south naturally took Marrakesh as its capital. It was here that 'Abd al-Mu'min and his successors usually resided when they were not in the country. The town prospered exceedingly under their rule. They gave it many important public buildings: the *kasha*, mosques, schools, a hospital, aqueducts and magnificent gardens. During this period of prosperity, there were very few events of particular interest in the history of Marrakesh. In 547 (1152—1153) according to Ibn Khaldun, in 549 (1154—1156) according to al-Badhdak and the *Kifras*, the Idrisi Amghir, brother of the Malik Ibn Tumart, entered the town and tried to raise the inhabitants against Abd al-Mu'min who was away at Sale. The rising was quickly put down and ended in the massacre of the rebels and their accomplices. But on the decline of the dynasty, i.e. after the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212) and the death of al-Nasir, son of al-Manar, Marrakesh became the scene of the struggle between the royal family decended from Abd al-Mu'min and the Almohad shahids decended from the companions of Ibn Tumart who, quoting traditions of the latter, claimed the right to grant investiture to the sultans and to keep them in tutelage. 'Abd al-Wahhab, brother of al-Manar, was strangled in Sept. 1221—1224. His successor 'Abd al-A'dd was drowned in a bath in the palace (Oct. 624 = 1227) and the Almohad shahids appointed as his successor the younger Yahya b. al-Nasir while Abu l-Ula Idris al-Ma'mun, brother of al-'Adid, was proclaimed in Spain. The whole country was soon in the throes of revolution. Yahya, fearing the defection of the noble Almohads, fled to Tinmal (April—May 626 = 1228). Disorder reigned in Marrakesh, where a governor named al-Ma'mun was finally appointed, but four months later, Yahya returned to Marrakesh with fresh troops, put al-Ma'mun's governor to death and after staying seven days in the town was forced to go to Gillaiz to fight a battle (Feb. 1230). For al-Ma'mun had arrived from Spain to take possession of his kingdom. Ferdinand III, king of Castile, had given in return for various concessions, a body of 12,000 Christian horsemen with whose assistance al-Ma'mun defeated Yahya and his followers, gained, with a few Ma'mun and install a plane of the Almohad regime there, marked not only by a terrible massacre of the shahids and their families but by a new orientation in religious matters quite opposed to that of the preceding reigns. On his arrival in Marrakesh, al-Ma'mun mounted the pulpit of the mosque of the *kasha*, recited the *khutba*, solemnly cursed the memory of Ibn Tumart and announced a whole series of measures, some of which are given by the *Kifras* and Ibn Khaldun and which show he intended to do everything on opposite lines to his predecessors. His innovations revived the discontent so that two years later (1232) while al-Ma'mun and his militia were besieging Ceuta, Yahya again occupied and entered the town. Al-Ma'mun at once turned back to the rescue of his capital but died on the way (Oct. 17, 1232 = 629 A.H.). It is said that Ahmad b. al-Habib, succeeded in getting the hand of al-Rasid, aged 14, proclaimed by the leaders of the army, including the commander of the Christian mercenaries. In return she gave them Marrakesh to plunder if they could reconquer it. But the people of the town, learning of this clause in the bargain, made their own terms before opening their gates to the new sultan. The latter had to grant them the *amiri* and pay the Christian general and his companions the sum they might have expected from the plunder of the capital — according to the *Kifras*, 500,000 dirhams.

In 633 (1235—1236) a rebellion of the Khtit drove al-Rasid out of Marrakesh and he took refuge in Sidjilmassa while Yahya recaptured Marrakesh. Al-Rasid however succeeded in retaking it and Yahya finally was assassinated. It was in the reign of the Almohad al-Salid (1242—1248) that the Marinids who had arrived in the east of the country in 1216, seized the greater part of the kingdom of Fas. His successor 'Umar al-Murtada, proclaimed in 646 (1248), found himself in 658 (1260) reduced to the solitary kingdom of Marrakesh, to the south of the Umm Rabit. In 660 (1261—1262) the Marinid Abul Yusuf Yahya b. Abd al-Hakim came to attack Marrakesh. He encamped on mount Gillaiz whence he threatened the town. Al-Murtada sent his cousin, the saiyyid Abu l-Ula Idris, surnamed Abu Dabbas, to fight him. The emir 'Abd Allah b. Abul Yusuf was slain in the battle and his father lost heart, abandoned his plans on Marrakesh and returned to Fas at the end of Raipur 661 (beg. June 1262).

From this time one feels that the dynasty is lost although peace was made, which moreover showed the humiliation of the Almohads who consented to pay tribute: but they were to destroy themselves. Falling into disfavour with his cousin al-Murtada, Abu Dabbas, this great-grandson of 'Abd al-Mu'min, who in the preceding year had defended Marrakesh against the Marinid sultan, sought refuge with the latter and obtained from him the assistance necessary to overthrow al-Murtada, on condition that he shared the spoils. Victorious and proclaimed sultan in October 1266, Abu Dabbas forgot his promises. Abu Yusuf Yahya came in person to remind him of them. He laid siege to Marrakesh in 1267 but Abu Dabbas had a stroke of good fortune for
the Marinid had to raise the siege to go and defend the kingdom of Fás against an attack by the sulṭān of Tiemcen, Yaghmurṣūna. The campaign being over, Abū Yusuf Ya'qūb returned to Marrakesh. He entered it in Muharram 668 (Sept. 1269). The ʿAlīṣa ra tells us that he gave the amān to the inhabitants and to the surrounding tribes, whom he overwhelmed with benefits and ruled with justice and remained seven months to pacify and organise the country. By accepting Marinid rule, however, Marrakesh lost for two and a half centuries its position as a capital. The new dynasty made Fās its capital.

Its sulṭāns however, did not neglect Marrakesh especially during this period (end of the xiiiith and first half of the xivth century). The chronicles record many sojourns made by them there but its great days were over. The town began to lose its inhabitants. Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAllī was the only Marinid to undertake buildings of any importance at Marrakesh (a mosque and a madrasa). In the absence of the sovereign, the sultan's six-monthly period was entrusted to powerful governors as befitted a large town remote from the central authority. For nearly 20 years, from 668 to 687 (1269–1288), this office was held by Muhammad b. ʿAlī b. Muḥallī, a chief greatly devoted to the Marinids, says Ibn Khaldūn, and allied by marriage to the family of their ruler. But in February 1288, fearing treachery from Muhammad b. ʿAlī, Abū Yaʿqūb Yusuf threw him into prison and gave his office to Muhammad b. ʿAmīn al-Dīn al-Maṭārī, a client and confidant of the royal family, to whom the sulṭān further entrusted his son Abū ʿAmīr. Abū Yaʿqūb had not left Marrakesh the six months when the sulṭān died and proclaimed himself sovereign at the instigation of the governor Ibn ʿAmīr (Nov. 1288). Abū Yaʿqūb hastened to Marrakesh which he took after several days siege. The young Abū ʿAmīr had time to escape and seek refuge in the mountains among the Masmūḍī tribes, after plundering the treasury.

The custom of giving the governorship of Marrakesh to a prince of the ruling family was kept up. Towards the end of May 1307, under the walls of Tiemcen, sulṭān Abū Ḥabīb gave his cousin Yusuf, son of Muḥammad b. Abī ʿIyād b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm, the governorship of Marrakesh and the provinces depending on it. By the end of the year, Yusuf rebelled and proclaimed himself independent at Marrakesh after putting to death the governor of the town, al-Hādjiyy Maṭṣūd. Defeated by the imperial troops on the banks of the Umm Rabi, the rebel fled to the mountains, plundering Marrakesh on his way (Jan. 1308). The punishment inflicted on the rebels was severe. Yusuf b. Abī ʿIyād, handed over by a šaykh with whom he had taken refuge, was put to death and the heads of 600 of his followers went to adorn the battlements of the town. Abū Saʿīd al-Qūṣnayn stayed at Marrakesh on several occasions. He did much rebuilding in 720 (1320). Peace and comparative prosperity seem to have reigned there under the rule of Abu ʾl-Ḥasan until this prince, as a result of reverses suffered in his struggle with the Ḥafsids, found his own son, the ambitious Abū ʾInān, rebelling against him. During the troubles which now broke out, Ibn Khaldūn tells us, the town was seriously threatened with being sacked by the Masmūḍī of the mountains led by ʿAbd Allāh al-Saksīwī. Abū ʾInān was able to consolidate his power and avert this danger. The struggle between father and son ended in the region of Marrakesh. Abu ʾl-Ḥasan, defeated at the end of Safar 757 (May 1350) near the town, sought refuge in the mountains with the emirs of the Hintāta and died there just after having become reconciled to his son and designating him his successor (June 1352).

During the course of the xivth century, the emirs of the Hintāta played a very important part in the country. The position of the tribe on an almost inaccessible mountain, from which it commanded Marrakesh, gave its chiefs comparative independence and predominating influence among the other Masmūḍī. Abū ʾInān took no steps against the emir ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz who had given asylum to the fugitive Abu ʾl-Ḥasan. He retained him in the command of his tribe, which he gave a few years later to his brother ʿAmīr. In 1353 the latter, becoming chief of all the Masmūḍī tribes and sufficiently powerful to keep under his thumb the governor of Marrakesh al-Muṭamīdī, son of Abī ʾInān, very discreetly distanced himself completely independent. He received and for a time held as hostages two rebel Marinid princes Abu ʾl-Faḍl, son of the Sulṭān Abū Sālim, and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, son of Sulṭān Abū ʿAlī. Quarrelling with his protégé Abu ʾl-Faḍl whom he had made governor of Marrakesh, he retired into his mountains and for several years defended the armies of the sulṭān. He was in the end captured and put to death in 1370.

After the death of Sulṭān ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, the pretender Abu ʾl-ʿAbbās, son of Abū Sālim, had himself proclaimed in Fās with the help of his cousin ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Abī ʾAlī ibn al-ʿUṣūrī, himself a pretender to the throne. The latter, in a letter written for his services was given the independent governorship of Marrakesh and the country round it (June 1374). The empire was thus completely broken up. The two rulers soon began to quarrel but then signed a treaty of peace in 1378. There was a new rupture and a new truce two years later but Marrakesh had been besieged for two months without result. Abu ʾl-ʿAbbās in the end took Marrakesh in Dhu al-Ḥijjah 784 (July–Aug. 1382), and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was slain. Abu ʾl-ʿAbbās, disposed in 1384 and exiled to Granada, succeeded in reconquering his kingdom in 1387 and sent to Marrakesh as governor his son al-Munṣīr. This event is the last recorded by Ibn Khaldūn. From the time his record ceases and throughout the xvth century we are incredibly poor in information about the history of Marrakesh. The south appears to have continued to form a large governorship in the hands of princes of the royal family. The only information at all definite that we have comes from a Portuguese historian who records that during the three years which followed the capture of Ceuta by the Portuguese (1415–1418), Morocco was a prey to the struggles among the pretenders. While Abī Saʿīd al-Qūṣnayn was ruling in Fās, Mawālay Baʿlī, king of Marrakesh, was fighting against another Marinid prince called Fāris. The "kingdom" or governorship of Marrakesh does not seem to have completely broken the links which bound it to the kingdom of Fās for the governor of Marrakesh supplied contingents to the army which tried to retake Ceuta. But they very soon ceased to take part in the holy war in the north of Morocco and their name is not found among the opponents of the Portuguese.
Marrakesh by 1450 seems to have become de facto if not de jure independent but we do not know within fifty years at what date the Hinta emirs established their power; they were descended from a brother of 'Amur b. Muhammad. They were "kings" of Marrakesh when in 1508 the Portuguese established themselves at Safi, taking advantage of the anarchy prevailing, for the power of the Hinta emirs hardly extended beyond the envoirs of their capital and they could not effectively protect their tribes against the attacks of the Christians. In 1512 the Portuguese governors of Safi had succeeded in extending their power over the tribes near Marrakesh (Awlad Mga) and the town lived in fear of the raid raids which on several occasions brought the Portuguese cavalry and their Arab allies into the district. The king of Marrakesh, overawed, entered into negotiations in 1514 but the terms were nothing less than his paying tribute as vassal and the building of a Portuguese fortress at Marrakesh. Agreement could not be reached.

The occupation of Marrakesh remained the dream of the Portuguese soldiers. An attack on the town led by the governors of Safi and Azemmour failed (April 25, 1515). This was the initial reaction against the anarchy and foreign invasions the Sa'dian sharifs began to come to the front in Srs. Ahmad al-Arajj, who appeared in 1513 to the north of the Atlas, had himself recognized as leader of the holy war and accepted as such by the local chiefs, even by al-Nsri, king of Marrakesh. In the month of April 1514, it is recorded that he was in Marrakesh with the king. At the end of 1521, al-Arajj established himself peacefully in Marrakesh which he found partly depopulated by famine and married the daughter of the king Muhammad b. Nsfr called Bi Shentijj. The latter in 1524 having tried to kick against the treading of his too powerful son-in-law, al-Arajj and his brother Muhammad al-Shaikh, seized the kasha, which seems till then to have been held by Bi Shentijj. They disposed of the latter by having him assassinated in the following year (1525). Marrakesh became the Sa'dian capital. The king of Fas, Ahmad al-Wattani, tried unsuccessfully to take it in June 1527. It remained in the hands of the Al-Arajj till 1534, when it was seized by his brother Muhammad al-Shaikh, up till then king of Fas. After the assassination of Muhammad al-Shaikh in 1537, the Al-Arajj was put to death at Marrakesh with seven of his sons and grandsons, so as to secure the crown for Mawlay 'Abd Allah al-Ghailbi. The whole of the latter part of the century was for Marrakesh a period of great prosperity. 'Abd Allah al-Ghailbi built a series of important public works, rearrangement of the palace and of the provision storeshouses in the kasha; in the town, the madrasa Ibn Yufal and the al-Ma’in mosque etc. Ahmad al-Manjar finished his brother’s work by building in the kasha from 1578 to 1594 the famous al-Badi palace. The sultan, enriched by several years of peace and good government, and by the gold brought from the conquest of the Sudan (1591-1592); lived almost continually in Marrakesh, to which he restored a splendour and a prosperity that it had not enjoyed since the end of the 14th century. But the death of al-Manjar opened a period of trouble and civil war "sufficient to turn white the hair of an infant at the breast" to use the expression of the historian al-Ifani. While Abi Farris, son of al-Manjar, was proclaimed at Marrakesh, another son, Zidan, was chosen sultan at Fas. A third brother, al-Shaikh, came and took Fas, then sent against Marrakesh an army led by his son 'Abd Allah, who seized the town in Dec. 22, 1606. But Zidan, who sought refuge first in Tlemcen, then made his way to Sus, via Tafifilat and coming suddenly to Marrakesh, had himself proclaimed there while 'Abd Allah b. al-Shaikh while escaping with his troops was attacked in the midst of the gardens (garden Rekbat) and completely defeated (Feb. 25, 1607). In October of the same year, 'Abd Allah returned after defeating Zidan's troops on the Wadi Tafifilat (Oct. 2, 1607), fought a second battle with them at Ras al-A'in (a spring in Tafsif), regained possession of the town and revived himself in a series of massacres and punishments so terrible that a portion of the population having sought refuge in the Gilla, proclaimed as sultan, Muhammad, great-grandson of Ahmad al-Arajj. 'Abd Allah was forced to fly (Jan. 25, 1608). Zidan, recalled by a section of the populace, regained possession of his capital in a few days. The struggle between Zidan and his brother al-Shaikh, in a series of campaigns and reprisals, culminated in the possession of Fas. Zidan failed in his plans to retake it and henceforth Fas, given over completely to anarchy, remained separate from the kingdom of Marrakesh. On these happenings, a marabout from Tafifilat, named Abi Mahall, attempted to intervene (1611) to put an end to the fighting among the pretenders, which was inflicting great suffering on the people. His intervention only made matters worse. He took Marrakesh on May 20, 1612. Zidan took refuge in Safi and succeeded in again gaining possession of his capital with the help of an influential marabout in Sus, called Vablya. 'Abd Allah. After a battle near Gilla, Zidan withdrew into Marrakesh on Nov. 30, 1613. But Vablya, succumbing to ambition, rebelled himself at the end of 1618, against the ruler whose cause he had once so well sustained. Zidan had again to take refuge in Safi. He was soon able to return to Marrakesh, taking advantage of the discord that had broken out in the enemy ranks. 'Abd al-Mallik (1627-1631), son and successor of Zidan, has left only the memory of his cruelty and debauchery. He was murdered in May 1631. The renegades, who killed him, also disposed of his brother and successor al-Walid in 1636. A third brother, Muhammad al-Shaikh al-Asghar, succeeded him but had only a semblance of power. He managed however to reign till 1655, but his son Ahmad al-Abbass was completely in the hands of the Shabban, an Arab tribe who assassinated him and gave the throne to 'Abd al-Karim, called Kasr al-Hajj, in 1659. "The latter", says al-Ifani, "united under his sway all the kingdom of Marrakesh and conducted himself in an admirable fashion with regard to his subjects". His son Abi Bakr succeeded him in 1668 but only reigned two months until the coming of the Filali Sultan al-Rashid, already lord of Fas, who took Marrakesh on July 31, 1668. Called to Marrakesh by the rebellion of his nephew Ahmad b. Mufriz, al-Rashid met his death there in the garden of al-Agdal, his head being having been injured by a branch of an orange tree against which his horse threw him when it stumbled.

Mawlay Isma‘il had some difficulty in getting himself proclaimed at Marrakesh, which preferred
his nephew, Ahmad b. Muḥṭir. Ḥismā'īl forced his way in on the 9th Safar 1083 (June 4, 1672). In the following year, Marrakesh again welcomed Ahmad b. Muḥṭir. After a siege of two years (March 1675—June 1677), Ḥismā'īl reoccupied Marrakesh and plundered it. He passed through it again in 1694 (1683) on his way to Siūsī to fight Ahmad b. Muḥṭir who was still in rebellion. Marrakesh was no longer the capital. Mawlāy Ḥismā'īl took an interest in it and destroyed the palaces of the kasba to use the materials for his works in MKnes. In 1114 (Feb. 1703), a son of Mawlāy Ḥismā'īl, Muhammad al-ʿAlīm, rebelled against his father, seized Marrakesh and plundered it. Zīdān, brother of the rebel, was given the task of suppressing the rising, which he did, plundering the town once more.

Anarchy again broke out after the death of Ḥismā'īl. Its centre was MKnes. Mawlāy al-Mustadīl, proclaimed by the Abd in 1375, was disowned by them in 1740 and replaced by his brother 'Abd Allāh. In 1782, 'Abd Allāh sought refuge in Marrakesh. His brother, al-ʿNaṣrī remained his khawīla in Marrakesh till 1745, while al-Mustadīl tried in vain to reconcile his kingdom. Marrakesh finally submitted in 1746 to Mawlāy 'Abd Allāh who sent his son Sīdī Muḥammad there as khawīla. The governorship and then the reign of the latter (1757—1790) formed one of the happiest periods in the history of Marrakesh. Sīdī Muḥammad completely restored the town, made it his usual residence, received many European embassies there, including a French one led by the Comte de Breugnon in 1767, and developed its trade. Peace was not disturbed during his long reign except for a riot raised by a marabout pretender named Qamar, who at the head of a few malcontents tried to attack the palace in order to plunder the public treasury. He was at once seized and put to death (between 1766 and 1772, according to the sources). On the death of Sīdī Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, the situation remained very unsettled for several years. After taking the oath of allegiance to Mawlāy Yazīd (May 3, 1790) the people of Marrakesh took in his brother Mawlāy Ḥishām and proclaimed him. On hearing this, Yazīd abandoned the siege of Ceuta, returned to Marrakesh, plundered it and committed all kinds of atrocities (1792). Ḥishām, supported by the 'Abda and the Dukāla, marched on Marrakesh. Yazīd, wounded in the battle, died a few days later in the palace (Feb. 1792). Marrakesh remained faithful to the party of Mawlāy Ḥishām, but very soon the Ḥāmnā soldiery abandoned him to proclaim Mawlāy Husain, brother of Ḥishām. He established himself in the kasba. (1200 = 1794—1795). While the partisans of the two princes were exhausting themselves in fighting, Mawlāy Slimān, sulṭān of Fās, avoided taking sides in the struggle. The plague rid him at one blow of both his rivals (July 1799) who had in any case to submit some time before. The last years of the reign of Mawlāy Slimān were overcast by troubles in all parts of the empire. Defeated at the very gates of Marrakesh, he was taken prisoner by the rebel Shīrāḍa. He died at Marrakesh on Nov. 28, 1822. Mawlāy 'Abd al-Raḥmān (1824—1859) died much for the aforesaid of Agīlāl and restored the religious buildings. His son Muḥammad continued his work by repairing tanks and aqueducts. These two reigns were a period of tranquillity of Marrakesh. In 1862, however, while Sīdī Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān was fighting the Spaniards at Tetwan the Ḥāmnā soldiery rebelled, plundered the Sūr al-Khamis and closed blocked the town, cutting off communications and supplies, until the Sulṭān, having made peace with Spain, came to relieve the town (June 1862). Mawlāy Al-Ḥasan hardly ever lived in Marrakesh but he stopped there on several occasions, notably in October 1875, to punish the Ḥāmnā and the Bu 'īsā, who had rebelled, and in 1880 and 1885, to prepare his expeditions into Sīa.

During the last years of the reign of Mawlāy 'Abd al-'Azīz (1894—1908), it was at Marrakesh that the opposition to the European tastes and experiments of the Sulṭān made itself most strongly felt. The xenophobia culminated in the murder of a French doctor named Mauchamp (March 19, 1907), and the spirit of separatism in the proclamation as sulṭān of Mawlāy 'Abd al-Hafīz, brother of 'Abd al-'Azīz and governor of the provinces of the south (Aug. 24, 1907). But 'Abd al-Hafīz becoming ruler of the whole empire (Aug. 24, 1910) and having signed the treaty of March 24, 1912 establishing the protectorate of France over Morocco, the anti-foreign movement broke out again in the south. The Mauritanian marabout al-Hība had himself proclaimed and established himself in Marrakesh. He only held out there for a brief period. His troops having been defeated at Sīdī Bū Ṭūmān on Sept. 6, 1912, the French troops occupied Marrakesh the next day.

Relations with Europe. Five minor friars sent by St. Francis were put to death at Marrakesh on Jan. 16, 1220, for having attempted to convert Muslims and having insulted the Prophet Muhammad in their discourses. Their martyrdom attracted the attention of the Holy See to Marrakesh. A mission and a bishopric were established by Honorius III in 1225 to give the consolations of religion to the Christians domiciled in Morocco: merchants, slaves and mercenaries in the sulṭān's army. In the Almoravid period, the sulṭān had Christian mercenaries recruited from prisoners reduced to slavery or from the Mozarab population of Spain whom they had from time to time deported to Morocco by entire villages. In 1227, Abu ʿl-ʿUla Idrīs al-Maʿmūn having won his kingdom with the help of Christian troops sent by the king of Castile found himself bound to take up quite a new attitude to the Christians. He granted them various privileges, including permission to build a church in Marrakesh and worship openly there. This was called Notre Dame and stood in the kasba, probably opposite the mosque of al-Mansūr: it was destroyed during a rising in 1232. But the Christian soldiery continued to enjoy the right to worship, at least privately, and the bishopric of Marrakesh filled by an episcopal court at Seville, existed so long as there was an organised Christian soldiery in Morocco, i.e. to the end of the xvith century. The title of Bishop of Marrakesh was borne till the end of the xvith century by the suffragans of Seville (cf. Father A. Lopez, Los obispos de Marruecos desde el siglo XIII, in Archivo Ibero-American, No. xii., 1920).

A Spanish Franciscan, the prior Juan de Prado, who came to re-establish the mission, was put to death in 1631 at Marrakesh. A few years later (1637), a monastery was re-established beside the prison for slaves in the kasba. It was destroyed in 1659 or 1660 after the death of the last Saʿdīan. Henceforth the Franciscans were obliged to live in the melūṣ.
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where they had down to the end of the xvith century a little chapel and a monastery. As to the Christian merchants, they had not much reason to go to Marrakesh in the middle ages. Trade with Europe was conducted at Ceuta from which the Muslim merchants carried European goods into the interior of the country. In the xvith century, 'Abd Allâh al-Gâlîbî had a fondôk or ‘bonded warehouse' built in the sûq where the Christian merchants were allowed to live; but the majority of those who came to Marrakesh preferred to settle in the Jewish quarter. It was here also that foreign ambassadors usually lodged, at least when they were not made to encamp in any of the gardens of the palace.

Monuments. The present enceinte of Marrakesh is a wall of clay about 20 feet high, flanked with rectangular bastions at intervals of 250 to 300 feet. Bab Aghnâm, Bab Alif, Bab Dukkâgh which still exist more or less rebuilt, are mentioned in the account of the attack on Marrakesh by the Almohads in 524 (1100). Bab inûnî, Bab al-Makhzen, mentioned at the same time, have disappeared. Bab al-Sâlîbî (no longer in existence: it stood on the site of the mâlikû and Bab Dukkâla (still in existence) figure in the story of the capture of the town by the Almohads (1447). The plan of the wall has therefore never changed. It has been rebuilt in places from time to time, as the clay crumbled away, but it may be assumed that a number of pieces of the wall, especially on the west and south-west, are original, as well as at least three gates all now built up, to which they owe their survival, but have lost their name. According to Mâlikû 'Fida' (xvith century), there were in Marrakesh seventeen gates, twenty-four at the beginning of the xvith century according to Leo Africanus. It would be very difficult to draw up an accurate list, for some have been removed, others opened, since these dates or the names have been altered. Ibn Faûl Allâh al-'Umarî (beginning of the xvith century) adds to the names already mentioned those of Bab Nîsî, Bab Mâlikû, Bab Mésûfâ, Bab al-Kešà all four of which have disappeared, Bab Taghâûtî, Bab Fâs (now Bab al-Khûnîs), Bab al-Kibîb which still exist. The only important changes, which have been made in the walls of Marrakesh since they were built, have been the building of the kasba in the south and in the north the creation of the quarter of Sidi ibn 'Abdû. The kasba, which as late as the xvith century stood outside the walls beyond the Bab Taghâûtî, was taken into the town with all its dependencies.

The Kasba. The little kasba and the palace of Dâr al-Gâlîmîa built by Yûsûf b. Tâshîn, lay north of the present Mosques of the Book-sellers of Kutubiyyâ. Ali b. Yûsûf added in the same quarter other palaces called Sâr al-Ḫadâjîr, or Kasr al-Ḫadâjîr because they were built with stones from the Gilân, while all the other buildings in the town were of brick or clay. It was here that the first Almohads took up their quarters. According to an almost obsolete passage of the Isbâbî, Abû Yaqîb Yûsûf seems to have begun the building of a ‘fort' in the south of the town but it was Yaqîb al-Mânsûr who built the new Kasba (1189–97); that is to say he handed to the south wall of the town a new walled area within which he built palaces, a mosque, and a regular town. Nothing remains of the Almohad palaces, but one can from pieces of wall and other vestiges follow the old wall, at least on the north and the east side. There also the line of the wall has hardly changed. The magnificent gateway of carved stone by which the kasba is now entered, must be one of al-Mânsûr's building. Its modern name of Bab Aghnâm (the Negro's Gate) is not found in any old text. It probably corresponds to Bab al-Kuhl (Gate of the Negroes), often mentioned by the historians.

Ibn Faûl Allâh al-'Umarî, in the xvith century, Leo Africanus and Marmol in the xvith, have left us fairly detailed descriptions of the kasba, in spite of a few obscure passages. In the Almohad period, the kasba was divided into three quite distinct parts. One wall in the northwest, around the mosque of al-Mânsûr which still exists, contained the police offices, the headquarters of the Almohad tribes and the barracks of the Christian soldiery. From this one entered through the Bab al-Tûbâî, a second enclosure in which around a huge open space, the ‘Cereque' of Marmol (al-qârî), were grouped the guardhouses, the offices of the minister of the army, a guest-house, a madrasa with its library and a large building called al-ṣaqqâfî (the porticoes), the ‘Acequife' of Marmol, occupied by the principal members of the Almohad organisation, the ‘Ten', the ‘Fifty' and the sâlimâ, the pages (ahl al-dār). The royal palace, sometimes called the Alhambra of Marrakesh, in imitation of that of Granada, was entered from the Assârî and occupied the whole area east of the kasba. The palaces of al-Mânsûr were still in existence at the beginning of the xvith century when the Sa'dîans took possession. 'Abd Allâh al-Gâlîbî incorporated them in the new palaces which he was building. Aḥmad al-Mânsûr added, in the gardens to the north, the famous al-Bâdi' palace decorated for its size and splendour. Only a few almost shapeless ruins remain of it, but its plan is perfectly clear. Mawlîya Ismâ'îl had it destroyed in order to use its materials. The kasba remained so completely in ruins that Sîdî Mâhâmîd b. 'Abd Allâh when he became governor of Marrakesh in 1746, was obliged to live in a tent until his new buildings were finished. It is to him that we owe an important part of the present palace with its inner garden, 'Arsat al-Nîl. Other works were later undertaken by Mawlîya Slimân and his successors. Some large unfinished buildings date only from Mawlîya 'Abd al-Ḫafîr. A number of gates, in addition to the Bab Aghnâm give admittance to the kasba: those are Bab Barûma and Bab al-Aḥmar in the east, Bab Iglî and Bab Ksa'î in the west. This place has vast gardens belonging to it: Dînân al-'Aţîf, Aghdâl, Dînân Kûhdân, Ma'ânîyâ, Ma'nânâ. The latter, two miles west of the town, contained, in the xvith century, a pleasure house of the sultans. The palace of Dîr al-Haîdâr, situated in the Agdâl, took the place of a Sa'dîan palace. It was built by Sîdî Mâhâmîd b. 'Abd Allâh and has since been restored. As to the gardens of the Agdâl, they seem to have been created in the xith century by 'Abd al-Ma'unî.

Mosques. Nothing remains of the early Almoravid mosques, in the building of one of which Yûsûf b. Tâshîn himself worked along with the masons as a sign of humility. But the cathedral mosque of 'Ali b. Yûsûf, where Ibn Tûmâr had an interview with the sultan, although several times rebuilt, still retains its name. The Almohads, on taking possession of Marrakesh, destroyed all the mosques on the pretext that they were wrongly
oriented. The mosque of ʿAli b. Yusuf was only partly destroyed and was rebuilt. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghālibī restored it in the middle of the sixteenth century. The present buildings and the minaret date from Mawāliyūs Simān (1792–1822).

Kutubiyya. When the Almohads entered Marrakesh, Abd al-Muʿmin built the first Kutubiyya of which some traces still remain and it has been possible to reconstruct its plan. As it was wrongly oriented he built a new mosque, the present Kutubiyya, in prolongation of the first but with a slightly different orientation. It takes its name from the 100 booksellers' shops which used to be around its entrance. It is a very large building with seventeen naves, which with its decoration in carved plaster, its stalactite cupolas, the moulding of its timberwork, its capitals and magnificent pulpit (минбар) of inlaid work, is the most important and the most perfectly preserved work of Almohad art. The minaret, begun by ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, was only finished in the reign of his grandson al-Mansūr (1195). It is 230 feet high and its powerful silhouette dominates the whole town and the palmergroves. It is the prototype of the Giralda of Seville and of the tower of Ḥassān at Rabat. It is decorated with arcatures the effects of which were formerly heightened by paintings still visible in places, with a band of ceramic work around the top.

The mosque of the ḥāṣba or mosque of al-Mansūr is the work of Yaʿkūb al-Mansūr. It was begun in 1189–95 and built in great splendour. It has been profoundly altered, first by ʿAbd al-Ghālib the Saʿdiyan, then in the middle of the sixteenth century by Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, then more recently by Mawāliyūs Ibn al-Rāmaḥ (1822–1859). The minaret of brick is intact and magnificently ornamented with green ceramics. The lamp-holder supports a ǧīmār of three bowls of gilt copper, which occupy a considerable place in the legends of Marrakesh. They are said to be of pure gold and to be enchanted so that no one could take them away without bringing on himself the most terrible misfortunes. This legend is often wrongly connected with the ǧīmār of the Kutubiyya.

Among the religious monuments of Marrakesh of archaeological interest, may also be mentioned the mosque of Ibn al-Mawāliyūs (dated 731 = 1331) and of the sanctuary of Mawāliyūs Ibn al-Kāsī, built in the Marinid period in the Almohad tradition, and two Saʿdiyan mosques: the mosque of al-Mawāliyūs or mosque of the Sharifs, which owes its origin to ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghālibī, and that of Bāb Dukkāla, built in 965 (1557–1558) by Līlā Masʿūdā, the mother of the Sultān Ḥamād al-Mansūr.

Madrassas. An Almohad madrasa, built to teach the children of the king and others of his family in it, formed part of the buildings of Yaʿkūb al-Mansūr. This royal school was presumably different from what later were the Marinid madrasas. It stood on the great square in front of the palace and was still in existence in the time of Leo Africanus. The Marinid Abu ʿl-Ḥasan in 1347 built another madrasa, also described by Leo. It lay north of the mosque of the ḥāṣba, where traces of it can still be seen. The madrasa of Ibn Yusuf is not, as is usually said, a restoration of the Marinid madrasa. It was a new building by ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghālibī, dated by an inscription of 972 (1564–1565), the only surviving example of a Saʿdiyan madrasa.

Saʿdīan tombs. The two fist founders of the dynasty rest beside the tomb of Sidi Muhammad b. Simān al-Djazīlī in the Rīyāḍ al-ʿArūs quarter. Their successors from 1557 were buried to the south of the mosque of the ḥāṣba. There was a cemetery there, probably as early as the Almohad period, which still has tombs of the sixteenth century. The magnificent kubbās which cover the tombs of the Saʿdīan dynasty must have been built at two different periods. The one on the east under which is the tomb of Muhammad al-Ṣaḥīḥ seems to have been built by ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghālibī. The other, with three chambers, seems to have been erected by Ḥamād al-Mansūr (d. 1603) to hold his tomb.
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Marak., 1928; Cap. Begèber, Notes sur l'organisation administrative de la Région de Marrakesh, in Bull. de la Soc. de Géogr. du Maroc, 1921; Vomot, Les tribus guich du Huome de Marrakesh, in Bull. de la Soc. de Géogr. et d'Archéologie d'Oudan, 1928; in France-Moroc., 1919-1921, a number of articles signed Aimel, Douette, Guichard, etc.; Doctores-se Legge, Contes et légendes populaires recueillies à Marrakech, 1926. (PIERRE DE CENIVAL)

AL-MARRAKUSHI. [See 'ABD AL-WASĪD]

MARSA (A.), from rasāda, “to wait on the road, to watch, to lie in wait”, originally any place where a watch was kept, for example, a custom-house, then (with or without al-kawāthīb) an observatory. Al-rasāda is also used in the latter sense “To consult the stars for any one” is rasāda al-fa'ilun, to take astronomical measurements with instruments to kāsī (cf. kāsī = ascertaining latitude and longitude and mekās = gnomon).

The Arab observatories had their models and predecessors in the Persian, Indian, Greek and Babylonian observatories. Very little is known about the construction of the oldest observatories. It is obvious however that when the advance was made from the observation and recording of isolated phenomena in the heavens, which were regarded as omens of good or ill fortune, to the exact following of the movements of heavenly bodies, simple instruments to calculate time and measure areas and angles in the heavens would become necessary. Such must have existed in the towers of Babylonian temples which were used as observatories in the form of sundials, sand- and water-clocks measuring rods, and graduated circles. In the time of Ptolemy sundials and water-clocks were certainly in use, a circle divided parallel to the equator of the heavens which was used to calculate the equinoct and length of the year, a meridian circle, the amrylary sphere and the astrolabe or planisphere. The Arab astronomers, however, received their knowledge from the Hindu- and Persian, among whom astrology and practical astronomy had reached a high level. While the first astronomical observations were made under the Abbāsids at Qandah-Sābūr and the first astronomical works were translated out of the Sanskrit and Pahlavi, there is no doubt that the observatories erected in Baghdad were also modelled on Indian and Persian prototypes.

In his astronomical work, al-Battāni describes the construction of the sundial (al-rākhāna), a globe of the heavens (al-baṣfa), a wall-quadrant (al-rub' or al-linā) and a quadratran (al-ṣuṣa'id al-fa'īla or al-dīl al-bat'tain). The instrument most used in the Arab period however was the astrolabe which was portable (cf. above i., p. 501). The number of makers of astrolabes, observers and compilers of astronomical tables from the beginning of the Abbāsīd period is immense and the rivalry of princes to obtain more and more accuracy in the astronomical foundations of astrology also led to the improvement of instruments and the arrangements in observatories generally. It is sufficient to mention out of the many observatories that of Cairo where Ibn Yūnus (d. 400-401 = 1009) completed the Ḥākimī tables, the observatory of Nishāpar where al-Khāzīnī (d. beginning of the 10th-11th century) took observations, that of Maragha which Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī erected with many new instruments for the Mongol Khan Hūlagū (1259) and the observatory of Salmān, where Ulugh Beg employed the astronomers of his time. Following him in many points but also stimulated by European astronomy Dājīn Singh in India built the great observatories, the remains of which still arouse admiration in Delhi, Dājīpur, Udjain, Benares and Mathura.


(M. RUSKA)

MARTHIYA (A., plur. marathī), translated variously by elegy or dirge, is a poem in Arabic (and other languages following Arabic tradition) in memory of a deceased person. The word elegy is hardly applicable in most cases as such poems differ somewhat from the style of Greek and Latin poems bearing this name; some notable exceptions exist and the finest example of a real elegy is perhaps the poem of a woman named Bara al-Kinānīya preserved in the Kitāb al-līḥtiyyārān, and still unpublished. It was the custom of the ancient Arabs after the usual nasīr or introduction of women [q.v.] that a member of the family, gifted as a poet, should commemorate the noble qualities and deeds of the departed in a poem by enumerating them. These poems as a rule do not contain the tāzāh or amatory introduction like ordinary ḫatūs and in many cases have a peculiarity in their diction, the introduction of a kind of internal rhyme resembling sadī, called tarṣī. This has been fully discussed by Rhodokanakis in his analysis of the poetry of al-Khansā', but is found in many other marthiyas. Many poets, remembering the widespread, naïve universal, belief of the ancient Arabs in fatalism, embellish their poems with descriptions to show that nothing can escape inevitable fate. A typical example is the long poem by Abū Dhu'ain (Dīwān, N. 1; Muḥaddithiyat, N. 125) in which three vivid pictures are drawn of the impossibility of escaping death, both for man and beast. This tradition has been followed by Arabic poets from the times of paganism to the present date and the quantity of poems produced for example upon the death of the Egyptian statesman Zaghlīl Pāšā proves that the taste for them has not abated. The collected poems of al-Zahāwī, the most prominent living poet of
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the 'Irāk, contain several pages mourning Zaghul. As regards the earlier period, poems have been preserved in considerable numbers and from the Ḥanāsāt of Abū Tammān downstairs nearly every anthology has a special chapter devoted to marāṭī. Several early scholars in addition made special collections of this class of literature and one such collection has come down to us, made by the Kūfī grammarian Ibn al-ʿĀṣīḥī, and published from an incomplete manuscript by W. Wright. The poet par excellence in this class of poetry however was a woman, al-Ḥansāʾ [q. v.].

Bibliography: W. Wright, Opuscula Arabica, Leyden 1859, p. 97—136; Rhodokanakis, al-Ḥansāʾ und ihre Träumerlieder, Vienna 1904; Ibn Ṭaḥṣīḥ, ʿUmda, Cairo, i. 117—126; chapters on marāṭī in the Ḥanāsāt of Abū Tammān, al-Balṭūṭī and Ibn al-Shadījī.

(F. KENKOW)

MARTOLOSEN, Lexicons explain martolos and martolios as "Christian soldiers, volunteers in the Ottoman army". The word apparently is not to be found in Turkish authors, but is often met with in Western books and dogmas.

Leunclavius (Annales, p. 142) says that martolos means "robber"; Ricaut (Italian translation by C. Belli, Istoria dello stato presente dell' Impero ottomano) relates that Buda was garrisoned by 300 martoloi "who are like infantry"; M. Sanudo (Diarii, xxxvi. 271) mentions one Sholovach "a very brave man and great marteloso", who served the Turks and was killed in action near Zara in Dalmatia. According to Lazaro Soranzo (L'Ottomano, 4th ed., Naples 1600, p. 110—111), martelos means spy and thief.

Sathas (Monum. Historiae Hellenicae, iv., lvi., No. 4) derives the word (martoloi, martolios, martelos, martolios, armatolo) from ḥamārōlā and says that they were soldiers of fortune serving the Turks, often opposed the "Stradioti", who fought for the Venetians.

Von Hammer (G. O. K., iv. 211—212) observes that the martelos were bands of brigands, armed by the Turks on the frontiers towards the Venetians and Dalmatians; while, quoting Pouqueville, who favours the etymology ḥamārōlā, he inclines to an etymology from the Hungarian.

Pouqueville's and Sathas' explanations seem to us the most probable. The appellation was not limited to brigands on the western frontiers of the Ottoman empire, but was also given to armed bands of volunteers (xvih—xviiith centuries) in the Danube region (Jorga, Geschichte des osm. Reiches, iii. 419; Hurnuzac, Documente etc., xii., p. 130).

MARUF AL-KARKHI. As-Sā`ūdi, E. F., Marof al-Karkhi, and Fīruz or Fīruz, who died in 200 (818—816), was a celebrated ascetic and mystic of the Baghdād school. The mīda al-Karkhi probably refers to Karkh Bājdāda, a township in eastern Ḥarān (Samānī, Annāb, p. 478b, l. 10; cf. Yāḥyā, Muḥtarik, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 369, l. 8 sγ.), though some authorities connect him with the Karkh quarter of Baghdād. His parents are generally said to have been Christians; according to Ibn Ṭabghibirdī (ed. Juybībīl and Matthes, i. 575), they were Sā`ūdīs belonging to the district of Wāśīt. Bakr b. Khunais al-Kūfī and Farqād al-Sabākī, also of Kūf, are named as his teachers in Ṣufism (Abū Ṭālib al-Makki, Kūt al-Kūfī, i. 9; Fīruz, p. 183).

Of those whom he taught or influenced the most famous was Sāri al-Sā`afi (q. v.), who in his turn became the master of Dānjād. The story that Ma`rūf was a client of the Shīʿī Imām, ʿAlī b. Mūsā al-Ridā, before whom he made profession of Islam and induced his parents to do the same, deserves no credence. Among the sayings attributed to him are the following: "Love is not to be learned from men; it is a gift of God and comes of His grace"; "The saint is known by three signs: their cares are for God, their business is in God, and their flight is unto God". "Ṣūfism consists in grasping the realities (ḥaṣāʾiḥ) and renouncing that which is in the hands of created beings". Ma`rūf was venerated as a saint, and his tomb at Baghdād on the west bank of the Tigris is still a great resort for pilgrims. Ṣuṣṭārī relates that the people used to go there in order to pray for rain, saying: "The tomb of Ma`rūf is an approved remedy (tirās ṣuṣṭārī)."


(M. LASSER)

MARUF RUSHAFI, one of the best of contemporary Arab poets, born in Baghdād of a Kurd father and a Beduin mother in 1292 (1875). His ḥāfīds have been collected into a Diwān and edited by Muḥy al-Dīn al-Khaṭṭā, Bāirūt 1910, following quite an original classification. 1. Kaʿimāt, 2. Liḥmatā, 3. Taʿrīkh, 4. Wasfiyāt. Raʾīṣ al-Buṭṭā has devoted an excellent study to him (in al-ʿAdab al-ʿArabī fī ʿIrāq al-ʿArabi, Cairo, Salāfiyā 1932, p. 67—96).

(L. MALLERGAN)

MARUT. [See MARUT AND MART.]

MARW, [See MERK.]

MARWAN, [See MARWAN.]

MARWÂN B. AL-ḤAKAM, the father of the Marwānid Caliph, was born at Mecca or at Taif, probably several years before the Hijra. Tradition, by placing his birth 2, 4, or 5 years later than the beginning of this era, aims at depriving him of a right to the title of "Companion" by showing that he could not have effectively accompanied the Prophet, as he must have followed his father who was exiled to Taif. Further, it endeavours in its hostility to give him the epithet of farīd ibn al-ṭarīf, "the banished son of the banished man". After becoming Caliph, his grand-uncle ʿUthmān adopted him as his secretary and under this title he is said to have governed in his name. Seriously wounded on the "day of al-Dār", at the siege of the palace of ʿUthmān, he took part later in the battle of the Camel in which he received fresh wounds. All his life his health suffered from these terrible shocks. Muʿsāwiyā intended to use him alternately with ʿAṣūd b. al-ʿĀṣ [q. v.], his cousin, to govern Medina and the Ḥusayn. He showed in this function a capacity and vigour, far above the ordinary.

Finally dismissed from office, he passed into obscurity during the latter years of Muʿsāwiyā who dreaded his ambition. When Ḥusayn b. ʿAli refused
to recognize the Caliph Yazid, Marwan advised Walid b. 'Utba, his successor at Medina, to employ force against the rebel. The revolt of the people of Medina caused him to be expelled with all his followers from this town. He returned to it in the train of Muslim b. 'Abd Allah [q.v.] whose military operations he was supporting. Put to flight once more after the death of Yazid I, he took up his residence in Syria and attended the court of the Caliph Mu'awiyah II. After the disappearance of this prince, Marwan, desiring of the fortunes of the Omayyads, was disposed to recognize Ibn al-Zubayr, when 'Abd Allah b. Ziyad persuaded him to set up himself as candidate. Acclaimed at the assembly of 'Iqabiya, he defeated the Kaisis under 'Alidj ak b. Khaz [q.v.] at Mardj Rāhī [q.v.]. The submission of the whole of Syria was the first result of this victory.

The reign of Marwan may be epitomized as an uninterrupted series of battles. Immediately after his official installation at Damascus he was forced to take up the gauntlet. He laid it down only to die in its capital. His chief task was the conquest of Egypt. A rapid campaign gave him possession of it, while his lieutenant repelled a raid into Fal-siyya by Ibn al-Zubayr. At 'Iqabiya he was compelled to recognize as his eventual successors Khalid the son of Yazid I and the Omayyad 'Abd al-Ashāf [q.v.]. After laborious negotiations, he was able to end them to the advantage of his own sons 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd al-'Azīz, the latter being nominated by him governor of Egypt. This was the last success of his adventurous career. Worn out, the septuagenarian caliph died at Damascus on the 27th Ramadān 65 (9th May 685). He is said to have been murdered by the wife of Yazid I, the mother of the Sufyānid Khalid, whom he had married after Mardj Rāhī.

The estimates of the length of his reign vary between 8 and 11 months, according as they count the first recognition of him at 'Iqabiya or the second — the exact date is not known — more ceremonious one at Damascus. We do not know his exact age any more definitely. The two extremes 61 and 71 years reveal the mone-stancy of tradition. The 63 years sometimes given to Marwan are merely a lucky number which has been much abused to give the ages of the older caliphs. It has the advantage that it takes us back to the year 2, often said to be the year of his birth. Our texts describe him as an old man, karbā kahān, when he ascended the throne and contrast him with the Lād, middle-aged man, i.e. Ibn al-Zubayr who, however, was nearly sixty. There must therefore have been an appreciable difference of age between the two competitors. Marwan, therefore, seems to us to have been over seventy. The last five years of his life, filled with rebellions, his two exile, his share in the campaign against Medina, and in those of Syria and Egypt to reconquer these provinces of his empire were, as it were, the constitution of this vigorous old man, who had never been completely cured of the effects of his terrible wounds he received in his youth. This long lean waned old man — these physical characteristics earned him the nick-name 'ākāf ẓafīr — was destined to fall a victim to the great epidemic that swept over the East. In 65 H. the plague reached Syria from the Irāq; it had begun by carrying off Mu'awiyah II, the decrepit predecessor of Marwan, as well as Walid b. 'Utba, a relative of both; it ended by laying low the first of the Omayyad caliphs.

Marwan showed himself a statesman worthy of the highest rank. A contemporary of the great Mu'awiyah, he had under the Sufyānids to accept — without ever resigning himself to it — the part of a brilliant second. He attained the caliphate, ever the object of his wishes, at the moment he had ceased to care about it. He allowed himself to be raised to the throne, rather than mounted it himself. But once at the top he regained that power of lucid decision and spirit of initiative which had earned Mu'awiyah's appreciation, though he feared his ambition. The new ruler remained on the throne just long enough to save the Omayyad fortunes from an imminent collapse and to save the future of the younger branch of this dynasty which bears his name. The work was continued by his favourite son 'Abd al-Malik. He early recognized the merits of this, the elder, more mature, and with a brutality and absence of scruple which was thoroughly Arab, he put him in the place of the young Khalid b. Yazid I, who was less well fitted for the difficulties of the restoration. This is sufficient to characterize his place among the Syrian caliphs. It will explain the hatred of 'Abdūsīd and 'Alid historians, a hatred adopted by Muslim tradition. In energy and knowledge of the art of government, Marwan, recalled his illustrious relative Mu'awiyah. He would have equalled him, if to these eminent qualities he had been able to add that variety of political knowledge, a mixture of cunning and bonhomie, so appreciated by the Arabs, which they call ẓība. He became Caliph in most critical circumstances and had to display firmness above all things, to put down rebellions, and to defend himself against the ambition and resentment of his relatives, frustrated in their attempts on the throne, or spoiled by him of their rights to it. If it had been given to him to live longer, we may well believe that he would have rivalled the first of the Omayyad Caliphs in nobility of soul.


MARWĀN II b. MUḤAMMAD, the last of the Omayyad caliphs in Damascus. He was the grandson of the caliph Marwān b. al-Hākam. As governor of Mesopotamia and Armenia his
father Muhammad for several years directed the campaigns against the Byzantines. His mother was a Kûrish slave-girl. Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik [q. v.] was one of those who followed Muhammad b. Marwân to war; it is not till 115 (733–734) that we find Marwân coming to the front as governor of Armenia and Adharbâdja. In this position, which he held for 12 years, he fought with success against the peoples of the Caucasus and thus acquired military experience which enabled him to reorganise the Muslim army. In place of divisions consisting of the different tribes he created regular, paid troops under professional commanders; the men levied for military service were divided up into smaller divisions (kârâlis) which possessed much greater mobility and strength than the long Arab battle-lines. After the death in 126 (744) of Yazid III the succession passed to his brother Hishâm b. al-Walîd; the latter however was only recognised in the southern part of Syria. Under the pretext of protecting the interests of the sons of the murdered Walîd II, Marwân crossed the Euphrates into Syria where the Kaisîs at once joined him. At 'Ain al-Djarr between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon he encountered the Kâlibîs under Sulaîmân, a son of the caliph Hîshâm. In spite of his years of experience in war with the Byzantines the latter was no match for Marwân. He was defeated and fled to Damascus, where he put to death the two sons of Walîd II. He then went with his father, the nominal caliph Ibrâhîm to Palmyra, the capital of the Kâlibîs, whereupon Marwân entered Damascus and received the homage of the people (Safar 26, 127 = Dec. 7, 744). After arranging matters in the capital he made his headquarters in Haraqân, where he could rely upon the support of the Kaisîs who were devoted to him. The result was a rising of the Kâlibîs in Syria. Marwân soon succeeded in restoring order; but when in the following year he was preparing a campaign against the 'Irâk not yet subject to him, he made the mistake of levying Syrian troops also who were to join the rest of the army on the march. On reaching al-Rusûf where Sulaîmân b. Hîshâm lived, the Syrians deserted from Marwân and proclaimed Sulaîmân commander of the faith-ful. When Sulaîmân occupied Qamagram, Marwân had to come back. A battle took place near the town, Sulaîmân was defeated and fled first to Hîmas and then to al-Kûfa. After a siege of several months Hismî was forced to surrender; Marwân razed its walls to the ground and also those of Ba'albek, Damascus, Jerusalem and other large towns of Syria. In the summer of 128 (746) peace was finally restored in Syria.

In the eastern provinces however complete anarchy reigned. The governorship of the 'Irâk had been given by Yazid III to a son of the caliph 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, named 'Abd Allah [q. v.]. The latter of course did not recognise the claims of Marwân to the caliphate and the 'Abd Allah b. Mu'awiyâ [q. v.] also rebelled in al-Kûfa. Marwân appointed a new governor of al-Kûfa, Yazîd b. 'Abd al-Harâshî to restore peace and security; the latter however soon fell in battle with 'Abd Allah b. 'Omar and only the approach of a danger that threatened both sides, the Khârîjî movement brought the two opponents to terms. The Khârîjîs a little later seized the town of al-Mawâil: 'Abd Allah, the son of the caliph, was defeated and had to retreat. In the late summer of 28 (746) however the Khârîjî leader al-Dâhîbî b. Kais al-Shâhînî [q. e.] fell in battle with Marwân himself and in the following year the power of these dangerous rebels was finally broken after one of Marwân's generals Yazid b. 'Omar b. Hu-bair had taken the 'Irâk from them.

Soon afterwards however a cloud that boded evil appeared in another direction. 'Abd al-Lâ'îhî, governor of Khorâsân, had long before warned the caliph of the sedidious activities of the 'Abhâsîs and urgently appealed for assistance to render their cunning adversaries harmless. Marwân however had his hands full and could devote no attention to the distant east. In Ramâzân 129 (June 747) the long prepared rebellion broke out in Khorâsân. Apart from a few isolated successes, the government troops were defeated by the rebels and after the fall of al-Kûfa Abu al-'Abbas who with his brother Abu Dîjâfar had taken command of the 'Abhâsî party had himself proclaimed caliph on the 12th Kabi' II, 132 (Nov. 28, 749). In Dhûl-Muhammâd II of the same year (Jan. 750) Marwân was defeated on the upper Zâb. He then fled from one place to another till he was overtaken at Bûr in the district of 'Ushmûnîn in Upper Egypt. There the last Damascus caliph of the Omâyây dynasty fell fighting bravely (end of 132 = Aug. 750).


MARWÂNIDS, a Muhammedan dynasty in Diyar Bakr, founded by the Kurd chief Bâdhî, who had begun his career when he was a shepherd and later took to brigandage. With the help of a body of men similarly inclined, he seized the town of Adîjish in Armenia with other strongholds on the Armenian frontier. After the death of Bûyid 'Adud al-Dawla (372 =983), he invaded the province of Diyar Bakr and captured 'Amîd, the Mâyâfârikûn and Nasûbûn. The armies, which Sâmûn al-Dawla sent against him, were defeated and al-Mawillî also passed into his hands. But when he tried to seize the capital, Bâghdâd (Safar 373 = July–Aug. 983), he suffered a complete defeat and had to abandon al-Mawillî. After vain attempts to retake this town, he took the field again in 380 (990–991) but was defeated by the Hamûnîs, the lords of al-Mawillî, and fell in the battle. 'Abd al-'Alî b. 'Abd Allah, Marwân's sister's son, then married his widow and thus came into possession of the lands conquered by Bâdhî and continued the war against the Hamûnîs whom he twice defeated. After the murder of 'Abd al-'Alî in 387 (997–998) in 'Amîd, his brother 'Umarîhî al-Dawla Abu 'l-Mâshûr succeeded him. The third brother 'Abd al-Dawla Abu Nasr Ahmad at first attempted to dispute his authority but without
success. In 402 (1011-1012) Abu 'l-Mansur was poisoned by one of his generals, whereupon Abu Nasr was recognized as lord of Diyar Bakr. During his rule of fifty years, peace and quiet as a rule prevailed, and poets and learned men found a hospitable welcome at his court. In 433 (1041-1042) the Ghurids (q.v.) who had invaded Mesopo-
tamia in the previous year, raided Djazirat Ibn Omar; but Sulaiman, son of Abu Nasr, succeeded in outwitting and capturing their leader whereupon the others dispersed; they soon returned however and continued their plundering, although Abu Nasr released their chief and gave them a considerable sum to induce them to withdraw. They then occupied al-Mawzil, which was completely sacked while the emir there, Karshah, b. al-Muqaddad (q.v.), saved himself by flight. In 435 (1044) he finally succeeded in driving out the Ghurids whereupon they withdrew to Diyar Bakr and thence to Van. When the Saljuk Sultan Toghru
glu seized in 445 (1054-1055) advantageous terms of cession of Djazirat Ibn Omar, Abu Nasr gained his former position over them and a friendly relationship was established between them Abu Nasr died in 453 (1061-1062) aged 82. He was succeeded by his son Nyam al-
Dawa' Nasr, who had however to go through a hard struggle with his brother Sulaiman. The former was victorious in Maqafirku, while the latter had to be satisfied with Amid. In 463 (1070-
1071) Nasr submitted to the Saljuk Sultan Alp Arslan. After Nasr's death (472 = 1080) his son Mansur was recognized as his successor. Soon afterwards, the Saljuks overthrew the Marwanid dynasty. In 478 (1085-1086) Ibn Dujur, Malik-
Shah's vizier, and his son Za'im al-Rasah Abu l-Kasim conquered the towns of Amid, Maqafirku and Djazirat Ibn Omar and then brought the whole province of Diyar Bakr under the rule of the Saljuk-
s. Mansur, the last Marwanid, died in Muharram 459 (Dec. 1055-Jan. 1056) in Djazirat Ibn Omar.

B i b l i o g r a p h y : Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg), IX. 25 (v. 49-52. 272-276. 416 sq.); x. 11. 36 sq. 93 sq. 151. 174 sq.; Ibn Kathir, al-
-Nabat (Cerulli), iv. 251-253. 259-261. 315-321; Wel, Grund d. chald. Spr., iii. 106. 151; Stanley Lane-Poole, The Mohammedan Dynasties, p. 118.

(M. ZEFFERSTEIN) 

MARYA, a tribe in the Western zone of Eritrea. They are for the most part shepherds and inhabit the middle valley of the An'abs river in the district of Karan. Their tribe is formed by two sections of nobles: Marya Kayi'ih, the "Red Marya" and Marya Salim, the "Black Marya"; and the families of the vassals. The "Red" Marya have been traditionally in a lower position than the "Black" and they were obliged to pay on certain occasions special gifts to the "Black", as for instance, when the chief of the "Black" died. The vassals were practically divided between the Red and the Black as every family of them lived under the patronage of the chief of a noble family. Both the paramount chiefs of the noble sections had some particular rights over all the vassals of the noble families of their sections as they had, for instance, the power to order that every vassal may give them the same gift as to his individual patron or to oblige the patrons to pay as a duty to the highest representative of the tribe, the tenth part of every gift or duty of their vassals.

The Marya claim to be descendants of a warrior, Marya, born of Saho stock, who emigrated with seventeen soldiers to the borders of the 'Ansab and was received there as a guest by the natives. But, afterwards, the sons of Marya had so greatly increased that they were able to occupy the whole territory and to establish the right which strongly defend their vassals. These natives, who are called segi, on account of their origin, were really Abyssinians and Bedja. However, the Marya and their vassals to-day speak only the Tigre language; and the Saho, as the Bedja, has been wholly forgotten.

The Marya were Christians but, about half a century ago, they were converted to Islam. Even their clans (as the 'Ad Te-mik'al, a section of the "Red") and their ancestors till recent generations bore Christian names. In any case, Islamic law has gradually gained great influence, among the Marya; and this has been from many points of view a real profit to the population, as the laws of Islam may moderate in a good way the ancient rough customs which formerly gave the privileges of the nobles and their mastery on the vassals. As a matter of fact, in the hereditary law, the prevalent right of the first born son and the exclusion of the daughters from the succession of their father's estates became gradually disused on account of the Islamic influences. In the same way, the custom of declaring slaves those vassals who could not pay their debts to the nobles and the great differences, in the penal law, as to the punishment of crimes perpetrated by the nobles or by the vassals, had already been diminished after the conversion of the Marya to the Islam, when the occupation of Eritrea by Italy caused the complete abrogation of those rules.

B i b l i o g r a p h y : W. Munzinger, Ostafrikanische Studien, Schaffhausen 1864; E. Litt,

MARYAM, Mary. The Arabic form of the name is identical with מְרִי and מָרִי which are used in the Syriac and in the Greek Bible in the New as well as in the Old Testament. In the latter it corresponds to the Hebrew מִרְי. This name, like other ones with the same suffix, such as Amram, B'ilam, points to the region between Palestine and Northwestern Arabia as its home. According to Muslim interpretation the name means "the pious" (al-'abida; cf. the commentaries on sūra ii. 31). It occurs frequently in the Kur'an in the combination [Tā'] Ibn Maryam ["Jesus"] son of Mary (sūra ii. 81, 254; iii. 31 112; iv. 156, 169; v. 19, 50, 76, 82, 109, 112, 114, 116; ix. 31; xix. 35; xxiii. 52; xxxii. 7; xlii. 57; lii. 27, lxi. 6, 14); no father being mentioned, because, according to Muslim tradition also, 'Isa had no earthly father. In the majority of these passages Ṭā' is clearly regarded as the higher of the two. Yet Maryam's place is important from a dogmatical as well as from a historical point of view.

Maryam is mentioned in the Kur'an, from the oldest parts down to the later Madinan sūras.

To the first Maakkian period belongs sūra xxiii. 52: "And we made the son of Maryam and his
mother a sign; and we made them abide in an elevated place, full of quiet and watered with springs”. Here is possibly the first allusion in the Kurān to the virgin birth. This idea is accenteduated in sūra xix. 37, where Maryam gives the spirit (i.e. the angel) who announces to her the birth of a male child, this reply: “How should I have a male child, no human man having touched me?” In sūra lxvi. 12 the conception is ascribed to this divine spirit (cf. Luke i. 34 sqg.). Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.

The virgin birth is also mentioned in sūra lxvi. 12 (Madinan): “And Maryam bint Imrān who kept her body pure. Then we breathed into it from our spirit. She acknowledged the truth of the words of her Lord and of his book and she belonged to the obedient.”

A third mention of the announcement and the virgin birth is in sūra iii. 37: “When the angels said, O Maryam, verily Allāh has elected and purified thee and elected thee above the women of all created beings. O Maryam, be obedient unto thy Lord and prostrate thyself and bow down with those who bow down” (cf. Luke i. 28). Maryam is indeed reckoned as one of the four best women that ever existed, together with Āsya [q.v.], Khadijā [q.v.] and Fātimah [q.v.], (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, iii. 135), and the chief of the women of Paradise (Ibn Ḥanbal, iii. 64, 80).

According to tradition the announcement took place in the following manner: Jubūl appeared to Mary in the shape of a headless youth with a shining face and curling hair, announcing to her the birth of a male child. She expressed her amazement, but, on the angel’s reassuring answer, she complied with the will of God.

Thereupon the angel blew his breath into the fold of her shirt, which she had put off. When the angel had withdrawn, she put on the shirt and became pregnant. The announcement took place in the cavern of the well of Siwāḥ, whither Maryam had gone, as usual, to fill her pitcher; she was then 10 or 15 years of age; and it was the longest day of the year. In Christian tradition also the voice of the angel was heard by Maryam for the first time when she had gone to fill her pitcher. According to a different tradition ʿĪsā’s spirit entered Maryam through her mouth (Ṭabarī, Taḥfīr, vi. 22).

A second important dogmatical feature is that Maryam belongs to the Trinity according to the Kurān. A glimpse of this conception is given in sūra v. 79: “al-Mashh, the son of Maryam, is an Apostle only, who was preceded by other Apostles, and his mother an upright woman; and both were wont to take food”. This verse is apparently meant as a refutation of the Christians who venerated ʿĪsā and his mother as divine persons, elevated above human needs. With this verse may be compared sūra iv. 169: “O people of the book, beware of exaggeration in your religion and say of Allāh nothing but the truth. ʿĪsā b. Maryam is only the Apostle of Allāh and His word, which He conveyed unto Maryam, and a spirit that came forth from Him. Believe, therefore, on Allāh and His Apostles and say not ‘three’. Beware of this, this will be better for you. Allāh is but one God” etc.

Clearer is sūra v. 116: “And when Allāh said, O ʿĪsā b. Maryam, hast thou said to the people, Take me and my mother as two Gods besides Allāh? He answered: Far be it, that I should say to what I am not entitled. If I should have said it, Thou wouldst know it”. etc.

The commentaries above describe the Trinity as consisting of Allāh, ʿĪsā and Maryam. Al-Bajḍawi, however, admits that in sūra iv. 169 there could be an allusion to the Christian doctrine of one God in three hypostases: Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

The question how Muhammad had come to conceive of Maryam as one of the persons of the Trinity, has often been asked. Maracci has made a reference to Epiphanius, Adv. Haereses, Haeres. lxxviii. § 23, where this author speaks of women in Arabia who venerated Maryam as God, and offered to her cakes, from which the heresy is often called that of the Collyridians. Sale, in his Preliminary Discourse, p. 45, mentions the Maria-salutantes, who worshipped a Trinity consisting of God, Christ and Mary, referring to a passage in the work of al-Makin. It may, however, be that Muhammad’s conception was not influenced by any sect, but by the veneration of which Maryam was the object in the Church itself. Or it may be an inference due to the identification of ʿĪsā with the Holy Ghost (cf. sūra iv. 169 as translated above), which made a vacant place in the Trinity, which Maryam seemed entitled to occupy. A different explanation is attempted by Sayyūs, l.c., p. 61 (see Bibliography).

A comparatively large place is occupied in the Kurān by the story of Maryam and ʿĪsā. Many of the features not agreed partially or wholly, with narratives in the apocryphal Gospels. Sūra xxiii. 32 (see above) mentions the elevated place that was prepared for ʿĪsā and his mother. It is not clear which tradition is here alluded to. According to St. Luke i. 39, Mary went to the mountains to visit Elisabeth. In the Protevangelium Jacobi (chap. xxii; Syriac text, p. 26) it is Elisabeth who flies together with John to a mountain, which opens to protect them against their persecutors. The Muslim commentators mention Jerusalem, Damascus, Ramla, Egypt as being possibly meant by the “elevated place”. Maracci thinks of Paradise.

In two passages of the Kurān there is a fuller narrative of ʿĪsā’s birth and what is connected with it, viz. in sūra xix. (which bears the title of Maryam), vs. 1—35, and in sūra iii. 31—42.

Sūra xix. opens with the story of Zakariyāʾ and Yahyā (vs. 1—15); on this follows the story of Maryam and ʿĪsā (vs. 16—34). Sūra iii. 31—42 contains a. the birth of Maryam; b. the announcement of Yahyā (vs. 33—36); c. the announcement of ʿĪsā (vs. 37—41). The comparison of sūra xix. with sūra iii. makes it probable that Muhammad became acquainted with the story of the birth of Maryam later than with those of Yahyā and ʿĪsā.

a. The birth of Maryam. This story goes back to a Christian tradition contemporaneously with that which is contained in the Protevangelium Jacobi and De nativitate Mariae. Mary’s father is called ʿĪmran in the Kurān, Ioachim in Christian tradition; Ibn Ḥalidūn (Faro, ii. 144) is also acquainted with the name Ioachim. It has been supposed that the name of ʿĪmran, which apparently corresponds with the Biblical "Amram, the father of Moses, as well as the fact that Maryam is called
a sister of Hārūn (Sūra xix. 29), is due to a confusion between the two Biblical Maryam’s. Sale, Gerock and others think such a confusion improbable. At any rate Muslim tradition assures us that there is a distance of 1,800 years between the Biblical Amram and the father of Mary.

Imrān’s wife, ‘Isa’s grandmother, is not mentioned by name in the Kurān. In Christian as well as in Muslim tradition she is called Hanna. It is only in Muslim tradition that her genealogy is worked out. She is a daughter of Fākith and a sister of Ishâr, the Biblical Elisabeth.

According to a different genealogy Ishâh and Maryam were sisters, daughters of ‘Imrān and Hanna (Mas‘ûdi, Murâd, i. 120 sq.; Tabari, Tafsîr, iii. 144).

Fākith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hanna</th>
<th>Ishâh</th>
<th>married ‘Imrān</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryam</td>
<td>Maryam</td>
<td>Vâhyâ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Imrān and Hanna were old and childless. One day the sight of a bird in a tree, which was feeding her young, around Hanna’s desire for a child. She prayed to God to fulfill her desire and vows, if her prayer should be heard, the child to the temple. She had however forgotten that, according to the Jewish law, it would be impossible, to accomplish her vow, if she should give birth to a female child (cf. Prover. Jacobi, chap. iii., iv.; Syriac text, p. 4). Compare with this Sûra, in 31: “How the wife of ‘Imrān said, O my Lord, I have vowed to Thee what is in my womb. Now accept this vow from me. Thou art the hearing, the knowing. And when she had given birth to the child, she said, O my Lord, I have given birth to a female child... and I have called her Maryam.”

The Kurān relates how she invoked on behalf of Maryam and her posterity Allah’s protection from Satan. On this verse is based the well-known hadith: “Every child that is born, is touched by Satan; but Satan touches the child of Maryam and her son” (Bukhârî, Jâfrî, Sîrî 44: Tafsîr, Sûra 3: 2). Muslim, Fadilât, tr. 140, 141; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Mustadr, ii. 233–274; Jâf., 288, 292, 319, 368, 52). This tradition is used in support of the impecuniousness of ‘Isa, Maryam and the Prophet(s), in general of al-Nawawi, ad. Muslim, i. and ad. Bahaijawi ad. Suna in 31.

The Kurān further relates (vs. 32) that the child grew up in a chamber in the temple (mihrâb); cf. the kahîrî in Prover. Jacobi, vi.; Syriac text, p. 5 (7) under the divine grace and under Zakkarâ’s care. According to Muslim tradition, ‘Imrân had died before the birth of Maryam, and Zakkarîa claimed authority over her on account of his being her uncle; the rabbis did not recognize his claim; his right was proved by an ordeal, consisting in the parties throwing their pens or arrows in a river; the only one that floated was that of Zakkarîa. Sûra iii. 59 refers to this.

Christian tradition knows of an ordeal only in the case of Joseph, who, because a dove comes forth from his staff, is recognized as Maryam’s guardian.

As often as Zakkarîa enters Maryam’s mihrâb, he finds her being provided with food in a miraculous way (vs. 32). This feature also belongs to Christian tradition (Proter. Jacobi, chap. viii.; Syr. text, p. 7). The person of Joseph is not mentioned in the Kurān. In Muslim tradition he takes care of Maryam, his cousin, because Zakkarîa is no longer able to do so, on account of old age. Maryam stays however in the temple, which she leaves during her monthly period only. According to Christian tradition, Joseph takes her into his house when she attains to womanhood, lest she should defile the temple.

b. The announcement of Yaḥyâ. See this art. and Zakkarîa.

c. The announcement and birth of ‘Isa. The more detailed narrative is that of Sûra xix. 16 sqq. Maryam retires to a place situated eastward, where she hides herself behind a curtain. The commentators do not know whether a place to the east of Jerusalem is meant, or the eastern part of her house, to which she retires every month. It is said that this is the origin of the kibla of the Christians.

In vss. 17–22 the story of the announcement is given (cf. above), followed by that of ‘Isa’s birth, which, according to some Muslim traditions, followed the conception either immediately or very soon. The pains of childbirth came upon Maryam when she was near the trunk of a palm. “She said, would to God I had died before this, and had become a thing forgotten, and lost in oblivion. And he who was beneath her [i.e. the child, or Dibrîl, or the palm] called to her, saying, Be not grieved; God has provided a rivulet under thee; and shake the trunk of the palm and it shall let fall ripe dates upon thee, ready gathered. And eat and drink and calm thy mind.” This story may, perhaps, be considered a part of the Christian tradition in which it is related that, during the flight to Egypt, the babe Jesus ordered a palm in the desert to bow down in order to refresh Mary by its dates; whereupon the palm obeyed and stayed with her head at Mary’s feet, till the child ordered it to stand upright again and to open a vein between its roots in order to quench the thirst of the holy family (Apocryphal Gospel of Matthew, chap. xx.). The Kurān goes on (vs. 26): “And when thou seest any man, say, I have vowed a fast unto the Merciful; so I may not speak to any man to-day.” The commentators say, this was meant to avoid importunate questions. This feature is not in Christian tradition; yet in the Proterogymnastum Jacobi it is said (chap. xii.; Syr. text, p. 11) that Mary, who was then 16 years of age, hid herself from the Israelites. According to Muslim tradition, she stayed in a cavern during forty days. “Then she brought him”, continues the Kurān (ix. 28), “to her people, carrying him. They said, O Maryam, now thou hast done a strange thing: O sister of Hārûn, thy father was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a harlot. Then she pointed to the child.” Then the child begins to speak, one of the well-known
mysteries ascribed to 'Isa. The "very shameful calumny" which the Israelites brought forth against Maryam, is also mentioned in sûra iv. 155.

As to the words "O sister of Hârûn" (cf. above), it should be added that, according to the commentaries, this Hârûn was not Moses' brother, but one of Maryam's contemporaries, who was either a wicked man, with whom she is compared in this respect, or her pious brother.

A legend about loaves of bread which Maryam gave to the Magi, is mentioned by al-Mas'ûdi, iv. 79 sq.

The flight to Egypt is not mentioned in the Kur'an, unless the "elevated place" (sûra xxiii. 52; cf. above) should be an allusion to it. According to Muslim tradition which is acquainted with it, the abode lasts 12 years. After the death of Herod the holy family returns to Naṣrâ.

After his alleged death 'Isa consoles his mother from heaven. According to others it was Mary Magdalen. The stories of the Transitus Mariae have not obtained a place in Muslim tradition. Instead of these, there is a narrative how Maryam went to Rome in order to preach before Mârut (Nero), accompanied by John (the disciple) and Shim'un, the coppersmith. When Shim'un and Tâdãwus (Thaddaeus) were crucified with their heads downward, Maryam fled with John. When they were persecuted the earth opened and withdrew them from their persecutors. This miracle was the cause of Mârut's conversion.


MARZUBÂN, Arabic form of the title of provincial governors in the Sasanian empire, especially of the "wardens of the marches", the "markgraves". The word is derived from marz which still means in Persian a frontier district (Horn, Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie, p. 218) and is found in Pehlevi in the form marcûn (in the Kûr-nâmâm; cf. H. S. Nyberg, Hilfsbuch der Pehlevi, i., Upsala 1928, p. 54) which suggests a north Iranian origin (cf. Lents, Z. I. L., iv. 255, 295). As we find alongside of marz also mardî in Persian (Horn, loc. cit.). The title is not found, however, before the Sasanian period and in the great inscription of Paikuli, the warden is called binâkh (Arm. binaâk), also a north Iranian title (Herzfeld, Paikuli, Berlin 1924, p. 155; cf. also Marquart, Erânshahr, p. 165 sqq.). In Syriac we find the forms marzûbân and marzûbân (Payne-Smith) and the Armenian has marzegh and marzgahan (Hubschman, Aramische Grammatik, p. 193). Persian finally has kept the word as marzûh, marzûbân or marzûzân (cf. e.g. the Burkhâni Kâfî).

It is from Arab sources that we are more particularly informed of the duties of the marzûbân. Al-Ya'kûbî (Ta'rikh, ed. Houtsma, i. 201) says that it was the title of the râdî al-balad, while the four great divisions of the empire were governed by pâdegushpân. The historians al-Tâbarî and al-Baladîrî tell us of the different marzûbân encountered by the Arabs in their conquests (cf. the list of provinces ruled by a marzûbân, drawn up by Baladîrî, and given by Nöldeke in Gesch. d. Perser und Araber, Leyden 1879, p. 446). In this period we find these governors dependent of any higher authority and concluding treaties and treaties. They sometimes retained their offices after the Arab conquest. Under the Sasanians the marzûbân were far from having such an independent position. We sometimes find them acting as generals under the command of the shâbul (e.g. Joshua Stylites, ed. Wright, p. 61).

Although the title gradually fell into disuse, Muslim Persia still retained the word, used in its original sense of "warden of the marches". It is frequently found in literature (cf. Sa'dî, Rustâm, ed. Graf, p. 73). On the other hand after the Sasanian period, marzûbân and its variants became a proper name (in Arabic sometimes al-Marzûbân) among Muslims and also among Persians (cf. the names of the caliphs of Palavi manuscripts; cf. especially just, "Iranisches Namentuch, s. v. Marzûpân.

Bibliography: A. Christensen, L'Empire des Sassanides, Copenhagen 1907, p. 43 sq.

MARZUBÂN b. RUSIM, a prince of the Bawand dynasty of Tabâristân [q.v.] regarded as the original author of the Marzûbân-nâmâ, a work in Persian prose containing a series of short stories and fables of a moral and didactic character. This book is known in two versions in elegant Persân of the xiiith century, the author of one of which was Sa'd al-Dîn al-Wârâmî; he dedicated it to Abu 'l-Kâsim Rabih al-Dîn, vizier of 'Uzbek b. Muhammâd b. Ildûs, 'Atâbeg of Adharbâydjân from 1210 to 1225. These dates give us probable limits for the composition of the book. The other version is the work of Muhammâd b. Ghâzi al-Malâyawî, secretary and later vizier of Kukn al-Dîn Sulaimân-shah, Safid-Dîn, who reigned from 1192 to 1204. It is called rawdat al-'alîqûl and differs a good deal in form and contents from the other, which is called the Marzûbân-nâmâ.

In the preface by Sa'd al-Dîn al-Wârâmî we are told that the original work had been written in the language of Tabâristân and the ancient Pûrî, the popular language, but that thanks to him this valuable work had been given a new life after 400 years (p. 6 and 35 of Mirât Muhammad Karwân's edition). In the first chapter Marzûbân b. Sharwân, descendant of Kayûs, brother of the Sasanian king Anushirwân, is mentioned as wâdl'i
MARZUBÂN — MASCARA

The Rawdat al-ʻUkāl on the contrary attributed the original book to a descendant of the Ziyārid ʿAlī b. Wāghnîr and says simply that it is written in a coarse style. Apart from these, there are very few references to the book in Persian literature. The author of the Kalâs-nûma (composed in 1082) says that the grandmother of his mother was the daughter of the prince Marzubân b. Rustam b. Sharwân, author of the Marzubân-nâma. Ibn Isândîyar in his Tarîkh-i Tabaristan (written in 1216) speaks of the Isfahân Marzubân b. Rustam b. Sharwân Parim as the author of the Marzubân-nâma, a work which is in every way better than the book of Kâlibâwân. He adds that this same Marzubân composed a diao in Tahâri verse called the Nikût-nâmâ (cf. An Unbridled Translation of the History of Tabaristan, by E. G. Browne, Leyden 1905, p. 86); finally the Persian bibliographer Rûdî Kûlî Kûmîn in the Fârhanâ-şârî (p. 94), who thinks that Marzubân was the son of Rustam b. Surkhtî, states that the date of Rustam b. Shahrîyar b. Shârvân b. Rustam was in all probability the father of Marzubân, is only known from a coin of the year 355 (966) (H. L. Rabino, Masândârân, Privatdruck, London 1928, G.M.S., N.S. vii, p. 135). Marzubân must have therefore flourished about 1000 A.D., i.e. during the period of the Persian renaissance.

In the first chapter of the Marzubân-nâmâ Marzubân is described as the brother of the reigning king. He had been begotten by the wife of Rustam, who reigned for 8 years (cf. Rabino, loc. cit.) and was supposed to have been begotten to live a life of seclusion and to compose a book containing wise counsels and useful directions for the conduct of life in this world. In this connection he has a dispute with the king and his vizier in the course of which he relates several anecdotes. The other chapters continue in the same style. Several of the fables and anecdotes are found in other books just as we find similar stories in the book of Kalîbâwân and in the Arabic Nights. The collection therefore belongs to an essentially Persian literary type, which has had considerable influence on Arabic literature. Since its contents have not been examined for comparison, it would be too hazardous to express an opinion on its relation to similar collections and popular Persian stories. It is very possible that a number of the stories are of Indian origin. On the other hand, we ought perhaps not to credit the statement that originally it was written in the Tabâri dialect; for then we should have to believe that the two authors of the new recension knew this dialect, about which however, we only have the notes in the Tarîkh-i Tabaristan of Ibn Isândîyar. Perhaps the reference is to a text in archaic Persian like the probable language of the Khudâi-nâmâ which Firdawsi used (cf. Noûdân, Geschichte der Aesthûrî in Pâplûn, Gottingen 1899, p. 27) and the source of a poem like Wis Îrânîn, a text which no longer pleased the taste of the literary connoisseurs of the xith century.

The Marzubân-nâmâ was published by Mirzâ Muḥammad Ḵâzwinî in 1908 (G.M.S., vii.) from a manuscript in the British Museum (Or. 6476) with the help of two other MSS. in the same collection, one in the Bibliothèque Nationale and another sent from Persia. The Paris manuscript had already been used for the publication of extracts from the Marzubân-nâmâ. For the Persian, Cf. Scheffer’s Chrœasthîkî perseâ, Paris 1885, p. 172—199. The Rawdat al-ʻUkâl is represented by a manuscript in Leyden (cf. M. Th. Houtsma, Eine unbekannte Bearbeitung des Marzubân-nâmâ, Z. D. M. G., lii. 359—392) and another in Paris. Mirzâ Muḥammad has given extracts from it in the preface to his edition. There is also an Arabic version of the same work from the pen of Ḵâzwinî, based on a Turkish version of Sa’d al-Wârâwîn’s recension; this Arabic text was lithographed at Cairo in 1278.

Bibliography: The philological data have been collected by Mirzâ Muḥammad Ḵâzwinî in the preface of his edition; Scheffer’s observations (p. 194—211) are to be utilised with caution. Cf. also: H. Ethé, Neupersische Litteratur, in Grundrisse d. iran. Phil., ii. 328 sqq., and E. G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii. 115, 436.

J. H. KRAMERS

MASCARA. [See Sa‘û.]

MASAGAN. [See MAZAGHÎ.]

MASCARA, a town in Algeria (department of Oran), 50 miles S.W. of Mostaganem and 60 S.E. of Oran. Its position is 35° 26’ N. Lat. and 8° E. of Greenwich. It lies on the southern slope of the Bôl Shârīb range, called by the Arabs Shârīb al-Rîh and is built on the edge of a ravine at the bottom of which runs the Wâd Stî Tûjjman on the other side of which to the N.W. lies the native faubourg of Bôb Āli. Mascara commands the plain of Eghrîn, which measures 25 to 30 miles from W. to E. and 10 to 12 miles from N. to S. and is one of the most fertile regions of Algeria. The natives have grown cereals here from the earliest times and the Europeans have introduced tobacco and created vineyards, the produce of which is celebrated. It is the market for a region, becoming more and more prosperous, and by the census of 1926 had 30,669 inhabitants of whom 16,630 were natives.

Mascara is of considerable antiquity. According to Bâkri: (Masûli, transl. de Spaine, rev. by Fagnan, p. 160), it included among its inhabitants people who came from Tiher (Tiaret) some of whom went and settled at Iğan, a day’s journey S.E., when this town was founded by Yâli b. Muḥammad, son of Sâlih the Frânî, in 938 (949—950 A.D.). Ibn Hawkâl (Description de l’Afrique, transl. de Spaine, Journ. Ar., 1842) and Idrîsî (transl. de Goeje, p. 96) mention Mascara as a large well watered village rich in fruits. The Almohads seem to have built a fortress there. The Zîyâkîs of Tiemcen seized a governor and a garrison there. Leo Africanus (bk. iv., ed. Scheffer, vol. iii., p. 34) notes the importance of the market which was held at Mascara “one of the towns of the Beni Râsîl (Bânâ Raqîd) where one could buy, along with cereals in large quantities, cloth and articles of
harness manufactured in the country. The rulers of Tlemcen drew considerable revenues from it: 40,000 pistoles, according to Marmol (Africa, vol. ii., p. 356).
The Turks established themselves at Mascara in the xvith century and placed a garrison there. In 1701 they made it the capital of the beylik of the west, which had hitherto been Mazūna in Dhiba. The beys lived there till Oran was reoccupied by the Algerians in 1792. During this period, Mascara, which had hitherto only been an insignificant place, began to look like a regular town. The beys built two mosques and a madrasa, a wall and a ḩaṣba and brought in a water-supply. The manufacture of burnuses and ḩaṭīs, celebrated throughout the Regency, enriched the inhabitants. This prosperity began to decline after the beys left Mascara and especially after the risings, which broke out in the province of the west in the beginning of the xviith century. The Darkkîn Ben Serf seized the town in 1805 and held it for a time. In 1827 it was attacked by the marabout Muhammad al-Dījānt. Supported by the Hashim he gained possession of the faubourg of Ḑebb 'Ali but was killed by the Turks when preparing to storm the town itself. At the end of Turkish rule, 'Abd al-Kâdir [q.v.] who had been proclaimed Sulṭān by the tribes of the plain of Egiris, established his seat of government at Mascara, but rarely lived there. An expedition, in the month of December 1836 led by Marshal Iauzel, occupied Mascara which the French abandoned next day, after burning down part of it. The emir returned to the town and held it till May 30, 1841, when a column under Buqzad occupied it finally for the French. Mascara, then half in ruins, had only a population of 2,540 inhabitants.

**Bibliography:** Ch.-Caupenne, Mascara, Paris 1856; Gorgouso, Notice sur Mohammed et Kbir, Rev. Africaine, 1857; Leeds, Notice sur les Cabinets de Mascara, Rev. Africaine, 1877; Correspondance du capitaine Daumas, Algiers 1912; Tableau des Établissements francs dans l’Algérie, year 1839.
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**MADSIDJ (A). Mosquée.**
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A. Origin.

B. Foundation of mosques after Muhammad’s death.

C. The mosque as a religious centre.

D. The building and its equipment.

E. The mosque as a state institution.
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II. (R. A. Kern)
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III. (E. Diez)

Architecture.

A. Origin of the Mosque.

The word מַדְסִידִיק is found in Aramaic, the earliest occurrence being in the Jewish Elephantine Papyri (ed. Sachau, pl. 32; ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Cent. B. C., No. 44); also frequently in Nabataean (Corp. Inscri., ii. 181, 178, 185, 188, 190, 218; cf. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., ii. 1898, p. 134; Lidziarski, Handbuch d. nord. Epig., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from מַדְסִידִיק “to prostrate oneself” seems to mean in Nabataean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning “place of worship” has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papyri where it is sworn by it is mentioned mīṣīd “temple, church” is perhaps a genuine formation from the verb (which is certainly borrowed from the Aramaic: cf. Noldke, Neue Beiträge z. sem. Sprachw., p. 36). The Arabic māṣīd may have been formed independently from the corresponding verb, which also undoubtedly comes from the Aramaic; probably the above mentioned Aramaic substantive was simply taken over, although no links can be shown between the Nabataean inscriptions and the Kurān.

The word in any case can hardly have been formed by Muhammad himself from its specific connection with divine service (“place where one saqīda or prostrates oneself”).

I. The Meccan period.

The word is used in the Kurān especially of the Meccan sanctuary (al-Māṣīd al-ḥāram, Sūrā ii. 139, 144, 145, 187, 192, 214; v. 3; viii. 34; ix. 7, 19, 28; xvii. 1; xxii. 25; xviii. 25, 27); according to later sources, this was already the usage in the Meccan period (cf. Yaḇṭīṭ, ed. Houtsma, i. 285, 12). According to tradition the term al-Māṣīd al-ḥadīj (Sūrā xvii. 1) means the Jerusalem sanctuary (according to Schrieke, Ish., vi. i qqq.; cf. Horovitz, ibid., ix. 155 qqq., the reference is rather to a place of prayer in heaven); and in the legend of the Seven Sleepers māṣīd means a tomb-sanctuary probably Christian, certainly pre-Muhammadan (Sūrā xvii., 20). The word is also applied to pre-Islamic sanctuaries, which belong to God and where God is invoked, although Muhammad was not always able to recognise the particular cult associated with them. It is undoubtedly with this general meaning that the word is used in this verse of the Kurān: “If God had not taken men under his protection, then monasteries, churches and places of prayer (išāraṭ) and māṣīd would have been destroyed” (Sūrā xxii. 41). The word is also used in a ḏud of an Alyssian church (Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 48, 54; Muslim, Māṣīd, Tr. 3) and in another of Jewish and Christian tomb-sanctuaries (Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 55; Muslim, Māṣīd, Tr. 3). Even Ibn Kathīr can still use the word in the general meaning of a temple or place of worship of any religion (Maḥdollama, fasc. 4, 6 at the end). There is therefore no question of a word of specifically Muslim creation. This is in entire agreement with Muhammad’s original attitude to earlier religions. Just as Abraham was a Muslim, so David had a masjid (Tabari, i. 2408, 7 qqq.).

To the Prophet the Meccan sanctuary always remained the principal mosque, known as Bait ʿAllah even before the time of the Prophet. It was a grave charge brought against the Kurān in the Meccan period that they drove the believers out of al-Māṣīd al-ḥāram (Sūrā ii. 214; v. 3; viii. 34; xxii. 25; xviii. 25), which was considered all the more unjust as they worshipped the true lord of the sanctuary. To the true God belonged al-māṣīd (Sūrā lxxii. 18, Meccan); it is therefore an absurdity for the godless to prevent the wor-
ship of God in “God’s own mosques” (Sūra ii. 108). The result was that it was revealed in the
year 9: “It is not right for polytheists to frequent the mosques of God” (Sūra ix. 17 sq.) and the
opponents of the new religion were therefore ex
cluued from the sanctuary. The Sūra agrees with the
Kūfī, that the sanctity of al-Masjid al-Haram was
which had been用途from childhood was
always regarded by him as indisputable. Like other
Meccans, he and his followers regularly made the
petition around the Ka'ba and kissed the Black Stone
(e. g. Ibn Hishām, p. 153, 17 sqq.; 239, 8, 251,
13; it is frequently stated that he used to sit in the
masjid like his fellow-citizens, alone or with a
follower or disputing with an opponent (Ibn
Hishām, p. 233, 15 sqq. 252, 24, 259, 260,
269, 15 sqq.). It is related that he used to perform
the prayer between the Yaman corner and the Black
Stone, apparently from the narrator’s context very
frequently (Ibn Hishām, p. 196, 5 sqq.). After his
conversion, 'Umar is said to have arranged that
believers should be admitted to the sanctuary of the
Ka'ba (Ibn Hishām, p. 224, 13 sqq. 17 sqq.).
How strongly Muhammad felt himself attached to
the Arab sanctuary is evident from the fact that
he took part in the traditional rites there before
the Hijra (Sūra evit. 21; in the year 1, one of
his followers, Sa'd b. Mu'ādh, took part in the
pilgrimage ceremonies and in the year 2 he himself
attended on the 10th Dhu '1-Hijja on the
masjid of the Banū Salīma. He therefore, here as
elsewhere, retained ancient customs where his new
teaching did not directly exclude them. But when an
independent religion developed out of his preaching,
a new type of divine service had to be evolved.

In Mecca, the original Muslim community had
no special place of worship. The Prophet used to
perform the prayer in secret in the narrow alleys
of Mecca with his first male follower 'Ali and
with the other earliest Companions also (Ibn Hishām,
p. 159, 166, 17 sqq.). The references are
usually to the solitary prayer of the Prophet, some
times beside the Ka'ba (Ibn Hishām, p. 190, 5 sqq.),
sometimes in his own house (Ibn Hishām, p. 203,
7 sqq.). That the believers often prayed together
may be taken for granted; they would do so in a
Abū 'Umar is said to have conducted the ritual
prayer together with others beside the Ka'ba (Ibn Hishām,
p. 224) because 'Umar was able to defy the
Kurāsh. When the Prophet recited in the mosque
the revelation, later abrogated, recognising al-Lāti,
al-'Alîsha and Ma'nāt, according to the legend,
only the believers but also the polytheists present
took part in the sūjud (Tabari, i. 1192 sqq.). Abū
Bakr is said to have had a private place of prayer
(masjid) in Mecca in his courtyard beside the
gate: the Kurāsh, we are told, objected to this
because women and children could see it and might
be led astray by the emotion aroused (Ibn Hishām,
p. 250; Bukhārī, Sahīh. B. 86; Kāfīzī, B. 14 etc.; Masudi, B. 22).

In the dogma taught by Muhammad a sanctuary
was not a fundamental necessity. Every place
was the same to God and humility in the pre
ience of God, of which the ritual prayer was the
expression, could be shown anywhere; hence the
saying of the Prophet that he had been given
the whole world as a masjid, while earlier pro
phets could only pray in churches and synagogues

(Vāqī'ī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 403; Corpus juris
di Zaid b. 'Ali, ed. Grünert, p. 50 and clxxix; Bukhārī,
Sahīh, B. 56; Tabari, B. 11; Muslim, Masājid, Tr. 1) and also the saying: "Wherever
the hour of prayer overtakes thee, thou shalt per
form the prayer and that is a merit" (Munawwir
Masājid, Tr. 1). That he nevertheless remained
firmly attached to the traditional sanctuary of the
Ka'ba, produced a confusion of thought which is
very marked in Sūra ii. 136 sqq. When in Medina
he was able to do as he pleased, it must have been
natural for him to create a place where he could
be undisturbed with his followers and where
they could perform the ritual prayer together.

2. The Foundation of the Mosque in Medina.

According to one tradition the Prophet came
riding into Medina on his camel with Abū Bakr as ri'di surrounded by the Banū Nadīlār.
The camel stopped on Abū Ayūb's fāna. Here (accordin
g to Abū Da'ūd), the Prophet performed the sūjud,
and immediately afterwards ordered the mosque
to be built and purchased the piece of land from
two orphans, Sa'd and Suhail, who were under the
guardianship of Mu'ādh b. 'Abd, for 10 dinārs,
but declining to accept it as a gift; he lived
after Abū Ayūb until the mosque and his houses
were completed. During this period he performed
the prayer in courtyards or other open spaces (Bukhārī,
Sahīh, B. 48; Muslim, Masājid, Tr. 1; Ahmad b.
Hanbal, Masājid, iii. 212 above; Ibn Hishām, p. 336;
Tabari, i. 1258 sq.; Mas'ūdī, Murūj, iv. 140 sq). According
to this tradition, the building of the mosque was intended by the Prophet from the
first and the choice of the site was left to the
wishes of his mount. According to another tradi
tion the Prophet took up his abode with Abū
Ayūb, but during the first period of his stay in
Medina he conducted the prayer in the house
of Abū Umāma Asād, who had a private masjid,
in which he used to conduct sūjāts with his
neighbours. The Prophet later expressed the desire
to purchase the adjoining piece of ground and
he bought it from the two orphans, who, ac

accordind to this tradition, were wards of Asād
(Bukhārī, Futūḥ al-Buldān, ed. de Goeje, p. 6; cf.
Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, p. 60).

The site was covered with graves, ruins (ghirāb; also bart, Tabari, i. 1259, 17; 1260, 1; cf.
Ahmad b. Hanbal, Masājid, iii. 212, 7, perhaps due
to an old misreading) and palm-trees and was
used as a place for keeping camels and (smaller
domestic animals, Bukhārī, Waṣṣa, B. 66). The
site was cleared, the palms cut down and the
walls built. The building material was bricks baked
in the sun (lābīn) (Ibn Hishām, p. 337; Bukhārī,
Sahīh, B. 62, 65; according to one tradition they
were baked at the well of FĀtima, Wustenfeld,
Stadt Medina, p. 31); in places it was a cour
tyard surrounded by a brick wall on a stone
foundation with three entrances: the gateposts
were of stone. On the iblīb side (i.e. the north
side) at first left open, the stems of the palm
trees which had been cut down were soon set up
as columns and a roof was put over them of
dissembled leaves and clay. On the east side two
huts of similar materials were built for the Prophet's
wives Sawāda and 'Āisha; their entrances opened
on to the court and were covered with carpets:
they were later increased so that there were nine
little houses for the Prophet's wives. When the 
ṣūffā or ẓūllā the homeless Companions found 
shelter (Bukhārī, Ẓādi, B. 48, 62; Wustenfeld, 
Medina, p. 60 sq., 66; Dīyārābārī, Tarīkh al-
Khāmis, Cairo 1302, i. 387 sqq.; on the ẓūffā, 
p. 387 in the middle; 391 after the middle; cf. 
L. Caetani, Annales dell'Islam, i. 377 sqg.). In 
seven months the work was completed (Wustenfeld, 
Medina, p. 59), according to others in the month 
of Safar of the year 2 (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 339, 48 sqq.).
The mosque was very simple. It was really only 
a courtyard with a wall round it; the ẓūffā 
already mentioned supplied a shelter on the north 
side, while on the south side, later the ẓūlība side, an 
arbour was probably built also, for the Prophet 
used to preach leaning against a palm-trunk and this 
must have been on the ẓūlība side. How large the 
arbours were cannot be ascertained. The mosque 
was the courtyard of the Prophet's houses and 
at the same time the meeting-place for the believers 
and the place for common prayer.

According to the sources, it was the Prophet's 
invention from the very first to build a mosque 
at once in Medina; according to a later tradition 
Gabriel commanded him in the name of God to 
build a house for God (Khāmis, i. 387 infra); 
but this story is coloured by later conditions. It 
has been made quite clear, notably by L. Caetani 
(Annales dell'Islam, i. 432, 437 sqq.) and later by 
H. Lammens (Mō'awwid, p. 8, note 5, 62 etc.; 
do., Zīdd, p. 39 sqq., 93 sqq.) that the earliest 
masjīd had nothing of the character of a sacred 
edifice. Much can be quoted for this view from 
Ḥadīth and Sīra (cf. Annales dell'Islam, i. 440). 
The unconverted Ḥākifis were received by the 
Prophet in the mosque to conduct negotiations 
and he even put up three tents for them in the 
courtyard (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 916; Wāḵīdī-Wellhausen, 
p. 382); envoy from Tāmīl also went freely 
able to the mosque and asked for the Prophet, who 
dealt with them after he had finished praying (Ibn Hīṣām, 
brought to the masjid the head of the Ḥudhaili 
Sūfṣān, threw it down before the Prophet and 
gave his report (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 981 sq.; Wāḵīdī- 
Wellhausen, p. 225). After the battle of ʿUḥd the 
Medina chiefs spent the night in the mosque 
(Wāḵīdī-Wellhausen, p. 149). The Āwssīl 
tended their wounded here (ibid., p. 215 sq.; ʿTabārī, i. 
1491 sqq.); a prisoner of war was tied to one of 
the pillars of the mosque (Bukhārī, Ẓādi, B. 76, 
82; cf. 75). Many poor people used to live in the 
yard (Bukhārī, Ẓādi, B. 58); tents and huts were 
put up in the mosque, one for example by converted 
and liberated prisoners, another by the Banū Ghifār, 
in whose tent Saʿd b. Muṣūf died of his wounds 
(ibid., B. 77; ʿUḍ-ʿal-Ghifār, i. 297). People sat 
as they pleased in the mosque or took their ease 
lying on their backs (Bukhārī, ʿIṣm, bāb 6; Ẓādi, 
bāb 85; Ibn Saʿd, i. 124, 4); even so late as the 
reign of ʿUmar it is recorded that he found 
strangers sleeping in a corner of the mosque 
(Kūmī, p. 118, 13 sqg.); the Prophet received 
gifts and distributed them among the Companions 
(Bukhārī, Ẓādi, bāb 42); disputes took place over 
business (ibid., bāb 71, 85) and in general people 
conducted themselves as they pleased. Indeed, on 
one occasion some Sudanese or Abyssinians with 
the approval of the Prophet gave a display with 
shield and lance on the occasion of a festival 
(ʿIṣm, bāb 69; Ṭalāʿīn, bāb 71, 25; Ẓīḥād, bāb 81) 
and on another a stranger seeking the Prophet, 
rode into the mosque on his camel (do., ʿIṣm, 
bāb 6). So little "sanctified" was this, the oldest 
mosque, that one of the Muḥājīrūn, ejected for 
scatting at the believers, could call to Abī Ayūb 
"Are you throwing me out of the Mirbād Bani 
Thālabu?" (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 362, 10 sqq.).

All this gives one the impression of the head- 
quar ters of an army, rather than of a sacred 
edifice. On the other hand the mosque was used 
from the very first for the general divine service 
and thus became something more than the Prophet's 
private edifice. Whatever the Prophet's intentions 
had been from the first, the masjid with the 
increasing importance of Islam was bound to become 
very soon the political and religious centre of 
the new community. The two points of view 
cannot be distinguished in Islam, especially in 
the earlier period. The mosque was the place 
where believers assembled for prayer around the 
Prophet, with whom he delivered his addresses, 
and not only appeals for obedience to God but 
regulations affecting the social life of the community 
(cf. Bukhārī, Ẓādi, bāb 70, 71); from here he 
controlled the religious and political community 
of Islam. Even at the real old sanctuaries of 
Arabia, there were no restrictions on what one 
could do; what distinguished the mosque from 
the Christian church or the Meccan temple was 
that in it there was no specially dedicated ritual 
object. At the ʿAbā or also people used to gather 
to discuss everyday affairs and also for important 
meetings, if we may believe the Sīra (Ibn Hīṣām, 
p. 183 sqq., 185, 1, 229, 8, 248, 257, v). Here 
also the Prophets used to sit; strangers came to 
visit him; he talked and they disputed with him; 
people even came to blows and fought there (Ibn 
Hīṣām, p. 183 sqq., 185 sqq., 187 sqq., 202, 19, 237, 
259; Chor. d. Stadt Mecca, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 
223, 11). Beside the ʿAbā was the Dār al-Nadwa, 
where important matters were discussed and justice 
administered (ibid., see index). From the Medina 
mosque was developed the general type of the 
Muslim mosque. It depended on circumstances 
whether the aspect of the mosque as a social 
centre or as a place of prayer was more or less 
emphasised.

3. Other Mosques in the Time 
of the Prophet.

The mosque of the Prophet in Medina was not 
the only one founded by Muslims in his lifetime 
and according to tradition not even the first, which 
is said to have been the mosque of ʿAbū. In this 
place, which belonged to the territory of Medina 
(see Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, 
p. 126), the Prophet on his Hīdjr stopped with 
the family of ʿAmr b. ʿAṣw; the length of his 
stay is variously given: 3, 5, 8, 14 or 22 days. 
According to one tradition, he found a mosque 
there on his arrival, which had been built by the 
first emigrants and the ʿAmr and he performed 
the ṣalāt there with them (see Wustenfeld, p. 
c. 56; Buṣārī, Futūḥ al-Baladīn, i. 1; 
Dīyārābārī, Tarīkh al-Khamis, Cairo 1302, i. 
380 sqq.). According to another tradition, the Prophet 
himself founded the mosque on a site, which 
belonged to his host ʿAbūl-Ḥaṣım and was used as a 
mirbād for drying dates or according to others,
to a woman named Labba, who tethered her ass there (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 131; Ibn Hisham, p. 335; Tabari, i, 1260; Ibn Sa'd, i, 1, 6; Mas'udi, Murug, iv, 139; Diyarbakri, Khamis, i, 381; al-Sira al-Halabyya, Cairo 1320, ii, 58 sq.). Out of this tradition arose a legend based on the story of the foundation of the principal mosque in Medina. The Prophet moved (first Abū Bakr and 'Umar without success, then) 'Ali mount a camel and at the place to which it goes builds the mosque with stone brought from the Ifarra; he himself laid the first stone, and Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān the next ones (Khamis, i, 381). The Prophet is said to have henceforth visited the mosque of Kūbah every Saturday, either riding or walking and the pillar is still shown beside which he conducted the service (Bukhari, Fālid al-Salāt fi Masjid Makka wa-l-Medina, bāb 2, 4; Muslim, Hadīj, tr. 94; Khamis, i, 382. Ballāghun, p. 5). We are occasionally told that he performed his ṣalāt on the Sabbath in the mosque at Kūbah when he went to the Banū Najir in Kailā of the year 4 (Wustenfeld-Wellhausen, p. 163).

It is obvious that the customs and ideas of the later community have shaped the legend of this mosque. The only question is whether the old tradition that the mosque was founded either by the Prophet himself or even before his arrival by his followers is also a later invention. We thus come to the question whether the Prophet founded or recognised any other mosques at all than that of Medina. L. Caetani, in keeping with his view of the origin of the mosque, is inclined to deny it, pointing to the fact that there was later an obvious tendency to connect mosques everywhere with the Prophet and that Sūra 108 strongly condemn the erection of an “opposition mosque” (M. al-Dirār). The Kurānic passage is as follows: “Those who have built themselves a masjid for opposition (dirār) and unbelief and division among the believers and for a refuge for him who in the past fought against God and his Prophet, and they swear: we intended only good. God is witness that they are liars! Thou shalt not stand up in it, for verily a masjid which is founded on pretence from the first day of its existence has more right that thou shouldst stand in it; in it are men who desire to purify themselves (and loveth those who purify themselves)” (Sūra ix, 108-109). According to tradition this was revealed in the year 6: when the Prophet was on the march to Tabūk, the Banū Sālim said to him that they had built a mosque to make it easier for their feeble and elderly people, and they begged the Prophet to perform his ṣalāt in it and thus give it his approval. The Prophet postponed it till his return, but then this revelation was announced, because the mosque had been founded by Mu'ādh ibn Jarrah at the instigation of Abū 'Amir al-Kalīb, who fought against the Prophet. According to one tradition (so Ibn 'Umar, Zad) they founded the mosque on pretence of that of Molīna from which the people wished to emancipate themselves: according to another (Ibn 'Abbās) the reference was to that of Kūbah; Abū 'Amir and his followers were not comfortable among the Banū 'Amir b. 'Awf and therefore built a new mosque. According to some traditions it was in Dūhā Awn. The Prophet however had it burned down (Tabari, i, 1704 sq.; Ibn Hishām, p. 557 sq.; Ibn Sa'd, i, 1, 6; Wustenfeld-Wellhausen, p. 410 sq.; Tabari, Tafsir, xi, 17 sqq.; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 131; al-Sira al-Halabyya, ii, 60; Ballāghun, p. 1 sq.; Muslim, Hadīj, tr. 93). If the connection with the Tabūk campaign is correct, the Masjid al-Dirār is to be sought north of Medina; “the mosque founded on piety” would then be the mosque of Medina rather than that of Kūbah which lies to the south of it. There is in itself nothing impossible about the rejection in principle of any mosque other than that of Medina. We should then have to discard the whole tradition, for, according to it, the Prophet is at first not unfavourably disposed to the new mosque and his wrath, according to the tradition, arises from the fact that it had been founded by a refractory party. But as a matter of fact there are indications that a number of mosques already existed in the time of the Prophet; for example, the verse in the Kurān: “In houses, which God hath permitted to be built that His name might be praised in them, men praise Him morning and evening, whom neither business nor travel restrains from praising God and performing the ṣalāt and the giving of alms” etc. (Sūra xxiv, 36 sq.). If this revelation, like the rest of the Sūra, is of the Medina period, it is difficult to refer it to Jews and Christians, and this utterance is quite clear: “Observe a complete fast until the night and touch thou them (i.e. women) not while ye are in the mosques” (Sūra ii, 183). This shows that there were already in the time of the Prophet, several Muslim mosques which had a markedly religious character and were recognised by the Prophet.

That there were really public places of prayer of the separate tribes at a very early date is evident from the tradition that the Prophet in the year 2 offered his sacrifice on the 10th Dhu l-Hijja on the Musalla of the Banū Salīm. In addition there are constant references to private masjīd where a few believers, like Abū Bakr in Mecca, made a place for prayer in their houses and where others sometimes assembled (Bukhari, Sunn, bāb 46, 87; Tāhājjudī, bāb 30; cf. also Ḥāḥīn, bāb 50).

B. Origin of Mosques after the Time of the Prophet.

I. Chief Mosques.

What importance the Medina mosque had attained as the centre of administration and worship of the Muslims is best seen from the fact that the first thought of the Muslim generals after their conquests was to found a mosque as a centre around which to gather.

Conditions differed somewhat according as it was a new foundation or an already existing town. Important examples of the first kind are Bāṣra, Kūfa and al-Fṣima. Bāṣra was founded by 'Utbah b. Nāfi' as winter-quarters for the army in the year 14 (or 16 or 17). The mosque was placed in the centre with the Dār al-Imāra, the dwelling of the commander-in-chief with a prison and Darāwīn in front of it. Prayer was at first offered on the open space which was fenced round; later the whole was built of reeds and when the men went off to war the reeds were pulled up and laid away. Abū Mūsā al-Asghārī, who later became 'Umar's Wālī, built the edifice of clay and bricks baked in the sun (tābīn) and used grass
for the roof (Balādhūrī, p. 346 sqq.; 350; B.G.A., v. 182 sqq.; Yaḵūt, Muḥjam al-Dalīlān, i. 641, 6 sqq.; cf. Ţabarī, i. 2377; 11 sqq.). It was similar in Kūfa which was founded in 17 by Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳās. In the centre was the mosque and beside it the Dār al-Imāra was laid out. The mosque at first was simply an open quadrangle, zāhn, marked off by a trench round it. The space was large enough for 40,000 persons. It seems that reeds were also used for building the walls here and later Saʿd used ṭabīn. On the south side (and only here) there was an arbour, ṣulūṭ, built (cf. Balādhūrī, p. 348, 1, 3; ṣuffa). The Dār al-Imāra beside the mosque was later by ʿUmar’s orders combined with the mosque (Ṭabarī, i. 2481, 12 sqq., 2485; v. 2487 sqq., 2494, 14; Yaḵūt, Muḥjam, iv. 323, 10 sqq.; I.Balādhūrī, p. 275 sqq.; cf. Annali delli 'Islam, iii. 846 sqq.). The plan was therefore an exact reproduction of that of the mosque in Medina (as is expressly emphasised in Ṭabarī, i. 2489, 4 sqq.); the importance of the mosque was also expressed in its position and the commander lived close beside it. There was no difference in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, which, although there was already an older town here, was laid out as an entirely new camp. In the year 21, after the conquest of Alexandria, the mosque was laid out in a garden where ʿAmr had planted his standard. It was 50 ḥārā long and 30 broad. Eighty men fixed its ḥabla, which however was turned too far to the east, and was therefore altered later by Kūra b. Shārik. The court was quite simple, surrounded by a wall and had trees growing in it; a simple roof is mentioned; it must have been in line with the above mentioned ṣulūṭ or ṣuffa. ʿAmr b. ʿAbī Ṣaḥī lived just beside the mosque and around it the Aḥl al-Raʿya. Like the house of the Prophet, the general’s house lay on the east side with only a road between them. There were two doors in each wall except the southern one (Yaḵūt, Muḥjam, iii. 898 sqq.; Makrīzī, Khuṭṭaṣ, iv., Cairo 1326, p. 4 sqq.; Ibn Ḍuḵmān, ʿA. al-Maṣāṭir, Cairo 1893, p. 59 sqq.; Suyḥī, Ḥusn al-Muḥṣafara, i. 63 sqq.; ii. 135 sqq.; cf. Annali delli 'Islam, iv. 554, 557, 653 sqq.). We find similar arrangements made in al-Mawṣil twenty years earlier (Balādhūrī, p. 331 sqq.).

In other cases the Muslims established themselves in old towns either conquered or surrendered by treaty; by treaty they received a site for their mosque (e. g. Balādhūrī, p. 116, 14, 147, 9). But the distinction between towns which were conquered and those which were surrendered soon disappeared and the position is as a rule not clear. Examples of old towns in which the Muslims established themselves are al-Madāʾin, Damascus and Jerusalem. — In al-Madāʾin Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳās after the conquest in 16 distributed the houses among the Muslims and Kīsār’s Fāṭimah was made into a mosque, after Saʿd had conducted the Sāḥīb al-Fāṭih in it (Ṭabarī, i. 2443; 15 sqq., 2451, 7 sqq.). In Damascus which was occupied in 14 or 15 by capitulation, according to tradition, the Church of St. John was divided so that the eastern half became Muslim from which Muslim tradition created the legend that the city was taken partly by conquest and partly by agreement (Balādhūrī, p. 125; Yaḵūt, Muḥjam, ii. 591; Ibn Ḍuḥairī, Khuṭṭa, p. 262; J. A., ser. 9, v. 376, 381, 404). As a matter of fact however, the Muslims seem to have laid out their own mosque here just beside the church

[cf. DAMASCUS]; and close beside it again was the Khaṭṭār, the commander-in-chief’s palace, from which a direct entrance to the maṣjid was later made (B.G.A., ii. 159, 9). Conditions here were therefore once more the same as in Medina. But the possibility of an arrangement such as is recorded by tradition cannot be rejected, for there is good evidence of it elsewhere; in Hīmṣ for example, the Muslims and Christians shared a building in common as a mosque and church, and it is evident from al-ʾIṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawkal that this was still the case in the time of their common authority, al-Balūkā (339 = 921) (B.G.A., i. 61, 7 sqq.; ii. 117, 5; iii. 156, 13), and a similar arrangement is recorded for Dābil in Armenia (B.G.A., i. 158, 3 sqq.; ii. 244, 21; cf. iii. 577, 3 sqq.). There were special conditions in Jerusalem. The Muslims recognised the sanctuary there, as is evident from the earlier Kibla and from Sūra xxvii. 1 (in the traditional interpretation). It must therefore have been natural for the conquerors, when the town capitulated, to seek out the recognised holy place. Indeed we are told that ʿUmar in the year 17 built a mosque in Jerusalem on the site of the temple of Solomon (F. Baethgen, Fragmenta syr. n. arab. Hist., p. 17, 110, following Ḫūd al-dnā, metropolitan of Basra after 700 A.D.; cf. for the viith century Theophanes quoted by Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 1890, p. 91 note). That the Kubbāt al-Šakhr (q. v.) which the Mosque of ʿUmar replaced, stands on the old site of the Temple is undoubted. How he found the site is variously recorded (cf. al-Kūns). The building was, like other mosques of the time of ʿUmar, very simple. Arculf who visited Jerusalem about 670 says “The Saracens attend a quadrangular house of prayer (domus orationis, i.e. masjid) which they have built with little art with boards and large beams on the remains of some ruins, on the famous site where the Temple was once built in all its splendour” (Itinerae Hierosolymitana, ed. P. Geyer, 1898, p. 226 sqq.; transl. by P. Mickley, in Das Land der Bibel, ii/2, 1917, p. 19 sqq.). It is of interest to note that this simple mosque, like the others, was in the form of a rectangle; in spite of its simple character it could hold 3,000 people, according to Arculf.

As late as the reign of Muʿawiyah we find a new town, Kārāwān, being laid out on the old plan as a military camp with a mosque and Dār al-Imāra in the centre (Yaḵūt, Muḥjam, iv. 213, 10 sqq.). As Balādhūrī, for example, shows, the Muslim conquerors even at a later date always built a mosque in the centre of a newly conquered town, at first a simple one in each town, and it was a direct reproduction of the simple mosque of the Prophet in Medina. It was the exception to adapt already existing buildings in towns. But soon many additional mosques were added.

2. Tribal mosques and Sectarian mosques.

There were mosques not only in the towns. When the tribes pledged themselves to the Prophet to adopt Islam, they had also to perform the ṣalāt. It is not clear how far they took part in Muslim worship, but if they concerned themselves with Islam at all, they must have had a Muslim place of meeting. Probably even before Islam they had, like the Meccans, their muḍjīf or nāḍī or dīr skāṭ, where they discussed matters of general importance (cf. Lammens, Muṭawwī, p. 205; Ẓiʿād.
As the mosque was only distinguished from such places by the fact that it was also used for the common salāt, it was natural for tribal mosques to come into existence. Thus we are told that as early as the year 5 the tribe of 'Amir b. 'Abd al-Kasid had built a mosque and introduced the asghām (Wākidh-Wellhausen, p. 351). How far one can rely on such stories in a particular case is however uncertain. A late writer like al-Diyārābāki says of the Banū 'Amšūṭ that they aslamū wa-banū masджīd (Tuṣkī Khimiz, i. 132, 201; cf. Annales dell' islam, ii. 221): in the early sources this is not found. Nor is the story, told by Ibn Sa'd at all probable, that envoys from the Banū Ḥasanah received orders to destroy their churches, sprinkle the ground with water and build a mosque (Ibn Sa'd, i. 56, 11 sgg., while Ibn Ḥishām, p. 945 sq.; Tahtābi, i. 1737 sqg., and Baladhuri, p. 36, sqg. say nothing about it). But that there were tribal mosques at a very early date is nevertheless quite certain. The mosque at Kubā' was the mosque of the tribe of 'Amr b. Ṭawfīq (Ibn Sa'd, i. 6, 6, and cf. above) and according to one tradition, the Banū Ḥanna b. Ṭawfīq were jealous of it and built an opposition mosque (Baladhuri, p. 3; Tahtābi, Tāṣīrī, i. 21 infra). A Companion, who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Īsā b. Mālik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masджīd of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (Bukhārī, Sūrat, bāb 46; Muslim, Masджīd, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masджīd of the Banū Zuraq (Bukhārī, Dālī, bāb 56—58) and in the masджīd of the Banū Salama during the prayer, there was revealed to him Sūrat i. 139, which ordered the new jihād, wherefore it was called Masджīd al-Khambatī (Wustenfeld, Mecen., p. 62).

The tribal mosque was a sign that the independence of the tribe was still retained under Islam. Indeed we hear everywhere of tribal mosques, for example around Medina that of the Banū Kurayra, of the Banū Ḫanūfa, of the Banū Zafar, of the Banū Wa'il, of the Banū Harām, of the Banū Zuraq, said to have been the first in which the Kurān was publicly read, that of the Banū Salama etc. (see Wustenfeld, Geogr. d. Stadt Medina, p. 29, 37 sqq., 44, 50, 57, 139 sqg.; the "mosque of the two Khubas" belonged to the Banū Sawad b. Ḥamm b. Ka'b b. Ḥamm (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 41). This then was the position in Medina the tribes had usually their own mosques and one mosque was the chief mosque. This was probably the position within the Prophet's lifetime; for in the earliest campaigns of conquest, mosques were built on this principle. 'Umar is said to have written to Abū Mūsā in Bāṣara telling him to build a mosque it is ījīf'amā and mosques for the tribe, and on Fridays the people were to come to the chief mosque. Similarly he wrote to Salīh b. Abī Waḳḫaṣ in Kūfa and to 'Amr b. al- Ḥaḍīd in Mīr. (On the other hand in Syria where they had settled in new towns, they were not to build tribal mosques (Mākurī, Khidrī, iv. Cairo 1326, p. 4 infra). It is actually recorded that the tribes in each ījīf'amā had their own mosques around the mosque of 'Amr in al-Fuqī (cf. Ibn Duḥaym, p. 62 infra sqg.) and even much later a tribal mosque like that of the Rāṣīda was still in existence (Mākurī, Khidrī, iv. 64, 4 sqg.). Even in the chief mosque, the tribes had their own places (ibid., p. 9, 12 sqg.). We have similar evidence from the Banū 'Adī in Bāṣara for example there was a Masджīd Banū 'Adī (Baladhuri, p. 356, sq.; one of the Banū Kūfah (R. G. A., vii. 201, 16), one of the Banū 'Adī (ibid., v. 101, 4) and one of the Anṣār (cf. Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, i. 77, note 5); in Kūfa we find quite a number such as that of the Anṣār (Tahtābi, i. 284, 13 sqg.), of the Banū Dhu al-Kāsir (ibid., i. 657, sqg.), of the Banū Duḥām (ibid., p. 670, 4), of the Banū Makhūm (ibid., p. 734, 15), of the Banū Ḥillal (ibid., p. 1687, 9), of the Banū 'Adī (ibid., p. 1705, 4), of the Banū Dhu al- Ḥijār (ibid., p. 532, 8 sqg.), of the Dhuḥayla (ibid., p. 533, 6), of the Banū Ḥāram (ibid., ii. 2509, 10) and the 'Abīs had even several masджīd (Baladhuri, p. 278, 12 sqg., s. also p. 265 and Goldziher, loc. cit.).

During the wars these tribal mosques were the natural rallying points for the various tribes; the mosque was a madīlah, where councils were held (Tahtābi, i. 532, 6 sqg.) and the people were taught from its minbar (ibid., p. 284); battles often centred for this reason round these mosques (e.g. Tahtābi, i. 130, 148, 6, 960). "The people of your mosque", al-masджīd al-fikhrī (ibid., p. 532, 10) became identical with "your party". Gradually, as new sects arose, they naturally had mosques of their own, just as Muslīmīs before them is said to have had his own mosque (Baladhuri, p. 90, 4 from below; Ibn Ḥanbal, Maqārīd, i. 404 infra). Thus we read later of the mosques of the Hanāfīs, the Shafi'īs, the Māturīdīs, in which there was continual riot and confusion (Hīfī al-Ṣūbī, Kitāb al-Wasāfī, ed. Amenedo, p. 335). It sometimes happened that different parties in a town shared the chief mosque (B. G. A., ii. 102, 5 sqg.) but as a rule it was otherwise. In particular the Sunnīs and Shi'īs as a rule had separate mosques (cf. M. Z., Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 63). It sometimes even happened that Hanāfīs and Shi'īs had separate mosques (Yākūt, Muḥallām, v. 509, 5; cf. B. G. A., iii. 323, 11). These special mosques were a great source of disruption in Islām and we can understand that a time came when the learned discouraged whether such mosques should be permitted at all. But the question whether one might talk of the Masджīd Banū Fuṣāl was answered by saying that in the time of the Prophet, the Masджīd Banū Zuraq was recognised (Bukhārī, Sūrat, bāb 41; ibid., bāb 56—58 and Tahtābi, Tāṣīrī, xi. 20 after the middle of the page).

3. Adaptation to Islām of Older Sanctuaries; Memorial Mosques.

According to the early historians, the towns, which made treaties with the Muslims, received permission to retain their churches (Baladhuri, p. 121, in the middle; Tahtābi, i. 2405, 2407) while in the conquered towns the churches fell to the Muslims without any preamble (cf. Baladhuri, p. 120 infra). Sometimes also it is recorded that a certain number of churches were received from the Christians, e.g. fifteen in Damascus according to one tradition (ibid., p. 124, 8; otherwise p. 121; cf. F. A., 9 Ser., viii. 403). It is rather doubtful whether the process was such a regular one; in any case the Muslims in course of time appropriated
many churches to themselves. With the mass-
conversions to Islam, this was a natural result.
The churches taken over by the Muslims were
occasionally used as dwellings (cf. Tabari, i. 2405,
2407); at a later date it also happened that they
were used as government offices, as in Egypt in
146 (Maqrizi, iv. 35; cf. for Káf, Baladhuri.
p. 286). The obvious thing, however, was to
transform the churches taken over into mosques.
It is related of 'Amr b. al-'Asi that he performed
the Salāt in a church (Maqrizi, iv. 6) and Zaid b.
'Ali says regarding churches and synagogues, "Perform
thy Salāt in them; it will not harm thee" (Corpus
not clear whether the reference to conquered
synagogues is evident, in any case, that the saying is intended to remove any
misgivings about the use of captured churches
and synagogues as mosques. The most important
example of this kind was in Damascus where al-Walid
b. 'Abd al-Malik in 86 (705) took the church of
St. John from the Christians and had it rebuilt;
he is said to have offered the Christians another
church in its stead (see the references above, B.1,
and also J. A., 9 Ser., vii. 369 sqq.; Quatremère,
Hist. Sali. Maml., i./i. 262 sqq. and the article
Damascus). He is said to have transformed into
mosques ten churches in all, which must have been particularly in the villages, with
the gradual conversion of the people to Islam, that
the churches were turned into mosques. In the
Egyptian village there were no mosques in the
earlier generations of Islam (Maqrizi, iv. 28 sq,
30). But when al-Ma'mūn was fighting the Copts,
many churches were turned into mosques (ibid.,
p. 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo
that they were converted churches. According to
one tradition, the Rāshīda mosque was an unfinished
Jacobite church, which was surrounded by Jewish
and Christian graves (Maqrizi, iv. 63, 64) and in
the immediate vicinity al-Hākim turned a Jacobite
and a Nestorian Church into mosques (ibid., p. 65).
Was there a palace church in the Salāt of the Muslins
that was taken in and transformed into a mosque
(ibid., p. 269); similar changes took place at later
dates (ibid., p. 240) and synagogues also were
transformed in this way (Masdjīd Ibn al-Illāna,
ibid., p. 265). The chief mosque in Palermo was
previously a church (Yākūt, Muq. Alm., i. 719).
After the Crusades several churches were turned
into mosques in Palestine (Sauvain, Hist. de
Jérusalem et d'Hébron, 1876, p. 77; Quatremère,

Other sanctuaries than those of the "people of
the scripture" were turned into mosques. For example
a Masjīd al-Shams between Hilla and Kerkela
was the success of an old temple (Goldziher,
Mish. Stud., ii. 331 sq.) Not far from Iṣṭakhūr was
a Masjīd Sulaimān which was an old "fire-temple," the pictures on the walls of which could still be seen in the time of Masjīd and al-Makdisī (ivth century) (Maqrizi, Mor. jv.,
77; B. G. A., iii. 444). In Iṣṭakhūr itself there was
a dījāmi, which was a converted fire-temple (ibid.,
p. 436). In Maṣštā, the ancient Mopsuestia, al-Mansūr
in 140 built a mosque on the site of an ancient
temple (Baladhuri, p. 165 sq.) and the chief mosque
in Dīhil was originally a temple (Ibn Batūta, iii.
151); as to Tā'i if Abū Dāwūd, Salāt, bab 10.
Thus in Islam also the old rule holds that sacred
places survive changes of religion. It was especially
easy in cases where Christian sanctuaries were
associated with Biblical personalities who were also
recognised by Islam: e.g., the Church of St. John
in Damascus and many holy places in Palestine.
One example is the mosque of Job in Shekh Sa'id,
associated with Sīra xxi. 83, xxxviii. 40, here
in Silvia's time (fourth century) there was a church
of Job (Masjīd, i. 91; Baecker, Palast. u. Syrien,
1910, p. 147).

But Islam itself had created historical associations
which were bound soon to lead to the building
of new mosques. Even in the lifetime of the
Prophet, the Banū Sālim are said to have asked
him to perform the Salāt in their masjīd to give
his authority (see cases above, p. 3). At the request
of 'Ibn b. Malik the Prophet performed the
Salāt along with Abū Bakr in his house and thereby
acquired it as a masjīd, because he could
not get to the tribal mosque in the rainy season
(Bukhārī, Salāt, bab 47; Tāhāshīyūd, bab 36;
Mishn, Masjīd, tr. 46; a similar story in
Bukhārī, Anfām, bab 47, Tāhāshīyūd, bab 33
is perhaps identical in origin). After the death of
the Prophet, his memory became so precious that
the places where he had prayed obtained a special
importance and his followers, who liked to imitate
him in everything, preferred to perform their Salāt
in such places. But this tendency was only an
intensification of what had existed in his lifetime:
and so it is not easy to decide how far the above
stories reflect later conditions. Mosques very quickly
arose on the road between Mecca and Medina at
places where, according to the testimony of his
Companions, the Prophet had prayed (Bukhārī,
Salāt, bab 89; Wāqıdī-Wellhausen, p. 421 sqq.);
the same was the case with the road which the
Prophet had taken to Tabūk in the year 9 (Ibn
Hishām, p. 907; Wāqıdī-Wellhausen, p. 394;
there were 19 in all, which are listed in Annali
dell' Islam, ii. 246 sq.). Indeed wherever he had
taken the field, mosques were built; for example
on the road to Badr, where according to tradition
Abū Bakr had built a mosque at Tabari (Wakidi,
1910, p. 39, also Wustenfeld, Med. p. 135). The
mosque of al-Fādīkh was built on the spot where
the Prophet had prayed in a leather tent during
the war with the Banū Naṣr in the year 4
(Wāqıdī-Wellhausen, p. 165; Wustenfeld,
Med., p. 132). He is said to have himself built a little
mosque in Khilah during the campaign of the
year 7 (Diyarbakri, Tariḥ al-Khamis, n. 49 sq.:
Annali dell' Islam, ii. 19). Outside Taʾif a
mosque was built on a hillock, because the Prophet
had performed the Salāt there during the rainy
season in the year 8, between the tents of his two
wives, Umm Salama and Zainab (Ibn Hishām, p. 872;
Wāqıdī-Wellhausen, p. 396); in Liyya the
Prophet is said to have himself built a mosque
while on the campaign against Taʾif (Ibn Hishām,
p. 872; Wāqıdī-Wellhausen, p. 368 sq.). Mosques
arose in and around Medina, "because Muhammad
prayed here" (Wustenfeld, Gesch. d. Staat Meden,
p. 31, 38, 132 sqq.). It is obvious that in most
of these cases later conditions are put back to
the time of the Prophet; in connection with the
"war of the 1stitch" we are told that: "he prayed
everywhere where mosques now stand" (Wāqıdī-
Wellhausen, p. 208). Since, for example, the
Masjīd al-Fādīkh is also called Masjīd al-Shams
(Wustenfeld, Med., p. 132) we have perhaps
here actually an ancient sanctuary.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
Mosques became associated with the Prophet in many ways. In Medina, for example, there was the Masjid al-Baghdādī where footprints of the Prophet's mule were shown in a stone, the Masjid al-ʿAbīya where the Prophet's appeal was answered, the Masjid al-Tabīth which recalls the victory over the Quraysh etc. (see Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 126 sqq.). In Mecca there was naturally a large number of places sacred through associations with the Prophet and therefore used as places of prayer. The most honored site, next to the chief mosque, is said to have been the house of Khaḍidja, also called Mawlid al-Sayyida Fāṭima, because the daughter of the Prophet was born there. This house, in which the Prophet lived till the Hijrah, was taken over by ʿAbī ʿAli, his brother, and bought by him through Muwāvia and turned into a mosque (Ch. von Meck., ii. 112. 440). She also purchased the Prophet's birthplace, Məsājid al-Nabi, and made it into a mosque (ibid., i. 422; in. 439). If Muwāvia really bought the Prophet's house from his cousin, it was probably the right one, but the demand for places associated with the Prophet became stronger and stronger and we therefore find more and more places referred not only to the Prophet, but also to his Companions, such as the birthplaces of Ṭāhā al-ʿUmar and ʿAbī ʿAli (Ch. von Meck., in. 445), the house of Māriya, the mother of the Prophet's son, Ṣaʿd ibn Māriya (ibid., i. 447. 450) who also had a mosque at Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 133). There were also a Masjid Khaḍidja (ibid., i. 324) and a Masjid ʿAbīya (ibid., in. 455). A Masjid of the “granted appeal” in a narrow valley near Mecca, where the Prophet performed the ṣalāt (ibid., in. 455), a Masjid al-ʿAbīya, the Prophet's house, which the Quraish overheard his preaching (ibid., i. 424; in. 453), a Masjid al-Raṣāḍ, where he planted his standard at the conquest (ibid., ii. 68 infra and 71 supra; in. 3. 453); a Masjid al-Raṣāḍ where the first homage of the Medinees was received (ibid., i. 428; in. 441). In the Masjid al-Khaṭif in Minaš is shown the mark of the Prophet's head in a stone into which visitors also put their heads (ibid. i. 438). Persons in the Bible are also connected with mosques, Adam, Abraham and Iša with the Ka‘bah, beside which the Muṣāna ir-Raḥmah is shown and in ʿArafah there is still a Masjid ir-Raḥmah (ibid., i. 415. 428), and another in al-Zahiri near Mecca (Ibn Ḏubair, Ḏibār, 1907, p. 112). To these memorial mosques others were later added, e.g. the Masjid Alū Bākīr, Masjid Bīlāh, the Mosque of the Splitting of the Moon (by the Prophet) etc. (Ibn Ḏubair, Ḏibār, p. 114 sqq.; B.G.A., in. 102 sqq. Snouck Hurgronje, Meck., ii. 27; al-Batānunī, al-Raṣāḍ al-Ḥajjatīya, Cairo 1329, p. 52 sqq.).

In al-Ḥijaz the Muslims thus acquired a series of mosques which became important from their association with the Prophet, his family and his Companions, and made Muslim history live. On the other hand, inlands formerly Christian, they took over sanctuaries which were associated with the Biblical history which they had assimilated (see Le Strange, Palestine, passim). Other mosques soon became associated with Biblical and Muslim story. The mosque founded by ʿUmar on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem was, as already pointed out, identified as al-Masjid al-ʿAlī mentioned in Sūra xvii. 1 and therefore connected with the Prophet's night journey to Paradise. The rock is said to have greeted the Prophet on this occasion and marks in a stone covering a hole are explained as Muḥammad's footprints (sometimes also as those of Idrīs; cf. Le Strange, Palestine, p. 136; al-Batānunī, Ḳīthā, p. 165; Badcker, Palestine, 1910, p. 52 sqq.; cf. Yaʿqūbī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 311). The name al-Masjid al-ʿAlī was used throughout the early period for the whole Ḥaram area in Jerusalem, later partly for it, and partly for the building in its southern part (B.G.A., v. 160; Sauvare, Hist. Jérus., Libron, p. 95, 121; cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 96 sqq.). Then there were mosques which had specifically Muslim associations, like the Masjid of ʿUmar on the Mount of Olives where he encamped at the conquest (B. G. A., ii. 172).

In Egypt not only was an old Christian sanctuary called Maḥbūd Mīṣa (Maḳrizī, iv. 269), but we are also told, for example, that the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn was built where Mīṣa talked with his Lord (Maḳrizī, iv. 36); according to al-Ḳudāt there were in Egypt four Masjadi of Mīṣa (Ibn Ḏuqmāk, ed. Vollers, p. 92); there was a Masjid Yaʿqūb wa-Yūnuf (B.G.A., ii. 200) and a Joseph's prison, certainly dating from the Christian period (Maḳrizī, iv. 315). There was also a Mosque of Abraham in Maryam al-Maḳṣūr (Ibn Ḏubair, p. 58). The chief mosque of San’a was built by Shem, son of Noah (B. G. A., vii. 110). The old temple near ʿIshāq mentioned above was connected with Sulaimān (Maḳūfī, al-Muṣāfī, iv. 77; Yaḳūt, i. 299). In the mosque of Kīfa not only ʿIrāhm but one thousand other prophets and one thousand saints, described as waṣī are said to have offered their prayers; here was the tree Yaḳūn (Sūra xxxvii. 146); here died Yaḥyā and Yaʿqūb, etc. (Yaḳūt, iii. 325; also Ibn Ḏubair, p. 211 sqq.) and in this mosque there was a chapel of Abraham, Noah and Idrīs (Ibn Ḏubair, p. 212) and a large number of mosques were associated with Companions of the Prophet. What emphasis was laid on such an association is seen, for example, from the story according to which ʿUmar declined to perform the ṣalāt in the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem, lest the church should afterwards be claimed as a mosque.

4. Tomb Mosques.

A special class of memorial mosques consisted of those which were associated with a tomb. The graves of ancestors and of saints had been sanctuaries from ancient times and they were gradually adopted into Islam. In addition there were the saints of Islam itself. The general tendency to distinguish places associated with the founders of Islam naturally concentrated itself round the graves in which they rested. In the Kur’ān, a tomb-masjid is mentioned in connection with the Seven Sleepers (Sūra xviii. 20) but it is not clear if it was recognised. As early as the year 6, the companions of Abū Iṣaṣ are said to have built a mosque at the place where he died and was buried (Wādīs-Wellhausen, p. 262). The Prophet is also said to have visited regularly at al-ʿAbīya in Medina the tombs of the martyrs who fell at Ṣuḥy and paid reverence to them (ibid., p. 143).
Whatever the exact amount of truth in the story, there is no doubt that the story of the tomb-mosque of Abū Basīr is ante-dated. The accounts of the death of the Prophet and of the period immediately following reveal no special interest in his tomb. But very soon the general trend of development stimulated an interest in graves which led to the erection of sanctuaries at them. The progress of this tendency is more marked in al-Wākidī, who died in 207 (823), than in Ibn Isḥāq who died in 151 (768).

The collections of Ḥadīth made in the third century contain discussions on this fact which show that the problem was whether the tombs could be used as places of worship and in this connection whether mosques could be built over the tombs. The Ḥadīth answer both questions in the negative, which certainly was in the spirit of the Prophet. It is said that “Salāt at the graves (ṣa’lah al-magāhir) is makrūḥ” (Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 52); “sit not upon graves and perform not salāt towards them” (Muslim, Qunāt, tr. 33); “hold the salāt in your houses, but do not use them as tombs” (Muslim, Salāt, al-Masājid, tr. 28). On the other hand it is acknowledged that Anas performed the salāt at the cemetery (Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48). We are also told that tombs cannot be used as masājid (Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48; Qunāt, bāb 62). On his deathbed the Prophet is said to have cursed the Jews and the Christians because they used the tombs of their prophets as masājid. Ḥadīth explains this by saying that the tomb of the Prophet was not at first accessible (Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48, 55; Qunāt, bāb 62; Abūd, bāb 50; Muslim, Masājid, tr. 3); as a matter of fact its precise location was not exactly known (Qunāt, bāb 96).

The attacks in Ḥadīth insist that tomb-mosques are a reprehensible Jewish practice: “When a pious man dies, they build a masjid on his tomb” etc. (Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 48, 54; Muslim, Qunāt, tr. 71). Although this view of tomb-mosques is still held in certain limited circles (cf. Ibn Taimiyyah, the Wahhābīs), the old pre-Islamic custom soon became a Muslim one. The expositors of Ḥadīth like al-Nawawī (on Muslim, Masājid, tr. 3, lih. Dīlī 1319, i. 201) and al-‘Askarī (Cairo 1239, i. 354) explain the above passages to mean that only an exaggerated ta’zīn of the dead is forbidden so that tombs should not be used as a kibla; otherwise it is quite commendable to spend time in a mosque in proximity to a devout man.

The name given to a tomb-mosque is often khunā, a word which is used of a tent (Bukhārī, Dīrāsāt, bāb 62; Ḥadīth, bāb 150); khunā, bāb 19; al-Lajina, bāb 15; Tarafa, Dīrāsāt, vii. 1), but later came to mean the dome which usually covers tombs and thus became the general name for the sanctuary of a saint (cf. Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 114, 115; cf. Dozy, Supplement, s. v.). Maṣjīd also means a little chapel and a saint’s tomb (v. Berchem, Corpus Inscrip. Arab., i., N. 32, 63, 417, 544; Maṣḥūrī, iv., p. 265, 309 sqq.) but also to tombs of other recognised saints, e.g. Mashhad Djurjis in Mawṣīl (Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 236) etc.

The transformation of the tombs of the Prophet and his near relatives into sanctuaries seems to have been a gradual process. Muḥammad, Abū Bakr and Umar are said to have been buried in the house of Ā{lī}ṣha; Fāṭima and Ā{lī} lived beside it. Ā{lī}ṣha had a wall built between her room and the tombs to prevent visitors carrying off earth from the tomb of the Prophet. The houses of the Prophet’s wives remained as they were until al-Walīd rebuilt them. He thought it scandalous that Ḥasan b. Ḥasan b. Ā{lī} should live in Fāṭima’s house and Umar’s family close beside Ā{lī}ṣha’s home in the house of Ḥaṣa. He acquired the houses, had all the houses of the Prophet’s wives torn down and erected new buildings. The tombs were enclosed by a pentagonal wall; the whole area was called al-Rawja “the garden”; it was not till later that a dome was built over it (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 66 sqq., 72 sqq., 78 sqq., 89). In the cemetery of Medina, al-‘Askāf, a whole series of Masājīd came to be built where tombs of the family and of the Companions of the Prophet were located (ibid., p. 140 sqq.; Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 195 sqq.). It is often disputed whether a tomb belonged to one or the other (e.g. Ṭabarī, iii. 2436, 3 sqq.) Such tomb-mosques were sacred (masājīd; Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 114, 13, 15); they were visited li’-baraka. The name al-Rawja of the Prophet’s tomb became later applied to other sanctuaries (Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 46, 56; 52, 11). Separate limbs were revered in some mosques, like the head of al-Ḥusain in Cairo, which was brought there in 491 from Ā{lī}ṣha (‘Alī Fāṭih bi-Mabruṣ, al-Khitat al-Dawād, iv. 91 sqq.; cf. Sauval, Hist. Jérus. Hôbr., p. 16); his head was also revered for some time in the Masjid al-Rūq al-Dawād (according to Ibn Shahīr, J. A., 9th ed., vi. 285).

Gradually a vast number of Muslim tombs of saints came into existence; and to these were added all the pre-Islamic sanctuaries which were adopted by Islam. No distinction can therefore be drawn between tomb-mosques and other memorial mosques. It was often impossible to prove that the tomb in question ever really existed. In the Masjīd al-Ā{lī} for example, the Ā{lī}’s tomb is honoured but Ibn Djbair leaves it in doubt whether he is really buried there (Rīḥā, p. 212) and many located his grave in the mosque at Kafrā and elsewhere (Masājīd, Murādb, iv. 289; v. 68; B. G. A., al-Masājid, p. 341). ‘Ākīkī there was also a Mashhad al-Ā{lī} (Yākūt, iii. 759) and also in the Mosque of the Umaysids (Ibn Djbair, p. 267); on this question cf. B. G. A., iii. 46. Names frequently become confused and transferred. In Mecca between Sāfi and Marwa there was a Kubba, which was associated with Umar b. al-Khaṭab but Ibn Djbair says that it should be connected with Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (Rīḥā, p. 115, 114 sqq.). In Ḍījżā there was a Mashḥad al-‘Ar∪ra, where the memory of this Companion of the Prophet was honoured; it is said to have been originally the grave of another Al-‘Ar∪ra (Muṣannaf, i. 355, 4). Wherever this rule is not, there arose numerous tomb-mosques of the Alī b. Ḥaṣa. In Egypt Ibn Djbair gives a list of 14 men and five women of the Prophet’s
family, who were honoured there (Qibla, p. 46 sq.). Islam was always creating new tombs of saints who had been distinguished for learning or asceticism or miracle-working, e.g. the tomb of Al-Shafi‘i in Cairo and Aḥmad al-Bada‘wī in Tanūţ. There were mosques, chiefly old established sanctuaries, of Biblical and semi-Biblical personages like Rūbūl (Reuben) and Aṣiya the wife of Pharaoh (Ibíd., p. 46). In and around Damascus were a number of mosques, which were built on the tombs of prophets and unmentioned saints (Ibn Dhuḥair, Qibla, p. 273 sqq.). In Palestine could be seen a vast number of tombs of Biblical personages (cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, Index and Guide in Palestine Explor. Fund, quarterly statement, 1871, p. 89 sqq.), usually mosques, with a kubbah.

After the sanctuaries of persons mentioned in the Bible came those of people mentioned in the Qur‘an. For example, outside the Džam‘ in ‘Akka was shown the tomb-mosque of the prophet Šāliḥ (Najrī Khuwarā, Sefīr-Namak, ed. Schefer, p. 15, s. v. 49), and in Syria that of his son (Ibn Dhuḥair, p. 49); that of Hūd also was also shown near ‘Akka (Sefīr-Namak, p. 16, s. v. 52), farther east that of Shu‘ab and of his daughter (Ibíd., p. 16, o. v. 53; the tomb of Hūd also was pointed out in Damascus and in Hasrā màta (Yākūt, ii, 596, 16); then we have particularly Mu‘āmmal saints like Du‘‘ Ḥikīth, the son of Job (Ibíd., p. 16, s. v. 52). Then there are the sanctuaries of saints who are only superstitiously Mu‘āmmal but really have their origins in old popular superstitions, like al-Kha‘lij who had a mosque in Damascus (Yākūt, ii, 596 sqq.), or a saint like ‘A‘kā, founder of the town of ‘Akka, who on a tour Najrī Khuwarā visited outside the town (Sefīr-Namak, p. 15, s. v. 53). Such tombs were much visited by pious travellers, and are therefore frequently mentioned in literature on Ma‘āshid of the kinds mentioned here in the Irāq, see B.G.A., ii. 130: for Mawjūd etc., ibid., p. 146). In this way ancient sanctuaries were turned into mosques and it is often quite a matter of chance under what names they are adopted by Islam (cf. Goldziher, Musl. Sūṣa, in. 325 sqq.).

Herefore sometimes happens that the same saint is honoured in several mosques. Abū Hurayra, who is buried on Medina, is honoured not only in the above-mentioned tomb-mosque in Džuraj but also at various places in Palestine, in al-Ramī‘a and in Yūbān south of Tabāniya, Khalīl ad-Dāhirī, Zoubliat Kakhfī al-Manhī‘īk, ed. V. Ravasi, p. 42, from below; Sefīr-Namak of Najrī Khuwarā, ed. by Ch. Schefer, p. 17, 3 from below: 59, Yākūt, ii, 512, 20; iv, 1007; cf. Simkhe Soudineau, Itin. Sufīkhī, ii (1928), 31). The tomb of the Prophet Joseph is revered not only in the ancient Ninveh but also in Palestine.

Just as the kubbah under which the saint lay and the mosque adjoining it were sanctified by him, so vice-versa a kubbah and a mosque could cause a deceased person to become considered a saint. It was therefore the custom for the mighty not only to give this distinction to their fathers but also to prepare such buildings for themselves even in their own lifetime. This was particularly the custom of the Mamlūk sultāns, perhaps stimulated by the fact that they did not found dynasties in which power passed from father to son. Such buildings are called kubbah (van Berchem, C. I. A., i, Ê. 82 sqq., 95, 96, 126, 138 etc.), exceptionally sāwīya (ibid., Ê. 98), frequently turba (ibid., Ê. 98, 68, 106, 107, 116 etc.); the formula is also found: “this kubbah is a turba” (Ê. 67); the latter word acquired the same meaning as masdjid, partly saint’s grave and partly sacred site (cf. Ibn Dhu‘hair, Qibla, p. 114, 196); but this word does not seem to be used of ordinary tomb-mosques, although the distinction between these and mosques in honour of saints often disappeared. In these kubbahs the regular recitation of the Kur‘ān was often arranged and the tomb was provided with a kīwā. The mausoleum might be built in connection with a great mosque and be separated from it by a grille (Yākūt, iv, 509, 6 sqq.).

5. Mosques deliberately founded.

In the early period the building of mosques was a social obligation of the ruler as representative of the community and the tribes. Very soon a number of mosques came into existence, provided by individuals. In addition to tribal mosques, as already mentioned, there were also sectarian mosques and prominent leaders built mosques which were the centres of their activity, for example the Masjīd ‘Aḍī b. Ḥa‘īm (Tabāri, ii, 130), the Masjīd Simāk in Kūfa (ibid., i, 265); the Masjīd al-Asbā‘ī ṣ. As other sanctuaries entered Islam, the mosque received more of the character of a sanctuary and the building of a mosque became a pious work; there arose a hadith, according to which the Prophet said: “for him who builds a mosque, God will build a home in Paradise!” some add “if he desires to see the face of God” (Corpus juris puri zaid b. ‘Alī, ed. Grimini, N°. 276; Ḍabārī, Sā‘ī, bāb 65; Muslim, Masdjid, tr. 4: Zād, tr. 3; Ma‘ṣūřī, iv, 36). Like other sanctuaries, mosques were sometimes built as a result of a revelation in a dream. A story of this kind of the year 557 is given by al-Sahnabā‘ī for Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 91 sqq.); and a similar case of a mosque in Damascus (J. A., Ser. 9, vii 354); a mosque was also built out of gratitude for seeing the Prophet (al-Madraṣa al-Sharī‘īya, Ma‘ṣūrī, iv, 209). It was of course particularly an obligation on the mighty to build mosques. Even in the earliest period, the governors took care that new mosques were built to keep pace with the spread of Islam (cf. Balāghūrī, p. 178 sqq.). About the year 1000 the governor of Media, Bād b. Ḥasanawwā‘ī, is said to have built 3,000 mosques and hostels (Mer, Die Renaissance des Islam, 1922, p. 24). The collections of inscriptions, as well as the geographical and topographical works, reveal how the number of mosques increased in this way.

In Egypt, al-Ḥākim in the year 403 had a census taken of the mosques of Cairo and there were eight hundred (Ma‘ṣūrī, iv, 264); al-Ku‘dā‘ī (d. 544 = 1006) also counted the mosques and his figure is put at 30,000 or 36,000 (Yākūt, iii, 901; Ibn Dhu‘hair, ed. Voller, p. 92; Ma‘ṣūrī, iv, 264) which seems quite a fantastic figure (there is probably a very lacking before i.e. 1036). Ibn al-Mutawwā‘ī (d. 750) according to al-Ma‘ṣūrī counted 480, and Ibn Dīmās (about 1050) gives in addition to the incomplete list of djāmī‘ a list of 472 mosques, not including madīras, khānahās etc.; the figure given by Ma‘ṣūrī is smaller. The fantastic figure of 30,000 for Baghdad is found as early as Yākūt (B.G.A., vii, 250). It is also an exaggeration when Ibn Dhu‘hair was told in
Alexandria that there were 12,000 or 8,000 mosques there (p. 43). In Baṣra where Ziyād built 7 mosques (B.G.A., v. 191), the number also increased rapidly, but here again an exaggerated figure (7,000) is given (B. G. A., vii. 361). In Damascus, Ibn Ṭāsikīr (d. 571 =1176) counted 241 within and 148 outside the city (7. A., Ser. 2, vii. 835). In Palermo Ibn Hawkal counted over 300 and in a village above it 200 mosques. In some streets there were as many as 20 mosques within a bowshot of one another; this multiplicity is condemned: everyone wanted to build a mosque for himself (Yāḵūṭ, i. 719; iii. 409, 410). As a matter of fact, one can almost say that things tended this way; Yāḵūṭ mentions in Baghārd a mosque for the Anbarī officials of the tax-office (B. G. A., vii. 245) and several distinguished scholars practically had their own mosques. It occasionally happened that devout private individuals founded mosques. In 672 Taḏj al-Dīn built a mosque and a separate chamber in which he performed the salāt alone and meditated (Maḵrīzī, iv. 90). The mosques thus founded were very often called after their founders, and memorial and tomb-mosques after the person to be commemorated. Sometimes a mosque is called after some devout man who lived in it (Maḵrīzī, iv. 97, 265 sqq.) and a madrasa might be called after its head or a teacher (ibid., iv. 235; Yāḵūṭ, ʿUdāqī, vii. 82). Lastly a mosque might take its name from its situation or from some feature of the building.

6. Al-Muṣāllā.

In addition to the mosques proper, al-Maḵrīzī mentions for Cairo 8 places for prayer (muṣāllā) mainly at the cemetery (iv. 334 sq). The word muṣāllā may mean any place of prayer, therefore also mosque (cf. Sūra, lii. 119; cf. Maḵrīzī, ʿĀdīṣaṭ, iv. 25, 16; do., Iftīṣāq, ed. Bunz, p. 91, 17; Yāḵūṭ, Muṣḥṣām, iv. 326, 2 sq.) or a particular place of prayer within a mosque (Ṭabarī, i. 2408, 16; Bukhārī, Gh布st, bāb 17; Ṣalāt, bāb 91). In Palestine, there were many open places of prayer, provided only with a mihrab and marked off, but quite in the open (cf. for Tiberias, Sīfer-Nāmah, transl. Schefer, p. 36). It is recorded of the Prophet that he used to go out at the two festivals (al-Fitr and al-Aḍḥā) to the place of prayer (al-muṣāllā) of the Banū Salāma. A lance which the Negus had presented to al-Zubair was carried in front of him and planted before the Prophet as swara. Standing in front of it, he conducted the salāt, and then preached a khutba without a minbar to the rows in front of him (Ṭabarī, i. 1281, 14 sqq.; Bukhārī, Ṣalāt, bāb 6; Ṣalāt, bāb 90; Ḥaḏīṯ, bāb 6). He also went out to the muṣāllā for the salāt al-ʿaṣr (1 ималь, ʿIṣṭiṣāq, tr. 1). This Muṣāllā was an open space and Muḥammadan is even said to have forbidden a building on it (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 127 sqq.). This custom of performing the salāt on a muṣāllā outside the town on the two festivals became swara. There is evidence of the custom for several towns. In Medina however, a mosque was later built on the muṣāllā (ibid., p. 128 sqq.) which also happened in other places. An early innovation was the introduction of a minbar by Marwān (ibid., p. 128; Bukhārī, Ḥaḏīṯ, bāb 6). When ʿAbd b. ʿAbd Wāḳṣās built a mosque in Ḳisrāʾ al-Wān in al-Maḏāʾin, in the festival in the year 16 it was expressly stated that it was ʿanūna to go out to it; ʿAṣd, however, thought it was a matter of indifference (Ṭabarī, i. 2451). Shortly after 300 a muṣāllā outside of Hamadān is mentioned (Mašūḵī, Marāḏī, ix. 23). There was al-Muṣāllā al-ʿAṭīq in Baghdad; here a daḵka was erected for the execution of the Kūfa prisoners (Ṭabarī, iii. 2444 sq.; cf. 1659, 18); in Kūfa, several are mentioned (ibid., ii. 628, 16; 1704, 8; iii. 367, 8 sqq.), two in Merw (ibid., i. 1931, 8; 1964, 19; cf. Sīfer-Nāmah, transl. Schefer, p. 274), one in Farghāna (B.G.A., ii. 393, 1). In Tirmidhī, the muṣāllā was within the walls (B. G. A., ii. 349, 8) which also happened elsewhere (ibid., 378, 6 sqq.). In Cairo the two festivals were celebrated on the Muṣāllā al-Ḥamāla (a Yemen tribe) with the ʿAṭāb al-Mosque of ʿAmr as leader: according to al-Kuḍāʾi the festivals were to be celebrated on a muṣāllā opposite the hill Yalānīn, then on al-Muṣāllā al-Kadīm where ʿAḥmad b. Ṭūlūn erected a building in 256. The site was several times changed (Maḵrīzī, iv. 334 sq.; B. G. A., ii. 200, 14 sq). In 302, 306 and 308 the salāt al-ʿaṣr was performed for the first time in the Mosque of ʿAmr (Maḵrīzī, iv. 20, 8 sqq.; Ḥaḏīṯ al-Muḥarrāra, i. 137 infra; Ibn Tabghīrī, ii. 194, 9 sqq.), Ibn Batṭūṭa notes the custom in Spain (a. 20) and Tunisia (i. 22) and also in India (iii. 154). Ibn al-Haḍīdī (d. 737) says that in his time the ceremonies still took place on the muṣāllā but condemns the ḥaḍīṯ associated with them (K. al-Maḏīḵ, ii. Cairo 1320, p. 82 sqq.). It is also laid down in Muslim law, although not always definitely (see Juyrboll, Handbuch d. islam. Gcs, 1910, p. 127; I. Guidi, Il Mehtayer, i., 1919, p. 136). The custom seems in time to have become generally abandoned. In the ninth century the Masjd Aḵsonkor was expressly built for the ḥāṭa at the Friday services and at festivals (Maḵrīzī, iv. 107, 17).

C. The Mosque as the Centre for Divine Service.

1. Sanctity of the Mosque.

The history of the mosque in the early centuries of Islam shows an increase in its sanctity which was intensified by the adoption of the traditions of the church and especially by the permutation of the cult of saints. The sanctity already associated with tombs taken over by Islam was naturally very soon transferred to the larger and more imposing mosques. The expression bāṯt Allāḥ "house of God", which at first was only used of the Kaʿba came now be applied to any mosque (s. Corpus irais ai Zaid b. Ṭālī, No. 48, cf. 156, 983; Chron. Meka, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 164, 17; Bukhārī, Mekka, Corpus Insr. Araba, i. No. 10, i. 1. Ibn b. Ḥadīḏi, K. al-Maḏīḵ, i. 20, 23; ii. 64, 68; cf. Bast Rūbbī, Ḥaḏīṯ, i. 23, 73; ii. 56). The alteration in the original conception is illustrated by the fact that the Manūḥik al-Malk al-Zahr Bāḥbars declined to build a mosque on a place for tithing camels because it was unseemly, while the mosque of the Prophet had actually been built on such a place (Maḵrīzī, v. 91; Abū Dāwūd, Sāḥīḥ, bāb 22).

In the house of God the Miḥrāb and the Minbar (see below) enjoyed particular sanctity, as did the tomb, especially in Medina (Bukhārī, Pāḏ al-Salāt fi Masjidī Makka wa l-Madīna, bāb 5).

The visitors sought baraka, partly by touching the tomb or the railing round it, partly by praying
in its vicinity: at such places “prayer is heard” (Qur. Mecca, ii. 441, 442). In the Masjid al-
Khaṭīb in Mīnā the visitor laid his head on the
print of the Prophet’s head and thus obtained ṭaṣāka (tirdūn, iii. 458). A mosque could be built on a site, the sanctity of which had been shown
in the finding of hidden treasure (Maḥṣūs, iv. 75).
There were often places of particular sanctity in
mosques. In the mosque at Kūḥā and Medina, the
spots where the Prophet used to stand at prayer
were held to be particularly blessed (Bādaḏār, p. 5: Būkhrā, Ṣalāt, bāb 91: Wustenfeld, Medīnā, p. 65, cf. 82, 109). In other mosques, places where a saint had sat or where a divine phenomenon had
taken place e.g. in the Mosque of Ṭāmir and in
the Ashr Mosque (Maḥṣūs, in. 19, 52) or the Mosque in Jerusalem (Masḍūj, B. G. A., in. 170)
were specially visited. Pilgrims visitors made proof
[41] between such places in the mosque (Ma-
ṣūs, p. 26). Just as in other religions we find
patrons-dedicating their children to the service of a
sanctuary, so we find a Muslim woman pouring
her child or child yet unborn to the mosque (Būkhrā, Ṣalāt, bāb 74: Maḥṣūs, iv. 20). The
fact that mosques, like other sanctuaries, were
sometimes founded after a revelation received in a
dream has already been mentioned (B. 5). This
increase in sanctity had as a natural result that
no longer a mosque at random as had been the case in the time of the Prophet. In the early Umayyad period, Christians
were still allowed to enter the mosque without
interdiction (cf. Lammens, Medīnā, p. 13 sq.;
told either in I. Z. K., vi. 100 sq.). Muḥāʾyīn
used to sit with his Christian physician, Ibn Uḥūl, in
the mosque of Damascus (Ibn Abī ʿUṣayn, in. 117). According to Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, the Aḥl al-Kītīb (or Aḥl al-Aḥbāb) and their servants,
but not polytheists, were allowed to enter the mosque of Medina (Maḥṣūs, in. 339, 392). At a later date
they were forbidden to Christians and this
regulation is related to Ṭāmir (Lammens, ep. cit.,
p. 13, note 6). A strict teacher of morality like Ibn al-Ḥaḏīḥī thought it un-chaste that the monks
who wove the mats for the mosques should
be allowed to lay them in the mosque (Maḥṣūs,
57). Conditions were not always the same. In
Hebron Jews and Christians were admitted on
payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in
194 (1203) Barmak forbade it (Quattromare, Hist.
Sah., M. 9, in. 18, p. 27).

According to some traditions, a person in a state of
vitiated impurity could not enter the mosque (Abū Dāwūd, Ṣalāt, bāb 92: Ibn Māḏa, Taḥārā, bāb 123) and in any case only the pure could
receive merit by visiting the mosque (Maḥṣūs,
Maṭāfīl, tr. 49: Corpus litterarī ad Ṣalāt κ Εί', Ni;
40), and in a later period it is specially mentioned that the ṣalāt cannot be undertaken in
the mosque itself (Maṭāfīl, in. 47 infra) nor could
having ṣalāt. p. 55.2)
It is always necessary to be careful not to spit
in a mosque, although some traditions which are
obviously close to the old state of affairs say,
“not in the direction of the kibla, only to the
left” (Būkhrā, Ṣalāt, bāb 53 sq.). The custom
of taking off one’s sandals in the mosque is
found as early as the time of Abū ʿUḥayda (second
century). (Ṭāmir, ʿUṭārā, v. 272, 4 sq.) and according
to al-Maṭāfīl (see below) is also mentioned by
Abū Dāwūd. Al-Ṭabari puts the custom back to
the time of ʿUmar (i. 2408). That is based on an
old custom observed in sanctuaries is obvious
(cf. on the history of the custom, F. Ceum, Ouvrages de Douar-Europes, 1926, p. 60 sq.). The
custom however seems not to have been always
observed. In the viii. century in the Mosque of
the Umayyads the shoes were taken off only in
the kibla, because the sanctuary was entered with
shoes; but in 827 an Egyptian superintendent
ordered that the mosque should only be entered
with bare feet (J. A., ser. 9, vii. 211, 217).
The visitor on entering should place his right foot first
and utter certain prayers with blessings on the Prophet
and his family (which Muḥammad is said to have
done!) and when he is inside perform two rak’a’s
(Būkhrā, Ṣalāt, bāb 47: Taḥadījūm, bāb 25; Muslim,
Ṣalāt al-Muṣṭafīrûn, tr. 12 sq.; Tabār, iii. 2464, 2532). Certain regulations for decent
conduct came into being, the object of which was
to preserve the dignity of the house of divine
service. Public and other animals about stray animals
were not to be made, as the Beduins did in their
houses of assembly, and one should not call out
aloud and thereby disturb the meditations of the
worshippers (Būkhrā, Ṣalāt, bāb 83; Muslim,
Masḍūj, tr. 18: more fully in Māḥṣūs, i. 19
sgg.). One should put on fine clothes for the
Friday service, rub oneself with oil and perfume
oneself (Būkhrā, ʿUṭārā, bāb 3, 6, 7, 19) as
was also done with ṣab for the Ḥadījī (Būkhrā,
Ḥadījī, bāb 143).

A question which interested the teachers of
morality was that of the admission to not enter
the mosques. That many did not desire the presence
is evident from the hadith that one cannot
prevent them as there is no ṣawwā connected with
it, but they must not be perfumed (Muslim, Ṣalāt,
bāb 29; Būkhrā, ʿUṭārā, bāb 13; cf. Chron.
Mecca, i. 168). Other Ḥadījī say they should
leave the mosques before the men (al-Naṣṣāb, Ṣahēr,
bāb 77; cf. Abī Dāwūd, Ṣalāt, bāb 14, 48). Some-
times a special part of the mosque was rolled off
for them; for example, the governor of Mecca in
156 had ropes tied between the columns to make
a separate place for women (Chron. Mecca, ii. 197
infra). According to some women were allowed
during their menstruation (Abī Dāwūd,
Ṭahārā, bāb 92, 103; Ibn Māḏa, Ṭahārā, bāb 117,
123). In Medina at the present day, a wooden
grille shuts off a place for women (al-Batanūnī,
al-Rīḥīl al-Ḥadījīyī, p. 240). At one time the
women stood at the back of the mosque here
(Ṭāmir, ʿUṭārā, vi. 400). In Jerusalem there were
special maṣjīd for them (B. G. A., v. 100). Ibn
al-Ḥadījī would prefer to exclude them altogether
and gives Ṣawwā as his authority for this.

Although the mosque became sacred it could
not quite cast off its old character as a place of
public assembly and in consequence the mosque
was visited for many other purposes than that of
divine service. Not only in the time of the Umayyads
was considerable business done in the mosques
(Tabār, iii. 1118: cf. Lammens, Zāīd, p. 68) which
is quite in keeping with the Ḥadījī (Būkhrā,
Ṣalāt, bāb 70 sg.) which, actually found it necessary
to forbid the sale of wine in the mosque (Ibn,
bāb 73), but a writer in the viii. century, Ibn
al-Ḥadījī, records with disapproval that business
was done in the mosques: women sit in the
mosques and sell threads, in Mecca hawkers even
call their wares in the mosque. The list given by
This holds especially the Friday salāt (ṣalāt al-jumā'ā), which can only be performed in the mosque and is obligatory upon every free male Muslim who has reached years of discretion (cf. Ḥuyyiboll, Handbuch, p. 86; Ghulim, "Seminar für die Geschichte des Islam". i. 125 sq.). According to Ibn Ḥāshim (p. 290) this salāt, which is distinguished by the khatbā, was observed in Medina even before the Hijra. It is hardly probable and besides is not in agreement with other sources (see Bukhārī, Q̄umā'a, bāb 11) but the origin of this divine service, referred to in Sūra lixx, 9, is obscure. The assemblies of the Jews and Christians on a particular day must have formed the model (cf. Bukhārī, Q̄umā'a, bāb 1). Its importance in the earlier period lay in the fact that all elements of the Muslim camp, who usually went to the tribal and particular mosques, assembled for it in the chief mosque under the leadership of the caliph. The chief mosque, which for this reason was particularly large, was given a significant name. They talk of al-Masdjī al-ṣanā'ī (Tabārī, i. 2494; B.G.A., vii. 245) or Masdjī al-Q̄umā (Yaḥṣūb, iii. 896, al-Fusṭāṭ; also Tabārī, i. 1119: Ibn Kūtaiba, Ma'ārif, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 106; Masdjī li-l-Q̄umā (Ma'κrizī, iv. 4); Masdjī Q̄umā' (Bādhūth, p. 51, Māzīrān; Yaḥṣūb, i. 643, 647, Buṣrā); then Masdjī al-Q̄umā (Yaḥṣūb, iii. 899; B.G.A., ii. 295, 315, 387; vii. 110 etc.). As an abbreviation we find also al-Q̄umā' (Yaḥṣūb, i. 400; Ibn Bāṣīr, iv. 343; cf. Masdjī al-Q̄umā', Bādhiyār, p. 348) and especially Q̄umā. As the khatbā was the distinguishing feature, we also find Masdjī al-Khutbā (Ma'κrizī, iv. 44, 64, 87) Q̄umā' al-Khutbā (ibid., iv. 55) or Masdjī al-Lebān (B.G.A., iii. 316 for Q̄umā', i. 8).

Linguistic usage varied somewhat in course of time with conditions. In the time of 'Umar there was properly in every town only one Masdjī Q̄umā' for the Friday service. But when the community became no longer a military camp and Islam replaced the previous religion of the people, a need for a number of mosques for the Friday service was bound to arise. This demanded mosques for the Friday service in the country, in the villages on the one hand and several Friday mosques in the towns on the other. This meant in both cases an innovation, compared with old conditions, and thus there arose some degree of uncertainty. The Friday service had to be conducted by the ruler of the community, but there was only one governor in each province: on the other hand, the demands of the time could hardly be resisted and, besides, the Christian converts to Islam had been used to a solemn weekly service.

As to the villages (al-kāna'), 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ in Egypt forbade their inhabitants to celebrate the Friday service for the reason just mentioned (Ma'κrizī, iv. 7). At a later period then the khutbā was delivered exceptionally, without minbar and only with máwūṣ, until Marwān, in 222, replaced the minbar into the Egyptian kūra also (ibid., p. 8). Of a mosque in which a minbar had been placed, we are told Q̄umā' masdjī al-kūra (Tabārī, i. 2451) and a village with a minbar is called kūra Q̄umā' (Bukhārī, Q̄umā', bāb 15; cf. Masdjī Q̄umā', B.G.A., ii. 321), an idea which was regarded by Bukhārī (d. 256--870).
as quite obvious. In introducing minbars into the
Egyptian villages, Marwaan was apparently fol-
lowing the example of other regions. In the
fourth century, Ibn Hawkal mentions a number of
masjids in the district of Ispah (R. G. A. II. 152
f.) and a few in the vicinity of Marw (ibid., p.
316) and in Transoxania (ibid., p. 378; cf.
p. 384) and al-Malaki mentions the same for other
districts of Persia (B. G. A., iii. 309, 317) and he
definitely says that the kuttus of Palestine are /iiit
arrab (ibid., p. 176; cf. i. 58); Baladhuri (p.
331) also uses the name minbar for a village
mosque built in 230; in general, when speaking of
the kuttus, one talks of minbar and not of /iitmi
(cf. R. G. A. I. 63). Later however the term Masjid
(jami‘) is used for a Friday mosque (Ibn Dju repairs,
p. 217). The conditions of primitive Islam are re-
lected in the teaching of the Hanafis, who only
permit the Friday service in large towns (cf. al-

As to the towns, the Shafis on the other
hand have retained the original conditions, since
they permit the Friday service in only one mosque
each (cf. QAFFA and cf. cit., p. 178 sq.), but with
the reservation that the mosque is able to hold
the community. The distinction between the two
sites was of importance in Egypt. When in 669
al-Hajjaj became supreme in Egypt, he ap-
nointed a Shafi‘i chief rajah and the Friday service
was therefore held only in the Hakim mosque,
the largest; but in 665 (1266) al-Malik al-
Zahur b. al-Hajjaj gave the Hanafis preference and
many mosques were therefore used as Friday
mosques (Makrizi, iv. 52 sq.; al-Suyuti, Han
I. 39 sqg]). During the Uniae period and to a
some extent in the ‘Abbasid period, the number of
jami‘ in the towns were still very small. The
graphers of the sixth and fourth centuries in
descriptions of towns as a rule mention only
the ‘jami‘. Ibn al-Fakhr, c. 290 (903), sometimes
says masjih jami‘ or jami‘, R. G. A. I. 304-306,
also minbar simply, p. 305. In keeping with the
oldest scheme of town planning, it was very
much in the middle of the town surrounded by
the business quarters (R. G. A. II. 298, 325; iii.
274 sq., 279; 280, 314, 316, 375, 376, 415, 426, 427
etc.; M. B. Khusraw, ed. Schefer, p. 55, 41, 56) and
the jami‘ was still frequently in the
immediate vicinity of the chief mosque
(B. G. A., ii.
208, 314; iii. 426).

Istakhri mentions as an innovation in Islam that
al-Hajjaj built a jami‘ in al-Wasit on the
west bank, although there was already one on the
east bank (R. G. A. I. 82 sq.; cf. iii. 118; viii. 372).
Ibn Dju bar (R. G. A. I. 211 sq.) mentions only one
jami‘ in Kufa, called Masjidul al-Kufa by Ibn
al-Fakhr, although he also mentions other mosques
(R. G. A. I. 173; cf. 174, 183 and iii. 116). In
Kufa where Yaqubi (278 = 891) already mentions
seven mosques (R. G. A. I. 361), al-Malaki
In Samarra‘, among many mosques, there was
the jami‘ (R. G. A. I. 258, 259), which was
later replaced by another (ibid., p. 260 sq.); al-
Mutawakkil also built one outside the original
town ‘al ‘ (ibid., p. 255; see also P. Schwarz, Die
A dzim in Renaissance, Samarat-an, 1000, p. 32). In Bagh-
dad, Ya‘qubi (278 = 891) mentions on jami‘
for the eastern town and one for the
western R. G. A. vii. 240, 245, 251, 253. The
most ancient Ibn Rosta just mentions the
old western town and its jami‘ (ibid., p. 109).
Although he gives the fantastic figures of 15,000
mosques in the east town (ibid., p. 254) and
30,000 in the west (or in the whole town, ibid.,
256). After 820 there was added the jami‘ of the
eastern palace of the caliph (Mez, Renaissance,
Baghdad; a private jami‘ of Harih al-Rashid in
the Bustan Litun Mids is mentioned by Ibn al-Khali‘,
These 3 jami‘ are mentioned about 340 (951)
by Istakhri (R. G. A. I. 84), who also mentions
one in the suburb of Kalkhadi. Ibn Hawkal in
367 (977) mentions the latter and also the jami‘
of al-Barathia (R. G. A. I. 164 sq., of 329; Mez, loc.
cit.), a fifth was added in 379, a sixth in 383
(MeZ. p. 389); thus al-Khali‘ al-Baghdadi in 460
(1058) gives 4 for West Baghdad, 2 for the east
town (cf. Le Strange, Bagdad, p. 324). Ibn
Dju bar in 581 (1185) gives in the east town 3,
and 1 jami‘ (Rikha, p. 225 sq.) for the whole of
Baghdad. For Cairo, Ithkari gives two jami‘:
the ‘Amr and Tulin mosques (R. G. A. I. 49)
besides that in al-Karafa which was regarded as
a separate town (cf. Ibn Rosta: c. 290 = 993),
R. G. A. I. 116 sq.). Al-Malaki, who writes (575
= 985) shortly after the Fatimid conquest, mentions
the ‘Amr and Tulin mosques, the new mosque in
al-Khara‘ (al-Azhar), also one in al-Djazira, in Dijza
and in al-Karafa (R. G. A. I. 156-209, 209; the
ejami‘ in al-Djazira, also jami‘ Mikyas (cf. Makrizi,
iv. 75), was mentioned in an inscription of the
year 485; see van Berchem, Corpus, i., no. 39). As
these places were all originally separate towns, the
principle that it was not abandoned that town had
only one jami‘. The Fatimids however extended the
use of Friday mosques and, in addition to those
already mentioned, used the jami‘ al-Hakim,
al-Ma‘ and Rishida (Makrizi, iv. 2 sq.). Nasiri
Khusraw in 439 (1047) mentions in one passage
the ‘jami‘ of Cairo, in another seven for Misr
and fifteen in all (ed. Schefer, p. 134 sq., 147).
This was altered in 569 by Salih al-Din (see above)
but the quarters, being still regarded as separate
towns, retained their Friday mosques (cf. for the
year 607 in al-Karafa: Makrizi, iv. 86). After
the Friday service in Egypt and Syria was freed from
restriction, the number of jami‘ increased very
much. Ibn Dukanik (about 800) gives a list of only eight ‘jami‘ in Cairo (ed.
Voliers, p. 59-78), but this list is apparently
only a fragment (in all he mentions something
over twenty in the part of his book that has
survived); al-Makrizi (d. 845 = 1442) gives 13
‘jami‘ (iv. 2 sq.). In Damascus, where Ibn
Dju bar still spoke of ‘the jami‘, al-Nu‘aimi’s
d. 927 = 1521) gives twenty ‘jami‘ (7, sq.,
231 sq.), and according to Ibn Battuta, there
were in all the villages in the region of Damascus
‘jami‘ (i. 236). The word jami‘ in
Makrizi always means a mosque in which the
Friday service was held (vi. 76, 115 sqq.) but
by his time this meant any mosque of some size.
He himself criticises the fact that since 799 the
’salat al-jam‘a‘ was performed in al-Aqmar, al-
though another jami‘ stood close beside it (iv.
76; cf. also 86).
The great spread of Friday mosques was reflected in
the language. While inscriptions of the viith
century still call quite large mosques masjid, in
the ninth most of them are called *djami* (cf. on the whole question, van Berchem, *Corpus*, i. 173 sq.); and while now the madrasa begins to predominate and is occasionally also called *djami* (see below, F. 4), the use of the word *masjid* becomes limited. While, generally speaking, it can mean any mosque (e.g. Ma'krizí, iv. 137, of the Mu'ayyad mosque), it is more especially used of the smaller unimportant mosques. While Ibn Bu'nán gives 472 *masjadi* in addition to the *djawai*, madrasas, etc., al-Ma'krízí only gives nineteen, not counting al-Karâfa, which probably only means that they were of little interest to him. *Djami* is now on the way to become the regular name for a mosque of any size as is now the usage, in Egypt at least. In Ibn al-Hajdjid (d. 737) *al-djawai* is occasionally used in this general meaning in place of *al-masjadi* (Madkhal, ii. 50). Among the many Friday mosques one was usually distinguished as the chief mosque; we therefore find the expression *al-djami* a-le-g'am (Ibn Battútá, ii. 54, 94; cf. the older *al-masjid* a-le-g'am, *ibid.*, p. 53). The principal *djami* decided in such questions as the beginning and ending of the Fast of Ramadan (Madkhal, ii. 68).

3. Other religious activities in the Mosque.

"The mentioning of the name of God" in the mosques, was not confined only to the official ritual ceremonies. Even in the time of the Prophet, we are told that he lodged Thāqífí delegates in the mosque so that they could see therows of worshippers and hear the nightly recitation (Wâjiíl-Wellhausen, p. 582). Although this story (which is not given in Ibn Hisáma, p. 916) may simply be a reflection of later conditions, the recitation of the Qur'án must have come to be considered an edifying and pious work at quite an early date. In the time of al-Ma'âdíd the *kurār* of Ni'sâbûr used to assemble on Fridays in the *djami* in the early morning and recite till the *duhâ* (B.G.A., iii. 328), and the same author tells us that in the Mosque of 'Amr in Egypt the *d'immat al-kurâr* sat in circles every evening and recited (*ibid.*, p. 205). In the time of Ibn Djugair, there were recitations of the Qur'án in the Umayyad mosque after the *salât al-Salâh* and every afternoon after the *salât al-A'zh (Rihla, p. 274 sq.). Besides the recitation of the Qur'án there were praises of God etc., all that is classed as *dhikr*, and which was particularly cultivated by Sufism. This form of worship also took place in the mosque. The Abú al-Tauhidí named Ma'ráfí formed *masjâd al-dhikr*, who assembled in the mosques (al-Makki, *Kitâb al-Kulûb*, i. 152). In the Mosque of the Umayyads and other mosques of Damascus, *dhikr* was held during the morning on Friday (*ibid.*, iv. 49). In the *Masjâd al-Abâj* the Hânâfí held *dhikr*, and recited at the same time from a book (B.G.A., i. 182). In Egypt, Ahmad b. Tullân and Khümârumawîth allowed twelve men quarters in a chamber near the minaret, and during the night four of them took turns to praise God with recitations of the Qur'ân and with pious *kusâd*. From the time of Salîh al-Dîn an orthodox *kJâd* was recited by the mu'addâdîn in the night (*ibid.*, iv. 48). Ibn al-Hâdjîdî demands that the recitation of the Qur'ân aloud should take place in a mosque for the special purpose (*masjâd maqûdâm*) as otherwise pious visitors are disturbed (Madkhal, ii. 53, 67). Mosques and particularly mausoleums had as a rule regularly appointed reciters of the Qur'ân. In addition there was, e.g. in Hebron and in a mosque in Damascus, a *shâikh* who had to read *Bukhârî* (or also *Muslim*) for three months. (Sauvâre, *Hist. Juris., Hebr.*, p. 17; *J.A.,* ser. 9, iii. 261). In Tunis, al-Bukhârî was read daily in a hospital (Zarkaši, transl. Fagnan, *Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantine*, 1894, p. 188).

Sermons were not only delivered at the *salât al-djum'â*. In the *I'rij, even in al-Ma'âdíd's time, one was preached every morning, according to the *sunna* of Ibn 'Abbás (B.G.A., iii. 130), it was said. Ibn Djugair, in the Niğâmîyâ in Baghdad, heard the *shâ'ita* *râ'îs* preach on Friday after the *'asr* on the minbar. His sermon was accompanied by the skilled recitation of the *kurâr* who sat on chairs; they were over twenty in number (Ibn Djugair, p. 219 sq. 222). In the same way, the calls of the *mu'âdhdin* to prayer to the Friday *khuţâba* were delivered to a musical accompaniment (see below, H. 4). The unofficial sermons, which moreover were not delivered in mosques alone, were usually delivered by a special class, the *kusâd* (plur. of *kusâd*; see ibid., p. 220 sq.). The *kusâd*, who delivered edifying addresses and told popular stories, were early admitted to the mosques.

Tânim al-Dârî is said to have been the first of these; in Medina in the caliphate of 'Umar before the latter's decease, he used to deliver his orations at the Friday solemn and was allowed to talk twice a week in the mosque; in the reign of 'Ali and of Mu'âwiya the *kusâd* were employed to curse the other side (*Makzûzi*, iv. 16 sq.). In the Mosque of 'Amr in Cairo by the year 38 or 39, a *kusâd* was appointed, named Sulâim b. 'Irî al-Tauĥidî, who was also *kaşî* (*ibid.*, iv. 17 wrongly: Sulâmân; Kindi, *Governers and Judges*, ed. Guest, p. 505 sq.). There are other occurrences of the combination of the two offices (Ibn Hudjâra [d. 83], *Kindi*, p. 317; Khâlîr b. Nu'â'âm in the year 120, *ibid.*, p. 348; cf. Ham al-Mahâdur, i. 131, *Dîr*.; according to Thâwba b. Nimr, *Ibn*, i. 130 infra; Ibrâhîm b. Ishâk al-Kâri [d. 204], Kindi, p. 467; see also Makzûzi, *ibid.* iv. 18) which shows that the office of *kusâd* was quite an official one. There is also evidence of the employment of *kusâd* in the mosque of the *I'rij* in the 'Abbasid period (Yâkît, *Râ'îs*, iv. 268; v. 446). The *kusâd* read from the Qur'ân and delivered an explanatory and edifying discourse, the object of which was to instil the fear of God into the people (*Makzûzi*, iv. 18). Under the Fâtimids also, *kusâd* were appointed for the mosques; for example, in 403 the umam undertook the office in the Mosque of 'Amr (Makzûzí, iv. 18 infra) and the rulers had also a *kusâd* in the palace. The *kusâd* were called *ahâshâr*, because they delivered their discourses, either in the *kurâr* (al-Makki, *Kitâb al-Kulûb*, i. 152; Ibn al-Hâdjîdî, *Madkhal*, i. 159; cf. Makzûzí, *ibid.*, 121). Their discourse was called *dhikr* or *wâz* or *mu'âsirâ*, whereas the *kusâd* was also called *mu'âshâkîr* (B.G.A., iii. 205) or *wâz* (*ibid.*). Specimens of their discourses are given by Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi (al-İhâ li-Al-faštîd, *Cairo*, 1321, p. 204 sqq.). It was not only the appointed officials who delivered such discourses in the mosque. Ascetics made
public appearances in various mosques and collected interested hearers around them (cf. e.g. Makrizi, iv. 155). In the Di'ami al-Kashfa, a whole society, the Banu IJahwari, delivered wa'az discourses on a kurd for three months on end; their servant collected money in a begging-bowl during the discourse and the shaikh distributed some of it among the poor (ibid., iv. 121).

The wa'az was completely taken over by popular Sufism and later writers would hardly reckon, as al-Makki does, the "story-tellers" among the mutakallimin (K'Ut al-Kutub, ii. 152). The whole system degenerated to trickery and charlatanry of all kinds, as may be seen in the Makama literature (cf. thereon Ya'qub, Udbi), vi. 167 sq. and see also Metz and Goldsmid, op. cit.). Al-Makki therefore distinguishes between al-wa'az al-dhijja, the regular and seemingly edifying discourse in the mosque, and al-wa'az al-tamma, which consisted in the people gathering round all kinds of speakers, which is wa'az (Makrizi, iv. 17). Others also have recorded their objections to the wa'az. Ibn al-Hudaq utter a warning against them and wants to forbid their activities in the mosque completely, because they deliver "weak" narratives (Madkhal, i. 158 sq.; ii. 13 sq., 50). He says Ibn 'Umar, Malik and Abu Dawla rejected them and 'Ali elected them from the madjil of Basra. It is of little significance that al-Mu'tadi cited in as forbade them to sit in the mosques and forbade people to gather around them, for he issued a similar interdict against the jahida and the reasons were evidently different (Tabari, ii. 2165); it was for political reasons also, but with a very different motive, that Abu al-Dawla forbade their activities appearing in Baghdad shortly before 400, because they increased the tension between Sunnis and Shi'a (Metz, op. cit., p. 310). As late as 580 the wa'az still flourished in the mosques of Baghdad, as is evident from the Kitab of Ibn Dujair (p. 219 sq., 224), and in the ninth century there was in the Ahrar mosque a madhja al-wa'az as well as a halal al-dhijja (Makrizi, iv. 54).

When Ibn al-Hudaq denounced speaking aloud in the mosque, it is in the interest of the pious vocation of those engaged in religious works and meditation. Litt. (q. v.), retirement to a mosque for a period, was adopted into Islam from the older religions.

The word wa'az means in the Kur'an the ceremonial worship of the object of the cult (Sura vii. 134: vv. 93, 97; xxi. 53; xxvi. 71; cf. H. H. Jarjawi, ed. Horovitz, p. 86, 19) and also the ritual stay in the sanctuary, which was done for example in the Meccan temple (Sura ii. 119: xii. 55). In this connection it is laid down in the Kor'an that in the month of Ramadan believers must not touch their wives "while ye pass the time in the mosques" (akhfan bi 'umma al-juma, Sura ii. 185), an expression which shows, firstly that there were already a number of mosques in the lifetime of the Prophet and secondly that these had already to some extent taken over the character of the temple. The connection with the early period is evident from a hadith, according to which the Prophet decides that 'Umar must carry out a vow of wa'az for one night in the Madison al-Haram made in the Di'ahiliya (Bukhari, Fikrak, bab 5, 15 sq.; Fird al-Khams, bab 19; Munawir, bab 54; Amman wa' al-Dir], bab 29). It is completely in keeping with this that the Prophet, according to the hadith, used to spend ten days of the month of Ramadan in Fikrak in the mosque of Medina (Bukhari, 'I'tikaf, bab 1; Fird al-Lailat al-Kadar, bab 3), and in the year in which he died as many as twenty days (ibid., 'I'tikaf, bab 17). During this period the mosque was full of booths of palm branches and leaves in which the 'akifun lived (ibid., bab 13; cf. 6, 7). The Prophet only went to his house for some very special reason (ibid., bab 3). This custom was associated with the asceticism of the monks. The faithful were vexed, when on one occasion he received Safiya in his booth and chatted for an hour with her (Bukhari, Fird al-Khams, bab 4; Fikrak, bab 8, 11, 12). According to another tradition, his Fikrak was broken on another occasion by his wives putting up their tents beside him and he postponed his Fikrak till Shawwal (Bukhari, 'I'tikaf, bab 6, 7, 14, 18). According to Zaid b. 'Ali, the Fikrak can only be observed in a chief mosque (dim) (Corpus iuris di Zaid b. 'Ali, No. 447). During the early period, it was one of the initiatory rites for new converts. In the year 14, 'Umar ordered the retreat (al-siyar) in the mosques during the month of Ramadan for the people of Medina and the provinces (Tabari, i. 2377). The custom persisted and has always been an important one among ascetics. "The man who retires for a time to the mosque devotes himself in turn to salat, recitation of the Kor'an, meditation, dhikr etc." says Ibn al-Hudaq (Madkhal, ii. 50). There were pious people, who spent their whole time in a mosque (a shima fikr; Makrizi, iv. 87, 97); of one we were told that he spent his time in the month of Ramadan in the Mosque of 'Amr (fikrak, ibid., p. 44). Al-Samhadi says that during the month of Ramadan, he spent day and night in the mosque (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 95). Sa'd al-Din (d. 644) spent the month of Ramadan in the Mosque of the Umayyads without speaking (Ibn Abi Usabib, ii. 192). Nocturnal vigils in the mosque very early became an established practice in Islam. According to the Hadith, the Prophet frequently held nocturnal salats in the mosque with the believers (Bukhari, Di'ama, bab 29) and by his orders 'Abd Allah b. Uais al-Ansari came from the desert for twenty-three successive nights to pass the night in his mosque in rites of worship (Ibn Kutaiba, Ma'arif, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 142 sq.).

Out of this developed the takahfiz (q. v.) salat, particularly recommended in the law and notably the tarawih salats (q. v.). In Bihl on these occasions women singers actually took part (Ibn Battuta, iii. 155).

During the nights of the month of Ramadan there were festivals in the mosques and on other occasions also, such as the New Year, sometimes at the new moon, and in the middle of the month. The mosque on these occasions was illuminated; there was eating and drinking; incense was burned and dhikr and kir'a performed.

The Friday Salat was particularly solemn in Ramadan, and in the Fajr period, the caliph himself delivered the khutba (see Makrizi, ii. 345 sqq.; Ibn Taghrir, ii/iii., ed. Juynboll, p. 482 sqq. and 1/iv., ed. Popper, p. 351 sqq.—333). The mosques associated with a saint had still have their special festivals on his memory (cf. Lane, Minutes and Customs, ch. xxiv. sqq.). The saint's festivals are usually local and there
are generally differences in the local customs. In the Madghrib for example in certain places the month of Ramaḍan is opened with a blast of trumpets from the manābīr (Madkhal, ii. 69).

The mosque thus on the whole took over the role of the temple. The rulers from `Umar on wards dedicated gifts to the Ka'ba (B. G. A., v. 20 sq. and Gl., s. v. Sāma), and as in other sanctuaries we find women vowing children to the service of the mosque (Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 74; Makrīzī, iv. 20). Tawfīq was performed, as at the Ka'ba, in mosques with saints' tombs as is still done, e. g. in Hebron; Muḍjir al-Din sees a pre-Islamic custom in this (Sauvare, Hist. Íuras. et Hebron, p. 5). Especially important business was done here. In times of trouble the people go to the mosque to pray, for help, for example during drought, for which there is a special salāt (which however usually takes place on the müqalla), in misfortunes of all kinds (e. g. Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 19-20; Makrīzī, iv. 57); in time of plague and pestilence, processions, weeping and praying with Kur'ān uplifted, were held in the mosques or on the müqalla, in which even Jews and Christians sometimes took part (Ibn Taghrībidī, ii/ii, ed. Popper, p. 67; Ibn Baṭṭāja, i. 243 sq.; cf. Quatrėmère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/i, 35, 40; ii/ii, 199) or for a period a sacred book like Bukhārī's Sāḥīḥ was recited (Quatrėmère, op. cit.; ii/i, 35; al-Dhahabi, Merveilles Biographiques, French transl., vi. 133). In the courtyards of the mosques in Jerusalem and Damascus in the time of Ibn Baṭṭāja solemn penance was done on the day of Ḍirār (i. 243 sq.), an ancient custom which had already been introduced into Egypt in the year 27 by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān (quīd after al-Ḥīṣr; cf. Kindi, Wustī, p. 50). Certain mosques were visited by barren women (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 133). An oath is particularly binding if it is taken in a mosque (cf. Joh. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, p. 144); this is particularly true of the Ka'ba, where written covenants were also drawn up to make them more binding (ibid., p. 143 sq.; Chron. Mecca, i. 160 sq.). It is in keeping with this idea of an oath that Jews who had adopted Islam in Cairo had to take oaths in a synagogue which had become a mosque (Makrīzī, iv. 285). The contract of matrimony (ṣaḥād al-niḥāb) also is often concluded in a mosque (San-tillana, II Muḥāṣṣir, i. 548; Madkhal, ii. 72 infra; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 163 sq.), and the particular form of divorce which is completed by the Ṭāʿān [q.v.] takes place in the mosque (Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 44; cf. Joh. Pedersen, Der Eid etc.), p. 114.

It is disputed whether a corpse may be brought into the mosque and the salāt al-ʿijānāzā performed there. According to one hadith, the bier of Saʿīd b. Abi Waḳāḥas was taken into the mosque at the request of the Prophet's widow and the salāt held there. Many disapproved of this, but ʿAṣīrī pointed out that the Prophet had done this with the body of Saḥāil b. Baṭṭāj (Muslim, Dhimmīs, tr. 34; cf. also Ibn Saʿīd, i/v, 14 sq.). The discussion on this point is not unconnected with the discussions regarding the worship of tombs. In theory this is permitted by al-Shāhī, while the others forbid it (see Juyboll, Handbuch, p. 170; I. Gudzi, II Muḥāṣṣir, i. 151). The matter does not seem to be quite clear, for Kuṭ b. Al-Din says that only Abū Ḥanīfah forbids it, but he himself thought that it might be allowable on the authority of a statement by Abū ʿUṣūf (Chron. Mecca, iii. 208-210).

In any case, it was a very general practice to allow it, as Kuṭ b. Al-Din also points out. ʿUmar conducted the funeral salāt for Abū Bakr in the Mosque of the Prophet and ʿUmar's own dead body was brought there; later it became a general custom to perform the ceremony in Medina close to the Prophet's tomb and in Mecca at the door of the Ka'ba; some even made a sevenfold ṭawfīq with the corpse around the Ka'ba. This was for a time forbidden by Marwān b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakam and later by ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (Kuṭ b. Al-Din, loc. cit.; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 77). The custom was very early introduced into the Mosque of `Amr (Makrīzī, iv. 7, 1 sqq.). That later scholars are quite wrong about the prohibition is not at all remarkable; for it is not at all in keeping with the ever increasing tendency to found mosques at tombs. Even Ibn al-Ḥadīdī, who was anxious to maintain the prohibition, is not quite sure and really only forbids the loud calling of the ṭawārīkh, ḥākīmīn, muškūlīn and masīhīn on such occasions (Madkhal, ii. 50 sq., 64, 81). When a son of Sulṭān al-Muʿayyad died and was buried in the eastern ʿūbah of the Muʿayyad mosque, the ḥāṭib delivered a ḥuṭba and conducted the salāt thereafter and the ṭawārīkh recited for a week at the grave, while the amirs paid their visits to the grave (Makrīzī, iv. 240, 2 sqq.). In Persia, it was the custom for the family of the deceased to sit in the mosque for three days after the death and receive visits of condolence (B. G. A., iii. 440 infra).

4. Mosques as Objects of Pilgrimage.

As soon as the mosque became a regular sanctuary it became the object of pious visits. This holds especially of the memorial mosques associated with the Prophet and other saints. Among them three soon became special objects of pilgrimage. In a ḥadīth the Prophet says "One should only mount into the saddle to visit three mosques: al-Masjid al-Ḥarām, the Mosque of the Prophet and al-Masjid al-ʿArḍ (Bukhārī, Fadl al-Salāt fi Masjid Maqka wa-l-Madīna, bāb 16; Ṣaḥīḥ al-ʿArḍ, bāb 26; ʿAṣīrī, bāb 67; Muslim, Ḥadīṯ, tr. 92; Chron. Mecca, i. 303). This hadith reflects a practice which only became established at the end of the Muʿayyad period. The pilgrimage to Mecca had been made a duty by the prescription of the Ḥadīth in the Kurʾān. The pilgrimage to Jerusalem was a Christian custom which could very easily be continued, on account of the significance of al-Masjid al-ʿArḍ in the Kurʾān. This custom became particularly important when Abū al-Malik made it a substitute for the pilgrimage to Mecca (Yaʿqūbī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 317). Although this competition did not last long, the significance of Jerusalem was thereby greatly increased. Pilgrimage to Medina developed out of the increasing veneration for the Prophet. In the year 140, Abū Ḥafṣa Mawṣūr on his Ḥadīṯ visited the tombs of the saints (Tabari, i. 120) and this became a very usual custom. Mecca and Medina however still held the preference. Although those of Mecca and Jerusalem were recognised as the two oldest (the one is said to be 40 years older than the other; Muslim, Masājīd, tr. 1: Chron. Mecca, i. 301), the Prophet however is reputed to have said "A salāt in this
Mosque is more meritorious than 1,000 salāt in others, even the al-Masjīd al-Ḥaram (Bukhārī, Bāqīʾ al-Saḥābī fī Masjīd Makkah wa l-Madīna, Bāb 1: Muslim, Ḥadīṣī, tr. 89; Chron. Mekka, i. 303) The hadīth is aimed directly against Jerusalem and therefore probably dates from the Omayyad period. According to some, it was pronounced because someone had commenced performing the salāt in Jerusalem, which the Prophet was against (Muslim, loc. cit.; Wakīlī-Wellhausen, p. 349). The three mosques however retained their pride of place (Ibn Khalūd, Makhdūmat, fāṣ 4; Ibn al-Ḥadījī, Madhkurīh, p. 55) and as late as 662 (1264) we find Bālsārīs founding azāfūr for pilgrims who wiled to go on foot to Jerusalem (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i, 1, 248).

Although these three mosques officially hold a special position, others also are highly recommended, e.g. the mosque in Kūfah [see AL-MADINA]. A salāt in this mosque is said to be as valuable as an ʿumāra or two visits to the mosque in Jerusalem (Iḅābarkī, Aḥāna, i. 381 sq.). Attempts were also made to raise the mosque of Kūfah to the level of the three. Aḥī is said to have told some one who wanted to make a pilgrimage from Kūfah to Jerusalem that he should stick by the mosque of his native town, it was “one of the four mosques” and two rakāʾ in it were equal to ten in others (B. G. A., iv. 175 sq.; Yaḥyū, Muṭḥam, iv. 345; in another tradition, salāt in the provincial mosques are said to be generally worth as much as the pilgrimage (Makrīzī, iv. 4), and traditions arose about the special blessings associated at definite times with different holy places of Islām (B. G. A., iii 183) and especially about their superior merits (B. G. A., iv. 174). The Meccan sanctuary, however, always retained first place, which was marked by the ʿIṣābāt. It was imitated by al-Mutawakkil in ʿṢamarrāʾ; he built a Kūfah as well as a Mina and an ʿArafah there and made his amirs perform their ḥajj there (B. G. A., iii. 122).

D. Equipment of the Mosque.

1. The Development of the Edifice.

Except in the case of Mecca the earliest mosques as described above (B. 1) were at first simply open spaces marked off by a ʿārās. The space was sometimes, as in al-ʿUṣāṣ, planted with trees and usually covered with palkās; e.g. in Medina (Muslim, Ḥadīṣī, tr. 95; Bālādhūrī, p. 63) and al-ḥājīṣ (Makrīzī, iv. 8; Ibn ʿUstādākī, iv. 62; Ibn Taḥṭāṣīrī, i. 77) which was introduced in Bāṣra and Kūfah the courtyards of which were otherwise dusty (Bālādhūrī, p. 277, 348). These conditions could only last so long as the Arabs retained their ancient customs as a closed corporation in their simple camps. The utilisation of churches was the first sign of a change and was rapidly followed by a mingling with the rest of the population and the resulting assimilation with older cultures.

Umar made alterations in the mosques in Medina and in Mecca also. He extended the Mosque of the Prophet by taking in the house of ʿAbbas; but like the Prophet, he still built of ṭakīn, palm-trunks and leaves and extended the booths (Bukhārī, Ṣaḥābī, Bāb 62; Bālādhūrī, p. 6). In Mecca also his work was confined to extending the area occupied by the mosque. He brought the surrounding houses and took them down and then surrounded the area with a wall to the height of a man; the Kaʿbah was thus given its ṣināʾ like the mosque in Medina (Bālādhūrī, p. 46; Chron. Mekka, i. 306 sq.; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 68 sq.) . Othūmān also extended these two mosques but introduced an important innovation in using hewn stone and plaster (ṣawṣaw) for the walls and pillars. For the roof he used teal (ṣuṣuṣ). The book, which had been extended by ʿOmar, were replaced by him by pillared halls (arwaṭa, sing. ṣiṣīk) and the walls were covered with plaster (Bukhārī, Ṣaḥāt, Bāb 62; Bālādhūrī, p. 46; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 70 sq.). Saʿd's. Abī Waqīfī is said to have already taken similar steps to relieve the old simplicity of the barely equipped mosque in Kūfah. The ʿtrakh consisted of pillars of marble adorned in the style of Byzantine churches (Ṭabarī, i. 2489; Ṭabūtī, iv. 324).

This was little in keeping with the simple architecture of the original town, for Bāṣra and Kūfah had originally been built of reeds only and after several great fires were they built of ṭakīn (see above Bāb 1; cf. Ibn Kultabā, Ṣurīfīṣrī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 279). As to Kūfah, Saʿd by ʿOmar's orders extended the mosque so that it became joined up with the Dār al-Imāra. A Persian named ʿUzābāh b. Burzūjmihr was the architect for this. He used bricks (ṣūrūr) for the building, which he brought from Persian buildings and in the mosque he used pillars which had been taken from churches in the region of Ifraj belonging to the Persian kings; these columns were not erected at the sides but only against the Kibla wall. The original plan of the mosque was therefore still retained although the pillared hall, which is identical with the ʿtrakh already mentioned (200 ʿārās broad), replaced the simple booth and the materials were better in every way (Ṭabarī, i. 2491 sq., 2494). Almost after the early Caliphs we can therefore note the beginnings of the adoption of a more advanced architecture.

These tendencies were very much developed under the Omayyads. Even as early as the reign of Muʿawiyah, the mosque of Kūfah was rebuilt by his governor Ziyādī. He commissioned a pagan architect, who had worked for Kīrāt, to do the work. The latter had pillars brought from al-Ahwāz, bound them together with lead and iron clamps to a height of 30 ʿārās and put a roof on them. Similar halls, built of columns (here like the old booth in Medina called ṣūrāf; Ṭabarī, i. 2492, 16; but also ʿtrakh, plur. ʿtrak, Ṭabarī, ii. 259 sq.) were also built by him on the north, east and western wall. Each pillar cost him 6,000 dirhams. The mosque could now hold 60,000 instead of 40,000 (Ṭabarī, i. 2492, 6 sqq. cf. 2494; Ṭabūtī, Muṭḥam, iv. 347, i. 977; Bālādhūrī, p. 276). Al-Ḥadījīḏāḏi also added to the mosque (Ṭabūtī, iv. 325 sq.). Ziyādī did similar work in Bāṣra. Here also he extended the mosque and built it of stone (or brick) and plaster and with pillars from al-Ahwāz, which were roofed with teak. We are told that he made al-ṣūrāf al-muṭḥadīna, i.e. the ʿtrak, hall, with 5 columns. This seems to show that the other sides also—as in Kūfah—had pillared halls. He erected the Dār al-Imāra close to the kibla side. This was taken down by al-Ḥadījīḏāḏi, rebuilt by others, and finally taken into the mosque by Harūn al-Kāshīdī (Bālādhūrī, p. 347, 348 supra, 349; Ṭabūtī, i. 642, 643). In Mecca also in the same period
similar buildings were erected. Ibn al-Zubair and al-Hādjīdālī both extended the mosque, and Ibn al-Zubair was the first to put a roof on the walls; the columns were gilt by 'Abd al-Malik and he made a roof of tiles. Chron. Meckba, i. 307, 309.

The Mosque of 'Amr was extended in 53 with Mu‘āwiya’s permission by his governor Maslama b. Mukhallad to the east and north; the walls were covered with plaster (mūrās) and the roofs decorated; it is evident from this that here also the original booth of the south side was altered to a covered hall during the early Umayyad period. A further extension was made in 79 in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik (Makrizi, iv. 7, 8; Ibn Dūkmaḳ, iv. 62). Thus we find that during the early Umayyad period and in part even earlier the original simple and primitive mosques were some extended, some altered. The alteration consisted in the old simple booth of the Mosque of the Prophet being gradually enlarged and transformed into a pillared hall with the assistance of the arts of countries possessing a higher degree of civilization. In this way what had originally been an open place of assembly developed imperceptibly into a court, surrounded by pillared halls. Very soon a fountain was put in the centre of the house and we now have the usual type of mosque. The same plan is found in the peristyle of the houses and in the atrium of a basilica like that of Tyre (Hertzog-Hauch, Realencyclopaedie, i. 780)."

The great builders of the Omayyads, 'Abd al-Malik and his son al-Walid I, made even more radical progress. The former entirely removed the original mosque in Jerusalem and his Byzantine architects erected the Dome of the Rock as a Byzantine building (cf. Sauvage, Jérus. et Hébron, p. 48 sqq.). Al-Walid likewise paid equal little attention to the oldest form of mosque, when, in Damascus, he had the church of St. John transformed by Byzantine architects into the Mosque of the Omayyads. As al-Maḳdisī distinctly states, they wanted to rival the splendours of the Christian churches (B. G. A., iii. 159). The new mosques, which were founded in this period, were therefore not only no longer simple, but they were built with the help of Christians and other trained craftsmen with the use of material already existing in older buildings. Al-Hādjīdālī, for example, used materials from the surrounding towns when building his foundation of Wāṣil (Tabatī, iii. 321; Baladhuri, p. 290). Columns from churches were now used quite regularly (e. g. in Damascus: Masūdī, Muḥadżīdī, i. 408; Ramla: B. G. A., iii. 165; cf. Baladhuri, p. 143 sqq.; for Egypt see Makrizi, iv. 36, 124 sqq.). Sometimes remains of the older style remained alongside of the new. In Irâksh, al-Maḳdisī found in the chief mosque wooden columns of the time of Abū Muslim along with round columns of brick of the time of 'Amr b. al-Laith (B. G. A., iii. 316). The building activities of al-Walid extended to al-Fuṣṭāṭ, Mecca and Medina (cf. B. G. A., v. 106 sqq.) where no fundamental alterations were made, but complete renovations were carried out. With these rulers, the building of mosques reached the level of the older architecture and gains a place in the history of art. There is also literary evidence for the transfer of a style from one region to another. In Iṣṭakhr, for example, there was a djamā' in the style of the Syrian mosques with round columns, on which was a sabara (B. G. A., iii. 436 sqq.; cf. for Shiraz, p. 430). Al-Walid also rebuilt the Mosque of the Prophet, in part in the Damascus style (B. G. A., iii. 80; Kaẓwīni, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 71). This revolution naturally did not take place without opposition any more than the other innovations, which Islam adopted in the countries with a higher culture which it conquered. After the Mosque of the Prophet had been beautified by Christian architects with marble, mosaics, shells, gold etc. and al-Walid in 93 was inspecting the work, an old man said: “We used to build in the style of Mosques; you build in the style of Churches” (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 74). The discussions on this point are reflected in Ḥadīth. When 'Omar enlarged the Mosque of the Prophet, he is reported to have said: “Give the people shelter from the rain, but take care to make them red or yellow lest you lead the people astray”, while Ibn 'Abbās said: “You shall adorn them with gold as the Jews and Christians do” (Bukhārī, Salīḥ, bāḥb 62). Ibn 'Abbās here takes up the Omayyad attitude and 'Omar that of old-fashioned people, according to whom any extension or improvement of the sūlla was only permissible for strictly practical reasons. The conservative point of view is predominant in Ḥadīth. It is said that extravagant adornment of the mosques is a sign of the end of the world; the works of al-Walid were only tolerated from fear of the jītna (Ibn Ḥanbal, Muw}m}a, iii. 134, 145, 152, 230, 283; al-Nasā'ī, Mawṣ}l}dī, bāḥb 2; Ibn Māja, Maṣ}mūlīdī, bāḥb 2). The lack of confidence of pious conservatives in the great mosques finds expression in a Ḥadīth, according to which the Prophet (according to Ibn Anas) said: “A trick will come over my umma when they will vie with one another in the beauty of their mosques; then they will visit them but little” (al-`Askālānī, Fath al-Bārī, i. 362). In the Fīhī, we even find divergence from the oldest quadrangular form of the mosque condemned (Guidi, al-Muḥ}t}aṣār, i. 71). Among the types which arose later was the “suspected” (muwallakah) i.e. a mosque situated in an upper storey (e. g. in Damascus, Ǧ, A., ser. ix., vol. v. 409, 415, 422, 424, 427, 430).

2. Details of the Equipment of the Mosque.

a. The Minaret (see also Manār). The earliest primitive mosques had no minaret. When the adhān call was introduced, Bilāl is said to have summoned the faithful in Medina to the early salat from the roof of the highest house in the vicinity of the mosque (Ibn Iṣ-hāb, p. 348; Wustenfeld, p. 75); on the day of the conquest of Mecca, the Prophet instructed Bilāl to utter the call to prayer from the Ka'ba, according to al-Azraḳī, from the roof (Chron. Meckba, i. 192: cf. Ibn Hisḥām, p. 822). During the early days of Islam, the muʾadhdhīn did not however utter his summons from an elevated position (cf. below G 4 d). It is doubtful in the first place when the minaret was introduced, and in the second whether it was adopted into Islam, expressly for the call to prayer.

The Omayyad caliph al-Walid (86–96) undoubtedly had considerable importance for the history of the minaret, although even earlier in 84 (703) Siddī Ḥākīma in Kairawān had been built by Ḥassān b. Nūmān with a minaret (so according to Bakrī: H. Salādīn, La Mosquée de Sidi Okba, 1899, p. 7, 19). There was also a minaret in the
Omayyad mosque in Damascus. At the present day, the mosque has 3 minarets as was the case in the time of Ibn Djibair, who mentions 2 on the west and one in the north (Rihla, p. 266), while Ibn Hajar also says there were three and added that one was in the west, another in the east and another in the north (f. 205), which agrees with present day conditions. One of the earliest authorities, Ibn al-Falikh (d. 289 = 902), however mentions only one minaret (miq'a;hana) and says that in the days of the Greeks it had been a watch-tower (mawârîn), which belonged to the church of St. John and was left standing by al-Walid (B. G. A., i. 106, 5). Al-Majdisi (d. 375 = 955) mentions only one minaret, which was above the Bab al-Paradis: when he calls it "miq'a;hana majâhita (B. G. A., iii. 159) he may perhaps mean a renovated minaret (cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 239) and besides his description does not exclude the existence of other minarets. The tradition that the minaret of the Omayyad mosque was taken over from the predecessors of the Muslims long survived: or Yâkit, who mentions the east and west minarets, says that the western belonged to a fire-temple and a temple used to be visible on it (Muhîyîn, n. 596) and according to Ibn Batûtah, the east- and west minarets had been built by the Byzantines while only the north one was built by the Muslims (t. 205 sqv; a story al-o given by al-Bosîrî [d. 1003 = 1594] quoting Ibn Asâkir [d. 1176], see Y. A. ii. 9; v. 423; Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Musul., ii. p. 273). Ibn Mecca also, al-Walid built turrets (khirbat al-Masjida, ibn Mecca, ii. 310), sometimes minarets (as is evident from ibid, p. 310, 311). They were later increased so that Kutb al-Din mentions 7 minarets (ibid, iii. 424-426). According to al-Samhîdî, he also built in Medina 4 towers but Sulaimân b. 'Abd al-Malik, in the year 97 had the southwestern tower taken down, because the shadow of the miq'a;hahana from it fell upon him, when he was in the house of Marwan b. al-Hâkim. While al-Samhîdî says that there were no minarets in Medina before al-Walid, he asserts on the other hand that 'Omar had already built towers on four corners of the mosque (Wustenfeld, Medîna, p. 73; cf. Ibn Batûtah, f. 272). In the time of Ibn Djibair (in 580) there were still only 3 minarets there (Rihla, f. 195). It was not until 707 that Muhammad b. Ka'b al-As'în rebuilt the fourth minaret (Wustenfeld, op. cit., p. 76).

After the time of al-Walid, minarets became more and more numerous, in Ra'mān b. brother al-Hîshâb built a beautiful minaret (R. G. A., i. 165, f. v. For the mosque in Jerus. ibn 'Abd al-Kâhidî about 400 mentions 4 minarets (Jâlî, Cairo 1351, iv. 274-275) which Muqarr bark al-Din claims to go back to the time of al-Mahc (Sa'dî, Hist. Jâlî, Cairo, p. 125). Ibn Hâwâl (367 = 977) expresses notes of the Umayyans in Fârayah in Kharîsân that it did not have a minaret (B. G. A., ii. 321) and he seems to consider it 'î'ta to build two minarets (f. 165, v. 13, sqv.). Apart from the isolated reference by al-Samhîdî to 'Omar's building activities, to which very little importance can be attached, it is probable from this evidence that al-Walid was the first to introduce the minaret into Syria and the Hijaz. That he introduced it into Islam itself, is however not certain. According to al-Baladhuri (d. 279 = 892), Ziyâd in Basra, where he was governor in 45, built the minaret of stone, when he built the mosque of brick (p. 348). This seems to suggest that there was already a minaret there. According to the Egyptian historians, Muslama b. Mu'âshad in al-Fustât by Mu'âshad's orders in 53 built a tower at each corner of the mosque (Amr (Ismâ'îl), which had not been done before (Ma'akrizi, iv. 7 sqv, 44; Ibn Taghribîrdî, i. 77). The staircase leading up to the minaret was originally outside the mosque, but was later put inside it. Muslama is said to have introduced the minaret into other mosques in al-Fustât (i.e. in all except those of Tûdîb and Kha'îl; cf. Ma'akrizi, iv. 44; Ibn Taghribîrdî, loc. cit.). How old this story is, cannot be ascertained, but the view often put forward that al-Walid was the first to introduce the minaret (cf. Schwally, in Z. D. M. G., ii., 1898, p. 143-146), is in any case not certain.

There are three names in common use for the minaret. 'Mîq'a;hahana or miq'a;hahana, "place of the al-tâbîn call", which is in general use in Egypt and Syria at the present day, is frequently found in literature and inscriptions (B. G. A., ii. 225, ii. v. 108, s; Ma'akrizi, iv. 13, 10, 20, 4, 6, and pass.; Ibn A. Usâîbî, i. 204, 3, from below; v. Berchem, Corpus, i, N°. 25, 63, 88, 89, 90 and others from the 9th century onwards), Safwâna, specially used in North Africa (Maria, Les Monuments arabes de Tlemcen, 1903, p. 45), is frequently found (Ibn Djibair, Rihla, p. 91, 100, 145, 195, 266; Ibn Batûtah, i. 203, 272; ii. 2, 12, 13; Ma'akrizi, iv. 7 sqv; Ibn Taghribîrdî, i. 77). This word means also cloister or cell and in the older literature is used as the equivalent of dair (Sûra xxii. 41; Ibn Hâšîm, p. 115; Bukhârî, al-A'mâl fi-l-Sâlîh, n. 7; Majlîs, n. 35; Anbâ'î, n. 48; B. G. A., i. 115, 154; Ma'akrizi, iv. 384; Dâ'î, n. 561). Manârâ is the most usual word in literature (Ibn al-Makrizi, iv. 7; mânâr; cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i, N° 63; K. al-Mas'âdî, ii. 63, 67). This word has the same meaning as Syr. mânârâ but is probably a analogously, independent formation. The word means light, position in which a light is put (Ibn 'Abbâs, Dîwân, 147, 37; Abî Dhu'aib, Dîwân, ed. Bell, i. 60; B. G. A., vii. 132); also light-house (B. G. A., i. 177; Kindi, Wulâr, p. 64; Ibn Dju'air, Rihla, p. 41). Manâr (or) also means a boundary stone or a signpost (Salûm, Lîsân, p. 99, from below; Kaîl al-Rukâyî, p. 37-77; Ibn Sa'd, ii. 135; Fratam, Hist. Arab., i. 12 and Gl.) or a watch-tower (Tabari, i. 864, 878) the boundary stones of the horasan area, for example, are called Manâr al-harâm (B. G. A., i. 25) and Abraha was called Dhu 'l-Manâr, because he put up signposts (Lîsân, vii. 105, 11; Djâhâna, Saûbî, i. 410); obelisks are also called manârâ (B. G. A., vii. 117, 118, s). The derivation of the last named mânâr from millârion (Franckel, Fremdeufer, p. 285) is likely and still less probable is a derivation from a Persian building for fire-worship (v. Berchem in E. Dier, Die sassanische Baukunst, i. (1908), 113 sqq. distinguishing rather ingeniously between manâr = "light" from nûr and mânâr = "fire-tower" from nûr). Probably there is only a single word in question and the signposts received their name from the watch-tower (note that ašlan also is used of the minaret: Ibn 'Arabshah, Vita Timuri, ed. Manger, 1767, vii. 704). There are a number of references to the existence on the coasts of a series of manârâ and each manârâ gave warning by light-signals of the movements of the enemy (B. G. A., ii. 177). According to al-Baladhuri
This was the already the custom in Omar's time and was in all probability an inheritance from the Byzantines. Similar watch-towers (έγκοιτέριον) were used inland in the Byzantine period e.g. in the eastern Hauran, and the Persians had similar towers on their frontiers (μανάρα: Tabari, i. 864, 878); a similar manâra in the Iraq is described by Ibn Djuhair (p. 210; cf. B. G. A., v. 176); in the Maghribi also, fort-like towers are called manâra, e.g. in Tunis and Gabes (al-Tidjâni in 706–707; J. A., ser. 4, xx. [1852], 99, 144). That these towers used fire-signals is very probable and Musil gives evidence of this custom for the Edom territory (Arabia Petraea, ii. 2, 233). In the sixth (sixth) century again al-"Umari (Zewaj, il'i: al-Mustalhak al-\'ilam, Cairo 1342, p. 199 sq.) refers to the use of a series of heights and towers for light-signals, including the Ma’dumat al-Farazdak, one of the minarets of the Omayyad mosque of Damascus (on the whole question see R. Hartmann, in Z. D. M. G., lxx., 1916, p. 486, 505; Memnon, iii. 221; Ist. i. 388 sq.). It is obvious that the tower of the mosque was given the name manâra from its resemblance to similar watch-towers and it is possible that its use for fire-signals was more general in earlier times. In Fâs the hours of prayer were indicated by lamps from the minarets (J. A., ser. 11, xii. 1918, p. 341).

This does not however answer the question why the minaret was introduced into Islam. From what has been said above it is probable that the minaret was introduced specially for the azžâd call. According to Ibn al-Fakhrî and others, it was incorporated in the Mosque of the Omayyads, simply because it was already there as a part of the church (cf. above); this agrees with de Vogüé's observation that the use of towers in churches and the larger public buildings in Syria in the ivth and vth century was common (La Syrie centrale, i. 57). The tower in the mosque of Baṣra is thought to be an original church-tower (cf. Diez, Die Kunst der islamischen Völker, p. 19 sq.). This indicates that the minaret in Syria became part of the mosque in a purely architectural way. But after its introduction, it was soon used as a place in which the ma’dâdhîn could stand, which has also been an obvious thing to do. This did not happen at once however. From Tabari and others we can see that the call to prayer at a much later date could still be uttered in the street, and al-Farazdak (d. about 110 = 728) who refers to the existence of manâr al-masâjid (Kimiš, p. 481; Aghâni, 2nd ed. Cairo, xiv. 18) also speaks of ma’dâdhîns on the city wall (Tabari, ii. 1302; Naṣîrid, p. 365; see J. Horovitz, in Ist., xvi., 1927, p. 253, 255) with which we may compare the tradition that the Prophet considered whether he ought to permit the call to prayer to be uttered on the fortifications of Madina ("ala az-Zam al-Madina; cf. Ibn Sa’d, i. 7).

It is however by no means impossible that the minaret may have arisen elsewhere in a different way. If we can trust the account by al-Mâkridî and others (see above), the minaret was introduced into Egypt by Mu'awiyâ's orders as a corner tower. Here it was at once used in a way which recalls the dwelling-towers of ascetics. It was used for the adhân, but not only for the five calls to prayer but also for vigil, in which the ma’dâdhîns repeated litanies (Mâkridî, iv. 44 middle) and its architect, Maslama b. Muhkâlîd, used it for the i'tikâf (ibid., p. 44). An ascetic who died in 469 lived in the manâra of the Mosque of 'Amr (YâkJît, Vdây3, iv. 274). This suggests the meaning of minaret expressed by the word guwâmâ (cf. also Mâkridî, iv. 7, 8) as a saint's cell. According to one source, rather late however, al-Walîd is said to have found a monk in the guwâm of the church of St. John who lived in the guwâm there (cf. J. A., ser. 9, vii., p. 189; Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Mant., i/1, 264). This use of the minaret was kept up during the golden age of Islam. Thus Ibn Djuhair records that he saw in the west minaret of the mosque of the Omayyads cells for devout Maghribi and in the topmost chamber, where al-Chârîdî had lived in i'tikâf, there was now a zâhid (Ribîl, p. 266, 18 sqq.); Ibn Tumtûn also lived there (YâkJît, Muqâyim, ii. 596, 19 sq.) and 'Abd al-Lâjî also found another devotee living there (Ibn Abî Usâbhî, ii. 204, 2 from below).

According to al-Mâkridî, the Egyptian minaret was not introduced in a purely architectural way, but even from his account it appears most likely to be Syrian in origin.

If the minaret did not have a single origin, it is improbable that a single type of tower served as the model for it. Ziyâd is said to have built the minaret in Baṣra of stone. The quadrangular Syrian Omayyad type (B. G. A., iii. 182), which was taken over from the church-tower, was also of stone. In Egypt, on the other hand, according to al-Mâkridî, minarets for many centuries were only built of brick and the earliest stone minarets in this country were not built till shortly before 700 in al-Mansûriya and al-\'Albâghâwîya (Mâkridî, iv. 224). In North Africa where the Omayyad, Syrian type was introduced, a round minaret of brick in 7 stories with pillars was built in 'Abbâsiya south of Kairawân in 184 (YâkJît, Muqâyim, iv. 119). Ibn al-Hâjîâdî condemns minarets of his time as being built too high. It is interesting to note as throwing a light on what was considered bid'a that he regards the round form as the old and genuine one (Mashâhid, ii. 61 below). — For literature see Frankel, Schwally, v. Berchem, R. Hartmann, Horovitz quoted above; Durât, in K. Afr., iv., 1900, p. 539 sqq.; J. H. Gotthelf, in Am. Ar. O. S., xxx, 1913, 132–154; N. A. C. Creswell, in Burlington Magazine, xlviii., 1926, p. 134–140, 252–258, 290–296.

b. The Chambers.

The old mosque consisted of the courtyard and the open halls running along the walls: these were called al-muçhaftâs (B. G. A., iii. 82, 158, 165, 182) because they were roofed over. When we are told that in Palestine, except in Jericho, towers were placed between the mucaba and the courtyard (ibid., p. 182), this seems to suggest that the halls were closed, which would be quite in keeping with the winter climate of this region.

The halls were particularly extensive on the kibla side, because assemblies were held here. The space between two rows of pillars was called risâlah or arwi'ka or riwâ'ik (B. G. A., iii. 158, 159: Mâkridî, iv. 10, 11, 12, 49). Extension often took the form of increasing the number of the arwi'ka. In some districts a sail-cloth was spread over the open space as a protection from the sun at the time of the service (B. G. A., iii. 205, 430).

The courtyard was called wâlî. The open space around the Ka'bah is called Fitâr al-Kâba
The name also given to the open space around the mosque (Makrizi, iv. 6). Trees were often planted in the courtyard: e.g. in the mosque of Amir (see B 1); when we read in Makrizi, iv. 6 that it had no ḥabā, this probably means that this space, planted with trees, between the covered halls was very narrow. In Medina, at the present day, there are still trees in the Kura (Batanum, Rīḥa, p. 249); in Ibn Dhu’fa’s time there were 15 palms there (Rīḥa, p. 194). Other mosques in Cairo had trees growing in them (Makrizi, iv. 54, 94, 65, 120; in al-Mawdūdī al-Ḳurān, there were as many as 516 trees: Rīḥa, p. 200) as is still the case today. In other cases the court was covered with pebbles (see above D 1); but this was alleviated with a more refined style of architecture.

Although the maṣṣūrā was only found in Tiberias, out of all the mosques in Palestine (B. G. I., in 182). Frequently, as in Ramla, the halls were covered with marble and the courtyard with flat stone (ibid., p. 165). In the halls also the ground was originally bare or covered with little stones: for example in the mosques of ‘Amr until Maslama b. Muḥammad covered it with mats (see below). The floor of the Mosque of ‘Amr was entirely covered with marble in the Mamluk period (Makrizi, iv. 15 sq.; cf. in Ṣanṣār, Ibn Ṣanṣār, ii. 53). But in the mosque of Mecca, the ḥabā is still covered with little stone. (Batanum, Rīḥa, p. 99 below) 400 dinars were used to be spent annually on this (Crown, Mecki, ii. 109 sq.). In Medina also little pebbles were used (Ibn Dhu’fa, Rīḥa, p. 190, Ibn Ṣanṣār, i. 263)

They were not at first enclosed chambers in the halls. A change in this respect came with the introduction of the maṣṣūrā (p. v.) (on this word cf. Quatremerie, Hist. Sult. Maml. i, p. 164, note 46). This was a box or compartment for the ruler built near the mihrāb. Al-Samhūdī gives the history of the maṣṣūrā in Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 71 sq., 89 sq.). The traditions all agree that the maṣṣūrā was introduced to protect the ruler from the falling of the little attacks according to some men. Qūḥānī built a maṣṣūrā of ṣiḥr with windows, so that the people could see the Imam of the community (ibid. and Makrizi, iv. 7). According to another tradition, Marwān b. ‘Abd al-Jaκām, governor of Medina, after an attempt had been made on him by a Yāmān in the year 44, was the first to build a maṣṣūrā of dressed stone with a window (Balādūn, p. 6 below; Tabari, n. 70). Maṣṣūrā is then said to have followed his example. Others again say that Maṣṣūrā was the first to introduce this innovation. He is said to have introduced the maṣṣūrā with the accompanying guard as early as the year 40 or not till 44 after the Khaṭirji attempt (Tabari, i. 3495; B. G. I., v. 109; Makrizi, iv. 12, 11 sq.); according to one story because he had seen a dog on the maṣṣūrā (Hābīš, ed. Schwyzer, p. 393 below; cf. on the whole question: H. Lammens, Maṣṣūrā, p. 202 sq.). This much seems to be certain, that the maṣṣūrā was at any rate introduced at the beginning of the ⁹th century and it was an arrangement so much in keeping with the increasing dignity of the ruler that, as Ibn Khuldūn says, it spread throughout all the lands of Islam (Maṣṣūrā, Cairo 1322, p. 212 sq.; fur/i. 37). The governor built themselves compartments in the principal mosques of the provinces, e.g. Ziyād in Kūfah and Baṣrah (Balādūn, p. 277, 348) and probably Kurra b. Shīrīk in al-Fustāti (Makrizi, iv. 12). In Medina, we are told that ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz as governor (86—93) raised the maṣṣūrā and built it of tunk, but al-Maḥdī had it taken down in 160 and a new one built on the level of the ground (ibid., p. 7; Wustenfeld, op. cit.: Balādūn, p. 7 cent.). We are further told that in 161, al-Maḥdī prohibited the maṣṣūrā of the provinces and al-Ma’mūn even wanted to clear all the boxes out of the masjadi al-Ǧamāʿa, because their use was a sunna introduced by Muʿāwiya (Makrizi, iv. 12; Yaḥūḥ, ed. Houtsma, ii. 571). But this attempt did not succeed. On the contrary, their numbers rapidly increased. In Cairo, for example, the Ḥājī al-‘Aṣkar built in 169 a maṣṣūrā (Makrizi, iv. 33 sq.) and the mosque of Ibn Tālūn had a maṣṣūrā beside the mihrāb which was accessible from the Dār al-Imāra (ibid., p. 36, 37, 42; Ibn Ṭāhribiṭī, ii. 8, 14). The maṣṣūrā was found in the larger mosques. In the Ḥājī al-Ḳurra and Muhammad b. Kālaṭūn in 718 built a maṣṣūrā of iron for the Sultan’s prayer (Makrizi, iv. 132). According to Ibn Ḥālūdūn, the maṣṣūrā was an innovation of Islam’s own. The question must however be left open, whether in its introduction and development there may not be some connection with the boxes of the Byzantine court, at least, for example, when the Turks in the Veṣḥi al-Ḥājī in Brussa put the Sultan’s box over the door (R. Hartmann, Im neuen Anteliten, p. 27).

Although the maṣṣūrā was introduced with the object of segregating the ruler and was therefore condemned by the strict aṣḥāb al-ṭarīq, it is the custom of Islam (e.g. Maṣṣūrā, ii. 4 sq.), maṣṣūrā were probably introduced for other purposes. Ibn Dhu’fa mentions three in the Mosque of the Omayyads: the old one built by Muʿāwiya in the eastern part of the mosque, one in the centre, which contained the minbar, and one in the west where the Ḥanafīs taught and performed the prayer. There were also other small rooms shut off by wooden lattices, which could be sometimes called maṣṣūrā and sometimes zawiya. As a rule, there were quite a number of zawiya connected with the mosque which were used by students (Rīḥa, p. 265 sq.). We find the same state of affairs in other mosques.

While the groups of the kūrīdū, the students, the lawyers etc. had originally to sit together in a common room, gradually the attempt was made to introduce separate rooms for them. Small compartments were either cut off in the main chamber or new rooms were built in subsidiary buildings. In the former case we get the already mentioned maṣṣūrā or zawiya. Ibn al-Ḥittājī says that a madrasa was often made by the simple process of cutting off a part of a mosque by a balustrade (darbasīn) (Maṣṣūrā, i. 44). Thus in the halls of the Mosque of ‘Amr there were several compartments for teaching, which are called maṣṣūrā and zawiya, in which studies were prosecuted (Makrizi, iv. 20, 15, 25). In the Aṣḥāb Mosque, a maṣṣūrā (Qāmūs) was made in the time of the Fatimids, which she had appeared, and the emirs in the following period made a large number of such maṣṣūrā (ibid., p. 52, 53). In the Aṣḥāb Mosque about 300 A.H., there were three more for women (B. G. I., v. 100). These divisions might be a nuisance at the great assemblies and this is why al-Maḥdī wanted to remove them in 161 from the masjadi al-jamāʿat (Tabari, iii. 486),
and Ibn al-Hajjāj condemned them as works of the mulk and numbers them like other embellishments with the ḥazrāt al-ṣā'i (Muḥarrar, ii. 43 sq.).

The mu'addhinūn not only lived in the minarets, where, at any rate in the Tūlūnī period, they held vigils (Makrizī, iv. 48). They had rooms (zawāfī, sg. ẓawāfī) on the roof and these rooms in time came to be numerous (ibīd., p. 13, 14). All kinds of rooms were put in subsidiary buildings, for the khaṭīb (ibīd., p. 13), for judges, for studies, etc. In addition there were dwelling-houses, not only for the staff but also for others. As already mentioned, devout men used to take up their residence in the mosque for a considerable period for ṣāhīḥ and any one at any time could take up his quarters in the mosque; he could sleep there and make himself at home. It therefore came quite natural to the devout to reside permanently in the mosque. Asceities often lived in the minaret (see above), a ṣāhīḥ lived there and resided there (Sauvage, Hist. férus. et Hébron, p. 11 sq.) and also beside the Masjid Yāni in the ancient Nīyeh (B. G. A., iii. 146). Kitchens were therefore erected with the necessary mills and ovens and cooked food (ḏaḵīzāh) and 14–15,000 loaves (raḏāfī) were daily distributed to those who stayed there and to visitors (Sauvage, p. 20 sq.; cf. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/ii., 231). Bread was also baked in the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (Quatre- mère, op. cit., vii, 233) and kitchens were often found in the mosques (for al-Azhar, see Djalartti, Merveillet, ii. 238 sq.; Sulaimān Ṭalādūn, Kanz al-Dīwān fī Taʾrikh al-Azhar, p. 71 sqq., 107 sqq.). Those who lived in and beside the mosque were called muḥāfīzin (cf. B. G. A., iii. 146; for Jerusalem, Nāṣīr-i Kborsaw, p. 82, 91; for Mecca, Ibn Dījbarīr, p. 149; for Medina, Ibn Baṭṭūtā, i. 279, where we learn that they were organised under a ḍāmidd, like the North Africans under an amūn in Damascus; Ibn Dījbarīr, p. 277 sq.). They were pious ascetics, students, and sometimes travellers. The students generally found accommodation in the madaris but large mosques like that of the Omayyads or al-Azhar had always many students who lived in them. The name of the halls rīwāk, plur. arwāhka, was later used for these students' lodgings (cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i. 43, note 1; perhaps Makrīzī, iv. 54, 25). Strangers always found accommodation in the mosques (cf. C 1). In smaller towns it was the natural thing for the traveller to spend the night in the mosque and to get food there (Ŷikhtūn, iii. 353; al-Kīfī, Taʾrikh al-Ḫubānā, ed. Lippert, p. 252). Travellers like Nāṣīr-i Kborsaw, Ibn Dījbarīr, Ibn Baṭṭūtā, al-Abdārī (J. A., ser. 5, iv, 1854, p. 174) were able to travel throughout the whole Muslim world from one mosque to the other (or madrasa or rīwāk). The traveller could even leave his money for safe keeping in a mosque (Sīfat-nāma, p. 51). Large endowments were bequeathed for those who lived in the mosques (Ibn Lūjair, op. cit.; Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/ii., 105 sq.).

In later times the rulers often built a lodge or pavilion (muṣāra) in or near the mosque (Makrīzī, ii. 345; iv. 13; cf. on the word: Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/ii., 15).

There was often a special room with a clock in the mosques; this also is probably an inheritance from the church, for Ibn Rosta (290 = 903) talks of similar arrangements in Con-tantinople (B. G. A., vii. 126 supra). Ibn Dījbarīr (p. 270) describes very fully the clock in the mosque of the Omayyads (cf. J. A., ser. 9, vii. 205 sq.). It was made in the reign of Nār al-Dīn by Fāhr al-Dīn b. al-Salātī (Ibn Abī ʿUṣābiʿa, ii. 183 sq.); an expert was kept to look after it (Ṭuḡrī, 191). There was a clock in the Mustaʿnīya in Baghdaḍ (Saʿre and Herrfeld, Arch. Rasse, i. 170) and the Muṣūd of ʿAmr also had a ghurjat al-Salātī (Makrīzī, iv. 13, 13). In the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn is still kept a sundial of the year 696 (1296–1297; cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i, N°. 514) but the clocks were usually mechanical (see also Duvey, Supplément, s.v. mināgāna and on the clock generally E. Wiedemann, in Nova Acta der K. Leop. Carol. Akad., vol. C, Halle 1915). In the Maghrib also we find mosque-clocks, e.g. in the Bilānāiya (J. A., ser. ii, xii. 357 sqq.).

The very varied uses to which the mosques were put resulted in their becoming storehouses for all sorts of things. In 668, the Mosque of the Omayyads was cleared of all such things; in the courtyard there were for example stores for machines of war and the rāwāi of Zain al-ʿAbīdu was a regular khān (J. A., ser. 9, vol. vii. 225 sq.).

 strawberries

Whether the Prophet considered it necessary to erect an indicator of the direction of prayer in Medina may be considered doubtful. According to Tradition, when the revelation of the ʿībā came to him, he turned round in the middle of the prayer without further investigation (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 41, 62; Ṭabarī, Taķāfī, xi. 23 centre; Muslim, Ῥassādīdīdī, tr. 2). On the muṣīlālā however and on journeys he used a spear, which was stuck in the ground right in front of him, but this zābā (q.v.) was not intended so much to give the direction a- to be a substitute for the wall, to mark off the area of the worshippers: it could therefore also be an animal or some living thing (Bukhari, Ῥassāt, B. 18, 80–90; Muslim, Ῥassāt, tr. 45; Zaikhāni on Munarrijā, i. 283; Abū Dīwālī, i. 69; Ḥāmid h. Ḥanbāl, Muṭwās, ii. 106). At the present day the mīḥrāb is often called ʿiḥā (and as early as Ibn Taghrībirdī, i. 351; Yūkūt, i. 642).

In al-Fustāṭ ʿAmr is said to have ascertained the ʿībā very carefully with the help of a number of other (Makrīzī, iv. 6 supra: B. G. A., vii. 359; Ibn Taghrībirdī, i. 75 sq.). But we are not told how it was indicated, probably by a pole or something of the kind. The ʿībā was however too far to the east, so that during the prayer the worshippers turned more to the south. At first they were probably content with the direction, roughly correct, in keeping with a ḥadith of Abū Ḥaṭairā, according to which the ʿībā in general lies between east and west (Tirmidhī, Mawākiṭ al-Salātī, p. 139; Makrīzī, iv. 24). The first mosque in Fīhān was built where Abū Mūḥā had performed the ḫātāt, and a brick placed in position
by him was taken as the kibla (B. G. A., vi. 200). But later the problem was tackled seriously. Makrizi mentions the different solutions of it in Egypt (xxi. 21—33). Al-Azhari had the kibla accurate; the mihrāb al-qālāba, i.e. that of the Mosque of 'Amr and those of the mosques in Dīzā, Bilbāis, Alexandria, Kus and Assuan were too far to the east, that of the Mosque of Ibn Tulun was found by a committee to be 14 dārdāb too far west, those of the villages too far west. The direction was ascertained from the stars. Many however followed the kibla of Syria. In the transformation of churches into mosques, frequent under al-Mansūr, their orientation from east to west was decisive. The door on the east side as a rule was made the mihrāb (Makrizi, iv. 30).

The word mihrāb and after the beginning of Islam meant in the first place a palace or a part of one (Immu'ul'ka', p. 52, 339 South Ar.; Mujaddidiyya, p. 21, 139, Persian; Bahuri, Humā'īn, p. 494; Iṣāf al-Rukayyāt, p. 2, 49, 3), also women's apartment ('Omar b. Râbi', p. 136, 9, 42, 7; Makrizi, iv. 378, 13), secondly a niche where a bust stood; e.g., before Islam (Ibn Khūtaiba, 'Uṣūl al-Abārār, p. 356) and for the Muslim period (Huljīn, 90, 14; Bahuri, Humā'īn, p. 492), especially of a niche with an image of a Christian saint ('Omar b. Râbi', p. 323, 7). Perhaps the part of the palace, called mihrāb in the above examples, is simply a niche with a throne in it (cf. esp. Mujaddidiyya, p. 21, 13). The same use of the word is found in the Kur'ān. In Sūra xxxvii. 20, it means the part of the palace where the king is. Sūra xiv. 12, most probably a place where images are put, and iii. 32 sq.; xix. 12, a temple or rather a cell in a temple where one prays. At a still later date we find expression-like mihrāb al-mā'morāb, apparently a name for the apse in the church behind the altar (J. A., ser. 9, vii. 189). Mihrāb has been derived from kisra 'spear' and from South Arabic mekrāb, 'church, mosque, temple.' But the etymology is not certain (see on the whole question: Fraenkel, Fremde Begriffe, p. 274; Khodakami, in W. Z. K. A., xiv. 1905, p. 296—298; Patorius, in Z. Ph. M. G., xi. 1907, p. 621 sq.; Nohlke, Neuer Bestand, z. em. Sprachw., p. 54; note 2; Lammens, in J. A., ser. xi., vi. 247; Becker, Islamstudien, i. 492 sq.; J. Horovitz, in J., xvi., 1927, p. 260 sq.).

If the word mihrāb means the niche placed in the mosque in the direction of prayer, this connects quite well with the usual usage of the word. All are agreed that the mihrāb did not originally belong to the mosque and that it was taken over from the church. The church finds confirmation in Muslim literature (see Lammens, Zīd, p. 33, note 7; note 1) and it is evident that the innovation found its way into the mosque by a purely archetypical way. The mihrāb became the place where the mā'mūm stood during the salāt. It may therefore be assumed that it was one of the principal niches in the church, which was taken over into the mosque: it may have contained the bishop's throne or the image or picture of an important saint.

There is no unanimity as to the date when the mihrāb was introduced into the mosque. Mu'awiyah is occasionally mentioned (B. G. A., v. 109, 11) as a rule, however, and probably with greater right, al-Walid. His governor 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz is said to have introduced it into Medina (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 74; B. G. A., iii. 80, 17 however takes it for granted that 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz only revived it); similarly his governor Kurra b. Shākit (90—96) is recorded to have introduced the prayer niche (mīhrāb mudajjawwuf) into Egypt (Makrizi, iv. 6, 149, 9; Ibn Dukāmāt, iv. 62, 12 sq.; Ibn Taghbirī, i. 76; Süyūṭī, Ḥan al-Muḫwadāra, ii. 135 sq.). Only occasionally is Mu'awiyah's governor Maslama b. Makkahullad (47—62) or 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Marwān (65—84) mentioned as having introduced this innovation (Makrizi, iv. 6). It therefore seems not to be wrong when one speaks of the mā'mūm in the mosque of the Omayyads is described as the oldest in Islam. But it is an anachronism to call it mihrāb al-qālāba and attribute it to Mu'awiyah (Ibn Dujair, p. 265; Ibn Bāṭṭūta, i. 203). The mihrāb is however said not yet to have come into general use in the second century (see Lammens, Zīd, p. 94, note 1; on the other hand, Tābārī supposes a mīhrāb in the Muslim sense as early as David (Tābārī, i. 2408, 71, 12; B. G. A., ii. 312, 10 sq.; other prophets also had their mihrābs in Jerusalem, ibid.).

In the larger mosques there were usually several mihrābs, used by the different madhāhib; in the mosque of 'Amr, for example (according to Ibn Taghbirī, i. 79), in Hebron (Sauvaire, Hist. de l'Islam, et al-Hobr, p. 17), in the mosque of the Omayyads (J. A., ser. 9, vii. 213 sq.; Ibn Dujair and Ibn Bāṭṭūta as above). They might be of wood, but as a rule they were built of masonry or put on pillars. They were often highly ornamented. In the mihrāb of al-Walid, a looking-glass that had belonged to 'Alī is said to have been placed (Kārwhī, ii. 71). A Fātimid adorned a mihrāb in the mosque of 'Amr and one in the Azhar mosque with a silver girdle which weighed 5000 dirhams (Makrizi, iv. 52).

The general objections to adorning mosques were also applied to the mihrāb. A hādīth is said to have forbidden this as an inheritance from the churches; it is compared with the altars (see Lammens, Zīd, p. 33, note 7), but even a puritan like Ibn Ḥudjī does not reject the mihrāb in principle; he only condemns its adornment (Maṣbah, ii. 48). In fact the mihrāb was held in special respect as the most important part of the mosque which found expression in the erection of a kūba over it (e.g. Makrizi, iv. 91; cf. v. Berchem, C. F., i., No. 79). The special importance of the mihrāb is shown from the fact that its position was occasionally revealed in dreams, e.g. in Kairawān (Yākūt, iv. 213) and in the Mosque of Ibn Tulun; here the Prophet appeared to Ahmad b. Tulun and showed him the mihrāb and the spot was surrounded by ants (Makrizi, iv. 39). In the principal mosque of Sanā' there was a prophet's tomb under the mihrāb (B. G. A., vii. 470), which recalls Christian altars. As the most sacred part of the mosque, the mihrāb is compared not only with Christian altars, but the word is used of the sanctuary of prayer in any sanctuary, e.g. in the pre-Christian temple, which stood on the site of the later mosque of the Omayyads (J. A., ser. 9, vii. 371). In Palestine, in keeping with this idea, very many mihrābs are said to have been the mihrābs of Biblical personalities (see Sauvaire, Hist. jér. et Libr, p. 42, 76, 96 sq., 102; Le Strange, Palestine, Index).
d. Minbar [q.v.].

In contrast to the mihrāb, the minbar was introduced in the time of the Prophet himself. The word, often pronounced minbar (cf. Brockeflamm, Grundris, i. 161), comes from the root m-br 'high'; it could be derived from the Arabic quite easily with the meaning "elevation, stand", but is more probably a loanword from the Ethiopic (Sa'd, Z. D. M. G., ii., 1898, p. 146—148; Noldeke, Neue Beiträge z. Sem. Sprachw., 1910, i. p. 49). Its case is therefore somewhat similar to that of masjid. It means "seat, chair" (e.g. Chron. Melkto, ii. 8; Aghāni?; Cairo, xiv. 75) and is used, for example, for saddle (Tabari, Gloss.) and of a litter (Aghāni, xiii. 155; cf. Schwallly). It is therefore identical with madī' (Bukhārī, Dāmu'a, B. 25), with sarī (Kimīl, p. 20; Aghāni, iii. 3), takht or kuri (Usd, i. 214; cf. also Becker, Kamil, p. 8). The use of the word for the pulpit is in keeping with its history.

When the khatib [q.v.] spoke among the Arabs, he usually did so standing (cf. Mafṣūlahiyyāt, ed. Lyall, xci. 33; Dājjājīqay, Bayān, Cairo, 1332, i. 129; ii. 143) frequently beating the ground with bow and lance (ibid., i. 198; Lohi, d. 15, 9, 45); or he sat on his mount as did e.g. Kuśa b. Sawda (Bayān, i. 25, 31; ii. 141). The Prophet did both of these things. In Ḡeṣa he sat on his camel during his khutba and on other occasions, when addressing the community during the early period, even as late as the day of the capture of Mecca, he stood (cf. Sūra xxii. 11). The people set on the ground around him (Bukhārī, Dāmu'a, B. 28; Tabari, B. 6). In the mosque in Mecca he had a particular place, as is mentioned in the stories of the introduction of the minbar. Sometimes, we are told, he stood beside a tree or a palm-tree (Bukhārī, Manāfiqī, B. 25; ed. Kreth, ii. 400); as a rule however, beside a palm-trunk (gūlū), so Ibn Sa'd, i. 9, 10, 11, 12) and on a few occasions beside one of the pillars (Bukhārī, Manāfiqī, B. 25, ed. Kreth, ii. 401; Dīyārbakrī, Khumīs, ii. 75). This is undoubtedly the original tradition: the Prophet stood beside one of the palm-tree trunks used as pillars in the mosque. For "beside" (usually kāna lī; Bukhārī, B. 32: Ibn Sa'd: B. 254: Kāmil: sūnīna: al-'uḍ) already in Bukhārī, Dāmu'a, B. 26) is sometimes found later and for the column or trunk, we find a stomp which he sat.

Various passages record how the minbar was introduced, notably the following: Ibn Sa'd, i. 9—13; Bukhārī, Sālit, B. 18, 64, 91; Dāmu'a, B. 26; Būyār, B. 32; Hība, B. 3; Manāfiqī, B. 25; Muslim, Mafṣūlahiyyāt, iii. 10; n. also Wensinck, Handbuch, iv., P. 3; Usd al-Ghābīha, i. 43 infra, 214; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 62 sq. Ibn Bayṭāt, B. 275 sq.; the whole material is in Dīyārbakrī, Khumīs, i. 129; ii. 75 sq. and Strat al-Hallabāh, ii. 146 sqq. The details are variously given. We know, we are told, was built of ṭarāf wood or tamarisk from the woods near Medina; the builder was a Byzantine or a Coptic and was called Buṭum or Būlīḥ, but the names Ibrāhīm (Usd, i. 43), Maimūn, Ṣabīḥ, Kūlāb, Minā [see Khumīs] are also given. He was a carpenter, but a slave of the wife of one of the Ansār or (Bukhārī, Hība, B. 3) of the Muḥādhirūn. Others say he belonged to al-ʿAbbās. The suggestion is sometimes credited to the Prophet and sometimes to others. The palm-trunk is said to have whined like a camel

or a child when the Prophet mounted his new seat but was calmed by stroking and kind words from the Prophet. Most stories take it for granted that the minbar was primarily intended for the khutba; in some it is added that the object was to enable the large assembly to hear him (Ibn Sa'd, i. 10, 11). We are told also that the Prophet performed the salāt on it, and, during the snūfīl, he came down from it. He also took care that the people could see his salāt and follow him (Bukhārī, Sālit, B. 18; Dāmu'a, B. 26). This last tradition however presumes the last custom customary upon the minbar (note that the same idea of the palm-stump occurs in Dāmu'a, B. 26).

In this connection it is interesting to note a tradition in Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, according to which the Companions asked the Prophet to take up a raised position as an early mufaddaliyyāt in Dāmu'a, (Al-Ghābīha, i. 43). Another tradition is in keeping with this, according to which the Prophet, when he was visited by a man named Ṭānīm, stood on a kuri and addressed him from it (ibid., i. 214; cf. Lammens, Mokwat, p. 204, note 5). Here we have a seat of honour on which the ruler sits. This is undoubtedly in keeping with the character of the minbar; while the raised seat was in general use among the northern Semites the Arabs usually sat on the ground, often leaning against a saddle. The raised seat was the special mark of the ruler or, what is the same thing, of the judge. We are told that Rāba b. Mughāshīn was the first to sit on a minbar or sarī when acting as judge (Aghāni, 2nd Cairo ed., iii. 3; Maškīr, iv. 6 sq.). Al-Ḥadīdī, for example, when he addressed the people (hardly in the mosque) sat on a chair which belonged to him (kuri ṭawīl: Tabari, i. 959) and when he tried and condemned his enemies, a sarī was erected for him (ibid., p. 1119); in the same way a kuri was placed for Yaḥyā when he issued his orders for a battle (ibid., p. 1107; see also Becker, Kamil, p. 8). If tradition usually suggests that the minbar was introduced exclusively for the khutba, this seems to be somewhat one-sided view. The minbar was, primarily, as Becker was the first to point out, the throne of the mighty Prophet in his capacity as a ruler. In keeping with this is the tradition that it was introduced in the year 7, 8 or 9 (Tabari, i. 1591; Khumīs, ii. 75; Usd al-Ghābīha, i. 23). The Prophet used it for the publication of important announcements, for example, the prohibition of wine. That he should also make his public speeches to the community from the new seat was only natural. His khutba, however, were not confined to the Friday service and could well deliver a khutba without a minbar, e.g. at the festival on the ṭuqālāh, when Mar-Wān was the first to put up a minbar (Bukhārī, ʿUṣūl, B. 6) and beside the Kalb after the capture of Mecca (Ibn Hisābām, p. 823).

The Prophet's minbar is often called a ṣawād from its material (Bukhārī, Sālit, B. 64; Dāmu'a, B. 26). It consisted of two steps and a seat (madī's: Khumīs, ii. 75; Bukhārī, Dāmu'a, B. 23; makāṭ: Tabari, i. 1591). After the time of the Prophet, it was used in the same way by Abū Bakr, ʿOmar and ʿUthmān (see below). Its significance as a throne is seen from the fact that in the year 50 Muḥāwiyya wanted to take it to Syria with him: he was not allowed to do so but he raised it 6 steps. At a later date, ʿAbd al-
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Malik and al-Walid are said to have wanted to take the Prophet's minbar to Damascus (Tabari, n. 92 sq.; Khudari, ii. 75; Yakuti, ed. Houtsm, ii. 283; B. G. A., v. 23 sq.; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 63). In the time of the Prophet, it stood against the wall so that a sheep could just get past (Bukhari, Salats, p. 91). In the time of al-Mahdi, in the centre of the Muhajjara there was pointed out the position of the old minbar, above which Mu'awiya was said to have built his new one (B. G. A., ii. 82; cf. ii. 26 and Kazimi, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 71). According to some hadiths, it was over the hand of the Prophet (Bukhari, Salats fi Makka, B. 5; FabiI-al-Medina, B. 5, 12 and pass.). At a later date, new minbars were erected in the mosque (see Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 64, 96).

That the Omayyads should have a minbar of their own was natural; they sat on it, just as their predecessors had done (cf. Goldhauer, Muhammet, ii. 42) or perhaps in the journey to Mecca (Chron. Meckia, i. 333; he also had it taken to the festivals on the musalla (Yakuti, ed. Houtsm, ii. 265), just as Marwan used to do in Medina (see above); it was therefore still portable and indispensable for the sovereign, when he wished to make a public appearance as such. In Ibn Lubbah's time, the minbar al-khutba in Damascus was in the central maksura (Ribat, p. 265). According to Ibn Khaldun, Mu'awiya was the first in Islam to use the throne (sawir, minbar, tarzat, kursi) but he is clearly not referring to the minbar of the mosque (Muqaddima, Canto 1322, p. 205 sq.; firdos, 3, iii. 37).

The minbar taken to Mecca by Mu'awiya remained there till the time of al-Rasheed; when the latter visited Mecca on his hajj in the year 170 or 174 a minbar maksura with 9 steps was presented to him by the emir of Egypt and the old one was put up in Arafat. At a later date, al-Wathiq made minbars for Mecca, 'Arifa and Minah (Chron. Meckia, i. 333; ii. 114). The Meccan minbar was a portable one. It usually stood beside the maksur but was put beside the Ka'ba during the khutba (Ibn 'Abbas, p. 95, 97; cf. Chron. Meckia, ii. 429). According to al-Tabani, this custom was kept up until Sultan Sulaiman Kanuni (926-974) built a marble minbar, north of the maksur (al-Tabari, al-Makdisi, p. 100).

It seems at first to have been doubtful whether minbars should be put up in the provinces or not. According to al-Kufi, 'Amr had a minbar made in al-Fustat but 'Omar ordered him to take it away: he was not to raise himself above the Muslims so that they would have to sit below his heels (Maqrizi, iv. 6 sq.; Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 76; Suyuti, Huma al-Muhammad, i. 63; ii. 135). The idea obviously was that the throne belonged to the caliph alone. After 'Omar's death however, 'Amr is said to have used a minbar (Maqrizi, iv. 8: 27). It stood there till Kurra b. Shabir rebuilt the mosque. During the rebuilding it was put in the Kasr, which was used as a mosque; only when the mosque was completed in the year 92 did Kurra put up a new minbar. This tradition however is uncertain. The minbar removed by Kurra perhaps dated from Abd al-Aziz b. Marwan, who had taken it from a church or had been presented with it by the 'Abbasid King (Maqrizi, iv. 8; Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 78). Kurra's minbar remained till 737 when the Fatimid vizier Yakuti b. Killis replaced it by a gilded one. A large new minbar was placed in the mosque of 'Amr in 405 by al-Hajim (Maqrizi, iv. 8; Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 78 sq.). We hear of no objections in other places to the manbar in the ansar. In al-Madawa' in as early as the year 16 Sa'd erected a minbar in the mosque improvised in the Iwan of Kisra (Tabari, i. 2451, q). In Basra, Abu Masu put up a minbar in the middle of the mosque. This was however found inconvenient because the Inam had to cross from the minbar to the kibla "over the necks" of the (seated) believers. Ziyad then placed the minbar against the south wall (Yakuti, i. 642). On the other hand, we are told that 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbâs (governor of Baṣra 36-40) was the first to mount the minbar in Basra (Dhajal, Bayan, i. 179). When Ziyad had to fly from Basra he saved the minbar which he put up in his Masjid al-Haddan (Tabari, i. 3414 sq.). The minbar was the symbol of the ruler and the governor sat upon it, as representative of the ruler. It therefore formed a feature of the Masjid al-Djamâ', where the community was officially addressed. In the year 64 therefore, there were minbars in all the provinces.

In this year homage was paid to Marwan b. al-Hakam not only in the capital but in other manabirs in the Hijaz, Misr, 'Arâb, Ifriqi, Khorasan, and other amâqis (B. G. A., vii. 307). Special mention is made of the fact that 'Abdunya had no minbar.

In the first century and beginning of the second, we find the wall in the smaller towns, delivering the khutba standing, with the staff only. But in 132 the governor 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan had manbar put up in the kura of Egypt (Maqrizi, iv. 8, 37 sq.; Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 350 sq.). When the khatba became purely an official service and the ruler was no longer the khatib (q.v.), the minbar became the pulpit of the spiritual preacher and every mosque in which the Friday service was celebrated was given a minbar. At the same time, i.e. after al-Rasheed, the change was gradually completed and the preacher spoke, standing on the pulpit. Hadiths therefore came into existence, according to which the Prophet used to deliver two khutbas on Friday, standing "just as is done to-day" (Bukhari, Zawwa'a, p. 27; 30 and 'Omar, ibid., p. 2).

The minbar was thus now quite analogous to the Christian pulpit. It is very probable that this latter also influenced its form. We have already noted above, of a minbar in the mosque of 'Amr, that it was said to be of Christian origin. The same thing came to be said of the Prophet's minbar (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 63). Mu'awiya made the Medina minbar larger, while the one bought by him to Mecca had only 3 steps and was of course portable. We again hear of portable minbars later, which did not exclude their being large (cf. above on the minbar of Mecca). Thus the manbar in al-Maghrib is said to have been portable. Ibn al-Hajjaj regards this (the oldest) custom as bid'a and therefore ascribes it to al-Hajjaj (Maghrib, ii. 47, 13 sqq.). The oldest minbars were all of wood. There is however one hadith which says that the Prophet had a kurji of wood with iron fittings made for the reception of Tamim ('Cd, i. 214 sq. from now; cf. Lammens, Maw'ita, p. 273; note 3); it is however uncertain what relation this had to the minbar. A minbar of iron was made as early as the Omayyad period (Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 78; 8: al-minbar al-hadil probably correct in
spite of Becker, Kanzel, p. 10, note; cf. 79, 49 (see below); and also of stone (Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii. 42, note 5 with a reference to Ibn Hadžar); later they were also built of bricks (Wustenfeld, Med. i., 64, 96). As a rule the minbar stood against the kibla wall beside the mihrab. Al-Mahdī tried to reduce the manāhib to their original small size (Tabari, iii. 486, r; Mašhīrī, iv. 12, 13 sqq.), but he could not arrest the development. In the larger mosques several manāhib were even built. Ibn al-Fakhrī about 300 A. H. already mentions 5 minbars in the mosque in Jerusalem (B. G. A., i., 100, 8 sq.). In the Sultan Hassan mosque in Cairo 4 were planned and 3 erected when a minaret fell down in 762 and diverted attention to other work (Mašhīrī, ii. 117, 18 sq.).

The importance, which the minbar already had in the time of the Prophet, caused special reverence to be paid to it and the sanctity of the mosque was concentrated round this and around the mihrab. The governor of Kufa Khaššīb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kasrī (105—120) received a letter of censure from the caliph because he had prayed for water on the minbar (Kasrī, p. 26, 13 sqq.). A false oath was taken on or beside the minbar of al-ʿAdī. He was led to hell absolutely (Ibn Saʿād, i/1, 10, 3 sqq., 12, 19 sq.; Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, ii. 329; cf. John Pedersen, Der Eid, p. 144, 147). Legends grew up which represented the Prophet seeing into the future from the minbar (Bukhārī, Qumra, bāb 29) and being able to follow the battle of Muʿta from it (cf. Wāqīdī—Wellhausen, p. 311; Ibn Ḥīṯām, p. 760) and also telling how his prayers on the minbar were specially efficacious.

Just as the Kaba was covered (kusūr) so was the same thing done to the minbar. ʿOṯmān is said to have been the first to cover the minbar of the Prophet with a kitṭa (Louma, ii. 75 sq.) from below. Muʿawiyah did the same thing when he had to give up his attempt to abolish it (ibid., p. 76 sq.; Tabari, ii. 92 sq.). It was not quite the same thing when al-Ḥākim rediscovered the already mentioned iron minbar and covered it with gilt leather because it was covered with dirt (read: kadhār) i.e. rust (Ibn Taḥṭibīrī, i. 79, 5 sq.). Under the ʿAbbāsid new κίσα was sent every year for the minbar of the Prophet from Baghdad; the Sultan Liṭr was not renewed so frequently (Wustenfeld, Med., p. 64). We find other references to the covering of the minbar on special occasions (Ibn Djabair, p. 149, 6). Ibn al-Hadīdī (Madkal, ii. 74) demands that the imām should put a stop to the custom of putting carpets on the minbar. —

On the question of the minbar see: C. H. Becker, Die Kanzel im Kultus des alten Islam, Novellae Festschrift, i. 331—351 = Islamstudien, i. 450—471; Caetani, Avvalli dell' Islam, i. 553, 739; ii. 68 sqq., 87, 213 sqq.; H. Lammens, Moesia, p. 63, 204—208, 273; J. Horovitz, in IsL, xvi., 1927, p. 257—260.

c. Dakka.

In the larger mosques there is usually found near the minbar a platform to which a staircase leads up. This platform (dakka, popularly often dikka) is used as a seat for the muʿādhīhūn when pronouncing the call to prayer in the mosque at the Friday service. This part of the equipment of a mosque is connected with the development of the service (cf. below under H. 4 and C. H. Becker, Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus, iii., 1912, p. 374—399 = Islamstudien, i. 472—500; E. Mittwoch, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islamischen Gebets und Kultus, Abb. Fr. Ak. W., 1913, Phil.-Hist. Cl., No. 2). The first adḥān-calling is pronounced from the minaret, the second (when the khaṭīb mounts the minbar) and the third (before the ʿalā, ʾišāma) in the mosque itself. These calls were at first pronounced by the muʿādhīhūn standing in the mosque. At a later date raised seats were made for them.

Al-Ḥadīdī records that Maslama, Muʿawiyah's governor in Egypt, was the first to build platforms (here called manāhib) for the calls to prayer in the mosques (Su a Ḥalabiya, ii. 111 below). This story however, given without any reference to older authorities, is not at all reliable. It seems that a uniform practice did not come into existence at once. In Mecca the muʿādhīhūn for a time uttered the second call (when the preacher mounted the minbar) from the roof. As the sun in summer was too strong for them, the emir of Mecca, in the reign of Hāṭān al-Rashīd, made a little hut (zanne) for them on the roof. This was enlarged and more strongly built by al-Muwattākik in 240, his contemporary al-ʿAzrāki relates (Chron. Melb., i. 352 sqq.). The attention in the mosque of Amr in Cairo was similar. Here also the adḥān was uttered in a chamber (dīghafū) on the roof and in 336 there is a reference to its enlargement (Mašhīrī, iv. 11) As late as the time of Barbās, when the many chambers were removed from the roof of the Mosque of ʿAmr, the old zanne of the muʿādhīhūn was left intact (ibid., p. 14; cf. al-Kindi, Wulțar, ed. Guest, p. 469, note 2). In the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn the adḥān was pronounced from the cupola in the centre of the ʿalā (Mašhīrī, iv. 40). Al-Maḏkīrī records in the fourth century as a notable thing about Khaṣrān that the muʿādhīhūn there pronounced the adḥān on a sarīr placed in front of the minbar (B. G. A., iii. 327).

The dīghafū "platform" in front of the minbar in the mosques of Shahrāṣīn must have had the same purpose (ibid., p. 357).

In the viiith century, Ibn al-Hadīdī mentions the dīghafū as a bidāʿ in general use, which should be condemned as it unnecessarily prevents freedom of movement within the mosque (Madkal, i. 45 above). In the year 827 a dīghafū in the mosque of al-Ḥākim was mentioned (Mašhīrī, iv. 61): the dīghafū mentioned in inscriptions from Cairo all date from the period before and after 900 A. H. Ibn al-Hadīdī mentions that in addition to the large dīghafū used for the Friday service there was sometimes a lower one for ordinary sermons (Madkal, ii. 46 sq.) and says that in the larger mosques there were several dīghafūs on which muʿādhīhūn pronounced the adḥān in succession so that the whole community could hear it (tablīgh; ibid., p. 45 sq.). Lane also mentions several musībalīgīn in the Azhar Mosque (Manners and Customs, Everyman's Library, p. 87, note 2).

c. Kursi, Kurraṣ and Relices.

In the mosques there is usually a kursi, that is a wooden stand with a seat and a desk. The desk is for the Kurraṣ, the seat for the kāṣīr or reader, kāṣīr. Ibn Djabair attended a divine service in Baghdad at which a celebrated preacher spoke from the minbar, but only from the kāris, the kāris had recited portions of the Kurraṣ (Rīkā, p. 219, 222). The kāṣīr's chair was sometimes identical with the kāṣīr sitting on a kursi made of teak (Ibn Djabair, p. 200; Yākūb, Udbãh, ii. 319; Mašhīrī, iv. 121);
sometimes he spoke from the minbar to which the wā'īt often had access (cf. Ibn Djubair: see M., Renaissance des Isams, p. 320). The kūṣṣāṣ are called by al-Makki uṣbā' al-kārāṣi which is in keeping with this (Kut al-Kulai, i. 152, quoting K. al-Madkhal, i. 159). Several kārāṣi are often mentioned in one mosque (cf. for the mosque of al-Makki, iv. 19). Whether the kārāṣi mentioned for the same period always had a desk cannot be definitely ascertained. The kārāṣi with dated inscriptions given by van Beecum in his Corpus all belong to the ith (xiiith) century (N°, 264, 302, 338, 359, 401). According to Lane, at the Friday service while the people are assembling, a kārāṣ recites the 18th Sūra up to the aṭṭāf (Manners and Customs, p. 86). The same custom is recorded by Ibn al-Hajdji and condemned because it has a disturbing effect (K. al-Madkhal, ii. 44, middle).

The Kūrsan very soon received its definite place in the mosque like the Bible in the church (cf. Baghṭa, Salīl, bāb 91: they prayed at a pillar besidē al-nūṣhāf). According to one tradition, 'Awāmīhāh had several copies of his Kūrsan sent to the provinces (e.g. Noledeko-Schwall, Gesch. d. Ṣūra, ii. 112 sqq.); al-Hādhāja, a little later, is said to have done the same thing (Makrizi, iv. 17). The mosques had many other copies besides the one kept on the kūrsan Al-Hakim put 814 aṭṭāf in the Mosque of IbnṬūlūn, where the founder had already put boxes of Kūrsan (Makrizi, iv. 36, 40, cf. Ḥasan al-Mūsāḥara, ii. 138) and in 403 he presented 1,289 copies to the Mosque of 'Amr, some of which were written in letters of gold (Makrizi, iv. 12; Ḥasan al-Mūsāḥara, ii. 136). Even earlier than this there were so many that the kāṣī al-Rāḥīḥ b Makīn (237—245) appointed a special aṭṭāf to look after them (al-Kindī, Wisti, p. 469); there are still a very large number in the Mosque of the Prophet (see Batanuni, Rīhla, p. 241 above). Of particular value was the Muḥājīr Āmūz, belonging to the Mosque of 'Amr, prepared by 'Abī al-ʿAzīz b. Muʿāwīya, later bought by his son and afterwards by his daughter ʿAmmār; he left it in 128 to the mosque and it was used for public reading (see its whole history in Makrizi, iv. 17 sqq.) Besides it, another copy was for some time also used for reading, which was said to have lain beside ʿOthmān, when he was killed and to have been stained with his blood, but this one was removed by the Fatimids (Usk., p. 19) in the time of Ibn Būṭṭa, a Kūrsan for which the same claim was made was kept in Ḥasra (ii. 10). On New Year's Day when the Fatimids used to go in procession through the town, the Caliph at the entrance to the Mosque of 'Amr took up in his hands a muḥājīf said to have been written by 'Ali and kissed it (Ibn Taghribirdi, ii. 4, p. 472 middle); it was perhaps the Muḥājīr Āmūz, in Syria, Egypt, and the Ḥud obst, in the fourth century, there were Kūrsan which were traced back to ʿOthmān (F. G. A., ii. 143; cf ii. 117) one of the Kūrsan made for ʿOthmān was shown in the Mosque of the Omaiyads in Damascus in the time of Ibn Djubair. It was produced after the daily Salahs and the people touched and kissed it (Rīhla, p. 268). It was bought there in the year 507 from Tiberias (Dhahab, Taqī al-Dīn Rāshīd, 1327, ii. 25). Other Kūrsan of ʿOthmān were shown in Baghdād and Cordova (see M., Renaissance des Isams, p. 327) and Ibn Djubair saw another in the Mosque of the Prophet; it lay in a desk on a large stand, here called milnā (Rīhla, p. 193; cf thereon Dozy, Supplement, s. v.). The Fāḍilīya Madrasa also had a Muḥājīr ʿUthmān, bought by the Khā ṣ al-Fāḍil for 30,000 dinārs (Makrizi, iv. 197) and there is one in Fāsid (Archives Muscovites, xviii, 1922, p. 361). Valuable Kūrsan like these had the character of relics and belonged to the kīṣānā they were. They were often kept in a chest (sandīk) (Ibn Djubair, cf. cit.); for amīṣ al-muḥājīf, Bukhārī, Sahīr, bāb 95; Makīn has al-sanāf (see al-ʿAskalānī, Fath al-Bātir, i. 385); also called ṭā ṣīb (Ibn Djubair, p. 104). In the Kūrsa Ibn Djubair saw two chests with Kūrsan (p. 84). Ibn al-Fakhrī mentions 16 chests with Kūrsan in the Jerusalem mosque (B. G. A., v. 100). In the mosques there were also sandīk for other things, such as lamps (Makrizi, iv. 53; Wüstenfeld, Meṣna, p. 82 = Ibn Djubair, p. 194), a ṭā ṣīb for alms (K. al-Madkhal, ii, 44, infra), for the kāṣī al-muḥājīn or the property of the mosque (see below). There were also chests for rose-wreaths (Makrīzī, v. 50) which were in charge of a special officer. In the Mosque of ʿAmr there was a whole series of ʿawādī (Makrizi, iv. 9).

The Kūrsan were not the only relics to be kept in the mosques. Bodies or parts of the bodies of saints (cf. B. 4, C 1) and other ʿāthār were kept and revered in mosques: the rod of Moses, (in Kūssā, Yāʿrī, iv. 325 being of Mecca, see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii. 192), the Prophet's sandals (in Ηebron, B. G. A., v. 101, also in Damascus, where the Ashrafīya Madrasa had his left and the Dammāghiya his right sandal; F. J. s. 9, i. 271 sqq., 402), his cloak (in Adbur, B. G. A., i. 178), hair from his beard (in Jerusalem among other places, Batani, Rīhla, p. 165) and many other things (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii. 355 sqq.; M., Renaissance des Isams, p. 325 sqq.). These relics were often kept in valuable reliquaries. The head of Husain was buried in a ṭā ṣīb in his mosque in Cairo (Ibn Djubair, p. 45). There was a black stone like that in the Kūrsa in the Mosque of Khāṭrān (B. G. A., iii. 433). On the other hand, pictures and images were excluded from the mosques, in deliberate contrast to the crucifixes and images of saints in churches, as is evident from Ḥadith (Bukhārī, Sahīr, bāb 48, 54); Ḩaṣnāt, bāb 71; Muslim, Maṣāḥid, tr. 3; or on the question Becker, Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung, Z. A., xxvi = Islamstudien, i. 445 sqq.). It is of interest to note that in the earliest period, Saʿd b. Abī Waḳkās had no scruples about leaving the wall-paintings in the Iwan of Kūrsa at Mā ḥaṣ standing, when it was turned into a mosque (Tahari, i. 2443, 2451). The case was somewhat different, when, before the chief mosque in Delhi which had been a Hindu temple, two old copper idols formed a kind of threshold (Ibn Battuta, iii. 151) although even this is remarkable (cf. Snouck, Islamische Kunst, Verspreide Geschichten, i. 451 sqq. = Z. D. W. G., i., 1907, p. 186 sqq.). In some circles the opposition to pictures extended to other relics also. Ibn Taimiya condemned the reverence paid to the Prophet's footprint, which was shown, as in Jerusalem, in a Damascus mosque also (Quatremère, Hist. Salt. Mani., ii. 248). g. Carpets.

Carpets were used to improve the appearance of the mosques. The custom of performing the
salât upon a carpet is ascribed by Ḥadīth to the Prophet himself. Anas b. Mālik performed the salât with him in his grandmother's house and the Prophet used a cloth or mat (ḥabūr), which had become block through wear; as a rule, he used a mat woven of palm leaves, ḫamūra (Baghdādi, Salāt, bb. 19, 20, 21; Ḥadd, bb. 30; Muslim, Masdjid, tr. 47; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, Muṣnad, ii. 145). In any case, it is clear from Balādhurī that the salât was at first performed in the mosque simply in the dust and then on pebbles (Balādhurī, p. 277, 348; cf. al-Zarqānī, Shahr ʿalaʾ l-Mawṣūfī, i. 283 sq.). Later, when the halls were extended, the ground, or the paving, was covered with matting.

The first to cover the ground in the Mosque of Ṣamr with ḥabūr instead of ḥabūr was Muḥāwīya’s governor Maslama b. Mukhliḍ (Maṭrī, iv. 8; Ḥusn al-Maṭḥūta, ii. 136; Ibn Ṭabarī, Rihla, p. 469). Ibn Ṭūlūn covered his mosque floor with ʿAbbaḍanī and Sāmānīan mats (Maṭrī, iv. 36, 38). For the mosque of al-Ḥākim in the year 403, al-Ḥākim bought 1,036 ḥārān of carpeting for 5,000 dinār (Maṭrī, iv. 56; cf. for al-ʿAzhar, ibid., p. 50). In the year 439 in the Mosque of Ṣamr, there were ten layers of coloured carpets one above the other (Nāṣīr Khusraw, ed. Schefer, p. 31 [text], p. 149 [transl.]). In the Mosque at Jerusalem 800,000 ḥārān of carpets were used every year (R. G. A., v. 100). In the Mosque in Mecca they were renewed every Ramadan (R. G. A., v. 100). On ceremonial occasions the minbar was also draped with a carpet (ṣadqāṣa, q.v.); in Medina, the minbar and the sacred tomb was always covered like the Kaʿba in Mecca (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 83; cf. Quatremère, Hist Suit. Islam., ii. 91) and some, especially the teachers, had their skins (jarwa), in some cases also a cushion to lean upon. The doors were also covered with some material (Maṭrī, iv. 56). On feast-days, the mosques were adorned with carpets in a particularly luxurious fashion (see Ibn Ṭabarī, Ṭabarī, i. 483). The Puritans rejected all this as bidʿa and preferred the bare ground (Maṭrī, ii. 46, 49, 73, 74, 76) as the Wahhābīs still do.

h. Lighting.

When evening meetings and vigils were of regular occurrence, artificial lighting became necessary. Al-ʿAzrākī gives the history of the lighting of the Meccan Mosque. The first to illuminate the Kaʿba was ʿIbā b. al-ʿAzrākī, whose house was next to the Mosque, just on the Maṭrī; here he placed a large lamp (muḥābāt). ʿOmar, however, is said previously to have placed lamps upon the wall, which was the height of a man, with which he surrounded the mosque (Balādhurī, p. 46). The first to use oil and lamps (ṣanāʿāt) in the mosque was Muḥāwīya (cf. R. G. A., v. 20). In the time of ʿAbd al-Malik, Khālid b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḵasrī placed a lamp on a pillar of the Zendem beside the Black Stone, and the lamp of the ʿAzrākī family disappeared. In the reign of al-Maʿmūn in 216 a new lamp-post was put up on the other side of the Kaʿba and a little later two new lanterns were put up around the Kaʿba Hārīm al-Rashīd (268–271) placed ten large lamps around the Kaʿba and hung two lanterns on each of the walls of the mosque (ḥurayṣa; cf. Ibn Ḥujayl, Ḥikāya, p. 149, 150, 155, 271; v. Berchem, Corp. Inscrip. Arab., i, N. 506). Khālid al-Kasrī had the maṣ’ā also illuminated during the pilgrimage and in 219 the torches called nafsāt were placed here and ʿOmar b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Maṭrī ordered the people, who lived in the streets of Mecca, to put up lamps on the 1st Muḥarram for the convenience of those visiting the Kaʿba (Chron. Mīkāb, i. 200–202, cf. 458 sq.). In 253 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Maṭrī ordered a wooden pole in the centre of the ṣamūʿ and ḥanūfī on ropes were hung from it. This was however very soon removed (ibid., ii. 196 sq.). About 100 years later, al-Maḍīṣi saw around the Taʿwīf wooden poles on which hung lanterns (ṣanāʿāt) in which were placed candles for the kings of Egypt, Yemen, etc. (B. G. A., ii. 74). Ibn Ḥujayl describes the glass ḥanūfī, which hung from hooks in the Meccan Īḍāma (Rīḥlā, p. 193) and lamps (masaṣāt) which were lit in iron vessels (ibid., p. 103, cf. i. 143). Similar silver and gold ḥanūfī were seen by him in Medina (ibid., p. 192 at the top; see also Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 83 sqq.). According to al-Ṭabīḥī (before 300), 1,000 lamps lit every evening in Jerusalem (ii. G. A., v. 100) and in the next century al-Maḍīṣi says that the people of Palaistine always burn ḥanūfī in their mosque, which were hung from chains as in Mecca (B. G. A., ii. 182). The illumination was thus greatly increased. In the year 60, when Ibn Ṣayyād was searching for his enemies in the mosque of Kaʿba, the lamps were not sufficient, and large torches had to be used in searching the pillared hall (Tabari, ii. 250 sq.). This shows that already been said about Mecca, shows us out of what modest beginnings this part of the mosque’s equipment developed.

In the time of the ʿAbbāsid, lamps and lanterns were part of the regular furniture of the mosque. Al-Maʿmūn is said to have taken a special interest in this. He ordered lamps to be put in all the mosques, partly to assist those who wanted to read and partly to prevent crime (Bañah, ed. Schwally, p. 473). For this purpose, the ḥanūfī, already mentioned, hung on chains were used, as at the building of the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn (Maṭrī, iv. 36, 38), in the Āzhār Mosque and elsewhere; they were often of silver (ibid., v. 100). Lanterns (ṣanāʿāt) were also used and were of course condemned by Ibn al-Ḥādī (Akhīdī, ii 54) as ostentations. At the same time, candles (ṣwām or ẓwām) were used in large numbers, the candlesticks (ṭāwūs, sing. ṭawṣ) often being of silver (Ibn Ḥujayl, Ḥikāya, p. 45, 151, 194; cf. Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 95, 100). About 400, large candleabra were made in Egypt, which from their shapes were called tanūrūs, stoves. Al-Ḥākīm presented the Mosque of ʿAmr with a tanūrūs made out of 100,000 dirhams of silver; the mosque doors had to be widened to admit it. He also gave it two other lamps (ṣwām) (Ṭalib, Ḥikāya, p. 45, 185, 186 [transl.]; Nāṣīr Khusraw, ed. Schefer, p. 51 [text]; p. 148 [transl.]; Ibn Ṭabarī, Rīḥlā, ed. Popper, ii. ii., p. 105). In the Mosque of al-Ḥākim, in addition to lamps and candle-lanterns, he also put 4 silver tanūrūs and he made similar gifts to the Āzhār and other mosques: the lamps were of gold or silver (Maṭrī, iv. 51, 56, 63; cf. Ibn Ṭabarī, Ṭabarī, ii. ii. 105). The tanūrūs and other lanterns could also be made of copper (see v. Berchem,
Corpus, i, No. 502, 503, 506, 507, 511), as, for example, the elebrated candelabrum of the Mosque of Mākiyad (Makrizi, iv. 137) which was made for the Mosque of Ḥasan but sold by it (ibid., p. 118).

This great interest in the lighting of the mosque was not entirely based on practical considerations. Islam made and the monastirs a divine service and Išlm here, as elsewhere, was taking over something from the Church. When, in 227, the caliph was on his deathbed, he asked that the sallt should be performed over him with candles and incense (bi 'isham wa 'ibābkūr) exactly after the fashion of the Christians (Ibn Abī Ṣaḥīfa, i, 165; cf. ii. 89). The dependence of Išlm on Christianity is also seen in the story that Othmān, when he was going to the evening sallt in Medina, had a candle carried in front of him, which his enemies condemned as ḫud' (Yāqūbi, ed. Houtsma, ii. 187). The ḥuṭa ḫis does not affect the significance of this story. A light was used particularly in the miḥrāb, because it represented the holy cell, to which light belonged (cf. Sūra xxiv. 35). Then, in Mecca, lamps were placed before the imāms in the miḥrāb and there were considerable endowments for such miḥrāb lamps (Ibn Djbair, Ḫība, p. 103. 144). Light, as everywhere the custom in ancient times, was necessary in mausoleums and the documents of endowment show that a large number of oil-lamps were used in this way (cf e.g the document for al-Malik al-Ashraf's mausoleum, v. Berchem, Corpus, i, No. 252). But in the mosque generally the use of lights had a devotional significance and lamps might be endowed for particular individuals (cf. R. G. A., iii. 74, quoted above). The lamps so given by al-Hārikī were therefore placed in the mosques with great ceremony, with blasts of trumpets and beating of drums (Ibn Djbairi, ii/ii. 105).

On ceremonial occasions a great illumination was therefore absolutely necessary. In the month of Rāmaḍān, says Ibn Djbair, the carpets were renewed and the candles and lamps increased in number, so that the whole mosque was a blaze of light (Ḫība, p. 143); on certain evenings trees of light were made with vast numbers of lamps and candles and the minarets, and the minbar, were illuminated (Ḫība, p. 149–151, 154, 155). In the Mosque of the Prophet in the time of Samhūdī, forty wax candles burned around the sacred tomb, and three to four hundred lights in the whole mosque (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 108). On the masjid al-nābī, says Kūt al-Din, a procession went from the Ka'ba in Mecca to the birthplace of the Prophet with candles, lanterns (fawāsin) and lamps (masā'il; see Chron Mecca, ii/ii. 450). In the haram of Jerusalem, according to Mahfūz al-Din, 750 lamps were lit by night and over 20,000 at festivals (Sauvage, Hist Jérusalem, Haver, p. 158). In the dome of the Sakhra in 452 a chandelier and 500 lamps fell down (Ḫība, p. 69); at the taking of the town in 492 (1099) the Franks carried off 42 silver lamps, each of 3,600 dirhams, 23 lamps of gold and a tawārīr of 40 rifl of silver (Ibn Aṣālī, p. 71). It was similar and still is in Cairo and elsewhere in the Muslim world. For the lahit al-aṣr in the Mosque of 'Amr, 18,000 candles were made for the Mosque of 'Amr and every night eleven and a half kinār of good oil were used (Makrizi, iv. 21 and more fully ii. 345 sqq.). The four "nights of illumination" fell in the months of Rādāb and Ṣaḥāb, especially Ma'rūf and Ṣaḥbān (Quatremère, Hist. Stat. Maml., i/ii. 131; cf. also Snouck-Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 77). Quite recently (1908) electric light has been introduced into the Mosque of the Prophet (al-Batanūnī, Ṭikība, p. 245 sqq.).

[On the question in general see Clermont-Ganneau, La lampe et l'oilier dans le Coran, in Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale, viii., 1924, p. 183–228; on the copper candelabra see A. Wingham, Report on the Analysis of various examples of Oriental Metal-Work etc. in the South Kensington Museum etc., London 1892; F. R. Martin, Altere Kupferarbeiten aus dem Orient, Stockholm 1902; on glass lamps see G. Schmoranz, Altorientalische Glass-Gefasse, Vienna 1898; v. Berchem, C. L. A., i. 678 sqq.; Max Herz Bey, La Mosquée du Sultan Hasan (Comité de Conservation des Monuments de l'Art Arabe), 1899, p. 8 sqq.; see also the Bibliography in Ist., xviii., 1928, p. 217 sqq.]

i. Incense.

According to some traditions, even the Prophet had incense burned in the mosque (Tirmidhi, i. 116; see Lammens, Moesenia, p. 367, note 8) and in the time of ʿOmar, his client ʿAbd Allāh is said to have perfumed the mosque by burning incense while he sat on the minbar. The same client is said to have carried the censer (mudjarār; cf. Lammens, loc. cit.) brought by ʿOmar from Syria before ʿOmar when he went to the sallat in the month of Rāmaḍān (A. Fischer, Biographie von Gewahrmännern etc., p. 55, note). According to this tradition, the use of incense was adopted into Išlm very early as a palatable imitation of the custom of the Church. In keeping with this is the tradition that in al-Fusṭāṭ as early as the governorship of ʿAmr, the masjid-al-Hakam incense was burned in the mosque (ʿAbd al-Hakam, p. 132; cf. Annali dell' Islam, iv. 565). The Sahāra Mosque had incense burned in it during the consecration ceremony (Sauvage, Hist. Jérusalem et Hébron, p. 53).

Under the Umayyads, incense was one of the regular requirements of the mosque (ṭib at-masjid; Tabari, ii. 1234, 10). Muʾawiyah is named as the first to perfume the Ka'ba with perfume (ḥašāt) and censer (tisajja; B.G.A., v. 20, 12). It became the custom to anoint the sacred tombs with musk and ṭīb (Chron. Mecca, i. 150, 10; Ibn Djbair, Ḫība, p. 194, 9). Baibars washed the Ka'ba with rose-water (Mašrīzī, iv. 96, 14). Incense, as well as candles, was used at burials (cf. de Goeje, Z.P.M.G., 1905, p. 403 sqq.; Lammens, Moesenia, p. 436, note 9). Al-Muʿtāsim's desire to be buried with candles and incense (mukkūr) exactly like the Christians (Ibn Usbīla, i. 165; 12 sqq., cf. above) shows that they were aware that the custom bore much the same relation to the Christian usage, as the mosque building did to the church. The consumption of incense in the mosques gradually became very large, especially at festivals (see for the Fātimids: Ibn Taghribirdi, ii/ii., 484, 12; ii/ii., ed. Popper, p. 106, 35; Mašrīzī, iv. 51; on vessels for holding incense see the Bibliography in Ist., xviii., 1928, p. 217 sqq.).

j. Water-Supply.

Nothing is said of a water-supply in connection with the oldest mosques. The Mosque of Mecca occupied a special position on account of the Zamzam well. In the early days of Išlm, two basins (hatut) are said to have been supplied by it, one behind the well, i.e. just at the side of the mosque for ṭawīm and one between the well...
and the rūbk for drinking purposes; the latter was moved nearer the well by Ibn al-Zabair. In the time of Sulaimān b. ‘Abd al-Malik, a grandson of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās for the first time, built a kūḥb in connection with the Zemzem (Chron. Mekka, i. 299). At the same time, the governor Khalīl al-Kāsri laid down lead-piping to bring water from the well of al-Thabīr to the mosque, to a marble basin (fāṣīka) with a running fountain (fāṣūrā) between the Zemzem and the rūbk, probably on the site of the earlier lāzīm. It was intended to supply drinking-water in place of the saltish water of Zemzem, but a branch was led on to a birka at the Bāb al-Ṣaffā, which was used for ritual ablutions. The people, however, would not give up the Zemzem water and immediately after the coming to power of the ʿAbbāsīs, the provision for drinking-water was cut off, only the pipe leading to the birka being retained (ibid., t. 339 sq.). In Ibn Djuḥair’s time, there was, in addition to the Zemzem, a supply of water in vessels and a bench for performing the wudu’ (Rīḥā, p. 89). Khalīl’s plan, arrangements for ablutions at the entrance and a running fountain in the sahn, seems to have been a typically Omaiyad one and to have been introduced from the north. Such fountains were usual in the north, not only in private houses, but also for example in the aṣḥāḥ sanā (stadium) surrounded by pillars, which, from Ennueis’s description, formed part of the church of Tyre (see Hauch in Herzog-Hauch, Realencyclo. f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche 3, x. 782).

The usual name for the basin, fāṣīka (in Egypt now fāṣāka) is pīṣina, which in the Mīḥāna and in Syria takes the form pīṣīn (see Levy, Nehrūhr. u. chald. Worterbuch, iv. §55; Fraenkel, Fronworter, p. 124; fāṣīna, found in al-Iṣraj, Chron. Mekka, i. 340 is probably due to a slip). At the same time, however, birka or sīḥa or sīḥīd which probably comes from the Persian (cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 287) or the old Arabic hawd are also used. The arrangements for ablutions in the Zemzem were called maṣṭāhir or maṣūlān, sing. maṣdā (now usually miḏā), “place for wudu’”. The accommodation in Mecca just mentioned was later extended. Ibn Djuḥair mentions a building at al-Zahīr, 1 mile north of Mecca which contained maṣṭāhir and sīḥa for those performing the minor ṣuḥrā (Rīḥā, p. 111).

In Medina, Ibn Djuḥair mentions rooms for ṭuḍūf at the western entrance to the mosque (Rīḥā, p. 197, 13 sq.; cf. the plan in al-Ṭabarīnī, Rīḥā, facing p. 244). At the same time Ibn Ṣāhīla mentions seventeen receptacles for water in the sahn in the year 199, probably for drinking-water; later (tenth century) a large basin surrounded by a railing is mentioned in the court. It was intended for drinking purposes, but became used for bathing and was therefore removed. Baths and latrines were built anew by al-Nāṣir’s mother (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 99 sqg.).

In Damascus, where every house, as is still the case, was amply supplied with water, Yākūt (d. 626 = 1229) found no mosque, madrasa or kha-naḵākh which did not have water flowing into a birka in the ṣaḥn (Yākūt, ii. 590). Ibn Djuḥair describes the arrangements in the Mosque of the Omayyads. In the sahn, as is still the case, there were three kuḥbas. The centre one rested on four marble columns, and below it was a basin with a spring of drinking-water surrounded by an iron grille. This was called ṣaḥāf al-maṣīʿ “water-cage”.

North of the ṣaḥn was a Masджid al-Kallāṣa in the sahn of which there was again a ṣiḥīd of marble with a spring (Ibn Djuḥair, Rīḥā, p. 267). There was also running water in an adjoining masḥad (p. 269), in the kha-naḵākh and madrasa (p. 271), and in a hall beside the living apartments there was again a kuḥba with a basin (ḥawd) and spring water (p. 269). There were also ṣiḥāyāt against the four outer walls of the mosque, whole houses fitted up with lavatories and closets (p. 275); a century earlier, we are told that at each entrance to the mosque there was a miḏā (R.C.A., iii. 159). The whole arrangements correspond exactly to those made by Khalīl al-Kāsri in Mecca in the Omayyad period and must therefore date from the Omayyad.

It was the same in other Syriān and Mesopotamian towns. In Sīmarā, al-Mutawakkil built in his new ḍāmi’a a fāṣūrā with a constant running water (B.C. A., vii. 265). In Nāṣib, the river was led through the ṣaḥn of the mosque into a sīḥīd; there was also a sīḥād at the eastern entrance with two sīḥāyāt in front of the mosque (Ibn Djuḥair, Rīḥā, p. 259). In Māsīlī in the mosque, which dated from the Omayyad period, there was a spring with a marble cupola over it (ibid., p. 255). In Ḫira, there was in the sahn three marble kuḥbas with ḍūf and drinking-water (ibid., p. 246), in Ḫaleb two (ibid., p. 255).

In Khīl there were three ḍūf with Euphrates water in front of the Dāmī’ (ibid., p. 212) but in the mosque a zāwīya a domed building with running water (Yākūt, iv. 325, 326, here called ṣamār; cf. F. G. A., v. 173; Ibn Djuḥair, p. 89, 267). It was the same in Amīd (Nāṣir-i-Khosraw, ed. Schefer, p. 28) and in Zarānd in ʿĪmā lat (B.C. A., ii. 298 sqq.). The principal mosques of the ʿīfīk had maṣūlān at the entrances, for which, according to a remarkable note by Maḥṣūsī, rents were paid (B. G. A., iii. 129, read kūrdī; cf. muṣṭāhir: Ibn Djuḥair, p. 89). In Palestine also, in al-Maṣṣūrī’s time, there were cubic boxes for ablutions, at the entrances to the ḍawāmī (muṣṭāhir: B. G. A., iii. 182; Maṣīrat: ibid., i. 58) and in ʿṢānā’ in the fourth century, beside each mosque, there was water for drinking and for ṭuḍūf (B. G. A., vii. 111). In Persia also, it was the custom to have a ḍūfī in front of the mosque (B. G. A., iii. 318) and there was drinking-water in the mosque itself on a bench (kūrdī) in iron jars into which ice was put on Fridays (ibid., p. 327). Not only at the Zemzem well but also in the mosques of the ʿīfīk, men were appointed whose duty it was to distribute drinking-water (Ṭabarī, ii. 2655). — The regular custom, therefore, was to have at the entrance to the entrance in the court of the mosque a fountain as the traditional ornament in the court of the mosque itself a fountain as the traditional ornament and for drinking water. It was the exception for the ṭuḍūf to take place in the mosque itself.

In Egypt at first the Mosque of Ibn Tulūn was arranged similarly to the Syrian mosques. In the centre of the sahn there was a gilt dome, supported by sixteen marble columns and surrounded by a railing. This upper storey was supported by nineteen marble columns and below was a marble basin (kaṭa) with a running fountain (fāṣūrā): the ṣaḥīn was called from the dome (Maḥṣūsī, iv. 37; the description is not quite clear). People complained that there were no arrangements for washing (miḏā). There, Ibn Tulūn replied that
he had not made them because he had concluded the mosque would be polluted thereby. He therefore made a miḥā'a with an apothecary's shop behind the mosque (ibid., p. 38, 39; Ḥusn al-
Maḥṣūla-i, ii. 139; Ibn Taghrībī, i. 11, 10). This suggests that previously in Egypt the washing arrangements had been directly connected with the mosque. After the fire of the year 376, the fadakība was renovated by al-Azīz (Maḥrizi, iv. 404), in 696 again by al-fājdūn, whose inscription still exists (C.F.A.I., i. NP. 10). A new miḥā'a was built in 792 beside the old one on the north, outside the mosque (Maḥrizi, iv. 42).

The Mosque of 'Amr first got a fadaka in the time of al-Azīz. In 378—379 his vīzir ʻAlā' Ḥās. Kīliš installed one in the cupola, already in existence for the batūt al-māl. Marble jars were put there for the water (probably drinking-water) (Maḥrizi, iv. 9, 11; cf. Ḥusn al-Maḥṣūla-i, ii. 139; ʻAlā′ Ḥās. Kīliš, i. 899). A new water basin was installed by ʻAlā' Ḥās. Kīliš beside his maṣrā on the mosque. The water was led to the faḍākība al-fiṣṭa from the Nile. This was prohibited in the reign of Ḥabūs al-ḥallūdakārī (658—676) by the chief khāja, because the building was being affected by it (Maḥrizi, iv. 14; Ḥusn al-Maḥṣūla-i, iv. 37). The emir, who restored it, brought the water for the faḍākība from a well in the street (Maḥrizi, iv. 15).

Like Ibn ʻṬabīb, the ifshāms do not seem to have considered the miḥā'a indispensable. For the Azhar Mosque had originally no miḥā'a; as late as al-Jikāmi's work for provision of miḥā'a, money is given only with the provision that something of the kind should be made (Maḥrizi, iv. 51, 54). At a later date we hear of two miḥā'a's, one at the adjoining Aḥbūgha'Ahwa (ibid., p. 54). On the other hand, there was already a baṣīya in the centre of the court, but whether it had existed from the first is not known. It had disappeared, when traces of it were found in 827 in laying out a new faḍākība (ibid., p. 54). The faḍākība of the Mosque of al-Ḥakim was not erected by the founder. Just like that of the Mosque of 'Amr, it was removed in 660 by the khāja ʻAbū Ḥās. Kīliš but after the earthquake of 702. It was again rebuilt and provided with drinking-water from the Nile (ibid., p. 56, 57) and again renovated after 780 (ibid., p. 61). A small miḥā'a later placed by another, was in the vicinity of the entrance (ibid., p. 61). Other ʻAlājmi'ī mosques had basins in the sahn, which were supplied from the Nile and from the Khālid (ibid., p. 76, 81, 120).

The traditional plan was retained in the period following also. For example, we know that the emir Ṭūḥān in 815 placed a ḍar in the centre of the Ḥāja'maj' Aḥṣanīr which was covered by a roof supported by marble pillars and supplied by the same pipe as the already existing miḥā'a as (Maḥrizi, iv. 107, cf. 124, 158, 159, 160 etc.). At the ceremonial dedication of mosques, it was the custom for the patron to fill the ḍar in the sahn with sugar, lemonade or other sweet things (e.g. al-Muayyadhi, 822; Maḥrizi, iv. 139; Mudarras Ḥāja'mal in 811: Ibn Ḥanbal, p. 253; another in 757: ibid., p. 256).

The importance of the birka of the mosque as a drinking-place, diminished as pious founders erected drinking fountains everywhere (cf. for Mecca, Certain ii. 116—118; also F.G.I., iv. 211. v. ḍar; p. 258, v. ʻabd) and especially when it became the custom to build a sabil with a boy's school in part of the mosque (see below, E 4 end). A ḍar for washing animals was also sometimes built in the vicinity of the mosque (Maḥrizi, iv. 76). Sometimes also the birka of the sahn was used for washing. In the year 799 the emir Yelbuga made arrangements for this in the Aṣkāmar mosque so that one could get water for ʻawdī from taps from a birka put up in the sahn (Maḥrizi, iv. 76). Maḥrizi condemns this addition, but only because there was already a miḥā'a at the entrance and the sahn was too small for the new one (ibid.) and not on grounds of principle; and it was only because the wall was damaged that the emir's gift was removed in 815 (ibid., p. 77). The custom of using the water supply of the sahn for a ḍar survived in many places in Egypt. The arrangements were therefore usually called miḥā'a or rather miḥā'a (which is not found in the inscriptions). If they had taps, they were called ṣanaflāya; according to Lane's suggestion because the Ḥanafis only permitted ablutions with running water or from a cistern on 10ells broad and deep (Lexicon, s. v.; cf. Manuscripts and Customs. Everyman's Library, p. 69; cf. on the question: Max Herz, Observations critiques sur les bassins dans les Sahn des Mosquées, H. I. E., iii 7, 1896, p. 47—51; do., La Mosquée du Sultan Husan, p. 2; Herz wrongly dates the modern usage from the Turkish conquest in 1517).

In quite recent times the miḥā'a's have often been moved outside to special buildings. Ibn al-Hadżjīden makes the same object for ablutions and ablutions in the mosque are forbidden by "our learned men" (Maḥbūl, ii. 47 sq. 49); like shaving, ablutions should be performed outside the mosque in keeping with the Prophet's saying: aṣṣā'īn muṣarratun ʻalā abwāb masjid-jābīn (ibid., i. 58). It was in keeping with this principle that in earlier times the miḥā'a was usually put at the entrance and the barbers took up their places before the entrance (cf. the name Ṣah Ṣalma-yinīn, "The Barbers' Gate" for the main entrance to the Azhar mosque). Miḥā'a's were also to be found in hospitals; thus the "lower hospital" was given two in 346, one of which was for washing corpses (Ibn ʻUkāb, p. 99 infra).

E. The Mosque as a State Institution.

1. The Mosque as a Political Centre.

Its Relation to the Ruler.

It was inherent in the character of Islam that religion and politics could not be separated. The same individual was ruler and chief administrator in the two fields, and the same building, the mosque, was the centre of gravity for both politics and religion. This relationship found expression in the fact that the mosque was placed in the centre of the camp, while the ruler's abode was built immediately adjacent to it, as in Medina (and in al-Fustāf, Damascus, Basra, Kīfī). We can trace how this ḍar al-imāra or ḍar (so for Kīfī: Ṭahā, ii. 230 sq.; ḍar al-imāra: ibid., p. 234) with the growth of the mosque gradually became incorporated in it in al-Fustāf and Damascus and was replaced by a new building. The tradition remained so strong that in Cairo, when the chief mosque Ḥāja'm al-Asqar was being planned in 169, a ḍar al-imāra ʻaubā must be built beside it with direct access to the mosque (Maḥrizi, iv. 33
...and when Ibn Tülin built his mosque, a building called the Dür al-Imāra was erected on its north side, where the ruler, who now lived in another new palace, had rooms for changing his dress, etc., from which he could go straight into the maqṣūra (ibid., p. 42).

The ʿAbbāsid s at the foundation of Baghdād introduced a characteristic innovation, when they made the palace the centre of the city; the case was similar with Fāṭimid Cairo; but Sulaimān b. ʿAbd al-Malik in Ramla had already built a palace in front of the mosque (Baladhurī, p. 143). Later rulers who no longer lived just beside the mosque, had special balconies or something similar built for themselves in or beside the mosque. Ṣālāḥ al-Dīn built for himself a minbar under the great minaret of the mosque of ʿAmr (Makrizī, iv. 13; Ibn al-Muḥāḍara, ii. 137) and just to the south of the Azhar mosque the Fāṭimids had a minbar from which they could overlook the mosque (Makrizī, ii. 345).

The caliph was the appointed leader of the ʿulāmā and the ʿālim of the Muslim community. The significance of the mosque for the state is therefore embodied in the minbar. The installation of the caliph consisted in his seating himself upon this, the seat of the Prophet in his sovereign capacity. When homage was first paid to Abū Bakr by those who had decided the choice of the Prophet's successor, he sat on the minbar. ʿOmar delivered an address, the people paid homage to him and he delivered a khutba, by which he assumed the leadership (Ibn Ḥājīm, p. 1017; Ṣaharīa, ii. 182; v. 119; cf. Yākūbī, ii. 142); it was the same with ʿOmar and ʿOthmān (ibid., p. 157, 187).

The khutba, after the glorification of God and the Prophet, contained a reference to the caliph's predecessor and a kind of formal introduction of himself by the new caliph. It was the same in the period of the Omayyads and ʿAbbāsids (see for al-Walīd: Ṣahīrīa, ii. 1177 sqq.; al-Aʿīma: ibid., iii. 764; al-Mahdī: ibid. iii. 457; cf. supra on this question also Bukhari, ʿAbd al-Rahmān, bāb 43). The minbar and the khutba associated with it was still more important than the imāmāt at the ʿulāmā, it was minbar al-mulk (Hamāyūn, ed. Fraytag, p. 156, v. 4). According to a hadīth, the Prophet carried the little ʿHasan up to the minbar and said, "This my son is a chief-you" etc. (Bukhari, ʿAbd al-Mahdī, bāb 25). This reflects the last custom by which the ruler saw that homage was paid to his successor-designate; this also was done from the minbar (cf. khutba yurum al-duʿāʾ fī ʿl-maṣājid bi-ʿl-iʿlāmāmāt li-ʿl-ʿulāmā, Ṣahīrīa, iii. 2131). The Fāṭimid caliph showed honour to a distinguished officer by allowing him to sit beside him on the minbar (Husn al-Muḥāḍara, i. 91): in the same way Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Qādir was allowed to sit beside him al-ʿāli ṣarīrī (Ibn Abī Yūsuf, ii. 119) but whether the reference is to the minbar is perhaps doubtful. The minbar could also be received by another of his brothers but it must be accepted on the minbar. Thus the governor of Mecca in 196 accepted on the minbar homage to ʿAbd Allāh b. Muʿāwiyah and the deposition of Muḥammad b. Ḥārūn (Ṭabarī, iii. 561 sq.; cf. for al-Mahdī: ibid., p. 389). There are other cases in which the solemn deposition of a ruler took place on or beside the minbar (Aḥmadī, 2nd ed. Cairo, i. 12; Wüstenfeld, Ṣaḥīrīa, p. 15). Even at a much later date, when spontaneous acclamation by the populace was no longer of any importance, the ceremonial installation on the minbar was still of importance (Makrizī, iv. 94). It had become only a formality but still an important one. Homage was paid to the ʿAbbāsid caliphs in Egypt in the great ʿīdān of the palace or in a tent in which a minbar had been put up, and similarly to the ʿulāmā whose investiture was read out from the minbar (cf. Quatemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i. 117, 149 sqq., 183 sqq.). If one dreamt that he was sitting on the minbar, it meant that he would become sultan (ibid., ii/ii. 103). — The ʿAbbāsid caliph had however long had his own throne after the old Persian fashion in his palace (ʿAbd Allāh fi ʿAbbāsid al-Maṣūm, ed. Ahmad Zaki, Cairo 1914, p. 7 sqq.) and so had the Fāṭimids (Ibn Ṭahānīa, ii. 457) and the Mamluks (Quatemère, ed., ii. 87; cf. 147). When later we find mention of the kūta ʿīkhāliya (v. Berchem, Corpus, i., N° 33), sarīr al-mulk (Chron. Mekk., ii. 113), sarīr al-ṣalātīna (Makrizī, ii. 157; cf. al-ṣarīr, royal throne; B. G. A., ii. 282, 285; kūta similarly cf.: Ibn ʿĀrābshāh, Viṣṇu Viṃśṭrī, ed. Manger, i. 486) or marḥabat al-mulk (Quatemère, cf. i., ii. 61), the reference is no longer to the minbar. This does not mean that the ruler could no longer make public appearances in the mosques: thus in 648 Muʿizz al-Mulk regularly gave audiences in ablāḏūrīn al-ṣūlāḥīya (Quatemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i. 17) and memorial services for Baḥrūs were held a year after his death in several mosques, madāris and khanqāhs (677 = 1278; ibid., ii. 164 sqq.).

The caliph spoke chiefly from the minbar of the capital, but when he made the pilgrimage he also spoke from the minbar in Mecca and Medina (cf. e.g. Ṣahādī, ii. 1234; Yākūbī, ii. 541, 501; Chron. Mekk., i. 160). Otherwise in the provinces, the governor stood in the same relation to the mosques as the caliph in the capital. He was appointed "over ʿulāmā and sword" or he administered "justice among the people" and the ʿulāmā (Ṭabarī, ii. 860), he had "province and minbar" under him (ibid., ii. 611), hāṬalīya wa l-ḥatba (B. G. A., ii. 337). Speaking from the minbar was a right which the caliph had delegated to him and it was done in the name of the caliph. ʿAmr b. ʿĀs therefore refused to allow people in the country to hold ḍūmūt except under the direction of the commander (Makrizī, iv. 7). This point of view was never quite abandoned. The khutba was delivered "in the name of" the caliph (ibid., p. 94) or "for" him (ibid., p. 66, 74, 198; Ibn Ṭahānīa, i. 85 infra; B. G. A., ii. 485 supra) and in the same way an emīt delivered a khutba "for" a sultan (Makrizī, ii. 213, 214). The sultan did not have the "secular" and the caliph the "spiritual" power, but the sultan exercised as a Muslim ruler the actual power which the caliph possessed as the legitimate sovereign and had formally entrusted to him. During the struggles between the different pretenders, there was thus a confession of one's politics if one performed the ʿīdān with the one or the other governor (Ṭabarī, ii. 228, 234, 258; Chron. Mekk., ii. 168). The pretenders disputed as to whether the one or the other could put his standard beside the minbar (Ṭabarī, iii. 2009).

I like the caliph, the governor also made his formal entry into office by ascending the minbar
and delivering a khutba; this was the symbol of his authority (e.g. Tabari, ii. 91, 228, 242; Chron. M. M., ii. 173; cf. Hawamid, p. 660, v. 2-3; Ibn Jarir, iii. 135). After glorifying God and the Prophet, he announced his appointment or read the kätar from the caliph and the remainder of his address, if there was a war going on, was exclusively political and often consisted of crude threats. The khutba was not inseparably connected with the Friday service. The commander-in-chief could at any time issue a summons to the salah and deliver his khutba with admonitions and orders (see Tabari, ii. 260, 257 sq., 208, 300, 89, 179) and it was the same when he left the pulpit (ibid., p. 245): a governor, who could not preclude his authority with the khutba, was dismissed (bid., p. 592).

Since war was inseparably associated with early Islam and the mosque was the public meeting-place of ruler and people, it often became the scene of warlike incidents. While the governor in his khutba was issuing orders and admonitions relating to the fighting, cheers and counter-cheers could be uttered (ibid., p. 238) and councils of war were held in the mosque (Tabari, i. 3415). Soon after his election, Abu al-Malik asked from the minbar who would take the field against Ibn al-Zuhair and al-Hadj Japhet shouted that he was ready to go (Chron. Mekb., ii. 20). After the battle of the Camel, Ali sent the body to the mosque of Basra and Aisha led from another mosque (Tabari, l. 3178, 3223). Rowdy scenes occasionally took place in mosques (Kindi, Wulat, p. 18); Zayd was stoned on the minbar (Tabari, ii. 88); one could ride right into the mosque and shout to the governor sitting on the pulpit (ibid., p. 682); fighting often took place in and beside the mosque (ibid., p. 960. 1701 sqq.; Wustenfeld, Medzir., p. 13 sq.) Sometimes for this reason, the governor was surrounded by his bodyguard during the salah or on the minbar or even clothed in full armour (al-Walid, Tabari, i. 1234. Yâkub, ii 341: al-Hadî Japhet Tabari, i. 254; salah and wood were thus closely associated in reality.

It thus came to be the custom for the enemies of the rulers and his party to be buried in the mosques. This custom continued the old Arab custom of regular campaigns of obsequiation between two tribes but can also be paralleled by the Byzantine ecclesiastical anathematization of heretics by Becker, „Handbuch u. d. iran. Kultur“.

The first to introduce the official cursing of the Abds from the minbar of the Ka'ba is said to have been Khalid al-Kasrî (Chron. Mekb., ii. 36). The cursing of cursing ofOmaysids and Abds became general (cf. Tabari, ii. 12, 2: al-Attab, ed. edition coro. x 102. Ibn Taghibirdi, i. 248: see also Minnemos. Maviçin, iii. 186 sq. cf. the blessing upon the ruler, it was uttered by the bytab. (Makrizi, iv. 165), it was even recorded in inscriptions on the minbar of Ibn Taghibirdi, ii. 112. ed. Popper, i. 13, 15; cf. also M. R. Mashal, ed. press. 61: 

Ibn as-284, al-Ma'djadi wanted to restore the anathematization of Muslims from the minbar that had been abandoned (Tabari, in 2164). Anathematizations were also pronounced on other occasions, for example, Sulayman had al-Hadî Japhet (Chron. Mekb., ii. 37) and al-Mami al-Tbaïian solemnly cursed from the minbar (Tabari, in 2048 sqq., and other rulers had M'azhdh heretics cursed from the pulpit (see Mz. op. cit. p. 198; cf. against Ibn Taimiya: Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 256)). Ibn Battûta describes the tumultuous scene with thousands of armed men uttering threats in a mosque in Baghdad when a Shi'i khutba was on the minbar (ii. 58).

It was very natural to mention with a blessing upon him the ruler in whose name the Friday khutba was delivered. Ibn 'Abbas, when governor of Basra, is said to have been the first to pronounce such a dâ'â over 'Ali (ibn Khaldun, Muhabl. of thing, 37, end); it is not improbable that the custom arose out of the reciprocal objurgations of 'Abd and Omaysids: the hajjâr, who had to curse the Abds in the mosques, used to pray for the Omaysids (Makrizi, iv. 17). Under the 'Abbâsids, the custom became the usual form of expressing loyalty to the ruler (Ibn Taghibirdi, i. 115). After the caliph, the name of the local ruler or governor was mentioned (bid., p. 156, 161); even in Baghdad in 369 by order of the caliph al-Tâ'ifî, the actual ruler 'Adud al-Dawla was mentioned in the dâ'â (Ibn Miskawwah, vi. 499: Cairo 1915, p. 396) and the Buyids, according to al-Makdisî, were generally mentioned in the khutba even in the remotest parts of the kingdom (this is evident from the above-mentioned expression khutba unh, for which we also find adelâd: see F. A. A., ii. 29; iii. 337, 338, 400, 472, 485; cf. Glossary, s. v.). There is also evidence that prayers used to be uttered for the heir-apparent (Makrizi, iv. 37; Khûb al-Huwâzâ, ed. Amelroz, p. 420). Under the Mamikâ also, the sultan's heir was mentioned (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 101; iv. 3). Under the Fâtimids, it was even the custom to call adlân upon the ruler from the minaret after the adâh dâ'â (Makrizi, iv. 45); this also took place under the Mamikâ (e.g. in 696 = 1297, when ifâm was elected: Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 45). The prayer for the sovereign in the khutba did not find unanimous approval among the learned (see Snouck Hurgronje, Vergezicht geschieden, 214 sq.).

In general, the mosque, and particularly the minbar, was the place where official proclamations were made, of course as early as the time of the Prophet (ibkhâr, Said, bâb 70, 71), 'Othmân's bloodstained shirt was hung upon the minbar (Tabari, i. 3255); messages from the caliph were read from it (ibid., in. 2084). al-Walid announced from the minbar the deaths of two distinguished governors (Ibn Taghibirdi, i. 242); the results of battles were announced in khutbas (Yâkît, i. 647: ad alik al-fard, ii. Cairo 1321, p. 149 sq.). In the Fâtimid and 'Abbâsî periods also proclamations, orders, edicts about taxation etc. by the ruler were announced in the principal mosque (Tabari, ii. 40; iii. 2165: Ibn Taghibirdi, ii. 68: Makrizi, tilatâ, ed. Bunz, p. 87 supers. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 89; iii. 44. 1511): documents appointing the more important officers were also read upon the minbar (Kindi, Mau. p. 580, 599, 603, 604. etc. pas. Makrizi, ii. 246; iv. 43. 88; frequently the people trooped into the mosque to hear an official announcement (Kindi, Wulat, p. 14: cf. Dozy, Gesch. d. Mârûn in Speten, ii. 179).

After the position of the caliph had changed, tradition was so far retained that he still delivered the khutba in the principal mosque on special occasions,
particularly at festivals. Thus the Fatimid al-Aziz
preached in the mosque of al-Hākim on its com-
pletion (Maqrizi, iv. 55) and in the month of
Ramadan he preached in the three chief mosques
of Cairo, one after the other (ibid., p. 53: cf.
61 sq.; Ibn Taghribirdi, ii. 482 sqq.; exceptionally
also in al-Maqrizī: Maqrizi, iv. 63). The "Abdābād
caliph also used to preach at festivals (e.g. al-Khādīj,
Yaṣṣāf, Cāhāb, ii. 349 sqq.); it was the exception
when a zeal on al-Muḥātaddī (255) followed the
old custom and preached every Friday (Masūdī,
Muṣṭaṣ, v. i. 2). Even the caliph Ṣaʿīdī in Egypt
preached occasionally (Maqrizi, iv. 94; Quatremère,
Hist. Sutt. Musul., i. 138 sqq.). Although the
mosque lost its old political importance in its
later history, it has never quite lost its character
as the place of assembly on occasions of public
importance. This is evident from al-Harrazī's
history and even quite recently large meetings
have been held in the mosques of Egypt on questions
of nationalist politics.

2. The Mosque and public
administration.

The actual work of government was very early
transferred from the mosque into a special dāwān
or muqaffa (see Tabārī, Gr. v.) and negotiations
were carried on and business frequently done in
the kāya al-bātī (cf. Tabārī, n. 259 sqq.). But
when financial business had to be transacted at
public meetings, the mosque was used, of this
there is particular evidence from Egypt. Here the
director of finance used to sit in the Mosque of
Amr and auction the farming out of the domains,
with a crier and several financial officers to assist
him. Later the Dīwān was transferred to the
Lāmi' Aḥmad b. Ṣūlīn but even after 300 A.H.
we find Abū Bāki al-Muḥājīrī sitting on such
occasions in the Mosque of Amr. Under the Fātimids
the vizier Yaṣṣāf b. Killās used first the dār al-
amāra of the Mosque of Ilūn Ṣūlīn (see above),
later his own palace and afterwards the caliph's
kāya was used (Maqrizi, i. 131 sqq.). In the same
way, in the reign of Muḥāyīn, the Coptic churches
were used and the taxation commission took up
their offices in them (Egyptus Erzherzog Rainer,
Führer durch die Ausstellung, N° 577); and Ibn
Rosta (c. 290 = 903) says that the officials
charged in the measurement of the Nile, when they
noticed the rising of the river, went at once to
the chief mosque and announced it at one kūbat
after another, at the same time scattering flowers

The connection with administration was al-
so seen in the fact that the treasure-chest, the bātāt
al-māl (identical with the rābīt; Kindi, Wulāt,
p. 70, 117) was kept in the mosque in al-Muḥājīrī
Usāma b. Zaid, the director of finance, in 97 and
99 built in the Mosque of Amr a kūbat on pillar-
in front of the minbar for the bātāt al-māl
of Egypt. A drawbridge was placed between it and
the roof. In the time of Ibn Rosta (c. 300) it was
still possible to mount freely below the kūbat
but in 378-379 al-Azīz put up a running fountain
below it (R. G. A., vii. 116; Maqrizi, iv. 9, 11,
13; Ḥasan al-Muḥājīrī, ii. 136; Yaṣṣāf, iii. 899).
Ab-Kindi records an attempt to steal the chest in
145 (Wulāt, p. 112 sqq.). In the disturbed years
about 300, the wali al-Νasāhīrī closed the mosque
between the times of ṣalāt for the safety of the
chest, which was also done in Ibn Rosta's time
(Kindi, Wulāt, p. 266; R. G. A., vii. 116) New
approaches to the Bait al-Māl were made in 422 from
the khīzāna of the mosque and from the Dīwān
(Maqrizi, iv 13).

In Kāfā, the būyāt al-amādī, at least during the
early period, were in the Ḥār al-Imāra (Tabārī,
12459, 2491 sqq.); in the year 58 during the
fighting, it was saved from Ḫāṣra and taken with
the mūtabar to the Mosque of al-Hudūn (iv. 2,
p. 3414 sqq.). In Palestine, in the chief mosque
of each town, there was a similar arrangement to
that in the Mosque of Amr (R. G. A., ii. 182). In
Al-Maṣrāb the bātāt al-māl was in the most
western of the three kūbās in the court of the
Mosque of the Omanīyāds; it was of lead and tested
on 8 columns (R. G. A., ii. 157; Ibn Ḫūdhaib,
p. 264, 267; Ibn Ḫattāba, i. 200 sqq.); it is still
called khubāt al-dīwān (treasure-chest), earlier
khubāt al-dīwān (cf. Baadeker, Palatina und
Süden). In the time of the two travellers
mentioned, the khūba only contained property of the
mosque. Ibn Ḫūdhaib saw a similar khūba in the
chief mosque of Ḥārān and says that it came from
the Byzantines (246). In Aḥabar da'līn also by the
time of Ḫāṣra, the Byzantine custom had been everywhere established (Tabārī, i. 184); in İnān da'līn in the centre of the court, there
was a building with marble columns and doors
(R. G. A., i. 316) which perhaps points to a
similar statement of affairs and in Armenia it is
recorded that the bātāt al-māl was kept in the Lāmi'
in the time of the Omanīyāds as in Ḫāṣra and elsewhere
(R. G. A., ii. 241). The khūba was usually of lead
and had an iron door. Ibn al-Hudhaib considers it
highly illegal to shut off a dīwān in a mosque,
which is the same as forbidding entrance to it. This
shows that the custom still survived in his time.

Ibn Ḫūdhaib's remark about Ḥārān suggests
that here again we have an inheritance from
Lyakinum. It was probably the building belonging
to the ṭūrma (cf. above) that the Neōshur put
practical use in this way. For the Byzantines
they had the treasury (tēkērī) in the palace and it was
doubtful if the treasurer-chambers of the church
(kinŏ̱y̱y̱ō̱kān) were built in this way (cf. F. der
Bolker, in Byzantinische Arch., Heft 9, 1927,
p. 26, 34).

3. The Mosque as a court of justice.

That the Prophet used to settle legal disputes
in his mosque was natural (see Bukhārī, Ṣāḥīb,
bāb 19, 29 etc. of Ṣaḥīḥ; Bukhārī, bāb 41); but he could also deliver judgments in other places (ibid., pass.); in Ḫāṣra it is recorded
that some kāfās of the earlier 397 (Bukhārī, al-
Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 41; cf. ibid., bāb 41), but he could also deliver judgments in other places (ibid., pass.); in Ḫāṣra it is recorded
that some kāfās of the earlier 397, and in the mosque
of Khurāsān, Ilūn Ṣūlīn, was a court of judgement
beside the minbar. Other (e.g. Ḫāṣra, Zārā b.
Awwāfī) on the open square beside the mosque
(Bukhārī, II. 184, bāb 18). The courts had all the
better chance of survival, as churches were
ruined in the same way (Josua Stylites ed. Wright,
20; cf. Mgr. Renan, p. 223). Sitting in
judgement was primarily the business of the ruler
but he had to have assistants, and Abū Bakr's
kāfā is mentioned as assisting Omar (Tabārī, i.
2135) and a number of judges appointed by
Omar are mentioned (R. G. A., ii. 227). In the
reign of Umayyad, Abd Allāh b. Masūd is said
to have been judge and financial administrator
On the other hand, we are told that 'Abd Allāh
MASDJD

b. Nasif, appointed by Marwan in 42. was the first kadi in Damascus (Tabari, ii. 2477): it is recalled that in the year 132 the kadi of Medina administered justice in the mosque (ibid., p. 2505). In Bagdad, we are told that al-Aswad b. Sari al-Tamim immediately after the building of the mosque (i.e., in 131) worked in it as kadi (Baladhurî, p. 349). In the early period, 'Amr wanted to choose a kadi, who had been already acting as a judge before Islam (Kindî, Wâlî, p. 301 sq.; Idrîs al-Muhadara, ii. 86). Even the Christian poet al-Akhfâl was allowed to act as arbiter in the mosque of Kufa (see Lammens, Mu'dra, p. 435 sq.).

In al-Fâsid, as early as 23 or 24 A.H. in command of Omar, 'Amr b. a-Shammâ appointed a kadi named Khuwâs (Ibn al-Mukhtârah, ii. 86; Kindî, Wâlî, p. 300 sq.). The kadi held his sessions in the Mosque of 'Amr but not exclusively there. The kadi Khuwâs b. Nu'aim (120-127) held his sessions sometimes before his house, sometimes in the mosque and for Christians on the steps leading up to the mosque (Kindî, Wâlî, p. 351 sq.). A successor of his (177-184) invited Christians who had lawsuits into the mosque to be heard (ibid., p. 391); of another judge (205-211) it is recorded that he was not allowed to sit in the mosque (ibid., p. 428). It seems that the kadi could himself choose where he would sit. A judge, officiating in the year 217, sat in winter in the great pillared hall turning his back towards the kibla-wall and in summer in the courtyard near the western wall (ibid., p. 443 sq.). During the Fâtimid period, the undivided building on the north-east of the Mosque of 'Amr was reserved for the judges. This judge, called from the year 376 onwards khalil 'al-żamâr (cf. Idrîs al-Muhadara, ii. 91; Kindî, Wâlî, p. 590), sat on Tuesday and Saturday in the mosque and laid down the law (Maârifî, ii. 245; iv. 16, 22; cf. Kindî, Wâlî, p. 587, 589; cf. Sâlihiyya, transl. Schefer, p. 149).

In Yâsîn's time in Baghdad, the judge of the caliph was used to sit in his chief mosque (B.G.A., vu. 245). In Damascus the vice-kadi in the fourth century had a special iwan in the Mosque of the Omayyads (F.G.A., iii. 158) and the notaries (architects) also sat in the Mosque of the Omayyads at the Bab al-Asfâr (ibid., p. 17). In Nishapur, every Monday and Thursday, the mulkân al-žawwâd was held in a special mosque (ibid., p. 328). In course of time the judge was given a mulkân al-žawwâd of his own (cf. Idrîs, ii. 90) and in 279 al-Mu'tadâd wanted to forbid the kâdis to hold sessions in the mosques (Ibn Fâhri, i. 87 infra); perhaps however we should read see Goldziher, Mu'tadâd, stud. ii. 163, note 4). Justice was also administered in the dar al-žawwâd (Qurâyshî, Hist. Sult. Mâlik, ii ii. 79). But the administration of justice did not at once lose all connection with the mosque. Under the Fâtimids, the custom had been introduced that the kâdis should hold their sessions in his house. But Ibn al-'Arâm, appointed just after 400 A.H., held them either in the Idrîsî at the Bab al-Malî in a room (Kindî, Wâlî, p. 612; cf. Ibn Taghrûbarî, ed. Popper, ii. p. 69; 'Abûκhâsî, ed. ibid., p. 497: for 439 = 1046, see Na'irî Khwâsî, ed. ibid., p. 514, transl. 1). In Mecca, the dar al-žawwâd was in direct connection with the mosque (Ibn Ujairî, p. 104). In the 9th century Ibn Bâsh'ân attended a court presided over by an eminent jurist in a mosque (madrasa) in 'Uarb (n. 55: 63; cf. also Mâk-}

A mufti, especially in the large mosques, was also frequently appointed; he sat at definite times in a khatla l'Cin addâdâ, e.g. in Cairo (al-Kazwînî, Hâsn al-Mu'âmâlar, i. 182; Djâlîl al-Dîn, ibid., p. 157), in Tunis (Zarkashi, Chronicles, transl. Fag-}

P. The Mosque as an Educational Centre.

I. Islamic studies in the Mosque to the end of the Fâtimid period.

The new studies stimulated by Islam were from their nature associated with the mosque. The learning by heart and the understanding of the Qur'an formed the starting-point and next came the study of Hadîth, by which the proper conduct for a Muslim had to be ascertained. The Prophet was often questioned on matters of belief and conduct, in or outside the mosque (Bukhârî, 'Îm, bâb 6, 52; 23, 24, 26, 46). After the death of the Prophet, his Companions were consulted in the same way and scientific study began with the collection and arrangements of hadîths, as has been shown, notably by Goldziher. This process is reflected in the hadîths themselves. According to them, even the Prophet in his lifetime was asked about hadîths (ibid., bâb 4, 14, 33; tr. 9, 51, 53); the Prophet sits in a mosque surrounded by a hâlqa and instructs his hearers; the latter repeat the hadîths three times until they understand them (ibid., bâb 8, 39, 35, 42). The necessity of 'Îm is strongly emphasised and the ta'âl al-}
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in or hikma (ibid., bāb 15). Such knowledge was imparted to the tribes by the Prophet (ibid., bāb 25) or by teachers sent to them. In the year 17, Omar sent teachers of the Kurān in all directions and ordered the people to appear every Friday in the mosque. The complicated nature of the subjects of study resulted at the principal centres of Islam in the formation not only of a guild of teachers but of a regular system of instruction. The typical scholar, in addition to the kāfir, was the muqaddith (ibid., bāb 29) although new branches of study were soon added as a result of contact with lands of older cultures, notably linguistic studies and in this connection the study of the old poetry, philosophical and speculative studies, logic, etc. The learned man of the old period was also called faṣkhi (Hum al-Muḥājara, i. 131; Taḥārī, ii. 1183, 1266; Aṣghīni, viii. 89; Ibn Saldī, v. 167 etc.). Even after the new branches of learning were added to the older studies, the mos- que remained the chief centre of instruction. This may have been facilitated by the fact that in the old Christian countries it had been the custom for such studies to be prosecuted in connection with monasteries and churches (on the university connected with the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople cf. A. Heiseberg, Gotteskerc he und Apostelkirche, ii., 1908, p. 179). We hear of a madras for educational purposes in the Medina mosque in the first century A.H. (Aṣghīni, i. 48; iv. 162 sg.). Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb sent by ʿOmār b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz as mufti to Egypt (d. 128), is said to have been the first to teach in Egypt (Hum al-Muḥājara, i. 131); he is mentioned along with another as teacher of al-Lāḥi (Kindī, Wafāʾ, p. 89) and the latter, upon whose pronouncements fatwas were issued had his hakīma in the mosque (Hum, i. 134). Omar II had before this sent al-Nāfiʿ, the Makāli of Ibn ʿOmār, to Egypt to bring them the sunan (ibid., p. 150). He also sent an able reciter of the Kurān to the Maghrib as ḡādi to teach the people (Hum, i. 52, p. 131). Education was arranged for by the government, allowing suitable people to give instruction in addition to their regular office. From the very first, education in Egypt was closely connected with admonition to right living. The first teachers in the mosques were the ḡādīs, as a rule ḡādīs, whose discourses dealt with the interpretation of the Kurān and the proper conduct of divine service (cf. C 3). Their masjīfa was the direct continuation of the moral instruction given by the old Companions (cf. Bukhārī, ʿIṣnā, bāb 12). The instruction started in the mosque of Amr was continued for centuries. In the third century A.H. al-Shafiʿī taught various subjects here the morning till his death (240) (Hum al-Muḥājara, i. 153, l. 183, vi. 38). It was after his time that the study of fiqh came markedly to the front and the great teachers used at the same time to give fatwas (cf. Hum, i. 182: ‘Abd Allāh al-Kaẓwīnī, d. 315: i. 183: ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Rāzī, d. 339). In the year 326 (938), the Shafiʿis and Mālikis had each 15, the Ḥanafis 3 groups in the mosque of Amr (Ibn Sālid, ed. Tallquist, p. 24). The Mālikī Muhammad al-Nāʿalī (d. 380) had so many hearers that the chest occupied the area which 17 pillars included (Hum, i. 207). In the fourth century, al-Maḍāqīl mentions the groups (ḥalaf) of fiqhāt, kirtā and al-ṣalat an i-hikma, who sat in the mosque (B. G. A., iii. 205; cf. for the fifth

centures—Nāṣīrī Ḵosrow, ed. Schefer, p. 50 [text], p. 148 [transl.]). He also mentions that the followers of Abū Ḥanīfah held meetings in the Masjd al- Ṭṣa with ẓihār, which here must mean something like lectures, where they read out of a volume and the fukāṭ used to sit in the mosques of Palestine generally, to teach between the salāt (B. G. A., iii. 182). In the third century, Ibn al-Ṭāfīḥ tells how the fukāṭ sit in the mosque of Sidjāt, Balkh and Herāt, while the people crowd around them (ibid., iii. 217). The maṭāḥīḥ which later lost their importance had also their study-places in the mosques. For example al-Maḥtūt says that the Dāwāṭiya had study-groups in Ābāz (ibid., p. 439) and the Awānṣa had even a madras in the mosque of the Omayyads (ibid., p. 179).

Arabic philological studies were ardently prosecuted in the mosques. The interest of the early Arabs in rhetoric survived under Islām; the fāṣālī b. al-Musayyab (d. 95) (cf. Tabārī, b. 1269) discussed Arabic poetry in his madras in the mosque in Medina, but it was still thought remarkable that poems should be dealt with in a mosque (Aṣghīni, i. 48; iv. 162 sg.). In the year 256, al-Talhārī by request dictated the poems of al-Tirīsu in the Baṣr al-Mal in the Mosque of ʿAmr (Yāḥū, Quraysh, viii. 452 infra). In the chief mosque of Ṭabaṣṭa the Aṣghī- the Arantzja: the mosque, which bears his name and the pupils used to take their places in front of him after the morning salāt (Yāḥū, Quraysh, i. 243 sg.). About 200 A.H. we hear of lectures on tafsīr in the principal mosque of the same town (ibid., vii. 105). At the mosque of Ḥadīth still retained its importance (Wustenfeld, Šaṭṭ, iii. 362). The Mosque of al-Manṭir remained the most distinguished school, the goal of all the learned (Yāḥū, Quraysh, i. 246 sg.). When a traveller came to a new town, he could go to the dāmar in the confidence that he could attend lectures on Ḥadīth there (B. G. A., iii. 415; in Sūs). In Mecca, for example, al-Ṣafrī lectured (Yāḥū, Quraysh, vii. 391), in Medina Ibn Ḥabīb, who died in 234 (ibid., p. 400, 401). In Damascus we hear of some one who lectured on kirtā (Hum, i. 182) and of another, Abī Ṭaḥīr al-ʿIs̱kandarānī (d. 359) who lectured on Ḥadīth in the same place (ibid., i. 185). Teachers went from one town to another. Makī b. ʿAbī Ṭalīb came from Kairawan to Miṣr, Mecca and Kurṭubā; in the last named place he put up in two rijāls of the chief mosque, where he lectured on ḥadīth, afterwards in another mosque, and he was much sought after on account of his ḥadīth (Yāḥū, Quraysh, vii. 174). At quite an early date we read of special apartments (which were certainly also lecture-rooms) for authorities on the Kurān, for, according to al-Walāʾi, Abī Ḥanīfah b. Umm Makṭūm lived in Medina in the Dār al-Ḥabīrā (Hum al-Muḥājara, i. 142).

As is evident from the examples quoted, studies were not only prosecuted in the chief mosques but also in other mosques. In Egypt, not only
the Mosque of Amr but also the chief mosques of later date were important centres of study. As soon as the Mosque of Ibn Tulun was founded, a pupil of al-Shāhī's began to lecture in it. In 921 (Fihrist, ed. Flugel, p. 423; cf. Ibn al-Kīfī, Tārīkh al-Hadā'īn, p. 98). During the Fatimid period this was continued. In the year 361 (1972) the Azhar Mosque was finished. Soon afterwards, the new Shi'i Kādi, 'Ali b. al-Nu'mān, lectured in it on Fikh according to his school; in 378 Al-Qādir and his vicer Yā'kūb b. Killis founded 35 lectureships in a large house built beside the mosque (Maqrizī, iv. 49; Sulāḥīn Ṭāhā al-Ḥāfi, Kurz al-Dā'irah fi Tārīkh al-Ashar, p. 32 sqq.). Immediately after the foundation of the Mosque of al-Hākim, the fājūkhī gave lectures (mulḥākāt: Maqrizī, iv. 55) in it. In the Fatimid Mosque of al-Akmar, also founded in 378, teaching was carried on from the very first (Ibid., p. 77).

We can therefore say definitely that mosques were from the beginning throughout the centuries educational institutions, that learned men occasionally used to live in mosques and that under the Fatimids and probably much earlier, there were special houses for the learned teachers. The mosque therefore corresponded to church, town hall and school, and sometimes hostel. It was, then, a public place of assembly for the town. Nāṣīr Khosraw in 439 (1047) gives a vivid picture of the activity in the Mosque of Amr which was visited by 5,000 people daily, teachers, kūrān-teachers, students, strangers, scholars, who drew up bills of exchanges and contracts etc. (ed. Schefel, text, p. 50 and transl., p. 148). It was therefore an exception when the Sāhīra Mosque was open only on Mondays and Fridays (Sana'ī, Hārār, et urb., p. 54) which happened with very few other sanctuaries, and also unusual for the mosque only to be opened for prayer, as sometimes happened out of consideration for the safety of the barāt al-māl. The people demanded unrestricted access to the mosque at all times (cf. Maqrizī, iv. 54).

2 Special Educational Institutions.

In the descriptions of the larger mosques the libraries are often mentioned. These collections were gradually brought together from gifts and bequests, and it was a common thing for a scholar to give his books for the use of the Masjid or Al-ʿālam (e.g. al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī: Yākūt, Uṣūl, i. 252; cf. cv. 287). Many other libraries were semi-public. These often supplemented the libraries of the mosques, because they contained books in which the mosques were not much interested, notably on logic, falsafa, geometry, astronomy, music, medicine and alchemy: the latter were called al-ʿālam al-kutub (Ibn Abī Usāibīa, i. 113, use this already for the pre-Islamic period) or al-ʿālam al-nilvān (on them see Golzheiser, in 'Ab Fr. dh. II. 1915. Phil.-Hist. Kl., Nr. 8. Berlin 1916). The academy, Baitul-Hikma, founded by al-Maḥmūd (138–202) in Baghdad, deserves first mention. It recalls the older academy founded in Córdoba by, to which Maḥsūr had invited Gorgias and, after his death of the hospital; he also translated works from the Greek (Ibn Abī Usāibīa, i. 123 sqq.). In the new academy there was a large library, and it was extended by the translations which were made by men qualified in the above-mentioned fields; there was also an astronomical observatory attached to the institution in which there were also apartments for the scholars attached to it (Fihrist, ed. Flugel, p. 423; cf. Ibn al-Kīfī, Tārīkh al-Hadā'īn, p. 98). When the caliph al-Mu'ātifid (279–289) built himself a new palace, he had apartments and lecture-rooms in an adjoining building for men learned in every science, who received salaries too to teach others (Maqrizī, iv. 192, 202; Fihrist, ed. Flugel, p. 239). Al-Mu'ātifid also presented a whole library to Fāth b. 'Aḥmad ibn al-Majdīsī, which he visited, and by giving books to the libraries with which students worked daily at all branches of knowledge which were even supplied with free paper. The founder lectured on poetry in it (Ibid., p. 240). In the fourth century al-Majdīsī visited in Shirāz a large library founded by 'AbdAllāh ibn al-Dawla (367–372) on which people of standing had access. The books were arranged in cases and listed in catalogues, and the library (kāfīn al-kutub) was administered by a director (waḳīl), an assistant (beṣīr) and an inspector (muṭāhir) (B. G. A., iii. 449; cf. a little later: Yākūt, Uṣūl, ii. 406, 419 sqq.). In the fourth century, a certain Ibn Sawrār founded both in Baṣra and in Rām-Hurmuz a large dar al-kutub with stipends for the scholars who worked in it; in Baṣra a shaykh used to hold classes (muḍarris) in Muṣṭarāli kalām (B. G. A., ii. 413, 418). In al-Ra'y, there was at the same time, a beṣīr al-kutub with over four hundred camel-loads of books, which were catalogued in a ten volume fihrist and included many šī'ī works (Yākūt, Uṣūl, ii. 315 a sqq.). In the year 583, the vizier Sābūr b. Arslānī founded a dar al-fīhrist in Karkh with a large library for scholars (Ibn Taghibīrī, ed. Popper, v. 51, 56 sq.; Ibn al-Adhīr, ix. Cairo edition, p. 35, 7).

Many of the libraries had a strongly, but by no means exclusively, Shi'a character. As to the ‘ilm al-ʿuraq, the ‘Abbāsidīs, as already mentioned, were interested in them and the Omayyad Khalīd b. Yazīd b. Muʿāwīyā studied alchemy and medicine along with Hadīth (Ibn Taghibīrī, i. 245, 3; Yākūt, Uṣūl, iv. 165). But the connection between the Shi'a systems and Hellenistic science of which we have evidence, for example in the Khāšā al-Saffa, perhaps caused a greater interest to be taken in this branch of knowledge among the Shi'is than among the Sunni. In Cairo, the Fatimids founded similar institutions in the interests of the Shi'is. In their palace, they had a library which was said to be the largest in Islam. It had about 40 rooms full of books and all branches of knowledge were represented; they had for example 1,200 copies of al-Ṭabarī's History and 18,000 books on the "old learning" (Maqrizī, ii. 254–255). The vizier Yākūb b. Killis founded an academy with stipends for scholars and spent 1,000 dinars a month on it (Yahya b. Sādī, ed. Tahlin-i, fol. 108'; Ibn Khallīkān, Wafayāt, Cairo 1310, n. 334; cf. Maqrizī, iv. 192, 193). It was
and one built by Abū Sa‘d ʿIsā强有力 al-ʿAshtarabādī and another built for the teacher Abū ʿIsā强有力 al-ṣafiʿarabī. A Nisāmīya was also built here by Nisām al-Mulk for the Imam al-Ḥaraman al-Sinquati (Maqrizi, iv. 192; Hāsa al-Mufaddas a, i. 141 sq.). It was an event of great importance when Nisām al-Mulk (456–485, vizier of the Seljuq sultans Alp Arslan and Malik Shāh) founded the celebrated Nisāmīya Madrasa in Baghdad; the building was begun in 457 and on the 10th Dhu ʿl-Ka‘da 459 (Sept. 1067) it was consecrated. It was founded for the Shāhī teacher Abū ʿIsā强有力 al-ṣafiʿarabī; but he at first refused to accept the call, because the ground on which it was built was said to have been acquired illegally, and Abū Naṣr Ibn al-Sabībāgh therefore held the office for the first twenty years (ibid.; and Wustenfeld, Schāhī, iii. 297; Ibn Khallikān, Wajlayt, Curo, i. 143 sq.).

The Muslim historians are in some doubt about the foundation of the madrasa. Nisām al-Mulk is given the credit of having founded it, but al-Maqrizi and al-Suyūtī point out that madrasīs were already in existence before him and mention the four above-named, but, as we have seen, even they were not innovations. Al-Suhki thinks (says al-Suyūtī) the new feature was that Nisām al-Mulk endowed scholarships for the students. But this again was nothing new as we have already seen. But the enthusiasm and energy of Nisām al-Mulk meant the beginning of a new period of brilliance for the Madrasa. The sultān and men of high rank were now interested in it and the type evolved by Nisām al-Mulk, a school in which the students were boarded, became the prevailing one after his time. We may presume that the older schools also had a place for prayer in them, i.e., they resembled mosques. The type of school known to us is built as a complete mosque. Since even the older mosques containing living-rooms which were frequently used by students, there is no difference in principle between the school and the ordinary mosque; only the school was especially arranged for study and the maintenance of students. This character is expressed by the name madrasa, plural madrasīs; it is a genuine Arabic formation from the word darasa, “to read,” “to study,” taken from Hebrew or Aramaic (Sura lviii. 37 and elsewhere; Hāsa al-Mufaddas a, ed. Horovitz, p. 53; ibid., xiv., 2nd Cairo ed., p. 78; cf. darasa “to teach”: Bukhārī, Babu ‘l-Waḥrār, bab 5 and elsewhere “to study”: Kūmālī, ed. Wright, p. 178; where Bāt Mūrās is used in a Jewish school (Bukhārī, Dīqān, bab 6; Ibn Ḥishām, p. 383; 388); it is therefore an analogous formation to Masjīd (cf. also Heiecher, Klein. Schriften, ii. 122 sq.; Noldke, Neue Beiträge z. sem. Sprachw., p. 38).

In the time of Nisām al-Mulk and immediately afterwards, the madrasa spread in the Trāb, Kūhārān, al-Baṣra etc. He was not content with the two he founded in Nisābūr and Baghdad. There was also a Madrasa Nisāmīyā in Balkh (Wustenfeld, Schāhī, iv. 240); in Māwṣīr (ibid., p. 219); in Hīrāt to which al-Shāhī (d. 485 = 1092) called from Ghazna and in Merw (Yakut, iv. 509).

Ibn al-Sabībāgh, who had to give up his position in favour of al-ṣafiʿarabī, received a promise from Nisām al-Mulk that he would build a madrasa for him in Baghdad, but the death of this scholar prevented this being done (in 477; ibid., p. 304). The great vizier’s rival Tādīj al-Mulk (d. 486 = 1093) in Baghdad founded a Madrasa Tādījya (ibid., p. 311). In Nisābūr, other madrasas were founded at the same time, for example one by al-Manṣūr who died in 463 (ibid., p. 277) and a Shāhīyya (ibid., p. 327). In Mār w, al-Samānī who died in 484 taught in a Shāhīyya madrasa (ibid., p. 321; cf. above). In Marw, al-Rudh, Abū al-Manṣūr (d. 512) built a madrasa (ibid., p. 326).

The prosperity of the madaris stimulated by Nisām al-Mulk in the fifth century survived for a long time in the east. In the sixth century Ibn Ḫubair (580 = 1184) mentions some thirty madaris, all in the eastern part of the town, the most notable being the Nisāmīya, renovated in 504 (Kībhā, p. 229). In 631 (1234), the caliph al-Mustānṣir founded the magnificent Mustānṣiriyā as a school for the four rites, each with a teacher and seventy-five students and a teacher for Kurān and one for Ḥadīth, as well as a physician. Attached to it were a library, baths, hospital and kitchens; there was a clock at the entrance; beside it was a garden where the caliph had a pavilion (mawsira) from which he could survey the building (cf. Le Strange, Baghdad, p. 366 sq.; Wustenfeld, Académies des Arabes, p. iv. and 29).

The Nisāmīya and the Mustānṣiriyā survived the destruction of Baghdad by Hūlāgū and both are mentioned at the beginning of the viiith century by Ibn Bāṭṭūta (ii. 108 sq.) and the building of the latter still exists. Ten others are known of the viiith–ixth century including the Madrasat Abū al-Kādir al-Dījānī (688 = 1286), Madrasat Abū Ḥanīfah (of about the same date) and al-Mīrānīyya (758 = 1357), all still in existence, which were founded for Shāhīs, Ḥanafis and for the study of Kurāna and Ḥadīth. Besides these there still exist seven madrasas founded in Baghdad in the xvith and xviith centuries (L. Masségnson, Les Madrasses de Bagdad, B.F.A.O., vi., 1909, p. 77–86; the inscriptions, do, in M.F.A.O., xxxii., 1912). Although the Tatars in 699 (1300) destroyed many madāris (Quatremère, Histo. des Sult. Maml., ii/ii. 163 sq.), Ibn Bāṭṭūta shows that in the eighth century there were still flourishing schools in the east. In Wāṣiţ there was a madrasa which specialised in taḏījīyya al-Kūrān; it had three hundred rooms for foreign students (ii. 3). In Tustar, the sultān expended one-third of the revenues on madrasas and monasteries (ii. 31) and in Ḡirāz and other Persian towns he also found madrasas (ii. 62 and pass.). For Nisābūr, he mentions four madāris beside the chief mosque (ii. 80); according to Ḥanīf ʿAbrū (c. 820 = 1417), this town still had eight madāris under the ʿAbūl-wādās and he mentions seventeen in which Shāhī fīḥ was taught (Sefer Namek, ed. Schepfer, p. 281). For Marw, Yākūt about 600 mentions, in addition to the Nisāmīya, the school founded by Abū Sa‘d al-Muḥī, b. Mansūr al-Mustāwī (d. 494), also the ʿAmidiyya and the Kūṭānīyya (iv. 509). Large madāris were still being built in Persia in the xviith century and they are still to be found there in modern times (E. G. Browne, A Year amongst the Persians, ii., 1916, p. 104, 217 sq.). Although the institution had for long a Sunni tendency, it could of course be taken over by the Shīʿī without any difficulty. In 728 (1328) in Mashhad, Ali Ibn Bāṭṭūta found a large Shīʿī madrasa (i. 415). The Mongols also built madāris, e.g. Karakā Khan (Quatremère, Histo. Sult. Maml., vii. 56). Hūlāgū’s mother built two madrasas in Bukhārā.
where 1,000 students studied daily in each (J.A., ser. 4, xx. 389). The period of greatest prosperity of the madrasa in Central Asia was under the Timurids, notably in Samarkand, where Timur built a dār al-hadith "in the Indian style," and his madrasa, the (ibid., p. 631). Al-Mulk al-Din rebuilt the Shafii Kallasa, which had been burned down (J.A., ser. 9, iii. 430) and himself founded the Maliki al-Salihya and a Maliki zawiya in the Mosque of the Omayyads (ibid., iv. 460 sq.). There were also built in his reign a dār al-hadith by the Kadi al-Fadil (ibid., iii. 277), a madrasa for Shafii's and Hanafis, the 'Ahdawiya, by his daughter or brother's daughter in 530 (ibid., p. 425), six Shafi'i madaris (ibid., p. 391, 399 sq., 403, 435, 442), some five Hanafi including one founded by his (previously Nur al-Din's) wife (ibid., iv. 256, 266, 277, 284 sq.). This building activity was continued into the seventh to ninth centuries so that al-Nu'aimi can give the following totals: seven dār al-Kur'an, sixteen dār al-hadith (one, the Kusya, is not given in Fleischer), three for both Kur'an and Hadith, sixty Shafii (two of them also for Hanafis); in Fleischer, Nrs. 16 and 30 are not given), fifty-two Hanafi (two of them for Shafii's; in Fleischer, one of them, the Dammaghaya, is not given: it appears among the Shafi'i as Dabghaya), four Maliki and ten Hanbali madaris (in Fleischer, one of the two Uyiyiya is not given; on the other hand he has the Musa-miraya), also three madaris al-tibi, all of which belong to the seventh century. The founders were mainly rulers and emirs, but also included merchants and quite a number of men of learning, and a few women also. As in the east, especially in earlier times, a madrasa was often founded for a particular scholar (ibid., iii. 400, 488) and one sometimes finds a learned man handing over his house to be a madrasa (al-Dawla'iya, ibid., p. 403, cf. 439, iv. 470). According to Mikhail Mejshaka, in his time (1848) these madaris had practically all disappeared or were used as dwelling-houses, because their endowments had disappeared and there were only five left in his time (Fleischer, op. cit., p. 397—311).

Salih al-Din introduced the madrasa into Jerusalem. In 585 (1189) he endowed the Khannah al-Salihya, in 587 the Zawiya Khataniya south of al-Aksa for a particular scholar and in 588 he turned the Church of St. Anna into the Salihya Madrasa; in 589, 583 and 598 emirs built similar institutions and in the seventh—ninth centuries a whole series of them came into existence. According to Mujir al-Din (d. 927 = 1521), there were thirty-one madaris and monasteries (which were in part used in the same way as madaris) in direct connection with the Haram area or near it, and sixteen at some distance. Of these some were also called madrasa, one a dār al-Kuran and one a dār al-hadith (Sauvare, Hist. Juris. et Heb., 1876, p. 139 sqq.; v. Berechim, Corpus, ii. 1; cf. for Salih al-Din: Ibn Khallikan, Wafa'vat, ii., Cairo 1310, p. 402 sq.). In Hebron there was also a madrasa, that of al-Malik al-Nasir (Sauvare, op. cit., p. 23).

Next to Ni'am al-Mulk, Salih al-Din has the greatest reputation as a builder of madrasas. He owes this mainly to the fact that his great activity as a builder lay in countries, which became of great importance in the Muslim world, Syria with Palestine, and Egypt. Even before the fall of the Fatimids he had founded in the year 566 in the vicinity of the Mosque of 'Amr, the Nasiriya
overshadowed by the "House of Knowledge" (dār al-kitāb) founded by al-Hākim in 395 (1005). It was at the northern end of the west palace and contained a library and reading-room as well as rooms for meetings and for classes. Librarians, assistants, with their servants administered it and scholars were given allowances to study there; all branches of learning were represented — astronomy, medicine etc. in addition to the specifically Islamic subjects. Al-Hākim built similar institutions in al-Fustāt (Makrizi, ii. 334 seq.; according to Ibn Dukhamī, ed. Volters, p. 582 c infra; there still existed in his time about 20 a building called the Dār al-kitāb in al-Fustāt). In the year 435, al-Sanbadi saw in Cairo a library with 6,500 books on astronomy, handasa and falsafa (Ibn al-Kīfī, p. 440, 13 sqg.). We do not learn very much of the subjects taught there but occasionally hear of someone who lectured on Arabic philology in it (Kindī, Wusat, p. 616, 13). But the whole institution was closely associated with Shi'a propaganda, which is obvious from the fact that it was administered by the Dīfī l-Dīdar who held conferences with the learned men there every Monday and Thursday (Makrizi, iv. 226; Kālqashandi, Suhb al-fā'lid, iii. 487); occasionally he was a kādī (Kindī, Wusat, p. 606, 11). A similar missionary institute (dār al-hikma) was built in Ḥalab in 207 by the emir Fakhr al-Mulk (Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Popper, p. 360, 17). We may assume that these buildings were also arranged for the performance of the salāt.

With the dār al-hikma, Islam was undoubtedly continuing Hellenistic traditions. Al-Makrizi mentions a dār al-hikma of the pre-Islamic period, where the learned men of Egypt used to work (iv. 377, 4); Ibn Abī Uṣaiḥa, also mentions pre-Islamic seminaries in Egypt where Hellenistic learning was cultivated (dār al-kitāb, i. 104, 16, 24; Athens is also called dār al-kitāb al-Fustātīyīn; B. G. A., i. 135, 14) and the similarity with the Alexandria Museum, which was imitated in Pergamon and Antioch, for example, is apparent (John W. H. Walden, The Universities of Ancient Greece, New York, 1928, p. 60). We do not know just when this institution was closed by the vizier al-Afdar on account of political and religious disputes, but shortly afterwards (517 = 1123) reopened by the vizier al-Ma'mūn in another building, south of the east palace (Makrizi, ii. 313, 337, 17 sqg.). But it was now considerably smaller. During the famine in the reign of al-Musta'ṣir, the library was plundered. In 461 (1068) an eye-witness saw twenty-five camels carrying books from the palace library (Makrizi, ii. 254; cf. Wustenfeld, Fāṭimidenchalifen, p. 261). The institute was finally closed with the end of the Fāṭimid dynasty (567 = 1171). Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had all the treasures of the palace, including the books, sold over a period of ten years. Many were burned, thrown into the Nile, or thrown into a great heap which was covered with sand so that a regular "hill of books" was formed and the soldiers used to sole their shoes with the fine bindings. The number of books said to have disposed of varies from 120,000 to 2,000,000 but many were saved for new libraries. The Kādī al-Fā'lid is said to have procured 120,000 volumes (Makrizi, ii. 253—255; Abū Shāma, Kitāb ar-Ruwaḥtābin, Cairo 1827, i. 200, 268). Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn also allowed anyone interested to take what he liked from the khisānat al-kitāb in Ḥalab for example (Yākūt, Udabā', vii. 20). These attacks on libraries did not mean they were tired of books as Yākūt (Udabā', v. 389) suggests, but was only one expression of the reaction against the Shi'is.

3. Origin and spread of the Madrasa.

While the institutions called the Dār al-kitāb developed in Fāṭimid countries into centres of Shi'a propaganda, the madrasa grew up in the east out of similar Sunni institutions. It is interesting to note that in 400, al-Hākim built a Sunni Dār al-kitāb in Cairo. In it lived two Maliki scholars, who gave instruction and ground round them men learned in Ḥadīth and fikr (Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Popper, ii. 64, 105, 106; al-Dhahabi, Dowlat al-Islām, Hādarādārād, 1337, i. 186). As the instruction (see the first reference) was given in the Dāmārī, the institute must have been connected with a mosque, probably that of Amr. It owed its existence however only to a passing fancy and after three years, the institution was abolished and the two learned teachers executed. With the growing strength of the Sunni, especially in the Ṣa'īfī and Ḥanafi form, many educational institutions arose in the east which had a pronounced Sunni character; the Sunni in the fourth century wanted to have influence with the other schools (P. G. A., iii. 375, 365, 415). Many teachers built houses of their own, where they dictated hadiths and held lectures on fiqh, e.g. a teacher who died in Merw in 420 (Wustenfeld, Islām Schā'ī, ii. 232). Abū Ḫātimī al-Butṣī born in 277 (890) founded in his native town a school with a library with apartment and allowances for the maintenance of foreign students (ibid., p. 163). In Amul, al-Rāyānī (d. 502) built a school; he himself taught in the mosque, also in al-Rāy (iii. 245). In Tābarān a school was built for al-Ḥātimī (d. 393 = 1003) (ibid., ii. 202). In Baghdad, al-Isma'īlī (d. 395 = 1006) founded two lectureships in fiqh studies, one of which was filled by al-Isfārā'īnī, who otherwise lectured in the Mosque of Ibn al-Muḥarrak, and the other by al-Bāfī (ibid., p. 204, cf. p. 217). The philologist al-Mukhtārī, poet al-Zawzānī who died in 465 lived in other learned men in a madrasa al-Suyūtī (Yākūt, Udabā', vi. 409).

In Nisābūr especially, where studies were vigorously prosecuted in the mosque (e.g. Wustenfeld, Schā'ī, iii. 236) many such institutions arose. Thus a special school was built for the Shāfī fiqh-scholar al-Ṣā'īdī al-Nisābūrī (349 = 960; ibid., ii. 156; cf. 160). Abū 'Ali al-Ḥusainī (d. 393) himself founded a school in which to teach Ḥadīth and it was attended by 1,000 scholars (ibid., p. 203). Ibn Fūrāk (d. 406; ibid., p. 216) did the same and in the year 437 Abū ʿl-Kāsim al-Kušairī (ibid., ii. 284) and for Rukn al-Dīn al-Isfārā'īnī (d. 418 = 1027) a school was built which survived the end of the Fāṭimid dynasty. Thus, as early as the fourth century, we thus find al-Maḳdisī praising the very fine madāris of Is̱mā'īl Firrān (P. G. A., ii. 315). In the first half of the fifth century, there were four especially famous madāris in Nisābūr: al-Madrasa al-Bahākhaya, founded by al-Baihaqī (d. 384), when he became a teacher in Nisābūr in 441 (Wustenfeld, Schā'ī, iii. 270; al-Suyūtī is therefore wrong in ascribing its foundation to the birth of Nīżām al-Mulk [in 408]; see Hāsan, ii. 141), al-Sa'dīyya founded by the emir Naṣr b. Subuktakīn (governor of Nisābūr in 389).
for Shafi'i and the Kamhiyya for Malikis; for Shafi'is also the Sharifiyya (called after its head also Madrasa Zain al-Taqdijir) and notably the great Salajiyah or Najarriya (for the identity of the two see Makrizi, iv. 233, with Ibn Idris al-Maliki, ii. 142 sq.) beside al-Shafi'i's mausoleum; he also built a madrasa beside the Mashhad al-Husain and in 572 a Hanafi madrasa, the Suyufiya, and he turned the house of an emir named Sa'd al-Su'adā into a khanaqāh (Husain al-Muhaqara, ii. 141 sq.; Makrizi, iv. 193 sqq.; Ibn Khaliljain, ii. 402 sqq.). Those around him emulated this activity. His vizier the Khāt 'Filīdir in 580 built the Fīlīdir for Shafi'is, Malikis and for Isrā (Makrizi, iv. 197), a brother the Sufya (ibid., p. 199), another, an al-Malik al-'Ahdhi, the Madrasat al-'Ahdhi (ibid., p. 195), his nephew Taqi al-Din built in Cairo the Mausul al-I'zz or Taqawiya for Shafi'i (ibid., p. 51; Ibn Dukmkā, p. 93) and two others in the Faiyum (Makrizi, iv. 195). Other emirs and their relatives followed his example (ibid., p. 196, 199 sqq.) and even a merchant, al-Ārshādi, founded a madrasa in 570 (ibid., p. 194). Ibn Lūnābīr, who travelled through Egypt in the time of Salāḥ al-Dīn, speaks of several madrasas in Alexandria (Khdta, p. 42) and particularly of one beside al-Shafi'i's tomb, which looked like a whole town (ibid., p. 48).

During the period of the Ayyūbids and Mamūls the number of madrasās increased even further an extraordinary degree. In the street called Bāl al-Khayr, there were two long rows of madrasās on the site of the old Fajmā idpalace in Cairo (cf. P. Ravasse, in M. M. A. F., i, 1889, p. 409 sqq., pl. 3). As a rule, the madrasās were in the street in line with the houses. Ibn Dukmkā mentions that in Cairo only two existed (ibid., p. 98). Al-Nāṣirīyin and Ibn Dukmkā describe several madrasās (and madāsijdīt) as maṣālaqāt i.e. above the ground-floor. Ibn Ṣafāqī, who travelled at the beginning of the eighth century, found madrasās even in quite small towns, e.g. in D̄imāqā, Manyat al-Khänjū, Kina, Kāṣ, Aṣwa (i. 65, 96, 106, 108). Ibn Dukmkā (p. 92-99) gives about 800 a list of twenty-four madrasās; this is obviously very incomplete; on the other hand, it contains nine names, not given by al-Makrizi. This author (d. 845 = 1442) mentions 74 madrasās, fourteen for Shafi'is, four for Malikis, ten for Ḥanafis, three for Shafi'is and Malikis, six for Shafi'is and Ḥanafis, one for Malikis and Ḥanafis, four for all four rites, two exclusively used as dār al-hadīth, while the rite of twenty-five is not mentioned and four remained unfinished. Of these madrasās, according to him, about thirteen were founded before 600, twenty-seven in the seventh century, twenty-nine in the eighth century and two after 800. To the two schools of Ḥadīth (al-Kāsimīyā of the year 622 and al-Kharābūya of about 758, see iv. 201, 211 sqq.) it is to be added the Matfīghiyya mentioned by Ibn Dukmkā (p. 99). A notable feature is the decline of the Ḥanbalis and in contrast to Damascus the large number of schools which included all four rites. The first Egyptian madrasa to include all four rites was the Ṣāhīfyya, founded in 640-641 by al-Malik al-Salīhi (Makrizi, iv. 209 sqq.) probably on the model of the Mustansiriyah.

In Salāḥ al-Dīn's time, the madrasa was also introduced into 'Aпад in Mecca a madrasa for the Ḥanafis and in the following year a Shafi'i madrasa was also founded there (Chron. Mecca, i. 104). Up to the beginning of the ninth century, eleven madrasās are mentioned (ibid., p. 104—107) but others were added (ibid., iii. 117 sqq., 211 sqq., 225 sqq., 351 sqq., 417). In the xiiith century they could be used for their original purpose (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 229 sqq.). Madrasās were also built in Medina (Wis-}

As for Asia Minor, madrasas spread under the Saljūqids; the oldest known date from the seventh century. In Konya for example there were the Sīrājī Madrasa of the year 640 (1242—1243), Karatāj Madrasa 649 (1251—1252) and İ̄bdin in the xiiith century, may even be used for their original purpose (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 229 sqq.). Madrasas were also built in Medina (Wisstenfeld, Medina, p. 58, 88, 112).

In Asia Minor, madrasas spread under the Saljūqids; the oldest known date from the seventh century. In Konya for example there were the Sīrājī Madrasa of the year 640 (1242—1243), Karatāj Madrasa 649 (1251—1252) and İ̄bdin in the xiiith century, may even be used for their original purpose (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 229 sqq.). Madrasas were also built in Medina (Wisstenfeld, Medina, p. 58, 88, 112).
al-Shridij in 723 (1324), the al-Mutta'ari in 725 (1325) later called M. al-Wadi and in 747 (1346–1347) M. Mišdž after the teacher; the next Marinid Abu 'Inan (749–759) built in 756 (1358) the Bu’ananya (Tomberg, Annales Reg. Maur., i. 280 infra; Ibn Marājuk, in Heftier, v. 34 and 63; Ed. Pauly, ibid., 1905, p. 548 sqq. Bel. Inscriptions de Fès, in J. A., ser. 1, x., 1917; xii., 1918; Maçais, Manuel d’Art Musulman, ii. 1927, p. 465 sqq.). These Marinid madāris are all still in existence. No longer in existence is the M. al-Lebbādin (Bel, J. A., ser. 1, i., x. 148); the M. al-Shridij consisted of a larger and a smaller madrasa; the latter is now the M. al-Shari‘a (ibid., p. 215 sqq.). Others were built under the Sharifs, notably the M. al-Sharrāt in the xiiith (xvith) century, now the largest in Fas (ibid., p. 114; Bel writes Shaghāḥatn). In other towns also Abu l-Hasan built madāris: in Tāzā Minkāsah, Salī (742 = 1340), the muqaddasa, Sabta, Afsa, Xumāmūr, Alu-prāj, Marrākash, al-Kabīr (747 = 1346–1347), Tilmisān and al-Djażāzir (Ibn Marājuk, Heftier, v. 35 and p. 69). That of Minkāsah was completed by the son of Abu l-Hasan, Abu Inan who was a great builder of schools (Ibn Battūtā, i. 84). In Tilmisān, the Ziyānīn Abd Hamīn Miṣli I had already built a mosque in 710 (1310) and before 737 Abu Tahṣīfīn founded the similar institution, whose name he bore (Maçais, Monumentes arabes de Tlemcen; do., Manuel d’Art Musulman, 1927, ii. 483, 515).

In Spain according to Ibn Sa’d (viith = xith century), there were no madrasas; instruction was given in the mosques (al-Maṣkari, ed. Dozy, i. 136); but in the following year, however, a large madrasa was founded in Granada by the Nasīrid Yūsf Abu l-Haddājā in 750 (1349) (Almagro Cardenas, in Bolletin de la Real Acad. de la Hist., xxvii. 490; Maçais, op. cit., p. 517).

According to Ibn Sa’d, men of learning were held in high esteem in al-Andalus; the Marinids in the Maghrib also built madrasas in their enthusiasm to further learning. The traveller al-Abbārī (688 = 1289), however, found no interest in learning in Tilmisān, al-Djażāzir or Constantine (with one exception); it was only in Tunis that he found any enthusiasm (J. A., ser. 5, iv., 1854, p. 154, 157, 158, 161, 169). This is certainly connected with the fact that the madrasa had just then been introduced into Tunis. But not even the madrasas brought about any deepening of interest in study in the west. Ibn Khaldūn (508 = 1406) testifies to the spread of madrasas in Tunis and the Maghrib but laments the decline in education. In al-Andalus, Muslim culture was dying out and after the decline of Kūrtuba and Kairawa, education in the Maghrib was on a low level; while the old schools in the ‘Irāk were no longer of importance, Cairo was a centre of learning to which all made their way and studies also flourished in Persia (Muḥaddidin, Cairo 1323, p. 342–344, flyl 6, No. 2). This decline in interest in learning soon became general. The learning of the time lacked vitality and international scholarship was affected by political conditions. In 1517 A. D. Leo Africanus says that the lecture-rooms in Cairo were largely empty but the numbers who attended them were small. Some still studied fiqh, but very few the arts (Deor. de l’Afr., iii. 372, in Rev. de Voy. et de Doc., ed. Scherer, Paris 1896–1898). In Egypt, interest in the specialised madrasa decreased considerably and the great builder of the xiiiith (xvith) century, the emir Kāthiūdī, still built madrasas, but his real interest was in the mosque (see below). Lāne only mentions the Azhar Mosque as an important centre of study in Cairo. The development in Mecca was similar, where in modern times studies are only prosecuted in the mosque (Snouck Huisronge, Mekka, i. 17, and cf. above). On education and the madrasa in general cf. also F. Wustenfeld, Die Akademien der Araber und ihre Lehrer, Gottingen 1837; Kremer, Kulturgeschichte, 1877, ii. 479 sqq.; Hanenberg, Abhandlung über das Schul- und Lehrwesen der Muhammedaner im Mittelalter, 1850; v. Berchem, Corpus Inscrip. Arab., i. 252–269; G. Gabrieli, Manuale di Bibliografia Mulsmana, i., 1916, p. 109 sqq.

4. Development of the Madrasa and similar Institutions.

a. Madrasa, Masjid and Djimma.

There was, as already mentioned, no difference in principle between the madrasa and other mosques. Even after the introduction of the madrasa, the regular mosques remained schools as before. Ibn Battūtā, who travelled in the eighth century, in the period when madrasas flourished most, attended lectures on Ḥadīth not only in the Džimma of Shārāz but also in the Džimma of Maṣūr in Baghdad (ii. 83. 110). In Damascus in 580, Ibn Dhu‘ayr refers to rooms in the Mosque of the Omayyads, which were used for Shafī‘ī and Malikī students, who received considerable stipends (ṣīrāj, mūlam) and among them were many Maghāribīs; the mosque had large endowments (maḍārā) for strangers and abī al-falān (kibta, p. 266 supra, 272 supra). Ibn Battūtā also speaks of the halāfāt al-ta’dīrī of this mosque in the different sciences (i. 212). In Egypt in the time of al-Maṣrī (ninth century), there were 8 rooms for fiqh studies in the Mosque of ‘Amr and before 749 there were over 40 halāfāt in it (Maṣrözī, iv. 20, 21). In the Mosque of Ibn Tullūn after its renovation in the reign of Lāḏīn (696–708) courses of fiqh, according to the four madhāhib, and other studies were arranged (ibid., p. 41; cf. Quatremer, Hist. Sult. Muls., ii/i. 47 sqq.) and in 767 an emir appointed 7 teachers in Ḥanāfī fiqh there (Maṣrīzī, iv. 42). In al-Ashtar in the seventh century and later after the earthquake of 702 many lecture-rooms with paid teachers were built (ibid., p. 52), likewise in the Mosques of Ḥākim, where, after the earthquake, lecture-rooms in fiqh for each madhhāb and for Ḥadīth were founded with salaries for the teachers and scholarships for the students (ibid., p. 57). In Fātimid mosques, like the Džimma of al-Zafrī and the Džimma of Makṣ built by al-Ḥākim, Mamlūk emirs founded new lecture-rooms (ibid., p. 66, 81) and not only in the Masjid al-Ḥusain but also in the Masjid al-Nafisi were studies carried on in the eighth century (Ham al-Muḥāfar, i. 195; Muḥi‘ l-Dīn).

When a particular room was set apart for teaching purposes in a mosque, this was often called a madrasa; for example 6 of the Damascen madāris were in the Mosque of the Omayyads: the Shāhīnīya, Ghazzāliya, Kūṣīya, Iṣīyūya, Safiyyīya. Munādjīyya, of which the first and third were also known simply as Ḥalīkha (J. A., ser. 9, iii. 410, 432, 437; iv. 262, 270, 481; others: vii. 239); al-Ḥākim’s Ma‘līki madrasa was
in the Mosque of ‘Amr (see above) and Ibn Dukānī (p. 160 sq.) mentions 8 zawāyā in this
mosque, which were remodelled for tabītī. The madrasas were often also built close beside
the large mosques so that they practically belonged to them. This was the case in Mecca (Chron.
Mobk, ii. 104 sqg.; cf. Ibn Batuṭa, i. 324), in Damascus where there was a Shāfi‘i madrasa beside
the western gate, Bāb al-Barid (Ibn Djabair, p. 271), in Nīšābur (Ibn Batuṭa, ii. 80) and in Cairo where
al-Madrasa al-Taibarsiya in 790 and al-‘Akhdarīyya about 770 were built so close to the Azhar Mosque
that they had common walls and windows in them, which was specially permitted by a fewa; they
were afterwards completely incorporated in the Mosque (Makrizi, iv. 223 sq.). In Fās, the chief
madrasas are arranged round the great mosque al-Karaṣly and the same arrangement is found in

If the madrasa, as a building, had little independ-ence, its character as a home for students
and place of instruction was very marked. But even where it was quite an independent institution,
the distinction between madrasa and ordinary mosque was very slight, all the less as sermons were
also preached in the madrasa. In the fifth century the minbar had already been introduced into
a large number of mosques. In the Nīšāmiya in Nīšābur, services were held as soon as it was
finished (by ‘Abd al-‘Raḥīm: Wustenfeld, Schäffl, ii. 285) and the Nīšāmiya in Baghdaq had a
minbar (Ibn Djabair, p. 219). A problem was however raised by the fact that these madīras were
Shāfi‘i and this school held that only one mosque in a town could celebrate the Friday service,
unless the town was of very considerable size and we are definitely told that al-Djuiwaini conducted
the Friday service in the madrasa in Nīšābur although he was also kātib at the Manṣī mosque
(Wustenfeld, Schäffl, ii. 251). In Egypt from 659 to 665 there was only one Friday khatba, but
after this time there was usually a minbar in the larger madrasas. The caliph actually preached in
the madrasa built by Ka‘īlān (657-659; Makrizi, iv. 221). The minbar for the djumā in many mosques is
expressly mentioned, e.g. the Ḥijāzīyya 761 (ibid., p. 222 sq.), the Bakrīyya 776 (ibid., p. 230), the Za-
mānīyya 797 (ibid., p. 241), the Džamī‘ (ibid., p. 249).
The Šaffā‘īya, which had not a minbar at first, was
given one in 758 and was henceforth used for the Friday service (ibid., p. 205). In Fās the
mixed type of djumā and madrasa was found in the Bū‘ānānīya (Bel, J. A., ser. 11, xii. 339).

It was only natural that the madrasa should also be called masjid (cf. Ibn Djabair, p. 48, 11
with line 19), 20). Ibn al-Hādjīj in the viiiith
century still wants to distinguish between masjid and madrasa and to give more importance to the
former (Maknzi, ii. 48). The distinction remained however, however for quite an artificial one and this is
also true of the distinction between madrasa and djumā. The name madrasa was decided by the
main object of the institution and the special style of the building. The name djumā was only given
if the Friday service was held in it. Thus, as late as 772, we find the emir Bāb al-Qabbār building a
madrasa and opposite it a djumā; but in the year 815, the madrasa was given a minbar and used as a djumā (Makrizi, iv. 235 sq.). If these two uses of the building are equal, either name may be used
(cf. the double name in an inscription of the emir Muḥbīl: van Berchem, Corpus, i, No. 201). In
some cases a Friday mosque can be said to be in the madrasa (Ibn Batuṭa, ii. 39). The great
Djami‘ hasan begun in 757 was also one of the
largest madrasas in Cairo (Makrizi, iv. 117 sq.) and on the other hand, the Djami‘ Khaṭṭār in Bālāk,
built in 737 and the Djami‘ Aṣlam founded in
746 were educational institutions (ibid., p. 106, 111; Hüsnu al-Maḥāsura, i. 192). In the ninth century the Djami‘ al-Mu‘ayyad was the most im-
portant new madrasa in Cairo (Makrizi, iv. 139).

The same variation in nomenclature is often found in this century (cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i, No. 235,
245, 253, 262). On the other hand Makrizi, in the ninth century, only uses masdjīd as a name for
quite insignificant mosques (iv. 263 sqq., where 19 masdjīd are mentioned). In the xiith
century the emir Kaḥībdū built 18 large mosques and
many smaller ones and his interest in the furtherance of learning was specially displayed in his
buildings at the Azhar mosque, which had developed to the expense of the specialist madāris (al-Djabairi,
Mercoiates Biographiques, iii. 230 sqq.; Sulaimān Raṣal, Kanz al-Djauhar fi Ta‘rikh al-Azhar, p. 74 sq); for the similar situation in Mecca
cf. above.

The connection between mausoleum and
mosque was also found with the madrasa. The tomb of the founder was placed in Nūr al-
Din’s madrasa in Damascus (Ibn Djabair, p. 284, 4
and during the Manūlik period it was the
regular custom for the founder of a madrasa to be
buried under a kūbba in it.

Monasteries.

A close connection arose between the monastery and the madrasa. As already mentioned, it was
quite a common thing for devout men to live
permanently in the mosque e.g. in the minaret or
somewhere else on the roof or in subsidiary buildings
or in a cell in the mosque. Such a cell which
can be used for teaching or for meditation is called
ṣawīya, lit. corner (Ibn Djabair, p. 240, 245, 266; Makrizi iv. 20; cf. Greek vousa; see Dossy, Sup-
plement, s. v.). Pious ascetics however had retained
from the older religion the custom of living in
special monasteries e.g. in Djawlan in the fourth
century (B. G. A., i. 185); Muslim historians trace
these back to the time of the Companions (Makrizi,
iv. 272 sq). In the fourth century ascetics and
Sufis, especially the Karrāmīya (s. v.) or Kirrāmīya
(cf. Mea, Renaissance, p. 273), had quite a number of monasteries (khānas, khanān, sing. khānas) in Farghāna. Marw al-Kūḏj, Samarḵand,
Djurān, Tabaristān etc. (B. G. A., iii. 325, 365;
I in Jerusalem and in Egypt also the Kirrāmīya had
their monasteries in which they held ḥāhb (ibid., p. 179, 182, 202).

The distinction between khānas and ribāt
(plur. rubāt) is one of origin rather than fact.
Ribāt was simply a dwelling for men who waged the
ḍjihād on the frontier but the word was also used
by the Sufis who waged a spiritual ḡāns (cf. Maḥrzī, iv. 292 sqq.). There was a ribāt in
the Maghrib in the fourth century in the place of
Salā (B. G. A., ii. 56). When Ibn Mārūf says that they had only two rubāt of the eastern kind
(in Sāf and Salā, Hespéris, v. 36, 71), it is doubtful
whether he means an establishment of Sūfis or of
ghāfīs. In the xiiith century there were several military rubāt on the river Niger, from
which the Almoravids originated. From the xvth century onwards many were built in Morocco against the Spaniards and Portuguese. *Ma'āris* is the usual word for *riḥāṭ* (see Bel, *J. A.*, ser. 11, ix, 1917, p. 325, No. 1). In the east in the fourth century, ribūt are frequently mentioned, which probably had a military character (*J. G. A.*, ii. 303, 354, 415). The original distinction between *khanākah* and ribūt is never quite forgotten; as late as the beginning of the eight century we find ribūt used of a barracks (Ma'ārizi, *v*. 276). Ibn Baṭūṭa says that the word *khanākah* had not reached the west; here the old Arabic term *sāmera* was used (Ibn Baṭūṭa, i. 71; *khanākah* however in Ibn Marrūf, *Hatari*, v. 35 sq.). Usually we find the three terms used without any definite distinction being made between them (*sawama* also seems to be used in the *Kfīs* of a Muslim monastery, see Tornberg, *Annales*, p. 143; cf. p. 18); for all three names are applied to Sufi monasteries, which also take in strangers, i.e. are used as hospices.

Ibn Baṭūṭa mentions many monasteries in the *Tūr* and *Persia*. Beside the tomb of Al-Rifa'i, not far from Waṣṣāf was a ribūt, which he calls *rīwaḵ*, where "thousand of poor men", i.e. Sufis, lived (ii. 4). In Al-Lār especially, he found a vast number of monasteries; the saffārīn there built 460 *sawāma* and spent 1/3 of his revenues on them and the madāris (ii. 31).

For *Syrīa*, Ibn Dūbair testifies to the flourishing monasteries which were in many a regular palaces and places where scholars lived. His time, he says, the names *khanākah* and ribūt are used indiscriminately (p. 243, 271, 284); the word *khanākah* sounded strange to him as a westerner, as to Ibn Baṭūṭa (p. 284). Nevertheless al-Nu'aimi distinguishes the three terms and mentions 29 khanwānīk, 23 ribūt and 26 zawāyā. The oldest *khanākah* mentioned by him (Dawairī) was founded for a learned man who died in 401 (Sauvare, in *J. A.*, ser. 9, v. 269, 377, 389 sqq.).

It was similar in Egypt. The first *khanākah* was built by Ṣalah al-Dīn in 560 in Cairo (al-Sāliḥiya, originally called Dur Sa'd al-Sa'dād: Ma'ārizi, *v*. 273), the next in the seventh century by Baibars al-Bundukdārī, who also founded new monasteries in Syria (ibid., p. 282, 298). Of *khwānūth*, al-Ma'āriti mentions 22 (Ibn Du'ūmok only one), of the sixth century: one, seventh: one, eighth: 18, ninth: one. Of ribūt 12 (Ibn Du'ūmok 8), of the seventh century: 9, of the eighth: one, besides 5 on al-Karāfī. Of zawāyā 26 (Ibn Du'ūmok 9): these were mainly outside the town and were obviously quite small, often being simply the house, later the tomb of some devout man. The oldest dated from the sixth century. In Jerusalem also Ṣalah al-Dīn built a *khanākah* (v. Berchem, *Corpus*, ii. p. 87 sqq.). Among the khanwānīk, zawāyā and ribūt in this city the last named seem to have been specially intended as hostels for pilgrims (ibid., p. 197 sqq.; see also Sauvare, *Jérus. et Liban*, index). In Mecca 50 ribūt are mentioned; the oldest dated from 400 (Charon, *Mekka*, i. 108—115). At places of pilgrimage, the monasteries played an important part as hostels but even in other places they also gave accommodation to strangers. Ibn Baṭūṭa on his travels usually stayed in them (he calls them *sawara*) but he also lodged in madāris, which were also used as hospices (cf. Quatremère, *Hist. Sait. Mani.*, v. 35; note). Some of these institutions were convents for single women (Ma'ārizi, *iv*. 293 sqq.).

The main object of monasteries, however, was to afford Sūfis a home and place for their devotional exercises. In the *khanākah* of Baibars founded in 766, 400 Sūfis were maintained (Ma'ārizi, *v*. 276 *infra*) and in the *khanākah* Sīrāqūs 100 (ibid., p. 285). They were given lodging, food, clothing and money; there were often baths attached to them. The building was arranged for *dīkīr* exercises, and also for *salāt* so that it was a kind of mosque. Ibn Dūbair mentions a ribūt on the summit of Abū Kūba in which there was a mosque (p. 108). A ribūt may be actually called a masdjid (Ma'ārizi, *v*. 289; cf. *khanākah* and masdjid, * infra*). Sometimes the term masdjid al-ribūt: Ibn `Arabshī, *Vita Timuri*, ed. Manger, iii. 880). The monastery founded by Ṣalah al-Dīn was actually given a minaret in 780 (maf'dama) and it is recorded that people used to wear sandals to walk in the *zāhū* (Ma'ārizi, *v*. 275 *infra*). Sometimes only the occupants of the monastery are admitted to the *salāt* (ibid., p. 277: Kha'nākah al-Baibars). There was therefore an imām on the staff of the khanākah (ibid., p. 287). Like other sanctuaries the monasteries sometimes preserved relics; the Ribūt al-Āthār, for example, preserved a piece of iron and wood which had belonged to the Prophet (ibid., p. 295). We sometimes find a khanākah built close to a large mosque like the khanākah of Ašūrābād beside the Āthār Mosque (ibid., p. 292; cf. p. 289: Kha'nūth). For the founder built a masdjid for the Friday *salāt* beside the monastery (Sitāyka, ibid., p. 285). The occupants of the sūlahiya Kha'nākah took a prominent part in the Friday service in the mosque of Ḥikum (ibid., p. 274). At a later date, we find the monasteries themselves arranged for the Friday *salāt*. This was the case with the Ribūt al-Afram, which in 663 was given a minbar for the Friday and festival *khūṭba* (ibid., p. 297) and al-Mu'ayyad made a house, that had begun before he came to the throne, into a *dāmīn wa-khanākah* (ibid., p. 134 *infra*) just as *rīwaḵ* a *dāmīn* could be built with living-rooms for Sūfis, e.g. the *dāmīn* al-Ībā'ī (beginning of the xth century, like the preceding, ibid., p. 140 *infra*) and in the xth century, the *dāmīn* Shāhī (before the building of his khanākah, ibid., p. 113) Baibars al-Bundukdārī was buried in his khanākah and the monasteries had as a rule tombs, either of the founder, or of devout men who had lived in them.

The development of the monastery is therefore quite analogous to that of the madāra: the one institution merges into the other, because learning and manifestation of piety are inseparable in Islam. Learning was also cultivated in the monasteries; at the present day, we find students living in a monastery and attending lectures in a madrasa. Some scholars lectured on Ḥadīth in their rooms in a monastery (ibid., p. 294, 295, 305) but instruction was also arranged for in some monasteries just as in the madāras. `Abd al-Ṭālib (d. 629 = 1231) lectured in a ribūt in Baghdād on ṣūrā, ḥāṣib, etc. (Ibn Abī Usā'ibā, ii. 203) and a Ribūt al-Kha'nāmah is mentioned here, which had a library (Ibn al-Kifi, ed. Lippert, p. 269). There are other references to libraries in monasteries (see for Marw: Vākūt, iv. 509). In Kha'nākah Shāhī founded in 756, an extensive course of lectures, Fīk according to all four Madhāhib, Ḥadīth and
Ikri' (Maqārī, iv. 283) was given. In the Ribāt al-Ahtār in the eighth century, instruction was given in Şāfi'ī Fīkh (ibíd., p. 296) and in the Djamī' al-Fakhrib built in 821, arrangements were made for students as well as for Şūifs (ibíd., p. 136); the Ḥāfiz madrasa al-Djamāliyya (730) was also a khānākhā (ibíd., p. 238 supra); they had a common director.

In the eighth and ninth century this combination of the two institutions became quite frequent, for example in the Nizānīya in Cairo in the year 757 (v. Berchem, Corpus, i. 242 sqq.), in the mausoleums of Dārābī 835 (ibíd., p. 365 sqq.; cf. Ibn lyan, ii. 21, 22, 41), of al-Maqqari in Cairo 865—866 (ibíd., p. 431 sqq.) and of Kā'f Bār 879 (ibíd., p. 431 sqq.). The same institution thus came to be given different names (cf. ibíd., p. 172 sqq.) and al-Suyutī deals with the khānākhā under the madrasa. In the east, Ibn Batūtā found the same relationship, for example in Shirāz and in Kerbelā (li. 78 sqq., 88, 99) and this is what he means when he says the Persians call the zāwia madrasa (li. 30, 32). In the west, he lauds his own sovereign, who had built a splendid zāwia in Fās (li. 84); here also learning and Sufism were associated (see the quotation in Dozy, Supplément, s.v. zāwija) and the zāwia still plays an important part in North Africa (see Dupont and Coppolani, Les Confréries Religieuses Musulmanes, Algiers 1897; EI-Hachachi, Voyages aux Pays des Sarrasins, transl. Scraes and Lassram, Paris 1912). Cf. on the monasteries: v. Berchem, C.T.A., i. 163 sqq., 174 sq. c. Hospitals.

We commonly find, e.g. in Ibn Dujab and al-Makrīzī, the hospital, bimaristan, māristān, nūriyān, mentioned in close connection with the madrasa, probably because it was administered by learned men and as a rule also contained a medical school. Al-Walîd is said to have been the first in Islam to build a hospital in the year 866 (Makrīzī, iv. 258 sqq.; B.G.A., v. 106). In Cairo in 259 or 261 (i.e. before the mosque) Ibn Tulūn built a hospital for the poor. At the same time he installed a dispensary behind the mosque and a physician used to sit there to be consulted every Friday. According to al-Makrīzī, his māristān (called in Ibn Dujab 59, p. 90 the "upper") was then in Egypt; this probably means the first free public hospital; it is improbable that this Hellenistic institution did not already exist in Egypt (Makrīzī, iv. 38, 39, 258; Hāni, ii. 130). Al-Makrīzī (iv. 259 sqq.) mentions in addition to this hospital in Cairo the Māristān Kāfūr (in 346, perhaps identical with that called the "lower" by Ibn Dujab 59, p. 90; al-Maqāhīrī 232—247), al-Mansūrī (682), al-Mu‘ayyadī (821). To these must be added the two which Sa‘īj ibn Dujab maintained in Mīr and Kāḥira (Ibn Dujab, p. 51, 52. c. Ibn al-Khalīkan, Cairo 1302, u. 402 sq.). In Damascus Ibn Dujab found two hospitals, one of them the Bimaristan al-Dîn al-Nūri (p. 283, 284; cf. Ibn al-Khalīkan, ii. 403). He also mentioned one in Nayriz (p. 240), in Hātra 2, 247, in Halm 1, 2 (p. 253), in Halm 3 (p. 257); in Baghdad he refers to a number without particularising them but we know of hospitals here from the third century and in 304 Sinān b. Thābit was director of the hospitals of Baghdad; he was responsible for the foundation of three more (Ibn al-Kifīf, ed. Lippert, p. 193; cf. Kifīr al-Wusūr, ed. Amedroz, p. 21 and on the whole question: Mez, Renaissance, p. 326 sqq.). There was a hospital attached to the great Mustansirīya madrasa (Le Strange, Baghdad, p. 268).

As regards the teaching of medicine, Ibn Abu Usībīsī shows (i. 103 sqq.) that it was continued without interruption in Islam: for example, he mentions 'Abd al-Malik b. Abījar, who was in charge of the medical school in Alexandria, and after the conquest adopted Islam. At a later date, the chief medical schools were in Antakya and Harrān, among other places (i. 116 infra). For a long period most of the physicians were Christians (cf. also B. G. A., iii. 183). Teaching was usually given in connection with the hospitals. The students arrived on him whom he trained (kharrāq) and they assisted him (e.g. the Georgios, summoned from Gundāshāpur to Bâghdâd by Mansūr: Ibn Abu Usībīsī, i. 124). Kâla’tān had a lecture-room installed in his hospital, the Mansūrī, where the râlis al-ta‘żībah lectured on medical science (Makrīzī, iv. 260); instruction was also given in the great al-Bimaristan al-Nuri in Damascus (Ibn Abu Usībīsī, ii. 192). Lectures on medicine (tibb) were sometimes also given in the mosques but in this case it was for the most part a theoretical science closely connected with philosophy. Ibn al-Hajīmah (d. c. 430) lectured on tibb in the reign of al-‘Uthīm (ibíd., p. 90) and when Lâdīn restored the mosque of Ibn Tulūn he also endowed lecture-ships on this subject (Makrīzī, iv. 47; which shows that tibb should be read in Quatremère, Hist. Sall. Maml., i. 47). Tibb could also be studied in a madrasa; for example, al-Dūkî, who died in 641, lectured on it in the 'Alîshāwîya in Damascus (Ibn Abu Usībīsī, ii. 171). At the same time there were special mādārîs al-tibb; thus in the seventh century three were built in Damascus (J.A., ser. 9, iv. 497—499; Fleischer, Kf. Schr., iii. 329). The teachers in them could also be physicians at the hospitals (Ibn Abu Usībīsī, ii. 266).

d. Children's Schools.

These were older than Islamic science, since at the very beginning of Islam, reading and writing were taught in Arabia. In Medina the teachers were often Jews (see Bâlāḏūrī, p. 473 infra; cf. the name rabbānî for the teacher: Sîra, lii. 73; v. 48, 49; Bâhârī, 'Iln, lâb 10; Yâkîbî, ed. Houtsma, ii. 243); but ability to write was not so common here as in Mecca (cf. on the question Noldeke—Schwally, Gesch. d. Qorān, i. 15 sq.; Goldzīher, Med. Stud., i. 110 sq.). After the battle of Badr, several captured Mecceans were released to teach writing in Medina (Kâmil, ed. Wright, p. 171; cf. Goldzīher, op. cit., p. 111; Sprenger, Leben Med., iv. 131). After the capture of Kaḥiṣāyîsî, the prisoners were settled in al-Djurf and some were employed in the school (kuttāb) (Bâlâḏūrī, p. 142). Another contemporary of Omar’s, Dujab b. Hayaj, who was later an official and governor, was a teacher (mādārîn kuttāb) in a school in Tâif (Ibn Ḥadījar, Iqāb, Cairo 1323, i. 235). Muḍawwīya, who had acted as the Prophet’s amanuensis took a great interest in the education of the young. They learned reading, writing, counting, swimming and a little of the Kūrān and the necessary observances of religion. Famous men like al-Jadylībalī and the poets Kūmait and Trɪrɪnā n are said to have been schoolmasters (Jamāms, Mâṣhîria, p. 329 sqq., 360 sqq.). The main subject taught was adab, so that the schools of the children were called mādārîs al-adab (Aghâni, xvii., 2d Cairo ed., p. 101), and the teacher was called
often said to be "to teach them the Kur'an." In the Magribi also, the children only learned the Kur'an, i.e. to recite it, while in Andalus they also learned reading and writing (bíthb), poems and a little grammar. In Ifriqiya they learned, besides the Kur'an, some Hadith and a little of other sciences (Ibn Khaïdân, Maqdûda, p. 447 sq.; fayêt, vi. 32).

The children's school is called maktab (e.g. Yâkût, Udalbâ', iv. 272; Makrîzî, iv. 41. 201) or kuttab (Buçhârî, Dîyâr, bâb 27; Dâlûhîn, p. 142; Makrîzî, iv. 197, 240): those founded for poor children kuttab sulub or maktab sulub (cf. e.g. Makrîzî, iv. 53, 117, 199, 201). The word sulub characterises the school as a public benevolent institution; cf. the expression: "she made a maktab li 'izâbah" (ibid. p. 223; of Kâ'lânî's hospital, ibid.; p. 260; s. also Dâsy, Supplement, s. v.; Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml. sf., 229 note and B. G. A., iv. 211, 258). — Cf. on elementary education: Gokzlïer, Art. Education, in Hastings, Encycl. of Rel. and Ethics; Mec, Renaissance, p. 177 sq.; Lane, Manners and Customs; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekb., ii. 144 sqq.

5. Libraries.

In Mecca, as well as in Medina, there were large collections of books in the mosques (Ibn Dîjabar, p. 89, 193; on modern conditions in Medina, see Ghanûn, Rihla, p. 254 sqq.). The Dîmîfi Zaitûna in Tunis had a large library (Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantiine, 1894, p. 287). The Niqûmiya in Baghûdâd had a library of which al-îsârâtînî (I. 488) was librarian (Wustenfeld, Shî'tî, in. 314). The Mustânîrya was better supplied in this respect than any other madraa (Chron. Mekb., iii. 174). In Mâr Wîr there were in the sixth century to public endowed libraries in the mosques and madâris, two of them in the chief mosque, one of the latter containing about 12,000 volumes (Yâkût, iv. 599). Among the madhâris in Cairo, the Fâjilîya was particularly well endowed in this respect; it contained 100,000 volumes (Mârâkhî, iv. 197): these were acquired by al-kâdi al-Fâjîlî from the Fâjîmîd Academy (Shîhâb al-Dîn Abû Shâmâ, K. al-Râshûfâtînî, Cairo 1297, i. 200, 268; Makrîzî, ii. 253 sqq.) and in Kâlânî's hospital there were according to Ibn Tâghribîrî (lit., 482), 100,000 volumes from the same library. These libraries were often broken up and portions put in other madâris. During the famine of 694, the students of the Fâjîlîya sold the valuable books for a loaf a volume (Makrîzî, iv. 197; cf. also p. 252). In Syria, Avâl Mînîr (v. Berchem, Corpus, i/vi, 108 sqq.). Ibn Dîjabar says that in these eastern countries, the Kûrân was only taught orally (by tâlîf) while writing was practised with poems etc., out of respect for the Kûrân (Rihla, p. 272). This did not hold generally however. At a later date (sixth century) we are told that a pipe was led from a school in the Azhar Mosque to the tomb of the founder so that his grave could be watered by the water in which the slates, on which sentences from the Kûrân had been written, were washed (Sulâhân Rasîd, Kam al-Dînawar fi Tabîh al-Azhâr, Cairo 1320, p. 73). As a rule the school was placed close to the mosque and beside a drinking fountain. During the Mamlûk period, nearly every founder of a madrasa built in connection with it a similar institution for orphans and poor children, who received free instruction and sometimes also maintenance in it (see Makrîzî, s. v. madâris, passim). The object of such schools beside the mosque of Ibn Tûlûn is thus defined by Lâdîn as "to teach the orphans of the Muslims to recite the Book of God, the Exalted and also for other works pleasing to God and the various kinds of piety" (Makrîzî, iv. 41). Elsewhere it is
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'Alī still means Ḥadīth but, with the development of the systems of law and theology, these were also taught in the mosques. In the mosque of al-Mansūr in Bayra, al-ʿAshʿārī heard al-Dhumānī expound the Muʿāzīla kalām (Wustenfeld, Schafh., p. 131); closely connected with this was methodology (al-Maṣūba ṭara ʿal-Nuṣṣ, cf. Yākūṭ, Cdādā, vi. 353). But many different subjects could also be taught. Al-Khākhī al-Maghdūd, who taught in Mānṣūr’s Dīmān in Baghdad, lectured on his history of Baghdad (Yākūṭ, Cdādā, i. 246 sq.). Philosophy proper however disappeared from the mosques. In Spain, we are told, fīlāf and ṭajūf were only cultivated in secret, as those who studied them were branded as philosophers, un-Islamic (Maḳāṭī, ed. Dīvy, i. 136). The madāris were mainly established to teach the established systems of fiqh and originally each school was intended to represent only one madhab. Where the four madhāhīb are represented in one school, one can talk of four madāris, e.g. al-Madāris al-Ṣadīḥya (Maḳāṭī, iv. 209, 282; also al-Madiṣūnu, which was divided by the street, p. 209; cf. v. Bchem, C.I.A., i. 104 note 1). The custom, often occurring before Niẓām al-Mulk’s time of founding a Dār al-Ḥadīth was also continued after him. Al-Maḳāṭī mentions two of them in Cairo: al-Kamilīya, founded in 622 by al-Malik al-Kāmil (iv. 211 sq.) and al-Khāṣībiya, founded in 785 (ibid., p. 201). The former was restored in 1166 again as a Ḥadīth school (v. Bchem, C.I.A., i., No. 61). Before al-Malik al-Kāmil, Nār al-Dīn (d. 599) had founded the Niẓāmīya in Damascus as a Dār al-Ḥadīth (Maḳāṭī, iv. 211; cf. J. Ali, ser. iii. 262); when al-Maḳāṭī says this was built first on the earth he must be corrected. In Damascus many similar schools were built. 16 are mentioned, and 3 of which are not in the madāris. The ordinary madāras however included other subjects beside the study of ḥadīth alone. Special mention is made of al-Dīn al-Ṣadīḥya, Maḳāṭī, (iv. 205). In the Niẓāmīya in Baghdad and in other madāris in the cast. philosophical studies were professed (cf. Yākūṭ, Cdādā, vi. 409; v. 423 sq. and iv. 253, but it must be an anachronism when Sunnūm b. ʿAbd Allāh is said to have taught philosophy in 403 in the Niẓāmīya in Baghdad). In 604 (1207) al-Malik al-Muʿāẓim built beside the šākhra mosque a Madrasa al-Muṣīra, exclusively for Arabic linguistic studies (Sauvage, Hist. fr. et ii. br., p. 86, 140) and schools for special subjects were not rare (cf. Subki, Muʾfī, ed. Mīḥmūn, p. 153). In addition to those in Maḳāṭī, there are frequent references to šīrā (often al-ṣayf al-adḥāt), ḥadīth, ṭarīf and māzā (devotional exercises: cf. thecon Quatremeré, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. ii. 47). Al-Subki mentions, in addition to the special Ḥadīth schools, also Madāris al-Tasfīr and Madāris al-Ḥadīth (Maṭī al-Nāf, ed. Mīḥmūn, p. 153).

In the Muḥālida (qaṣī, 6, No. 4 sqq.), Ibn Khāblām gives a survey of the divisions of Islamic studies. They are divided into al-ḥadīth ṭahīṣiya and nāḥīya. The former are based on observation by the sense and deduction and are therefore also called fasaṭāfura or ṭukkīza, the latter are dependent on revelation by the “legitimate determiner” (al-Waṣī al-Shaṭīr), are therefore based on special communication. The ṭalīm nāḥīya therefore comprises all branches of knowledge which owe their existence to Islam, namely Kūran, i.e. tasfi and the seven ṣuṣūf (No. 5), Ḥadīth with the sciences auxiliary to it, including al-muṣuṣ wa l-ṣuṣūf, muṣalat al-Ḥadīth (No. 6), al-ṣaṣī with special emphasis on al-ṣūṣ, the law of inheritance (No. 7–8), waṣī al-Ḥadīth with the principles of law including methods of deduction on the differences between the madhāhib (No. 9), al-kalām, theology, which is nāḥīya in as much as it is really a further development of imām which comes under the head of religious duties, but is ʿaṣlīya in its nature since it is entirely based on abstract proofs (No. 10), al-tuṣawwur, something like practical theology. (No. 11), ṭuṣī ḥadīth, interpretations of visions (No. 12).

Linguistic sciences come next to the study of Kūran and Ḥadīth (cf. No. 4, 37 beginning), which are divided into 4 parts: al-maṣāa, al-taṣawwur, al-bayān, al-ṣaṣī (No. 57), and in the last named category comes the whole study of Arabic literature.

The ʿaṣlīya ʿaṣlīya are variously classified, usually into 7 main sections (No. 13) and are al-ṣuṣīya, logic, which is the foundation of all others (No. 17), al-arṣuṣiyya, arithmetic, including ʿaṣīhā etc. (No. 14), al-ḥankaṣa, geometry (No. 15), al-haṣa, astronomy (No. 16), al-ṣuṣīya, the theory of tones and their definition by number etc. (see No. 13); then there is al-taṣawwur, the theory of bodies at rest and in motion, — heavenly, human, animal, plant and mineral; among its subdivisions, special mention is made of al-ṣaṣī, medicine, and al-ṣaṣī, agriculture (No. 18–26; cf. No. 29). The seventh main head is šīr, al-ṣaṣī, metaphysics (No. 21). Magic, talismans, mysterious properties of numbers etc. also form branches of Muslim learning (No. 22 sqq.).

As above remarked, medicine was not only taught in special schools but also in the mosques; about 600 A.H., ʿAbd al-Laṭf lectured in the Aṣḥar Mosque but it is not quite clear whether his instruction in ḥadīth was also given there (Ibn Abī Usāibī, ii. 207) and in any case the “philosophical sciences” in particular were cultivated in the mosques. Another division which still prevails, developed, that into principal sciences, those having a definite aim (maṣūba) and instrumental sciences (ṭaṣī or waṣī). To the former belong kalām, al-akhlāṣ al-ʿanṣārīya (ethics, practically the same as tuṣawwur), ḥadīth, waṣī al-ṣaṣī, Ḥadīth, the latter comprise linguistics, (ṣaṣī, ṭaṣsam, ṭayyib, ṭaṣī) and in addition metrics and prosody (ṣaṣī, ṭaṣīyya), logic (waṣī) including the theory of proof (ṣaṣī al-ḥadīth), probably the same as the older muḥālida and muṣalat, mathematics (ḥaṣf and ḥaṣf), muṣalat al-Ḥadīth (cf. Muṣāfā Baim, Risāla, Cairo 1902, p. 20; Snouck Hurgonje, Mekkā, ii. 200 sqq.). These are hard and fast lines drawn. When in 1162 Ahmad Pāša came to Cairo as governor, no ḥadīth in the Aṣḥar could give answers to simple questions on mathematics and astronomy, because they only knew as much arithmetic as sufficed to deal with questions raised by the law of inheritance; a very few studied these subjects privately. The Pasha pointed out that astronomy was necessary for the study of religious duties, to settle the times and seasons (al-Duḥarfī, Mīr divorce, Biography, ii. 110 sqq.); cf. also A. Spranger, Die Schulfächer und die Schelastik der Muslimen, Z.D.M.G. xxiii., 1878, p. 1–20).
The method of teaching was by lectures which had to be learned by heart afterwards (tafiq). The first task was to learn the Qur'an by heart and then acquire as many traditions as possible. The ḥadīth was repeated three times so that the student could remember it (Bukhari, *Ithn*, p. 30). Lecturing soon became dictation (imālā), when the student wrote down what was said, except in the case of the Qur'an (approved: Bukhari, *Ithn*, bāh 34, 36). The method was the same for linguistic or literary subjects as for ḥadīth, Tafsīr, etc. The philologists not only used to dictate their grammatical works, as for example Ibn Duraid (Wüstenfeld, Schäfer, p. 127) or Amr b. 'Abd al-Wāliyād (J. 344) who dictated from memory 30,000 folios on tughra (Vāqūt, *pread.†*, vii. 26) but also the text of the poets, like al-Jabari, who lectured on al-Tirmidhī in the Mosque of Amr in 256 (ibid., vi. 432). Abū Bakr b. al-Anbārī (d. 327 or 328), who dictated in one part of the mosque and his father in another, knew by heart 300,000 sharāhibīd for the Qur'an and 120 commentaries on verses of the Qur'an with their iṣnāds (ibid., vii. 73). Dictation was specially important in the case of ḥadīth, as the exact establishment of the text was the first necessity. It is therefore always said "he dictated ḥadīth" (Hasan al-Mukhādira, ii. 130; Wüstenfeld, Schäfer, p. 210, 224, 248, 257, 287 etc.; Ibn Ḥalibūbughā, *Tabakht al-Hanafiya*, ed. Flügel, p. 51; Yāqūt, *Cf*., i. 426). The position of a teacher is therefore maghilib al-imālā (ibid., ii. 243; vii. 74), and his famulus among the students is al-mustamīl (cf. ibid., vii. 282; vii. 74). Problems of fikr were also dictated (so Abū Yūsuf, Ibn Ḥalibūbughā, ed. Flügel, N°. 249).

Instruction frequently began immediately after the salāt and the students performed the salāt along with the teacher. The class (darūr) began with the recitation of the Qur'an by a ḥāfiz, with blessings on the Prophet, and other religious formulae (Madkhal, i. 56; cf. Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 172 sq.). At the present day, the teacher as a rule simply pronounces the basma himself. Dictation alone was not everywhere the custom. In time, there came to be so many copies of the chief texts that the students were able to get copies for themselves. The text was in this case read aloud, and the teacher gave his emendations and comments on the text (Vāqūt, *Cf*., i. 255). It was only natural that the dictation of texts was first abandoned in philosophy; it is said to have been dropped as early as the fourth (tenth) century (Mez, Renaissance, p. 171 with a reference to Subkī, *Tabakht al-Shāfi`īya*, iii. 259; Suyūtī, *Mushir*, i. 30). This does not mean that dictation was completely abandoned for the teacher still made his pupils write down his comments; for example Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān (d. 584) dictated a commentary on Ḥaṭirī (Vāqūt, *Cf*., vii. 29), and the method of having a text read aloud, while the lecturer explained any remarkable phrases was used as early as by the teacher of Ḥadīth, Ibn Kāsān (d. 2999; ibid., vi. 258). At the present day, either the teacher or his famulus reads the text to be expounded from printed copy.

Cooperation between teachers and taught by questioning one another has always been an important feature of method. Ibn Khaldūn laments that so few teachers in his time understood the correct methods of teaching (jarr al-ta'em). They put difficult questions at once to the pupil instead of which the tahlīn must be arranged systematically, so that it is always combined with exposition and it is a fundamental principle that the pupil should not mix the different subjects. In Spain and North Africa in particular in his time, the instruction was not particularly good, and they laid too much stress on learning by heart (iṣfīf). (Mukaddimah, p. 342, 443 sq. 445 = fasc. 6, N°. 29, 30; cf. Subkī, *Mīd` al-Nam`, ed. Muhamm., p. 151 sq.). Mechanical learning by heart is recognised for the Qur'an. It is therefore regularly said "he dictated and expounded" (e.g. Wüstenfeld, Schäfer, p. 220, 326). When the above mentioned Ibn Kāsān expounded ḥadīth, he also asked his hearers about their meaning (Yāqūt, *Cf*., vi. 282). Vice versa, the class was at liberty to catechise the teacher. Al-Shāhī used to sit in his great hālka in Mecca and say: "Ask me what you want and I will then give you information on the Qur'an and sunna!" (ibid., vi. 391; cf. F. G. A., iii. 379). The teacher was sometimes overwhelmed with questions (Vāqūt, *Cf*., v. 272). Ibn Dūhair saw written questions being handed to a teacher in the Ni`āmīya in Baghda (p. 219 sq.). Both practices are still in vogue and even in large classes the student may interrupt with questions. Ibn al-Ḥādījī condemns irregular interruptions of the lecture (Madkhal, i. 57).

7. The Teachers.

The name for a teacher is muṣarrīs (also used in the pre-Muḥammadan period: Ibn Abī Uṣāfa, i. 104); usūdh is a kind of honorary title (see Vāqūt, *Cf*., i. 413, 209; i. 271; v. 353, 354, 438, 448) and is still in use and applied also to students. There were a very large number of teachers in the great mosques. In the madrasa at first only one was appointed, for example in the Ni`āmīya in Baghda (see above), in the first of those founded by Šāhāl al-Dīn in Cairo (al-Nāsira: Makrīzī, i. 193) and in many others. A madrasa frequently took its name from a distinguished teacher (e.g. the Gharawīya in Cairo: Makrīzī, iv. 235; the Shāfirīya, originally the Xīnīrīya: ibid., p. 193; M. Ibn Rashīd; ibid., p. 195; cf. Masdjid al-Kiṣā in Baghda). In the large madrasā, however, several teachers were appointed; Šāhāl al-Dīn appointed 4 lectures to the Khānīya in Cairo (ibid., p. 195 sq.); in this case a definite number (20) of students was allotted to each teacher (cf. Chron. Mekk., i. 105 sq.).

It is easily understood that the conditions in the older mosques, where every one could come and go, were freer than in the madāris, which were built for particular teachers and students. There was certainly no official recognition of the teachers in the earliest period. After textbook had come into use, the certificate of qualification was the iṣfīf, and so it has remained to modern times. Any one who had studied with a teacher could get permission from him to teach from the book, which he had copied out and studied from his dictation: the teacher wrote this permission (iṣfīf) in the book (e.g. Vāqūt, *Cf*., i. 253; ii. 272). A teacher could also give an iṣfīf a`wāma, which permitted the individual concerned to teach from all his works (Ibn Bāṭtūta, i. 251). In Damascus, Ibn Bāṭtūta was given quite a number of these 'diplomas' (i. 251–253). It was the usual thing for a travelling scholar to collect numerous iṣfīf.
thus 'Abd al-Latif had certificates of this kind from teachers in Baghdad, Khorasan, Egypt and Syria (Ibn al-'Itrā‘, ii. 202). As late as about 1700 we find al-Naṣirī acquiring ḏa‘a‘a‘ in his travels (Z.O., M.G., xi. 690). There were special formulae for the ḏa‘a‘ for Māturida‘ and ṣafā‘a‘ (al-Ṭalḥi‘a, fahhāl, al-ʿASh‘i‘, xiv. 322 sq.). Some scholars only gave occasional lectures. 'Abd al-Wāḥīd (d. 944) lectured on Ḥadīth every Friday in the Naṣimiyya (Wustenfeld, Schafī‘, p. 287) and originally this was the case in the Azhar Mosque (see above).

The caliph al-Kādir, in his earlier days, used to lecture every Friday in a mosque in Baghdad (ibid., p. 233) Some scholars only dealt with a very limited subject; thus one was appointed to the Naṣimiyya to lecture on Bukhārī's Šahih because he had attended lectures on this from a celebrated teacher (ibid., p. 288). There were however many learned men who devoted themselves mainly to teaching and taught several subjects. Thus al-Shafi‘ī began his ġāhā‘ immediately after the ṣalā‘ al-dā‘ah and taught students of the Kūrān, as Sunday the students of Ḥadīth came to him and heard his comments; later in the day he lectured on method (muḥākara wa tā‘aqar); at the ġaiša‘ the ahl al-ṭa‘ā‘ā‘ came to him and he lectured on ʿa‘dād, mákṣū‘a and šurā‘. He went off at midday (Yākūt, ḍabā‘, vi. 383). About 300 A.H. we find Ibn Kaṣān lecturing for the best part of the day on a number of subjects in somewhat the same order (ibid., p. 282); others lectured from early morning till late in the evening (ibid., vii. 176; Ibn Ṭabī‘a‘, ii. 207 supra) and pious teachers even spent the night in the mosque in prayer (Wustenfeld, Schafī‘, p. 258). Sometimes a young teacher began by dictating ḥadīth and later received a post with a wider scope in a mosque (ibid., p. 239).

The distinction between teacher and taught was not absolute; any one could have an ḏa‘a‘a‘ in one subject, while he was still a student in others and even men of ripe scholarship attended the lectures of notable teachers. This led students to travel from one seat of learning to another, just as they used to travel in early days, to collect hadiths (Bukhārī, ibn. p. 7, 19, 26). All the biographies of learned men give examples of this; the old Hellenistic custom was thus continued (cf. J. W. H. Walden, The Universities of Ancient Greece, New York 1910) and royal courts still played the same part; at them learned guests received donations, which enabled them to appear as teachers in the mosques (e.g. Ibn Ṭaṭṭa‘a‘, ii. 75 sqq.; Ibn Khallikān, Kifā‘ al-ṭa‘ā‘, al-Bā‘a‘, 1284. 452; Ibn Ṭā‘ā‘a‘, ii. 205; cf. Mommsen, Romische Gesch. ii. 59). Distinguished scholars were of course much visited by lovers of learning; of one of the latter, it is said ḥa‘itha‘ ḥa‘itha‘ or ḥa‘itha‘ ḥa‘itha‘ ‘they used to travel to him’ (Yākūt, ḍabā‘, vii. 174; Ḥasan al-Maḥsū‘a‘, l. 207; cf. p. 141). 4–600 ṛi‘a‘a‘ had gathered a teacher in the Maghrīb in the time of Ibn al-Hādhīj (Maṭbally, ii. 5). Sometimes a scholar attended another's class to try him with questions (see e.g. for al-Bukhārī: Ibnunow-Fischer, Christen-Handbuch, p. 103) and disputations often took place in which the pupils used to support their teacher very vigorously. If the stranger was recognised, the teacher might receive him with marks of honour (al-ʿAkhbā‘ at al-Kuṣai‘: Yākūt, ḍabā‘, iv. 243 sqq.). As in the Christian universities of Europe, public disputations were held in the mosques, in which considerable feeling might be displayed, e.g. in the disputations in the Raṣā‘a‘ mosque in Baghdad between Ibn Suraijī (d. 536 = 918) and the son of Dāwūd al-Zāhirī in which the former was victorious (Wustenfeld, Schafī‘, p. 110 sqq.). The teachers of the Naṣimiyya also used to hold disputations (ibid., p. 309). Celebrated teachers were not only visited by other scholars. When (about 300) Ibn Kāṣān was lecturing, about 100 horses etc. used to stand outside the mosque because prominent men were listening to him (Yākūt, ḍabā‘, vi. 282). The teachers made up the class of “the turban-wearers” (mawlā‘āmam, mawlā‘āmam, ṭa‘ā‘ā‘a‘ al-ṣī‘ā‘a‘, al-ṭa‘ā‘ā‘a‘ al-ṣī‘ā‘a‘; see Makrizi, ii. 246; Quartemere, Hist. Sult. Mar., i. 244 sqq.; ii. 266; Dozy, Supplément, ii. 169); in eastern Andalus, they did not wear the ḍabā‘a‘, but this was exceptional (Makrizi, i. 137). The Kādi‘ Abū Yūsuf (d. 82) is said to have settled the dress worn by learned men (Ibn Kathīrūbuahū, ed. Flugel, N. 249).

In spite of all this flexibility a certain stability developed in the teaching staff of the mosques. This was connected with the question of pay. It was for long in dispute whether it was permitted to accept payment for giving instruction. In the collections of Ḥadīth, the practice is both supported and condemned and it is said that the teacher may accept money, but not demand it, and avaricious teachers are strongly condemned. There are continual references to people who gave lectures without payment (Bukhārī, ḏa‘a‘a‘, bab 16; Abū Dāwūd, ḍabā‘, bab 26; Ibn Māda‘a‘, ṭa‘ā‘ā‘a‘, bab 8; cf. Goldziher, Dab. Stud., ii. 181 sqq.; Art. Education, N. 3–4 in Hasings, Encyc. of Rel. and Ethics; Lammens, Muskrat, i. 360 sqq.; F.A., 1901, p. 143; Wustenfeld, Schafī‘, p. 295; Mez, Renaissance, p. 176). The custom of the older Jewish scholars of exercising a handicraft was not common among the Muslims but was found occasionally. Among men of learning we find shoe-makers, locksmiths, sandal-makers (Wustenfeld, ii. 227, 231, 267; cf. also Mez, Renaissance des Islam, p. 179). It was the rule however for the teacher to be paid for his work. This might be quite a personal donation from a prince or other rich man, for example al-Ṭabarī was given a sum of money when he taught in the Mosque of al-Amr (Yākūt, ḍabā‘, vi. 428; cf. the remarks above on wandering scholars); it was as a rule however a regular salary which was paid out of endowment, so that the position was a regular professorial chair (see under G); this was especially the case in the madrasas. The salaries of the teachers (mawlā‘ām, also ḍabā‘ā‘, sg. ḍabā‘ā‘; see Dozy, Supplément, s. v.) varied considerably, according to the endowment. The lecturer in the Suṣyūfīya received 11 dinars a month (Makrizi, iv. 196) but in another of Salāh al-Dīn’s schools, the Sahlīya or Naṣīrīya, the pay was much higher; the principal teacher received 40 dinars (of 12 2 dirhams) a month and 10 dinars as principal, along with 60 ṣī‘a‘ of bread and two beasts of burden, to bring water from the Nile (ibid., p. 251). In the Djamāl al-Dīn madrasa, each teacher got 300 dirhams a month (ibid., p. 253). The teachers also received donations in kind on special occasions; in the other Naṣīrīya school they received sugar and meat every month at the festivals (ibid., p. 222),
in the Ḥidżāyiya on Ḩd al-litr different kinds of bread and biscuit (ba'k and ḥunāhunāk), at the feast of sacrifice meat and in Ṭa’īdān food was prepared for them (p. 223). According to al-Makrīzī, learned men might have 50 dinār a month and in addition to allowances in kind (ii. 364). On ceremonial occasions, they often were given special marks of distinction, such as gifts in money and robes of honour.

The men of learning were organised in a gild. How the organisation worked in detail is not known. At the end of the third century they found the institution of the riṣāla established in Egypt. While Yazid b. Ḥālib (d. 125) is called faṣīk Miṣr wa-shaykhūkā and saiyidunā wa-ālimunā and Usayd b. Ḍa‘far (d. 135) faṣīk Zamānī (Ḥusn, i. 131), it is said of a series of scholars beginning with Abū al-Khaṭām b. al-Ḳāsim (d. 191), Ṣaḥīḥ b. Abī Ḍa‘fār (d. 204), Abī Ḍa‘fār b. Abī al-Ḥakam (d. 214 or 215) that they had riṣāla-s in Egypt (Ḥusn, i. 135 sq.) which seems to mean that they belonged to an organisation. The position is also called riyāṣat al-fālām, as, for example, with reference to Vānuus (d. 264) (ibid., i. 136). When the madhhab arose, each school had its own rūt in the organisation. The formulae for this was intahat iṭla‘i ‘rīṣāla fi madḥḥab ṭalqā; e.g. of Ibn al-Mawāz (d. 251), and others (Ḥusn, i. 136; Ibn Ṭaghrībidrī, ii. 116). For the Ṣaḥīḥs e. g. Ḥusnain, died 406 (Ibn Ṭaghrībidrī, ii. 121 sq.; cf. Ḥusn, i. 196; Ibn Djugair, p. 219, 220); for the Ḥanafīs e. g. al-Ḳarkhī, died 340 (Ibn Kultubba, ii. 115; cf. No. 11, 13; Ibn Ṭaghrībidrī, ii. 116); for the Hanbalis al-Barbāhārī (d. 329) (Ibn Maskawāwī, i, Cairo 1905, p. 266). Besides rūt we find other names like Imam al-Ḥanafīya bi-Ṭaghrībidrī or bi-Kultubba or Shāfi‘i ʿAḥsān bi-ḥanīfat al-Nāḥir (Ibn Kultubba, No. 67, 96, 196; cf. Shāfi‘i al-Ḥanafīya: Ibn Ṭaghrībidrī, ii. 116). There is also evidence of the Ṣafīya within the special subjects, e. g. Shāfi‘i al-Kurūba bi-Mīṣr (Ḥusn, i. 230), Ṣafīyat al-Ḥadīṣ bi-Mīṣr (ibid., i. 163; Ṣafīyat), Ṣafīyat al-Ṭaqāwā (Quatremère, Hist. Sull. Maml., ii. 27), Ṣafīyat al-Iṣra‘ wa-l-I‘lāma in Alexandria (Ḥusn, i. 210). The physicians of a district had their Ra‘ī al-Ṭahāba (Maṭrīzī, iv. 237; Ibn Abī Usāfi‘a, ii. 86, 247); a Ẓafīr was appointed in 624 (1285) chief of the physicians (Quatremère, ep. cit., ii. 81). There was also a Ra‘ī al-Ṭahāba (Maṭrīzī, iv. 224). Ṣafīyat al-Ḥall is found as a title of honour for a scholar, e. g. in the viih, viihth century (Ḥusn, i. 143; 205; Quatremère, ep. cit., ii. 68, note; ii. 270, 280: Ibn Taimiya), and sometimes also for earlier (Mez, Renaissance, p. 179), while Ṣafīyyat al-Shaykhī means the most distinguished leader of the Sufis (Maṭrīzī, iv. 285).

It is not clear what real importance the organisation of teachers had in the earlier period. In different districts there was a principal director of the organisations, a ra‘ī al-Ṭulāmā, in Medina (Ibn Djugair, p. 200, 3), in Baghdād (ibid., p. 220, 22), in Cairo and Upper Egypt (Ḥusn, i. 141, 143; 191), also called ra‘ī al-rūṣā (Ibn Abī Usāfi‘a, i. 204; Yāḥūt, Usāfi‘a, i. 248). Every madhhab had its ra‘ī for the district (Ḥusn, i. 148, 21; Yāḥūt, iv. 512). The chief ra‘īs could interfere in the activities, for example, on the teachers of Ḥadīth (Yāḥūt, Usāfi‘a, loc. cit.). He is probably identical with the ẓafīr al-Ṭulāmā, without whose permission the caliph would not admit a teacher to the Mosque of al-Mansūr in 451 (ibid., i. 246 sq.). This shows that the head of the gild of learned men even then could exact influence on the appointment of new teachers. Whether appointments were made after an examination we do not know. The right of lecturing was in any case limited in this way in practice, but a systematic set of regulations hardly existed. Abū al-litr al-Ṭalūfi lectured in the Masjid al-Ḥadījīa Lu‘lu‘, being paid by the Ẓāfīr al-Ṭalūfi and afterwards in the Azhar, paid out of the Baḥl al-Mal (Ibn Abī Usāfi‘a, ii. 205, 207); but what his relation to the gild of teachers was is not known. In later times the chief of the learned men in Iraq and Mesopotamia had great influence, because he decided who should be admitted into the gild of teachers and also controlled salaries (see G 29).

The teacher had his particular place in the mosque, often beside a pillar: this was his madhhab, which was inherited by his successors. al-Husayn was hāliyat ʿI’t-Sa‘īdī fi ṣafīyat al-Ṭulāmā (Ḥusn al-Muḥādara, i. 135; cf. 181 infra, 182; Maṭrīzī, iv. 5; Yāḥūt, Usāfi‘a, iv. 135; Wustenfeld, Schāfi‘i, p. 239). The outward appearance of the class did not alter through the centuries. His hearers sit in a circle (ṣafīya: the listeners ṣafīyat al-Ṭalūfi: Maṭrīzī, iv. 49, 17 sq.; cf. on the word (Quatremère, Hist. Sull. Maml., ii, ii. 197 sqq.) on the ground before the lecturer. The teacher sits on a carpet (ṣafīyat al-Ṭalūfi, i. 254) or skin (ṣafīyat). This was described as a symbol of his dignity in his ṣafīya (al-‘Ummī, Tūrī, p. 134). It is quite irregular for any one to teach standing (Yāḥūt, Usāfi‘a, v. 424, 8; for the other view see Bukhārī, ’Ibn, bāb 45). On the other hand, we often find in large audiences that the teacher has a raised seat (for the older period see Ibn Battūta, i. 212). Ibn al-Halīḍījī condemns this because the teacher must not raise himself out of the circle of his hearers; he even wants to reject the use of the skin and carpet as effeminate (Mudīḥkal, i. 96 sq.). It was not the custom for teachers, to live in the mosque. Of course a teacher, like any other pious individual, could stay in the mosque and even have a room there; al-Qazwīnī for example lived in the mosque of the ʿUmayyads, where Ibn Djugair saw his room and Ibn Ṣa‘īd mentions a teacher, al-Kermānī, who lived on the roof of the Azhar Mosque (i. 92; cf. also Ibn Abī Usāfi‘a, i. 204). But these were exceptions; al-Ṭalūfi built a dwellinghouse for the teacher in the Azhar near the mosque (Maṭrīzī, iv. 49). The earlier madāris founded by Nizām al-Mulk had often lodgings for the teacher, especially a. the teacher sometimes made his lodging his classroom and this is also found later. Thus al-K genders, who died in 543 (1149) lived in the Bāḥākhāya (Wustenfeld, Schāfi‘i, p. 307) and in the Ṣabā‘iyya the head of the college had his home within the buildings (Ibn Djugair, p. 45). Shams al-Dīn (d. 637) lived in Damascus in the Ādīliyya where he taught fikh (Ibn Abī Usāfi‘a, ii. 171; cf. also p. 260). This must also have been the case in other madāris. But in any
somewhat modernised, was still given. The education in the madrasas is linked up with the new universities in Calcutta and elsewhere (Calcutta University: Commission, 1917–1919, Report, Calcutta 1919, p. 143–187; Yuli, 60–70). In 1922 there were already 14 universities of which five were founded after 1919 (Oriente Moderno, ii., 1923, p. 60; on earlier discussions on the foundation of a university see R. M. M., xxi. 1912, p. 268 sqq.). The older universities, founded on the model of that of London, are those of Calcutta 1857, Madras and Bombay 1857, Lahore 1882, Al-Rahaba 1887 (R. M. M., vi. 43; on Chiefs' Colleges, ibid., p. 1–51; ix. 44–51). The essential feature of the reforms is the new method of instruction, the systematic organisation of the courses, which are concluded by examinations, and the creation of a qualified body of competent teachers.

Inspired by the same spirit, if not so thorough, were the reforms which were carried through at the capital of Islamic studies, the Azhar in Cairo without the assistance of a European power. In 1872 an examination for those beginning teaching was instituted and the ordinance expanded by new regulations in 1885, 1888 and 1895. The principal could however appoint teachers without examination. The students had to be registered so that unworthy persons should not share the stipends. On June 4, 1895, a council of five members was appointed to prepare reforms. They dealt with the finance and organisation. In 1896 the mosque-schools in Tanjia, Damietta, and Dussik and in 1903 those of Alexandria were put under the Azhar. On July 1, 1896 (supplemented in 1897 and 1899), examinations for students were arranged; history, geography and mathematics were introduced as voluntary subjects and it was forbidden to read glosses and super-commentaries in the first four years. The driving power in the council was one of its members, Muhammed 'Abduh, but he retired in 1905. The Khedive 'Abbas II 'Ilmi in 1908 and in 1911, after several commissions had been working at the subject, promulgated a new law which is still (1928) practically in force. The administration of the Azhar Mosque and the institutions connected with it (particularly other mosques and the Kadi School) were reorganised. The organisation is based on the old organisation of the staff with the principal as head of the 'ulama and the heads of the madrasahs as members of the committee of management. New subjects were instituted, such as al-khudi in combination with the tirra, history, especially Muslim, geography, natural history, chemistry, mathematics, drawing, hygiene, education. Instruction is given in three divisions, each of which is estimated to cover 5 to 7 years. To obtain admission a student must be 10–17 years of age, be able to read and write and know the Kur'an by heart (by the law of 1911 he was allowed to learn half of it in his first six months in the Mosque, but this was abolished in 1921). Each year ends with the examination in the month of April; the final examination of the first section enables the successful candidate to teach in elementary schools, that of the second to obtain an appointment in certain offices or in imam or kulfis in the mosques; by the examination, the candidate obtains the highest degree of 'alam, and can become a teacher in the Azhar, or judge or council in the Shari'a courts. By new laws of 1921, 1923 and 1924, the examinations were reformed and the relationship to the Kadi School, Dîr al-'Ulîm and other educational institutions reorganised so that in the Azhar, a kism al-takhassus for Fikih, Tafsîr, Hadith, Tawhid, Mantiq, Waqf, Bayan, Akhbâr, Islamic history and practical courses in teaching and court practice were instituted. When by the law of Aug. 26, 1927, a university was founded with faculties of arts, law, scienc, and medicine (cf. Oriente Moderno, v., 1925, p. 110 sqq., 434–436; vii., 1927, p. 672 sqq.), the question of education in the mosque again came up and a new commission on Nov. 27, 1927 was charged to consider new proposals (for the reforms of Egyptian institutions see P. Arminjon, L'enseignement, la doctrine et la vie dans les universités musulmane d'Égypte, 1907; Mustafa Baimar, Risâla, 1902; Sultanin Rašid al-Lazîyât, Dîvawhar fi Turîkh al-Azhar, 1320, p. 147 sqq.; Akhî Mustaţfî Isârat al-Azhar, Cairo 1323, anonymous, but by 'Abd al-Karim Salâm, cf. M. Alâud-dîn, xxv., 1924, p. 703; Commission de la Réforme de l'Université d'El Asqar, Projet de Réforme présenté par Muh. Pacha Sâli, Cairo 1911, and the official regulations; C. Joh. Pedersen, al-Azhar, Copenhagen 1922, p. 65 sqq.; A. Sekaly, in Revue des Études Islamiques, i., 1927, p. 95 sqq., 465 sqq.; ii., 1928, p. 47 sqq. etc.; Oriente Moderno, v., 1925, p. 113 sq.; viii., 1927, p. 634). In Morocco the ruler in 1844 introduced European subjects into the Madrasa in Fas Jdirad (whence its name Madrasat al-Muhandisîn); these innovations did not become permanent but in 1916 the madaris in Fas and Rabat were reformed (Bell, in F.A., ser. ii., 1925, 1, 152; Péretie, in Arch. Maroc, xviii., 1912, p. 257 sqq.; see for Tunis: R. M. M., iii. 385).

Since the World War, throughout the world of Islam, particularly in Turkey, very far reaching reforms in education have been introduced the results of which cannot yet be surveyed.

...G. The Administration of the Mosque.

I. Finances.

The earliest mosques were built by the rulers of the various communities and the members of the community did all the work necessary in connection with the primitive mosques. The later mosques as a rule were erected by rulers, emirs, high officials or other rich men in their private capacity and maintained by them. The erection of the mosque of Ibn Tulun cost its builder 120,000 dinars, the Mosque of Mu'ayyad 110,000 (Makrizi, iv. 32, 137, 138). The upkeep of the mosque was provided for by estates made over as endowments (waqf, butûb) (cf. elsewhere besides the Fikh-books: J. Kremskii, Das Waqfrecht, Z.D.M. G., xiv., 1891, 1, 511–576; E. Mercier, Le code du hokoum ou onqâf selon la législation musulmane, 1899). In the third century we thus hear of houses which belonged to the mosques and were let by them (Papyrus Erzerhög Rainer, Führer, No. 773, 837 and Ibn Tulun handed over a large number of houses as an endowment for his mosque and hospital (Makrizi, iv. 83). This custom was taken over from the Christians by the Muslims (see Becker, in Id., ii. 404). According to Makrizi, estates were not given as waqf endowments until Muhammed Abâ Bakr al-Madâghâri (read thus) bequeathed Birkat al-Habash and Suyâf as endowments (about 300 a. h.); this was however cancelled by the Fatimids again (ibid.). Al-Íçitik made large endowments not only for his own,
but also for mosques previously in existence, such as the Azhar, al-Fākimī, Dār al-İmam and Dāmī al-Maṣṣ and Dāmī Kāshīda; the endowments consisted of dwelling-houses, shops, mills, kata'irīya and ḥawīrat, and the document (ibid., p. 50 sq.) specifies how and for what purposes the revenues are distributed. Baths were also given as endowments for mosques (ibid., p. 76 for 529; cf. 81 of the year 543). Sahāl al-Din granted lands to his madārīs: in 566, for example, a kata'irīya to the Kānīyā and a qā'a in al-Fayyūm and the teachers received wheat from al-Fayyūm and in the same year he endowed the Nāṣirīya with goldsmiths' shops and a village (ibid., p. 193 sq.; cf. another document: p. 196 sq.). During the Mamlūk period also, estates were given as endowments (for documents of this period see van Berchem, C. L. A., i., No. 247, 252, 528; Moberg, in M.O., xii., 1918, p. 1 sqq.; F. A., ser. 9, iii. 264–266; ser. 11, x. 158 sqq., 222 sqq.; xi. 195 sqq., 250 sqq., 363 sqq.). They were often a considerable distance apart: the mosques in Egypt often had estates in Syria (v. Berchem, C. L. A., i., No. 247; Makrizī, vi. 107, 137). Not only were mosques built and endowed but already existing ones were given new rooms for teachers, minbars, stipends for Kūrsān reciters, teachers, etc. There were often special endowments for the salaries of the imām and the mu'ādhānīs, for the support of visitors, for blankets, food etc. (see Ibn Dhubair, p. 277 with reference to the Mosque of the Umayyads). The endowments and the purpose for which they might be used was precisely laid down in the grant and the document attested in the court of justice by the kādi and the witnesses (cf. Maḳṣūrī, iv. 50, 196 infra). The text was also often inscribed on the wall of the mosque (cf. ibid., p. 76; the above mentioned inscriptions amongst others. Documents from Taškent see K. M. M., xiii., 1911, p. 278 sqq.). Certain conditions might be laid down, e.g. in a madrasa that no Persian should be appointed there (Maḳṣūrī, iv. 202 infra) or that the teacher could not be dismissed or some such condition (v. Berchem, C. L. A., i., No. 201), that no rooms could enter (F. A., ser. 9, iii. 389), that no Christian Jew or Ḥanīfī could enter the building (ibid., p. 25), Endowments were often made with stipulations for the family of the founder or other purposes. Those mosques could also be burdened with expenses is evident from a inscription in Edfū of the year 797 (1395) (v. Berchem, C. L. A., No. 539). If a mosque was founded without sufficient endowment, it decayed (e.g. Maḳṣūrī, iv. 115, 201, 203) or the stipends were reduced (ibid., p. 251), but in the larger mosques as a rule the rulers provided new endowments. According to al-Māwardī, there were also special "Sūṭān-mosques" which were directly under the patronage of the caliph and their officials paid from the Bait al-Mal (al-Aşıkam al-Sulṭānīya, ed. Enger, p. 172 supra, 175 supra).

Just as the Bait al-Mal of the state was kept in the mosque, so was the mosque's own property kept in it; e.g. the kanz or kīḍān al-Ḳaḥ'ū, which is mentioned in Omar's time and may be presumed to have existed under his predecessors (Baṣbūrī, p. 42 supra; C. M., i. 307; ii. 14). The Bait Māl al-Dāmūs in Damascus was in a kūba in the saḥn (B. G. A., iii. 157; Ibn Dhubair, p. 267; Ibn Barqīt, i. 201; cf. for Medina: Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 86). Rich men also had their private treasure-chambers in the mosque (see E 2) as used to be the case with the Temple (see Schurck, Gesch. d. jud. Vökele, i, 1907, p. 322–328; F. Cumont, Feuilles de Doura-Europæa, 1926, p. 405 sqg.).

2. Administration.

As Imām of the Muslim community, the caliph had the mosques under his charge. This was also the case with the sulṭān, governor or other ruler who represented the caliph in every respect. The administration of the mosques could however not be directly controlled by the usual government offices. By its endowment the mosque became an object sui generis and was withdrawn from the usual state or private purposes. Their particular association with religion gave the kādi special influence and on the other hand the will of the testator continued to prevail. These three factors decided the administration of the mosque but the relation between them was not always clear.

a. Administration of the separate mosques.

The mosque was usually in charge of a nāẓîr or wāli who looked after its affairs. The founder was often himself the nāẓîr or he chose another and after his death, his descendants took charge or whoever was appointed by him in the foundation charter. In the older period the former was the rule and is said to have applied especially in the case of chief mosques, if we may believe Nāṣîr Khāṣrāw, according to whom al-Fākimī paid the al-Dīn al-Maṣṣ al-Dīn al-Fākimī paid the endowment to the Amr b. al-Ḳaḥ'ū 50,000 dinārs for the mustaṣ'ir or the minaret and similarly to the descendants of 'Amr b. al-Ḳaḥ'ū 100,000 dinārs for the mosque and 5,000 for the minaret and similarly to the descendants of Amr b. al-Ḳaḥ'ū the Mosque of 'Amr (Sefir-Xama, ed. Scheler, p. 39 and 146, 49 and 148). In 578 we read of an administrator (muṣṭaṣ'ir) of the mosque in Jerusalem (Maḳṣūrī, iv. 11). In the case of mosques and madrasās founded during the Mamlūk period, it is often expressly mentioned that the administration is to remain in the hands of the descendants of the founder: e.g. in the case of a mosque founded by Bahbars (Maḳṣūrī, iv. 89), in the Dāmī Maṣḍ during the Mamlūk period, it is always the kādi al-ṭir (Maḳṣūrī, iv. 256) in the Khanāk of Bahbars the kīḍān al-ṭir (Maḳṣūrī, iv. 256), the Khanāk of Bahbars the kīḍān... (v. Berchem, C. L. A., i., No. 225) but it was more frequently a kādi: for example in the mosque of Bahbars just mentioned, the Ḥanāfī kādi was to take charge after the descendants (Maḳṣūrī, iv. 89) in the Aḵbūghawiya, the Shāfī kādi was appointed but his descendants were expressly excluded (ibid., p. 225). In the Mosque of the Umayyads during the Mamlūk period, the Shāfiʿī chief kādi was as a rule the nāẓîr (Kalkashandī, ed. Berchem, C. L. A., iv. 191) and in the Nāṣir mosque in Cairo (ibid., xi. 262–264). In this city we find during the Mamlūk period that emirs and kādis alternately acted as nāẓîrs in the large mosques (e.g. the Mosque of Ibn Tulun: ...
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Maktiz, iv. 42). Cases are also found however in which descendents of the founder unsuccessfully claimed the office of nazar (Maktiz, iv. 218, 255). This was the result of the increasing power of the kaid (see below). In the majority of cases, the kaid was often also the headmaster; the two offices were hereditary (ibid., p. 204: the Zahiyya al-Bahsiy, p. 238 supra: the Damaabia). In Tustar a descendant of Sahil as nazar and teacher conducted a madrassa with the help of four slaves (Ibn Battuta, u. 25 sq.).

The Nayar managed the finances and other business of the mosque. Sometimes he had a fixed salary (in Babars’ Khannah 500 dirhams a month: v. Berchem, C. I. A., i. No. 252: in the Dulaamya in Damascus in 847 only 60 dirhams a month; F.A., ser. 9, ii. 204), but the revenues of the mosque were often applied to his personal use. His control of the funds of the mosque was however often limited by the central commission for endowments (see below). The nazar might also see to any necessary improvements. He appointed the staf and he fixed their pay (e.g. Maktiz, iv. 41). He could also interfere in questions not arising out of the business of administration; for example the inn Sawdah, the nazar of the Azhar in 818 erected about 750 poor people from the mosque. He was however thrown into prison for this by the Sultan (ibid., p. 54). Generally speaking the nazar’s powers were considerable. In 784 a nazar in the Azhar decided that the property of a muhajir, who had died without heirs, should be distributed among the other students (ibid., p. 54). In Mecca, according to Kindi al-Din, the Nayar al-Habbar was in charge of the great festival of the masdul of the Prophet (120 Rabi’ I) and distributed robes of honour in the mosque on that occasion (C. M., iii. 439). In the Azhar, no nazar was appointed after about 1100 but a learned man was appointed Shakk al-Adhar, principal and administrator of the mosque (Sulmaan al-Qad al-Muwaqqat, Ka‘d al-Jawzat fi Tawiz al-Adhar, p. 123 f.) Conditions are similar in Mecca (Mouss Huguenin, M. A., ii. 233 sqq., 252 sqq.).

As we have seen, kaidis were often nazirs of mosques. This was especially the case in the mudaris, where the kaidis were often teachers (cf. Maktiz, iv. 200, 219, 222, 225, etc.); the kaidis were particularly anxious to get the principal offices in the large schools (cf. Khakah, ii. 235). Their influence was however further increased by the fact that, if a teacher qualified by the terms of the founder’s will no longer existed, the kaidi of the madrasah in question stepped into his place of j. P. M. G., xiv. 1897, p. 552. By this rule, which often gave rise to quarrels between the different kaidis (e.g. Maktiz, iv 218 the Zahiyya, a kaid could accumulate a large number of offices and thus the endowments (v. d.i. m. 364) sometimes their management was so ruthless, that the schools were declined (e.g. the Zahiyya and the Damaabia. Maktiz, iv. 204 sq. 345). They also exercised influence through the committee of management of the mosque.

Centralisation in the Management of the Mosques.

The large mosques occupied a special position in the Muslim empire, because the caliph had to interest himself particularly in them; especially those of Mecca and Medina where the rulers and their governors built extensions and executed renovations (cf. C. M., i. 145: iii. 83 sqq.). During the ‘Abbasid period, the kaidi occasionally played a certain part in this connection; for example Mahdi (189-190) presented the kaidi with the necessary money to extend and repair the Meccan mosque (C. M., i. 313: ii. 43). In 263, al-Muwafaq ordered the governor of Mecca to undertake repairs, at the Ka‘ba (ibid., ii. 200 sqq.). In 271 the governor and the kaidi of Mecca cooperated to get money from al-Muwafaq for repairs and they saw the work through (ibid., iii. 136 sqq.). In 281, the kaidi of Mecca wrote to the vizier of al-Mut‘addid about the Dar al-Nadwa and backed up his request by sending a deputation of the staff there (raduna). The caliph then ordered the vizier to arrange the matter through the kaidi of Baghdad and a man was sent to Mecca to take charge of the work (C. M., iii. 144 sqq.).

The importance of the kaidi was based primarily on his special knowledge in the field of theology. A zealous kaidi like al-Hariri b. Muhammed bin Ishaq (237-245) forbid the Meccan mosque to recite the Kur‘an melodiously; he also had the masjihf in the mosque of Amr inspected and appointed an amim to take charge of them (Kindi, Velat, p. 469). After the building of the Tullimid mosque, a commission was appointed under the kaidi al-Ku‘dai to settle the kibla of the mosque (Maktiz, iv 21 sq.), but at a quite early date they also obtained a say in the management of the funds. The first kaidi to lay his hands on the kibla was Tawba b. Namir al-Ishaqim. While hitherto every endowment had been administered by itself by the children of the testator or some one appointed by him, in 118 Tawba brought about the centralisation of all endowments and a single person, who was named, was created for the purpose (Kindi, Velat, p. 346). How this system of centralisation worked is not clear at first, but it was carried through under the Fatimids.

Al-Mu‘izz created a special dawla abu‘bikhi and made the chief kaidi head of it as well as of the dawla’i sun‘ al-masjihid (Maktiz, iv. 83 and 75; cf. Kindi, Velat, p. 585, 587, 589, according to whom al-Aziz specially appointed the chief kaidi of the two dawlas), and a special baiat al-mal was instituted for it in 363; a yearly revenue of 150,000 dirhams was guaranteed; anything left over went to form a capital fund. All payments were made through this office after being certified by the administration of the mosques (Maktiz, iv. 83 sqq.). The mosques were thus administered by the kaidis, directly under the caliph. The dawla al-adhar was Tawba‘a in Baghdad (Mar, Khazin, p. 72) perhaps served similar purposes.

Al-Ha‘im reformed the administration of the mosques. In 403 he had an investigation made and when it proved that 800 (or 830) had no income (zawi‘), he made provision for them by a payment of 9,220 dirhams monthly from the Bait al-Mal; he also made 405 new endowments (of estates) for the officials of the mosque (Makr, iv. 84, 264). Under the Fatimids, the kaidis used to inspect all the mosques and masjihid in and around Cairo at the end of Ramadan and compare them with their inventories (ibid., p. 84). The viziers of the Fatimids, who also had the title kaidi did much for the mosques (Djawawar, Yakhb b. Kifis, Badr al-Ijami; cf. v. Berchem, C. I. A., i. No. 11, 576, p. 631).
Under the Aiyubids, conditions were the same as under the Fatimids. The dawān al-ahābā was under the kādis (Makrizi, iv, 84). Shāh al-Dīn gave a great deal to the mosques, especially the madaris (cf. above): 20,000 dirhams a day is a figure given (ibid., p. 117). When Ibn Dīnawar says that the sultan paid the salaries of the officials of the mosques and schools of Alexandria, Cairo and Damascus (p. 43, 52, 275), he must really mean the dawān already mentioned.

The same conditions continued for a time under the Mamluks. In the time of Barbars, for example, the chief kādi Tāj al-Dīn was nāṣr al-ahābā. He caused the Mosque of 'Amr to be renovated and when the funds from the endowments were exhausted, the sultan helped him from the Bait al-Māl (Makrizi, iv, 14); after conferring with experts, the chief kādi forbade a water-supply brought by Sīlah al-Dīn into the mosque (ibid., p. 14; Suyuti, Husn al-Muhādara, ii, 132). In 657 the chief kādi Taqī al-Dīn complained to Khalāl that the 'Amr and Azhar mosques were falling into ruin, while the ahābā were much reduced. The sultan would not however permit their restoration but entrusted the repairs of the mosques to certain emirs, one to each (Makrizi, iv, 15). This principle was several times applied in later times and the emirs frequently gained influence at the expense of the kādis. Thus after the earthquake of 707 (1103) (cf. thereon Qutemere, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii, n. 214 sqq.), the mosques were allotted to emirs, who had to see that they were re-built (Makrizi, iv, 15, 53). From the middle of the seventh century, we often find emirs as administrators of the chief mosques. The kādis had however obtained so much authority that he was conceded “a general supervision of all matters affecting the endowments of his madżhab” (al-Umarī, Tārīkh bi 'l-Mujādalah al-Sharī'ī, p. 117; cf. Z. D. M. G., xlv, p. 559): according to this theory the kādi could intervene to stop abuses. In Syria in 660 (1262) Ibn Khalīkān became kādi over the whole area between al-Arīṣ and the Euphrates and superintendent of wakfs, mosques, madrasas etc. (Qutemere, Hist. Sult. Maml., iv, 170).

Sūlān Barbars reformed these endowments and restored the office of nāṣr al-ahābā or nāṣr al-ahābā al-malāwī or n. dīghāt al-bābī 'Kalīkānī, sīhāt, amr al-Mustālihī, ed. Rawāsī, p. 109). According to al-Makrizi, the endowments were distributed among the Mamlūks in three departments (dīghāt): 1. dīghāt al-ahābā, managed by an emir, the Dawādār: this looked after the land of the mosques, in 740 in all 130,000 faldān; 2. dīghāt al-ahābā al-ḥabībī bi-Dir wa 'l-Khānā, which administered dwelling-houses; it was managed by the Shāfī kādi 'l-Khānā, with the title Nāṣr al-ahābā. This department came to an end in the time of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Farajī because an emir supported by the opinion of the Ḥanāfī chief kādi, spent a great deal and misused the funds; 3. dīghāt al-ahābā al-lābū, comprised all the endowments which still had particular nāṣrs, either descendants of the testator or official of the Sūlān and the kādi. The emirs seized their lands and Bārīkā, before he became Sūlān, sought in vain to remedy the evil by appointing a commiss-ion. The endowments in general disappeared somewhat later because the ruling emirs seized them (Makrizi, iv, 83-86). In modern times, as a rule, endow-

ments in Muslim lands have been combined under a special ministry.

To be distinguished from the administrators of the mosque is the nāṣr who is only concerned with the supervision of the erection of mosques. Any one could be entrusted with the building of a mosque (e.g. Makrizi, iv, 92); under the Mamluks there was also a clerk of works, mārādī bābāl al-amār or nāṣr al-mārāq: he was the overseer of the builders (ibid., p. 102; see Zuh'īt Khūf al-Mamlūk, ed. Rawāsī, p. 115, cf. p. 100; v. Benchem, C. A., i 742 sqq., 751).

The caliph or the ruler of the country was in this, as in other matters, supreme. As we have seen, he intervened in the administration and directed it as he wished. He was also able to interfere in the internal affairs of the mosque, as necessary through his usual officers. In 753 (1357) after the rising in the Fāyun, the chief of police issued strict orders by which it was forbidden to say the ṣawādah aloud in the mosque, the number of prayers in the month of Rāmādān was cut down. The adhān from the minaret to be uttered (i.e., Fath al-Ashārī, Rawāsī, p. 788, 1944), the governor ʿAbd al-Nūshārī had the mosque of 'Amr closed except at the salats because the Bait al-Mal was kept in, which however produced protests from the people (Makrizi, iv, 11; Kindī, Wudāt, p. 606; R. G. I., vi 110). Many similar examples could be mentioned, especially during periods of unrest. In 821 the nāṣr in communication with the kādis revised the budget of the Mosque of the Umayyads and made financial reforms (J. A. ser. v, 719. The adhān formalistic was ended down in edicts by the ruler (Makrizi, iv, 43 45).

In the year 755, the vizier in Baghshīd had a man whipped who had recited a variant text of the Qurān in the miḥābāt, after he had been heard in his defence in the presence of the nāṣrs and learned men (Yūsūf, Uṣūl, p. 306). The importance of the sovereign in connection with the mosques depended on his personality. As a rule he recognized the authority of the regular officials. When for example al-Kharīb bi-Baghdādī asked the Caliph al-Kāmīn for authority to read ṣawādah in the mosque of al-Mansūr, the latter referred the question to the nāṣr al-mārāq (Yūsūf, Uṣūl, p. 246 sqq.; cf. Watanbeld, N. C. v, iii, 280).

The consecration of the mosque was attended by certain ceremonies. When for example the midday service was conducted for the first time in the Dīfām al-Salāh in Cairo, a representative from Baghshīd was present (Makrizi, iv, 15). At the consecration of the Mosque of Ibn Fālim, the builder gave al-Kāmīn b. Sulaman, a paul of al-Shāfī, who lectured on the Qurān there; a purse of 1,000 dinars (Ṣuyūtī, Hunr al-Mustawfī, p. 130). Al-Makrizi describes the consecration ceremony at several mosques. In the M. al-Mu'ayyad the sūlān was present seated on a throne surrounded by his officers; the basin of the xilūr was filled with sugar and jālwa, the people ate and drank, lectures were given; then the salāt was read and khutba delivered and the sūlān distributed robes of honour among the officials of the Mosques and Sāfīs (Makrizi, iv, 139): similarly at the Zūh'īyā (p. 602, were poems were also recited of Qutemere, Hi i Sult. Maml., i, p. 225 sqq.; Madrasat al-Dīm al-Dīn, p. 811; al-Sa'īghanī, p. 757 (Makrizi, iv, p. 217 sqq., 253, 256).
H. The Personnel of the Mosque.

1. The Imam.

From the earliest days of Islam, the ruler was the leader of the salat; he was thus called imam as leader in war, and commander of the government and leader of the common salat. The governors of provinces thus became leaders of the salat and heads of the kharidj and when a special financial official took over the fiscal side, the governor was appointed ‘ala’ l-qalal wa l-kharb. He had to conduct ritual prayer, especially the Friday salat on which occasion he also delivered the khutba. If he was prevented, the chief of police, qadi al-kutb, was his khalifa (cf. Makrizi, iv. 83). ‘Amr b. al-As, the first of these, permitted the people of the villages to celebrate the two festivals, while the Friday divine service could only take place under those qualified to conduct it (who could punish and impose duties; ibid., p. 7). This was altered under the ‘Abbasids.

The caliphs no longer regularly conducted the salats (after the conquest of the Persians: Makrizi, iv. 45), and ‘Abbas b. Ishaq, the last Arab governor of Egypt (238-242), was also the last emir to conduct the salat in the djami’. An imam, paid out of the baits al-mul, was now appointed (ibid., p. 83), but the governor still continued to be formally appointed ‘ala’ l-qalal. Henceforth the ruler only exceptionally conducted the service, for example the Fatimids on ceremonial occasions, especially in the month of Ramadan (ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Juyonboli, ii. 482 sqq.; Makrizi, ii. 509 sqq.); in many individual mosques probably the most prominent man conducted the service; according to the Hadith, the one with the best knowledge of the Kur’an and, failing him, the eldest should officiate (Bukhari, Had. bab 46, 49).

The imam appointed was chosen from among those learned in religious matters; he was often a Hafiz (Ibn Tanbhih, ed. Renaissance, p. 147); he might at the same time be a kadi or his nizam (see Kindi, Wala’, p. 575, 599; ibn Haitha, i. 276 sq.). During the salat he stood beside the mihrab; al-Ma’mun mentions the anomaly that in Syria one performed one’s salat “in front of the imam” (R.C.A., ii. 202); he could also stand on an elevated position; on one occasion Abu Hurara conducted the salat in the Meccan mosque from the roof (Bukhari, Sahi, bab 17). In Mecca, in ibn Dhubair’s time, each of the four recognized madjihab (with the Zaidis in addition) had an imam; they conducted the salat, one after the other each in his place, in the following order: Shafi’is, Malikis, Hanafis and Hanbalis; they only performed the salat al-maghrib together; in Damascus they held the ‘arajih in different places in the mosque, which was also often conducted by the kurrat (Kouta, p. 109, 102, 145 sq.). This is still the case; very frequently one performs the salat, not after the imam of his own madhab (Smouk Hurgmone Mekki, ii. 79 sq.). In Jerusalem according to Mudjar al-Zakani the order was: Malikis, Shafi’is, Hanafis, Hanbalis, who prayed each in their own part of the Haram; in Hebron the order was the same (Sauvage, Hist. Jér. et Hebron, p. 156 sq.). In Ramadan extraordinary imams were appointed (ibid., p. 138).

As the imam no longer represented a political office, each mosque regularly had one. He had to maintain order and was in general in charge of the divine services in the mosque. In al-Makdisi’s time the imam of the Mosque of ‘Amr read a dju’at of the Kur’an every morning after the salat (B.G.A., iii. 205). It was his duty to conduct every salat, which is only valid fi ‘dju’ut. He must conform to the standards laid down in the law; but it is disputed whether the salat is invalid in the opposite case. According to some, the leader of the Friday salat should be a different man from the leader of the five daily salats (Maqari, al-Akhom al-Sultanawiya, ed. Enger, p. 171 sqq.; ibn al-Hajjji, K. al-Makdisi, ii. 41, 43 sqq., 50, 73 sqq.; ibn al-Suhhi, Mu’al’i al-Nam, ed. Myhrman, p. 163 sq.; for hadiths s. Wensinck, Handb., p. 109 sq.). Many cherished misgivings against payment being made for religious services and quoted in support of their view a saying of Aba Hanifa (B.G.A., iii. 127).

2. The Khutb.

The development of this office is analogous to that of imam. When the ‘Abbasid caliph no longer delivered khatbas regularly, a man learned in religious matters was appointed to the office of khutb [see D 1 and the article KHUTB]. It could be pointed out that the Prophet himself had a khatib namely Umar b. Hisham (Daraj, Bayan, i. 178) and sermons outside the Friday service had in any case become quite usual. Thus Hasan al-Basri was already a noted preacher (ibid., p. 190). Later it sometimes happened that a general like Djawbar himself acted as imam at the salat, while the khutba was left to a learned man (Makrizi, iv. 44).

As the khutb in theory represented the ruler, he uttered a blessing upon him; to this extent the office had a political significance. The caliph was blessed and the heir-apparent and the king of the country (cf. above D 1). When the caliph himself preached, he also pronounced a prayer for himself (Yahyia, ‘U’dab, ii. 349 sq.) and the Fatimid mentioned their fathers. The sermons gradually became quite stereotyped; ibn Batuta (i. 348) praises the khutb in Mecca, because he gave a new sermon every Friday. A kadi was frequently chosen as a khatib; a chief kadi could also at times preach in a large mosque (Kindi, Wala’, p. 589; Makrizi, iv. 132; ibn Dhubair, p. 156; according to Quatreme, Hist. Sult. Mawl, i. 115; bab 25, a kadi was for the first time appointed khutb in 694[1295] in Damascus). The khutb could also be a “witness” (Ihlas al-Safi, K. al-Waziri, ed. Amledor, p. 421 etc.) or hold another office like that of khatib alasr (Makrizi, iv. 137, 138, 139, 140); in the last mentioned case the office was hereditary, which we also find elsewhere (ibid., p. 98; Suyuti, ‘Ibnu al-Mahdura, i. 185: al-‘Irak]. The khutbas had frequently a khalifa. In the Kasha mosque, where in 444 two khatubs were deliberately appointed, they both preached at the same time on the minbar (Makrizi, p. 63 sq.). Later we find in the larger mosques a number of khatubs being appointed who relieve one another.

In Mecca the khutb was a particularly imposing figure. In his black robe, trimmed with gold, and turban with tula’s, he went up to the minbar between two black banners carried by mutaddins, while a servant walked in front of him cracking a whip; after he had kissed the Black Stone, the chief mutaddin went quickly in front of him with the sword with which he girded him on the minbar (Ibn Djubair, p. 95 sq.; ibn Battuta, i. 376 sqq.).
The whip (farak'a: Ibn Dhuibair, p. 96, 97, 144, 156; Ibn Batuta, i. 376, 379, 390, 394; see B. G. A., iv., s. v.) is also used as he goes out and on other occasions. The black was the colour of the 'Abbâsids; it was also used in Egypt (Ibn Dhuibair, p. 56). The Fâtimid khatib wore a cap (balânuma: Makrizi, iv., 214). The dress of the khatib varied with time and country (cf. ibid., p. 90; B. G. A., iii. 129, 416; Ibn al-Hâdjîdji, Madkhal, ii. 73). In Mecca there were celebrations when a young man became a khatib (Ibn Dhuibair, p. 149).

Very frequently the khatib and the imâm were one individual, especially in the smaller mosques, but sometimes also in larger ones (Yâkût, Udâbâz, vii. 174, 179; Makrizi, iv. 124). Ibn al-Hâdjîdji even regards this as the normal thing (K. al-Madkhal, i. 59, 60, 73, 74); s. also al-Subki, Minid, p. 160 sq. and the article KHIAT.


On these see C 3. Sometimes, in the later usage wa'ir is used of the official speaker, very like khatib (cf. Ibn Batuta, i. 9), while al-kâshâf is only applied to the street-story-teller (al-Subki, Minid al-Nâm, p. 161 sq.). The kâshâf are also frequently appointed to madrasas and particularly to mausoleums (Makrizi, iv. 223; Yâkût, iv. 509; Subki, Minid, p. 162; v. Berchem, C. I. A., i., N. 252).

4. The Mu'âdhîdhin.

According to most traditions, the office of mu'âdhîdhin was instituted in the year 1, according to others only after the isra', in the year 2, according to some weak traditions while Muhammad was still in Mecca. At first they came to the salat without being summoned. Trumpets (bâk) were blown and rattle (nâkâs) used or fires lit after the custom of Jews, Christians and Mädiqis. 'Abd Allah b. Zaid learned the adhâf in a dream; it was approved by the Prophet and when Bilâl proclaimed it, it was found that 'Omar had also learned the same procedure in a dream (Ibn Hishâm, p. 357 sq.; Khamis, i. 404 sq; Bukhârî, A. dâhîn, bâb 1; Zurkânî, i. 121 sqq.). There are also variants of the story, e.g. that the Prophet and 'Omar had the vision, or Abû Bakr or seven or fourteen Ânûr; according to some, the Prophet learned it at the mû'âfîâ from Gabriel, wherefore the introduction of the adhâf is dated after the isra'; among the suggestions made, the hoisting of a flag is mentioned (Sira Halabîya, ii. 100 sqq.). Note worthy is a tradition which goes back to Ibn Sa'd, according to which at 'Omar's suggestion at first a mû'âfîâ, Bilal, was sent out who called in the streets: al-salahtâ qâtmât. Only later were other possibilities discussed, but the method already in use was confirmed by the dream, only with another formula, the one later used (Khamis, i. 404; Sira Halabîya, ii. 100 sqq.). According to this account, the consideration of other methods would be a secondary episode and probably the tradition in general represents a later attitude to the practices of other religions. But in Islam other methods were certainly used. In Fâs, a flag was hung out in the minarets and a lamp at night (J. A., ser. xi, xii. 341). The flag is also found in the legend of the origin of the practice.

The public crier was a well-known institution among the Arabs. Among the tribes and in the towns important proclamations and invitations to general assemblies were made by criers. This crier was called Munâdî or Ma'âdhîdhin (Sira Halabîya, ii. 170; Lammens, La Musique, p. 62 sqq., 146; do, Berceau, i. 229 note; do, Moujadda, p. 150). A'dhân therefore means 'call to prayer,' Sûra vii. 70 'to proclaim' and 'crier'. Munâdî (Bukhârî, Fârîd al-Khulun, bâb 15) and Ma'âdhîdhin (ibid., Samâl, bâb 69; Sârâ, bâb 10 = Qisâya, bâb 16; Sira Halabîya, ii. 270) are names given to a person used by the Prophet or Abû Bakr for such purposes. Official proclamations were ordinarily made by criers (cf. Tabari, iii. 2131, 3). Sâdâjâs and Musâlimâs used a mu'âdhîdin to summon the people to their prayers (Tabari, i. 1919, 1932; cf. Annals dell' Islam, i. 410 sqq.; 638 sqq.). It therefore was a very natural thing for Muhammad to assemble the believers to common prayer through a crier (mu'a'âdîn or ila 'l-isâ'ilât, Sûra v. 65; Is. 9); the summons is called Nûdâ and A'dhân, the crier Munâdî (Bukhârî, Wâdi', bâb 5; A'dhân, bâb 7) and Ma'âdhîdhin; the two names are used quite indiscriminately (ibid., Wâdi', bâb 5; Tabari, ii. 297 sqq.). Munâdî 'l-Salât, B. G. A., ii. 182, 19, also سلَّمَ 'crier' is used (Tabari, iii. 861; Chron. Mekka, i. 340). In these conditions, it was very natural for the crier in the earliest period to be regarded as the assistant and servant of the ruler; he is his mu'âdhîdin (Ibn Sa'd, i. 7; Muslim, Salat, tr. 4: Makriz, iv. 43; cf.; Tabari, ii. 1120). 'Umar sent to Kûfa 'Amûmar b. Ya'qûr as emir and 'Abd Allâh b. Masûd as mu'âdhîdin and wa'ir (B. G. A., v. 165); he is thus the right hand of the ruler. Al-Ijusain had his munâdid with him and the latter summoned to the salât on the Imam's instructions (Tabari, ii. 297, 298; cf. Ibn Ziyâd, ibid., p. 260 and in the year 196 the 'âmil in Mecca, ibid., iii. 861, 13; also Chron. Mekka, i. 340). During the earliest period the mu'âdhîdins probably issued summons in the streets and the call was very short: al-salahtâ qâtmât (Ibn Sa'd, i. 7, 7; Chron. Mekka, i. 340; Tabari, iii. 861; cf. al-o in the year 196, Sira Halabîya, ii. 101; Khamis, i. 404 sq.). This brief summons was, according to Ibn Sa'd, also used later on irregular occasions (i. 7 sqq.; cf. the passage in Tabari). Perhaps also the summons was issued from a particular place even at a quite early date (see D 2a). After the public summons the mu'âdhîdin went to the Prophet, greeted him and called him to prayer; the same procedure was later used with his successors: when he had come, the mu'âdhîdin announced the beginning of the salât (al-khâma 'l-salât, cf. Bukhârî, Wâdi', bâb 5; A'dhân, bâb 8; Sûra Halabîya, ii. 104 sqq.; Makriz, ii. 45). The activity of the mu'âdhîdin thus fell into three sections: the assembling of the community, the summoning of the imâm and the announcement of the beginning of the salât. With time changes were made in all three stages.

The assembling of the community by crying aloud was not yet at all regular in the older period. During the fighting, Ibn Ziyâd in the year 60 called his munâdî with threats to the evening salât in the mosque and when after an hour the mosque was full he had the âkâma announced (Tabari, ii. 260). When a large number of mosques had come into existence, the public call to prayer had to be organized lest confusion arose, and the custom
of calling from a raised position became general after the introduction of the minaret. While previously the call to prayer had only been preparatory and the ʿikāma was the final summons, the actual call (adḥāna) and the ʿikāma now formed two distinct phases of the call to prayer. Tradition has retained a memory of the summoning in the streets, now completely fallen into disuse, when it tells us that ʿOthmān introduced a third adḥāna, a call in al-Zawrāʾ, which was made before the call from the minaret; this call however was transferred by Ḥishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik to the minaret (Bukhārī, *Djmāʿa*, bāb 22, 25; *Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 110; Ibn al-Ḥāḍidī, *Madkhāl*, ii. 45). This may be evidence of the gradual cessation of the custom of summoning the community by going through the streets, Ibn Baṭṭūta, but this is exceptional, tells us that the muʿaddhīn in Khwarazm still fetched the people from their houses and those who did not come were whipped (i.ii. 4 sq.), which recalls Wāḥīdīn measures. When exactly the ʿinān and nīn calls were introduced to the ʿikāma formula, finally developed, can hardly be ascertained [see adḥāna]. The call haʾiya ʿalaʾr-fāṣidh is known from the time of ʿAbd al-Malik (65–85) (Akhṭal, ed. ʿAlāʾ, p. 2,541; see *Horovitz*, in *isl.,* xvi. 2971. p. 154; * transit * on adḥāna formulae see further *Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 105 sq.). At first the call was only made at the chief mosque, as was the case in Medina and Miṣr (Makrizī, iv. 43 *infra*), but very quickly other mosques were also given muʿaddhīn: their calls were sufficiently audible in the whole town. The chief mosque retained this privilege, that its muʿaddhīn called first and the others followed together (Makrizī, iv. 43 *infra*, 44).

The summoning by the imām in Medina was therefore quite a natural thing. The custom, at first associated with the ruler's mosque, was not observed in Medina only (see for ʿOthmān and ʿAḥ: ʿTabārī, i. 3059 sq.), but was also usual under the Omayyads. The formula was: al-Salām ʿalākum Bismillah r-rāḥmūna r-rāḥimān ʿAlāh wa-r-rahimātulla h, haʾiya ʿalaʾl-ʿadāna, haʾiya ʿalaʾl- ʿadāna, haʾiya ʿalaʾl- ʿadāna (Makrizī, iv. 45; *Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 105). After the alteration in the adḥāna and the greater distance of the ruler from the mosque, to summon him was no longer the natural conclusion to the assembling of the community. In the ʿAbbasid period and under the Fāṭimids there was a survival of the old custom, in as much as the muʿaddhīn ended the adḥāna call before the ṣalāt al-fāṣidh on the minarets with a ʿalāmah upon the caliph. This part of the muʿaddhīn's work was thus associated with the first adḥāna call. When ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Din came to power, he did not wish to be mentioned in the call to prayer, but instead he ordered a blessing upon the Prophet to be uttered before the adḥāna to the ʿalāmah al-fāṣidh, which after 761 only took place before the Friday service. A muḥta-ḥīb ordered that after 791 in Egypt and Syria at each adḥāna a ʿalāmah was to be uttered over the Prophet (Makrizī, iv. 45; *Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 110). Ibn ʿUṯair relates that in Mecca after each ʿalāmah al-ṣalāmah, the foremost muʿaddhīn pronounced a duʿa upon the Abbasid Imām and on ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīm from the Ṣemzem roof, in which the people joined with enthusiasm (p. 47) and according to Makrizī, after each ʿalāmah prayers for the ʿalāmah were uttered by the muʿaddhīn (iv. 53 sq.). Another relic of the old custom was that the trumpet was sounded at the door of the ruler at times of prayer; this honour was also shown to ʿAḥud al-Dawla in 368 by order of the caliph (Ibn Maskaʾi, *Cairo* 1275, p. 390).

The ʿikāma always remained the real prelude to the service and is therefore regarded as the original adḥāna (Bukhārī, *Djmāʿa*, bāb 24 sq.). In the earliest period it was fixed by the arrival of the ruler and it might happen that a considerable interval elapsed between the summoning of the people and the ʿikāma (cf. ʿṬabārī, ii. 260, 297 sq.). The times were later more accurately defined; one should be able to perform 1–3 ʿalāmahs between the calls (Bukhārī, *Adṛān*, bāb 14, 16). Some are said to have introduced the practice of the muʿaddhīn calling haʾiya ʿalaʾr-fāṣidh at the door of the mosque between the two calls (*Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 105). From the nature of the case the ʿikāma was always called in the mosque; at the Friday service, it was done when the imām mounted the minbar (Bukhārī, *Djmāʿa*, bāb 22, 25; *Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 110; Makrizī, iv. 43) and the muʿaddhīn stood in front of him. This μαυδόν in confessing to some, ought to be the one who called the adḥāna upon the minaret (*Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 109), while Ibn al-Ḥāḍidī ignoring the historical facts only permits the call from the minaret (*Madkhāl*, ii. 45). In Tunisia, the ʿikāma was announced by ringing a bell in the churches (Zarkašī, transl. Fagnan, in *Rei. Scl. Arch. Constantine*, 1894, p. 111 sq.). A similarity to the responses in the Christian service is found in the fact that the call of the muʿaddhīn, which contains a confession of faith, is to be repeated or at least answered by every one who hears it (Bukhārī, *Djmāʿa*, bāb 23); this is an action which confers religious merit (Ibn Kuštuḫbūgha, *Ṭabāṣī al-Ḥanafīyya*, ed. Fugel, p. 50). It is possible that we should recognise in this as well as in the development of the formulae the influence of Christians converted to Islam (cf. Becker, Zur Gesch. d. islam. Kultur, in *isl.,* iii. 1912, p. 374 sqq. and Islamstudien, i. 472 sqq., who sees an imitation of the Christian custom in the ʿikāma in general; on the possibility of Jewish influence see Mittwoch, in *Abb. Pr. A. W.,* 1913, Phil.-Hist. Cl. 2).

The muʿaddhīn thus obtained a new importance. His work was not only to summon the people to divine service, but was in itself a kind of religious service. His sphere of activity was further developed. In Egypt we are told that Maslama b. Muḥammad (47–62) introduced the tasbih. This consisted in praises of God which were uttered by the muʿaddhīn all through the night until ṣuḥūr. This is explained as a polemical imitation of the Christians, for the governor was troubled by theroubling of the muʿaddhīn at night and forbade it during the adḥāna (Makrizī, iv. 48). In the time of ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUṯair and Khumāraʾwah, the muʿaddhīn recited religious texts throughout the night in a special room. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Din ordered them to recite an ṣuḥūr in the night adḥāna and after 700 ʿādāk was performed on Friday morning on the minarets (*ibid.*, p. 48 sq.; *Sira* Ḥalabīyā, ii. 111). In Mecca also the muʿaddhīns performed ṣuḥūr throughout the night of the first ʿAshūrā and on ʿAlī al-Ḥaʾūm from the Ṣemzem roof, in which the people joined with enthusiasm (p. 49) and according to Makrizī, after each ʿalāmah the ʿalāmah were uttered by the muʿaddhīn (iv. 53 sq.). Another relic of the old custom was that
of the Maghrib in the eighth century each had regularly four mu'addhins who were stationed in different parts of the mosque during the salat (K. al-Makhdal, ii. 47 supra); but there were often quite a large number. In the Azhar mosque in the time of al-Hakim there were fifteen, each of whom was paid two dinars a month (Makrizi, iv. 51). Ibn Bat'uta found seventy mu'addhins in the Mosque of the Omayyads (i. 204). About 1900, in Medina there were in the Mosque of the Prophet fifty mu'addhins and twenty-six assistants (It-tanun, Rihla, p. 242). Blind men were often chosen for this office; Ibn Umm Maktum for example was blind (Bakr's, p. 429, n. 104; cf. Lane, op. cit., p. 75). Ibn al-Prophet is said to have forbidden the kaft to pay a mu'addhin (Wâsdti-Welzhausen, p. 353). Othman is said to have been the first to give payment to the mu'addhins (Makrizi, iv. 44) and Ahmad b. Talihin gave them large sums (ibid., p. 48). They regularly received their share in the endowments, often by special provisions in the documents establishing the foundations.

The mu'addhins were organized under chiefs (ru'ut = Makrizi, iv. 14). In Mecca the rû's al-mu'addhins were the two mosques with the mu'addhin al-Zamawî who had charge of the singing in the upper story of the Zenzen building (Chron. Mecca, iii. 424 sq.; Ibn Dhubair, p. 145; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mebka, n. 322). The rû's was next to the Imam but subordinate to him; in certain districts, it was the custom for him to mount the pulpit during the sermon with the Imam (when the latter acted as khâthî) (K. al-Makhdal, ii. 74; correct above p. 928, l. 31 sq. in keeping with this). The position which they originally occupied can still be seen from the part which they play in public processions of officials, e.g. of the Kûfî 'Alâ, when they walk in front and lead the ruler and his vizier (Makrizi, ii. 246).

Closely associated with the mu'addhin is the muwalkârî, the astronomer, whose task it was to ascertain the kibla and the time of prayer (Subki, Mu'âth', p. 165 sq.); sometimes the chief mu'addhin did this (Snouck Hurgronje, Mebka, n. 322).

5. SERVANTS

According to Abu Husain, the Mosque of the Prophet was swept by a negro (Buqhârî, Sahîh, bâhî b. 72, cf. 74). The large mosques gradually acquired a large staff of servants (ghâhibâni, mutâbâbî, coram, and water-carriers (cf. e.g. v. Berchem, C.C.A., i. No. 252) in Mecca there have always been special appointments, such as supervisor of the zeenâm and guard of the Ka'ba (sadîm, pl. sadan, also used of the officials of the mosque: Makrizi, iv. 76; cf. Ibn Dhubair, p. 278). In Ibn Bat'tûta's time the servants (zâbû.d) of the Mosque of the Prophet were numerous, particularly Abyssinian; their chief (zâbû.d al-khadâm) was like a great emir and paid by the Egyptian-Syrian government (c. 278, 458), cf. the title of an emir of the year 798: chîqâr bâd al-zâbû.d al-khadâm b'tûmâr al-fi.rîs a.t al-mawâ.dî (v. Berchem, C.C.A., i., No. 201). In the Mosque of Jerusalem about 300 A.H., there were no less than 140 servants (khâhidîn: B.G.A., v. 100); others give the figure 230 (Le Strange, Palestine, p. 165) and according to Medjl al-Dîn, 'Abd al-Malik appointed a guard of three hundred black slaves here, while the actual menial work was done by
certain Jewish and Christian families (Sauvage, Hist. fès et Mekn., p. 56 sq).

In other mosques superintendents (kāiyim, pl. ḫārāna) are mentioned, a vague title which covered a multitude of duties: thus the Madrasa al-Madżdiya had a kāiyim who looked after the cleaning, the staff, the lighting and water-supply (Ma'ṣrī, iv. 251), the Azhar Mosque had one for the mīḍā'a, who was paid twelve dinars (ibid., p. 51) and also four kāwāma, who were paid like mu'ādhdhins (two dinars a month) and are mentioned between them and the imāms, probably supervisors of the staff (ibid., p. 51). In other cases a kāiyim al-djātim, sometimes a kādi, is mentioned, who is apparently the same as the imām, the khāṭib or some similar individual of standing (ibid., p. 75, 121, cf. 122; cf. Ibn Dūbaī, p. 51). A muṣhirf, inspector, is also mentioned, e.g. in the Azhar (Ma'ṣrī, iv. 51).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(Johns Pedersen)

II.

The Mosque in the Dutch East Indies.

In the Dutch East Indies, two kinds of mosque have to be distinguished, the mosque for the Friday service—these alone are called mosques (masjīd, also mursīq)—and simple houses of prayer. This second category is found all over the country, especially in smaller villages and owes its origin, partly to private initiative and partly to public efforts; they have native names (lahār [Javan.], ḥāfج [Sum.], zuwan [Malay]). The lahār, or whatever it may be called, of the village is a centre at which the ḥalīt can be performed, but it also serves other purposes of general interest. The upkeep of the building is the affair of the community and in particular one of the tasks of the religious official of the village. The upkeep of the other lahārs, erected by private individuals, is left to them. The building stands on its own site and is maintained by the founder or his descendants. The owner cannot however refuse admission to strangers who desire to use it for the ḥalīt or as shelter the night. Such private chapels are always found beside the Muḥammadan seminaries (hakimiyāt). We sometimes find that these lahārs are endowed as ṣawāfī (Jav. Mal. sēkap). The village lahār on the other hand has a more public character.

The mosques, i.e. the masjīd al-qimā, are found in larger places, usually in those which are also centres of administration. Their erection and maintenance is regarded as a duty of the Muslim community; every one contributes his share in materials, work or money, according as he is requested and is able to do. When a new mosque is to be built, not only is the site necessary for the building reserved, but also that for the dwelling of the staff and other people, whose piety induces them to seek a dwelling-place near the mosque; here they find the spot, where in their opinion they can be best benefitted by the atmosphere of their faith, spiritually and socially. This mosque area, at least the mosque itself and its immediate neighbourhood, is popularly regarded as ṣawāfī although the conditions necessary to make it an endowment in the sense of the sharī'a are not fulfilled. In ṣawāfī affairs, the sharī'a is regarded as authoritative and not affected by common law.

Each mosque has its own staff, of the size it requires; in the large mosques there may be 40 or more. In Java and Madura, they form a regular hierarchy; this holds also for the relation of the larger and smaller mosques to each other. A mosque serves the requirements of a definite area; the staff of the mosque at the chief place in a smaller district is subordinate to that of a larger one and so on up to the capital of a regency (which is the highest native administrative unit). At each mosque a superintendent is appointed and the head of the mosque at the capital of the regency is regarded as head of all the mosque officials in the whole district. On the other islands the native, political organisation is less developed, the hierarchy of the secular power therefore less influenced by it. Generally speaking the personnel of the mosque is the same everywhere; the more the secular hierarchy is graded, the more noticeable is the classification of the personnel of the different mosques into various ranks; but we always find one recognised as the head of the staff.

The superintendent of a mosque in Java and Madura bears the general name ṣawāfī hākim. His main duty is to see that the Friday service is held; he can act as imām at it himself but usually he leaves this to someone else. Besides him there are a large number of other officials, whose names usually are taken from the Arabic and whose duties are very varied; among them however we find the ḥādam (Jav. ḥādām). He delivers the sermon; but this also can be done by some one else. The maintenance of the building is also the duty of the superintendent. The expenses have to be met from the money collected by the staff, of which he has control (see below).

In Java and Madura generally, and very often elsewhere, the superintendent of a mosque is also an official, i.e. he is the legal authority who is present at the marriage ceremony; sometimes he acts as ṣawāfī of the ṣawāfī. He is also authorised to give in marriage women who have no blood-relative to act as wāli; in this capacity he is called ṣawāfī ṣawāfī. Marriages are concluded in the mosque; it is exceptional for the ṣawāfī hākim to perform the marriage ceremony in person; he usually leaves this to one of his subordinates. People of high rank marry in the house; on these occasions the ṣawāfī hākim himself acts. The same person holds mutātis mutānis of ṣawāfī and ṣawāfī; these also are reported to the ṣawāfī hākim and recorded by him along with marriages in a register.

In smaller centres, where there are only lahäuser (chapels) there is an official, who assists the villagers in matters of Muḥammadan law; he belongs to the village administration and may be regarded as the lowest rank of the mosque hierarchy; people desirous of matrimony apply to him; he accompanies them to the mosque of the district to which his village belongs; he also acts for the ṣawāfī hākim as 'āmil of the ṣawak (ṣakāt) and ṣawāfī (ṣakāt al-ṣawāfī) (see below). From this capacity comes the name he bears in some parts of the country, ṣawāfī hākim.

The appointment of the mosque officials (as distinct from the village officials in whose cases the local customary law is followed) is not done everywhere in the same way. In Java and Madura, it is in the hands of the native chiefs who are also the highest state officials; on the other islands of the East Indian Archipelago, in so far as Islam prevails on them, the wishes of
the Muslim community are more or less respected; the secular authorities however exert a great influence.

The revenues of mosque officials come from various sources: donations, freewill offerings, in cases where their services are required: — at religious festivals, burials, etc. — need only be mentioned. The chief source of revenue is the so-called marriage fees, less from *djakat* and *pitra*; these are administered and distributed by the superintendent of the mosque. As already mentioned the mosque and its accessories have to be maintained out of the income. Neglect of this duty has induced the chiefs in Java and Madura to intervene and form a special fund, the so-called mosque fund for this purpose. This was arranged as follows: a certain percentage of marriage fees and of the *djakat* and *pitra* was set aside; the chiefs took charge of these funds. The revenues of the mosque officials earmarked in this way were however only a small fraction of the total; the greater part, perhaps 4/5 or more, remained at the disposal of the officials. This same procedure is found here and there on other islands but is not general.

The Dutch government maintains a neutral attitude to Islam, in all business matters of the mosque also. It takes no part in the building or restoration of mosques; only very exceptionally does it give a contribution in money for such purposes. This was done for example in Kuta Raja (Atjeh), where the chief mosque, which had been destroyed during fighting, was rebuilt from government funds in 1881. But this act of the authorities was not appreciated by the Muslim population; in general, the government officials only see that no compulsion is used to procure materials or funds for the building or maintenance of mosques.

With the end of the sixteenth century the Colonial administration began to pay some attention to the regular organisation of the staffs of the mosques, primarily in Java and Madura. Their measures aimed at maintaining things as they were and at getting rid only of abuses and such customs as had tended to be a burden on the people. *Djakat* and *pitra* are regarded as "freewill offerings" by the colonial authorities; the native chiefs and village authorities were therefore forbidden to interfere with them. It is left to the individual to give them or not; he is also free to give his gifts to whom he pleases. The giving of *djakat* varies very much with places and persons and is smallest in Central Java. It is concerned almost entirely with agricultural produce, especially with the staple product and even then it rarely happens that the legal quantity is given. In practice the *djakat*, where it is levied, is collected by the village mosque officials and handed over to the *pa[h]ulu; he then distributes it in a certain proportion among his subordinates. The proceeds go almost entirely to the staff of the mosque and the village officials, firstly because they are "simul and secondly because they consider themselves *fakir* and *maslin*: they have, as they say, no means of livelihood like other people.

Pitra is paid regularly: it happens very frequently with this "donation" that it is paid direct to those entitled to it and not through the officials. Nevertheless a considerable portion goes the same way as the *djakat*.

The government confined itself to seeing that the *djakat* and *pitra* collected by the *pa[h]ulu, was distributed as it ought to be according to custom but this was not always done.

Marriage, *talak* and *rudjūs* have been regulated by a colonial law. The *pa[h]ulu or his deputy was confirmed in his already mentioned functions as an official with legal standing. At the same time, others than the appointed *pa[h]ulu were forbidden by the secular authority to perform marriages. The registration of marriages, *talak* and *rudjūs* was improved. The fees and their distribution among the staff were fixed according to local custom. Every effort is made to keep these as low as possible. Similar regulations were later promulgated for the other islands.

As to the funds of the mosques, it was ascertained that there was more money in them than was required for the maintenance of the building and that they were being used for other purposes than the traditional ones. This caused the government to place the funds of the mosques under the joint control of European and native authorities. This holds particularly of Java and Madura; but whenever else the mosque had funds, these were retained.

The regulations promulgated for Java and Madura have recently been attacked by Muslims; they wanted as far as possible to withdraw everything relating to marriage from government interference. The intervention of the government is now (since 1929) limited to the fact that parties who wish to enter into matrimony have to report themselves to a registrar. *Talak* and *rudjūs* have also to be reported to him. The marriage ceremony may be performed by others, but they are under the control of the registrar; this last method is now the exception: the majority continue to go to the district officer.

In one other respect the mosque has come under the control of government regulations. In Muslim districts of the East Indian Archipelago hardly a mosque is built without the consent of the local secular authority. Although it does not have to give its approval expressly, no work will be begun until the plan is approved. In Java and Madura the chiefs have long held themselves entitled to decide on the question whether a new mosque should be erected, though they justified this claim by saying among other things that a new mosque, if not desired by the entire community, may easily lead to jealousy and disputes about the validity of the Friday service etc., which might result in general unrest.

The custom of making the site of a mosque *wakaf* — or at least regarding it as such,— results in it being impossible to use such pieces of ground for public purposes, even if it is long since the mosque buildings had been removed from them.

These and other difficulties induced the government to require the approval of the chiefs for the building of new mosques on Java and Madura and also that the sites should become *wakaf*. It was however expressly laid down that there can be no possible question of interfering with the religious requirements of the Muslims; the chief can only refuse his consent in the public interest.

The law of the Dutch Indies demands the presence of the *pa[h]ulu or some one with similar functions, at the courts for Muslim natives and also when a native appears as accused or plaintiff
in a court, to assist the court as adviser. An
deavour is made to get the most suitable people
as advisers; they are officially appointed. It was
found to be desirable to combine this office and
that of the administrator of the mosque in the
one individual; and this is now the usual practice.
The influence of the government on the appoint-
ment of the personnel of the mosque, which
otherwise is reserved for the chief, has thus been
increased, especially as in the appointment of the
assistant[s] of the pui[sk]a, the ability of acting
as adviser is also taken into account.
The bonds which connect the personnel of the
mosque and the secular authority are thus fairly
close; — in the opinion of some too close. In
recent years the effort has been made in nationalist
Muslim circles, to loosen or even break all secular
connections in the fulfilment of religious duties.
One way of doing this is to get private individuals
to found mosques with the help of similar-minded
people. This is quite possible in the conditions
described and is still done.
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Nederlân en de Islam, 2nd ed., Leyden 1915 
[French transl., in R. M. M., xiv. (1911) =
Töygen, Geschichten, Bern 1924, iv/2, p. 221
sqq.]; Th. W. Juyboll, Handtekening der Mo-
hammadansche wet. 3rd ed., Leyden 1925, p. 71,
85, 194 sqq., 283; Adaitzrichtbundl., vili 297
sqq.; x. 309 sqq.; xii. 257; where other works
are given. (R. A. Kern)

III.

Architecture.
The mosque with an open quadrangle was
the natural form for the hot southern lands of Islam,
and is simply a continuation of the many types
of pillared halls and chambers which were to be
found all over the near east, beginning with the
Egyptian temples and coming down to the apadana-
of the Persians and the stoa of the Greeks, of
which of course only the latter influenced the
development of the early Muslim mosque. This
consists of a courtyard or quadrangle (javan) usually
very large which is surrounded by cloisters (maksura)
which are either connected by flat beams, or
more usually by arches and covered by a flat
roof. At the kibla side the maksura were deeper so
that the rows of worshippers could find shelter
from the sun. The supports were at first very
often columns taken from ancient buildings and
where these were not obtainable, were of wood
or brick. The pillared hall at the kibla side was
called jâwâr al-jebîl or liwân. A portion of the
liwân was shut off by a railing and reserved for
princes and priests. On the quadrangle side of the
liwân is a podium (dikâra) supported by pillars
and reached by a staircase or ladder; this is for
the officials of the mosque, who repeat the words
of the imâm during the service to make them
audible on all sides. At the end of the liwân the
maksura is set into the middle of the wall and
beside it is the mihrâb. In the centre of the
court is a well, originally intended for ritual
adutions but these were as a rule performed in
rooms specially set apart for the purpose.

These mosques with open quadrangle were built
in the first century A.H. on a large scale, as they
were primarily intended to be mosques for the
troops, whence they were called askar mosques.
The Djâmi' Ibn Tulûn in al-Katâi, Cairo is a
comparatively well preserved specimen of one of
these askar mosques. It was built in 264-267
(876-879) and measures 466 X 383 feet and its
court is 300 feet square. The principal liwân had
originally five rows of pillars but has now only four
since the first one fell down, the others had to move
each, which are connected by projecting walls parallel
to the walls, thus still following the type of the
Hellenistic agora. The pillars are built of brick
and into the corners are let small columns. Between
the pillars are pointed arches and ornamental
windows with little pillars at the sides. Similar windows
with stucco gratings pierce the outer walls. The
roof, most of which is now modern, was made of
palm trunks with sycamore planks nailed over
them. In front of the mihrâb was a makâsar for
the ruler. This makâsar was as here usually distin-
guished by its cupola. In the later mosques of
this kind an aisle of some width led through the
pillars up to the makâsar, usually through the
columns of the liwân so that the building was
adapted for a ceremonial procession by the ruler into
the mosque. In the Djâmi' Ibn Tulûn as in the askar
mosques of the third (ninth) century in general
there are no transepts as yet so that the succession
of pillars is quite uniform. The mihrâb projects
out as the wall juts out a little here and the niche
has two steps cut into the wall and then projects
in a semi-circle. Two marble pillars are built into
the angles formed by the projection of the niche,
which have been taken from older Christian build-
ings. The white stuccoed surfaces of the walls
are ornamented along the upper margins and ar-
ces, with decorative strips of carving and arches,
which were originally painted. The interiors of the arches
were also originally decorated but are now for
the most part whitewashed. Immediately below
the roof on a wooden frieze runs a Kufic inscrip-
tion two miles long with sâras from the Kur'an,
the letters of which are cut out of wood and nailed
on to the boards. The mosque has a battlemented
wall, which again was surrounded on three sides
by a second outer wall so that the whole area
was square in shape and the outer courtyards
put some distance between the quadrangle of the
mosque and the surrounding streets. The outer
walls of these early mosques have turned out
like a fortress with round projecting towers even
though not intended for defence. This was not
the case with the Mosque of Ibn Tulûn. On
the maqām, which stood outside the mosque among
the outer buildings on the north side and like the
mosque itself was restored under the Manûlî Sultan
Lâdjîn, cf. the article MANâRA. Similar mosques
for the troops were built in all the garrison towns
of the young empire, like Baṣra, Kûfah, Baghdad,
Nîmarra, Râqîa, in Cairo, Kâhitân and elsewhere.
The type of mosque with quadrangle and piers
or columns was however by no means limited
for the mosques of the troops but was general in
the early centuries of Islam and survived much
longer than this, just as the early Christian basilica
had done. Many pillared mosques, the foundation
of which dates back to the early centuries A.H.
are still in use, like the mosque of the Umayyads
in Damascus, the great mosque of Sidi Uâba in
Kâhitân, many mosques in the Maghrib, where
they have frequently remained faithful to this
type down to the present day, the Djâmi' al-Askar
and others in Cairo. In towns that are cold in winter, the
The **Dome Mosque**. The great mosques built on piers—in so far as they were not simply army mosques—were primarily used for the Friday service in the larger cities. In addition to these, there were in every town several smaller mosques either for the use of the separate quarters or for special purposes. For these also in Egypt and the lands of the Maghrib the type of piersed mosque with open quadrangle persisted while in Mesopotamia, the lands of the Caucasus and Persia, suiting the ruder climate and undoubtedly stimulated by the influence of the Christian churches the closed domed mosque became the type. Some of these mosques (e.g. in Werrâmân) reveal with their combination of a long building and a dome such a striking similarity to the older, mainly Nestorian, churches that M. Dieulafoy and van Berchem comprised them under a type to which they gave the name "mosque-eglise". Typical mosques of this kind with a central dome and number and internal piers are to be found in Tabriz, Esiwân, Diýãr Bakr etc. It was only under the Ottomans in Asia Minor that the domed mosque attained the next stage in its development and it reached its zenith— not by chance — where the similar Christian style of church architecture had reached its final development, namely in Constantinople.

**Madrasa**. The foundation for the further development of the mosque with a great open quadrangle, as perfected under the Saljûqs in the east, was the type of madrasa which had in the meanwhile been evolved (cf. the articles Madrasa and Architecture). The ideal plan of a madrasa is an open court with vaulted cloisters opening on a central quadrangle in the centre of the four façades, i.e. at the intersection of the axes. This plan however only became regular in Persia and we only find a few specimens exceptionally in Cairo. On both sides of these four iwâns are the cells and dwelling apartments of the teachers and pupils usually in two stories. In contrast to the piersed mosque with an open court, which arose out of a Hellenistic Mediterranean type of building, the model for the development of the eastern madrasa, which combined both school and monastery, was on the one hand the Indian Buddhist monastery and on the other the Khurâsân iwân, while the madrasa of Syria, Egypt and the Maghrib was influenced by native types of mosque and house. The Turkish peoples, as representatives of the Sunna and its propaganda through the madrasa, before they invaded Persia and became Muslims, were mainly under the influence of Buddhism and Nestorian Christianity, which survived much longer in Turkestan and the Tâizîm basin than in Persia and still was very important as late as the sixteenth century A.D., as is evident from the narrative of William of Rubruck. The Turks before they adopted Islâm had, among the Buddhists and Nestorians, become acquainted with the missionary side of religion. This seems to explain the prominent part later played by them as propagandists of Islam in Persia and Asia Minor. It may have seemed to them that the most suitable centre of propaganda was the same type of building as that used by the Nestorians and Buddhists, namely the monastery. The Buddhist monasteries which were courtyards with cells built round them, numbered hundreds

In Central Asia. They are as a rule oblong quadrangles with cells built round them and a stûpa in the centre and several large rooms for meetings. In Persia, under the influence of these buildings, the type of quadrangle and cells with 4 iwâns in the form of a cross became established as the ideal scheme of a madrasa. That this plan which was architectonic in origin was also the practical ideal for the fourfold doctrine of the Sunnis, was a fortunate combination, which in some large state madrasas became of practical significance.

The **Persian Mosque-Madrasa**. The quadrangle surrounded by cells with four iwâns of the Persian Madrasa was now combined with the old piersed mosque and the result was a very happy combination: the mosque-madrasa (as we Europeans call it). The important result of this combination was from the architectonic point of view the monumental quadrangle with cells, which now replaced the old courtyard with pillars or piers which was no longer architectonically satisfactory and was also foreign to the spirit of Persian architecture. But with this transition an important change was brought about in the spiritual aspect of the mosque. It symbolised the transformation which had meanwhile taken place internally and externally in Islam from a combative, conquering religion organised on military lines into a spiritual attitude to life, controlled by theologians and men of learning. The fight however, which was still conducted by military forces, and the conquests had now become more or less the private business of the secular rulers, above whom was the religious propaganda of the Muslim clergy. The most instructive example of this penetration of the older type of mosque by the Persian quadrangle surrounded with cells is the Masjid-i Diwâna in Isfâhân. This mosque, like all the Friday mosques in Persia was originally built as a piersed mosque and had been frequently enlarged. At the present day, as the plan shows, it consists of colonnades which have in course of centuries been added to one another from time to time. A great deal of wood must have been built into its framework, since Yâkût tells us that during the siege of Isâhân by the Saljûq Tughîl Beg (â42 = 105â/105â) the mosque was destroyed to obtain wood. From the contemporary accounts that have been handed down, we further learn that the Saljûq Sultan Malik Shîth when the mosque was completely restored by his orders began with roofing the wall of the courtyard. He is credited with building the southern iwân. The other three iwâns are over their present form of later origin. By covering over this huge quadrangle, the courtyard, the only characteristic architectural feature of the mosque, received the necessary unity and importance. (Around it, this mosque, like most Friday mosques, was completely surrounded by bazaars which made any external development impossible: the quadrangle was therefore all the more important) The rows of cells had here no longer any practical significance as dwellings but became an architectural feature. Behind the southern iwân, directed towards Mecca, a large domed hall was built as a Mausoleum. The wall of which were the mihrab and pulpit. Here the solemn Friday service was held. Thus the Friday mosque was created of the type which became general in Iran and Turkestan. Mosques and madrasas were frequently combined with mausoleums (cf. the article Architecture).
The Mosque building in the early period. Muhammad left no instructions as to how future mosques were to be built so that the earliest mosques varied considerably and we can hardly talk of a fully developed type before the third (ninth) century. The Prophet's house in Medina, where he performed the sala' with his faithful followers and instructed them, was a dār of the usual local type quite unsuitable as a model for the future mosque. It consisted of a courtyard surrounded by a brick wall with living rooms and outhouses along the inner wall. As was usual and still is in every house of this kind in Arabia and other tropical lands, palm trunks were put up in the courtyard and a flat roof of palmealves put over them and covered with a layer of clay. This is how the earliest accounts would lead us to picture the Prophet's house. In the courtyard was a reception tent furnished with fine carpets and materials, for Muhammad did not despise the nomadic luxuries and comforts of his fellow tribesmen. (cf. fatima et les filies de Mahomet and do., in J. A., 1915, p. 258 sqq.).

Around this establishment of the Prophet, his wife and daughters, lay the court in which his friends and followers used to assemble for the daily prayer and which thus became the first quadrangle of the first mosque. The use of a typical Arabian courtyard arranged in this way as a masjid however gives us no idea of the future impoing building. For half a century, it is true, they were content with this primitive mosque, during the patriarchal period of the first four caliphs, out of respect for the Prophet's house. The first Omayyad caliph, Walid I who in transforming the church of St. John in Damascus into the Mosque of the Omayyads had acquired experience in matters of building and connections with builders, on the occasion of his pilgrimage to Medina in 90 (709) ordered the primitive mosque which had served the purpose so far, to be removed so that an entirely new building could be erected on its site, which was extended. For this purpose, as Sahnidhis tells us, he asked the Byzantine emperor for skilled workmen and shells for the ornamentation, which were sent to him. "The walls and columns of the new mosque were built of large hewn stones of equal size and bound with plaster, ornamentation in shell and marble was carried out and the roof built of palm wood and covered with gold paint". Instead of the early primitive mosque, Walid had thus given the Medinenc a substantial pillared mosque, like the first mosques which he had built in Syria with the help of Byzantine arti-ans from pillars plundered from Hellenic-colonies and Christian churches. It was only in this Hellenised form that the mosque of Medina could have influenced the further development of the mosque in so far as we can speak of such influence at all. (It was given its present form by the Mamlik Sultan Kā'it Bey in 888 = 1483). The ordinary Arab village mosque is different in appearance. It has retained the form of the Arab pre-Islamic meqallā. This "place of sala'" was and still is a long hall supported by pillars, open on one side without a courtyard and having no mihrāb and miḥmar.

The lack of any generally binding or recognised rules or tradition is shown by the varying form of the mosque in the early centuries A.H. The earliest mosque of the general "Amr in Fustā' of 21 (642) was an enclosed rectangular hall without a courtyard, with a kibla which was not yet marked by a mihrāb. The first mosque in Basra was, like the whole city of encampments, built of reeds so that it could be taken down with the camp. In the year 16 or 17 A.H. Abu Abī Mecca, the newly appointed governor of Basra, built a mosque of unbaked brick and clay with a roof of grass. It was only under the Omayyad governor Ziyād that a mosque was built of brick and plaster with a roof of teak and pillars, which came from the quarries of Ahwāz on the Kūrīn river. The first mosque in Kūfa on the other hand of 17 A.H. was "a covered hall...which had no side wings nor buildings behind it" (Tabarī); before it was an open square and so, continues Tabarī, were all the mosques except the Masjid al-Harām (i.e. Mecca); out of respect for the sanctity of the latter, it was not copied in the other mosques. This mosque also was rebuilt by Ziyād, governor of Kūfa, the first Omayyad caliph in Syria, however, 661-680.

For it he had plans drawn up by Mazdaean architects: "Uno degli architetti gli fece un disegno sul modello degli edifici celti dai rai sasanidi, ossia un vasto colonnato con tetto e chiuso ai lati" (cf. Annali dell' Islam, 111, p. 47, p. 857). When, on the other hand, the conquerors found buildings in towns which were suitable for masjīds from the point of view of space, they utilised them. In al-Madā'in, for example, the old twin-city of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the Ṣawra of the white palace was used as a place of assembly for the Friday sala', and the pictures of men and animals in it were not destroyed. In Syria, however, the churches were turned into mosques by changing the orientation from east to south and placing a quadrangle in front of them. In this way the building of the mosque of any place in the early centuries A.H. was adapted to the traditions in existence and where there were no buildings, as in the newly founded camp-cities, it was on every occasion a problem for the governor requiring much consideration. In spite of this uncertainty, as one can deduce from the descriptions, they were more inclined, even as early as the first century A.H., to the type of pilared mosque with a quadrangle, to which all the prototypes as well as the climate pointed.

Development of the Masdjid and the Madrasa in the different countries. Syria. As the place of residence of the first dynasty of the young Muslim empire and a land of ancient culture, Syria was naturally destined to build the first substantial mosques and to influence early developments. This influence it exercised on the one hand indirectly through the Syrian mosque built by Walid in Medina, next to Mecca the most sacred and most visited city of Islam; on the other hand, the Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus, as we know from Arabic sources, was taken as a model as far away as Córdoba. The earliest centre of Muslim building was Jerusalem, which the Omayyads endeavoured to play off against Mecca. Beside the rotunda of the Kubbah al-Sakhra on the Harām al-Šarif, the sacred rock of which was to supplant the Ka'ba, "Abd al-Malik used the parts still standing of Justinian's Church of the Virgin to build the Dār al-İṣra (finished in 85 = 702). According to de Vogüé's plan, this building, later often restored or rebuilt, was a pil-
lared hall with three naves, of necessity oriented to the south with the mihrāb in the long axis. At a later date the transept with the dome and four side naves was added. The Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus arose out of the rebuilding of the Church of St. John, which had been built on this site by the Mosquem and other stones of the Antonine temple of Jupiter. We must assume that Walid had the pillars of the basilica moved so that three equal naves were built. These were crossed in the centre by a transept, which led up to the mihrāb and had a dome over its centre. The rich decoration with mosaics was a suggestion from Syria and was probably done by Syrian workmen (plan and history of these buildings in Diez, Die Kunst d. islam. Volker, p. 14 sqq. of the first and p. 32 sg. of the second edition; with references to the literature). The Mosque of Damascus was the first to have a transept, the prototype of which Thiessen no doubt rightly finds in the chalc of Byzantium (Pharos, p. 214), which frequently appears again in Syria and Northern Mesopotamia. The great mosque of Aleppo was also built after the plan of the Omayyads with a transept, as the latter can hardly have been added until the rebuilding of 365 (976) (pictures in Saladin, Manuel, p. 85). The mosque of 'Iṣša in Ephesus, finished in 777 (1375), and the mosque of Dīyār Bakr arc northern outposts of this type, the influence of which can also often traced in Cairo and the Maghrib.

Alongside of these principal mosques in Syria a series of smaller mosques arose, partly out of ancient temples (Aleppo, Ḥamā, Ḥoms, Ba'albek, Tripoli, al-Ūmāya), partly built out of material available from Christian buildings (Ramla, ʿUṣayr, al-Hallabāt, Borsī). Some of these mosques may have been pre-Omayyad foundations, certainly the Mosque of ʿOmar in Baṣra. All these mosques, except ʿUṣayr al-Hallabāt, have the same type of quadrangle with halls around it, two or more being on the kibla side, without transept. The development of these halls varies however, as a result of local tradition or the material available (e.g. the naves of Christian churches). They are as a rule vaulted with pointed arches but sometimes have gable roofs and thus, along with their closed façades, in front of which we exceptionally have a bowered corridor, bear a western or northern stamp in keeping with the ruder climate. The later Syrian mosques under the Ayyūbids and Mamluks differ very much in their plans. The Mosque of Firdaws in Aleppo, for example, has a small pillared court and a broad nave, with a row of five small domes, the harām besides various side-rooms; cf. E. F. E. Diez, Voyage en Syrie (M. l. F. A. O., Cairo 1914, 2 vols.).

Madrasah in Syria. A very complete study of the madrasah in Syria and Egypt by K. A. C. Creswell (The Origin of the Cruciform Plan of the Cairoite Madrasah, B. I. F. A. O., 1920) has brought some clearness into the question of its typical form etc. After an examination of eight madrasas built before 1270 A. D., the plans of which can still be traced in Aleppo, Damascus and Ḥamā, Creswell shows that the symmetrical plan was unknown in Syria and that the plan was a regular scheme in the arrangement of the rooms, but it depended on the site available. A typical specimen is the always correctly oriented mosque: a nave of three vaulted rooms with three pointed arched doors to the court; a ṭurāb on the court, rows of cells in the rest of the court and usually two tomb-cupolas usually flanking the mosque; the rest of the area is occupied by rooms. Madrasas used by two rites had two iwans. Of the 80 madrasas counted by al-Ḥamawi in Damascus in the xviith century (F. A., ser. 9, vol. iii.-iv.), 33 were Hanāfī, 31 ʿAshārī, 9 Ḥanbalī, 1 Mālikī, 6 by Ṣahīfī and Ḥanāfīs. Creswell's investigation shows that in Syria there was not one madrasa of all four rites nor a cruciform one, a result, which suggests new deductions for the Egyptian madrasas.

Arabia. The indigenous form of the masjid in Arabia is a large hall formed of chambers with pillars and arches. The author found such oracles, more correctly to be described as miqaṣṣas, in Manāma on Bahrain (picture in Diez, K. d. isl. Arch., p. 46). These praying chambers, open to the street without a courtyard, have no furniture, not even a minbar or mihrāb. The latter was foreign to Arabia and in the larger mosques its place was taken simply by a slab of stone with some adornment. But these pillared halls were only a more substantial form of the local native masjid of palm-trunks, which could probably often be found in the simple villages of the interior and whose sanctified precursor was the masjid al-Nafāwī in Medina built in this fashion. Alongside of this type of mosque which was indigenous to Arabia we find imported forms, like the masjid in Medina (see above), of slight importance from the archaeological point of view. Mention may be made of the ruins of a mosque near Manāma of 749 (1339/1340) described in an inscriptions as masjd al-qāhir dhu l-imām dhut, with old pillars of teak of the fourth (seventh) century; the Shīʿa form of the creed on this as well as the inscriptions on the kiblah stones of the xivith century mark it as a Shīʿa edifice (see, Diez, Eine schützende Moscheenums auf der Insel Bahrain, in Jihāb, d. anat. Kunst, II, 1923).

Iraš and Mesopotamia. The earliest settlements of the conquering Arabs in the Iraš were primitive camps built of reeds; equally primitive were the earliest mosques. Masjīma, or ‘Umbān, were used for the purpose in conquered cities, like Ctesiphon. A pillared mosque was early built in Kīsā (17 Amīr), which Tabari describes and which was rebuilt as early as the beginning of the Omayyad period by "Persian builders" in the form of a completely enclosed pillared hall (see above). In the capital of the caliphs also, as a result of its complete destruction by Timūr nothing worthy of note has survived. We know however that the Friday mosqu of al-Manṣūr (1497-766) was built of pillars and a flat roof. A wooden dome over the ṭaḥqīra is probable. It was rebuilt under Ḥarūn in 192-193 (808). Al-Muʿṭāridi began to enlarge it after the return of the troops from Samarq (280 = 593) (cf. Sarre-Herfeld, Arch. Reis., II, 134 sqq. with plan). Outside of Baghdad the unlimited space available permitted great mosques for the soldiers to be systematically planned, as in Rāṣrā and Samarq; these were the great pillared mosques of the third (ninth) century, which were copied in the mosque of the Prophet in al-'Abbās in Cairo. Of the three large old mosques in Māzin, that of the Omayyads has completely disappeared; according to Yākāt's description it was "completely vaulted, with afaṣṭaṣ slabs". This seems to be the origin of that type of pillared mosque
with vaulted arches which was later further developed by the Saljūqs and Ottomans (see below). The Mosque of Nūr al-Dīn (541—560 = 1146—1173) or Ljāmī al-Kabīr was also vaulted from the first (with cross-vaulting) on piers (543 = 1148) and on its rebuilding in 566—568 (1170—1172) was crowned. The Third Mosque of the Madzhib, Kbihr Iyās, has been completely modernized. Smaller mosques of the 18th century like the Ljāmī Nābi, Djirās have single domed chambers as praying-rooms.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, the following madrasas were built under the Aḥṣāb: the Shāfī Nizāmīya in 459 (1066), the Tādjīya in 482 (1089), the Hanāfī Tuttūbiya in 508 (1114), the Nāṣirīya, c. 600 A.H. and the Mustaṣanīya about 630 A.H. Only the latter is still in existence and is used as a customs warehouse (sketch-plan in Sarre and Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt. ii. 161). Of remarkable oblong shape (86; x 210 feet) it has six iwans, a large vaulted hall, rows of columns and side rooms. In front of four iwans this, the first state madrasa, also accommodated a dār al-hadith and a dār al-‘urūrān. If the Mustaṣanīya was not planned in a strictly symmetrical way with four iwāns at the intersection of the axes, it nevertheless incorporated the same idea and may therefore have stimulated the development of the next type. In Muṣūl there were several Ḥanfī madrasas.

Egypt. The type of pillared mosque imported from the İlkak under Ibn Tūlūn prevailed in Cairo along with the pillared mosque down to the 11th century. It is the regular rule that the large central and Friday mosques always have piers. The smaller mosques intended for the people of the quarter have pillars. Some of the latter however were on occasion also used as Friday mosques. The rows of piers were always parallel to the Kibla wall and connected by arches, a natural result of the rectangular form of the piers, which had to run parallel to the rows of worshippers. In the pillared mosques the naves might also be perpendicular to the Kibla wall, without inconveniencing the worshippers. The Cairo mosques of this group are: The mosque of Amr Ibn al-isoner, Fatimid, J. A., 1891, reprint, p. 23.

The mosque of Al-Akmār, a small pillared mosque historically important: for its façade built by Abū ʿAli al-Manṣūr al-Amīr (495—524), finished in 519 (1125), restored by Barkūk in 799 (1396—1397) and then a manārā which was removed in 1414 (1412) (cf. M. v. Berchem, l.c., J. A., 1891, reprint, p. 81).

The mosque of al-Maḏīnī, built by the Fatimid caliph al-Zāhir in 543 (1148—1149) completely restored in the Ottoman period.

The mosque of al-Ṣalīḥī Tālīfī outside the Bāb al-Zuwāl, built about 550 (1160). A smaller pillared mosque of the usual type, which was sometimes used as a Friday Mosque (cf. M. v. Berchem, l.c., reprint, p. 3 sqq.; pictures in R. L. Devonshire, Some Cairo Mosques and their Founders, London 1921, pp. 1—10).

The mosque of al-Zāhirī Ḍawāb of the year 665—667 (1266—1269), a mosque with piers of brick, built for a mosque with a very strong stone wall and three portals jutting out like the mosque of al-Hākim. The six rows of columns in the jamāʿ are crossed by a transept with a dome of three naves breadth in diameter before the miḥrāb. Porticoes with double naves surrounded the court.

The mosque of Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Nāṣir on the citadel, of the year 718—735 (1318—1335) on pillars.

The mosque of Amr al-Mas (Ṣhāfī Ḥilmiyya) of 750 (1349—1350).

The mosque of the Maḏdānī of 739—740 (1338—1340) on pillars.

The mosque of Amr Akṣūkūr of 747—748 (1346—1348) on pillars.

The mosque of Muṣayyad of 819—823 (1416—1420).

Of pillared mosques in Egypt outside Cairo we may mention the mosque of St. Athanasius and the mosque of the "Thou-and Pillars" in Alexandria the plans of which were recorded by the French expedition (Description de l'Egypte, Antiquités, v., reproduced in Thiersch, op. cit., p. 224). Shortly before the arrival of the French, Alexandria still had 85 mosques, 46 of which were large. Practically nothing of these is left at the present day. The two above mentioned were pillared mosques and particularly the second, also called the "Mosque of the Seventy", with its iwāns of equal depth on all sides (only the northeastern one has 4 instead of 5 rows of pillars) the arches of which always run parallel to the outer walls, i.e. palm-like, continue the type of the Hellenistic pillared agora or the gymnasion as Thiersch has pointed out. The same type predominated in the towns of the Delta. The second, later type of mosque in Egypt was decisively influenced by the madrasa, to which we may now turn our attention. As Creswell has shown, the Egyptian madrasa was by no means always cruciform, as was usually supposed previously. It is also distinguished from the Syrian type and cannot be at once said to have been introduced from Syria. It is true that the first madrasa for all four rites in Cairo was built by Sāliḥ Naḏīm al-Dīn Ayyūb, but this Salihiya was a building divided into two halves and cannot be considered as the original of the later type (641 = 1243—1244). The first cruciform madrasa with 4 iwāns in Cairo was the Zāhirīya which was built on the site of a part of the old Fatimid palace which was cleared for this purpose and consecrated in.
The typical mosque of the Muslim west is the mosque with courtyard, on pillars or columns. It was only under Turkish rule that the domed mosque became established in those parts of North Africa affected by it. The rows of pillars ran, as a rule, perpendicular to the Kibla wall from which however they are separated by a transept. The axis of the latter is a continuation of the axis of the central nave which is always broader. Of the rows of pillars in the axis the two or three outermost ones are continued over the court and form the arcades, of which the inner entrance side of the court has as a rule only one.

The beginning and end of the central nave are as a rule marked by a dome. The western mosques are given their characteristic features by the horseshoe and bulbous arch (a mixture of the horseshoe and the pointed arch). The mihrab of the western mosques is as a rule a pentagonal niche considerably deeper than the eastern semi-circular one. The oldest surviving large mosques in the west are in Kairawan, Tunis and Cordoba (since the expulsion of the Church).

The foundation of the Great Mosque of Kairawan like that of ‘Amir in Cairo goes back to the first century A.H. but like that in Cairo also retains nothing from its founder ‘Abd b. Naif except the name. By 76 (695) the original masjid was rebuilt, and later enlarged but in 221 (836) it was completely taken down by the Aghlabid Ziyadat Allah and rebuilt and in the thirteenth century again enlarged on two occasions. In spite of many later restorations, the mosque has retained the form it was given in the thirteenth century. Seventeen naves on pillars run perpendicular to the Kibla wall from which however they are separated by the transept. The central nave is broader and flanked by double columns and marked externally by two domes. It may be noted as a special feature that the first two travées of the haram seem to be one with the court arcades while the part behind was shut off by doors. The arcades of the court rest on pillars with double columns in front of them, which with their bulbous arches give the eastern corner of the place its special character. The Qayrawan Great Mosque in Tunis was built as early as 114 (732) by the Omayyad governor Ibn al-Habbab but entirely rebuilt in 250 (864); in spite of many internal restorations, it has in the main retained to the present day its old form of the end of the ninth century. In Spain we have from the Omayyad period the (former) Mosque of Cordoba. It was built by ‘Abd al-Rahman I (912–961) and several times extended by his successors until the haram contained 19 rows of arcades. The special feature of this mosque is the double storied arrangement of its rows of arches, a bold innovation, which does not seem to have been imitated elsewhere. Recent investigations have revealed the original floor of the mosque at a much lower level, which is decorated with mosaic. This would alter the proportions. The horseshoe arch taken over from the Visigoths was varied in the clover leaf and indented arch and these arches were imitated in the Maghrib (mosques of Algiers, Tlemcen etc.). The domes swelling into various shapes were first imitated in Kairawan and Cordoba. The mosque of Seville (1236 = 850) and Sfax (235 = 849) were founded in the Aghlabid period but the latter was completely restored in the tenth century. The rise of
the Fatimid empire in North Africa (927 = 909) brought about a new development of mosque building. The mosque of the new Shi'i capital Mahdia in Tunis however corresponds completely to the preceding Aghlabid type. A novelty however is the use of cross vaulting which henceforth we find frequently, first of all in the two mosques of Monastir and in the new part of the Great Mosque of Sfax. Of the great pillared mosque of the Kala' of the Bani Hammad, the minaret of which still stands and was mentioned in the article MAXARA, it is only possible to reconstruct the ground plan, which had 13 naves with 8 travées (cf. Blanchet, *Nouvelles archives de Missions*, vol. xviii, P. 123 sqq. and De Beylié, *La Koutoubia*, p. 77 sqq.). A second mosque of the Bani Hammad has been destroyed in Bourg, but it is evident from an old description that it belonged to the type of Kairouâin (De Beylié, *op. cit.*, p. 102—104).

**Mosques of the Almoravids** (448—541 = 1056—1147) and Almohads (524—667 = 1120—1267). The great mosques in Algiers and Tlemcen, the Kutubiyya in Marrakesh and the mosque in Tinmâl are pillar mosques with bulbous arches. On the other hand the Mosque of Hasan in Rabat, now completely destroyed, the largest mosque of the Magrib, stood on round pillars (1610 x 465 feet; begun 539 = 1196—1197). A noteworthy feature is the mausoleum behind the mihrâb in the mosque of Tlemcen, which now becomes frequent in the Magrib (but seems not to have been unknown in eastern Islam, as the plan of the madrasa of Khargird shows; cf. Dece, *Churassan. Baudenknater*, p. 73).

**Marrinids in Morocco** (1195—1470). The Almohad Mosques of the Almohads (xvith—xviith century): a large mosque in Tâza, Morroco, piers, broad central nave and transversal nave, finished in 693 (1294). A large mosque in Auydâ on the Algerian-Moroccan frontier (696 = 1296). Sidi bîl-Hasan in Tlemcen (696 = 1296), a small mosque with minaret on onyx columns, and Alâd al-Iman in Tlemcen (710 = 1310), small, but richly decorated. The most important mosque in Tlemcen (736 = 1336), a very regular building, thirteen naves on onyx columns, a broad central nave, a three nave transept, a mausoleum in the centre, a polygonal mihrab with mausoleum behind. Sidi bîn Medyên of al-Imad (739 = 1339) and Sidi al-Halwî (754 = 1353), both in Tlemcen, small, the former on piers, the second on columns with slightly modified horseshoe arches with a wide span. Shelid (harbour of Rabat), Necropolis of the Marrinids, a tomb mosque (739 = 1339) (plan in Marçais, *Manuel*, ii. p. 408). Around Tlemcen are several small mosques of the xvith century. The Medersa of the Magrib. Medersas were first introduced into the western lands of Islam by the Almorahds but nothing of these seems to have survived. The oldest medersas date from the xiiiith—xivith centuries. The Marrinids in Magrib al-Askâ were particularly active in building and encouraging medersas, which, as in Syria and Egypt, were also state institutions. This evolution of the medersa was apparently a result of the Sunni, particularly Maliki, revival under the Marrinids (1195—1470). Al-Saffarînî, the oldest medersa in Fès, built by the great warrior and champion of the taif Yakûb Yûsûf (685—706 = 1286—1306) of the Marrinids who also built the mausoleum of the tombs (see above), was the prototype of all the other medersas in the extreme Magrib. An angular gateway, such as is usually only found in private houses leads into a court with a central basin and the cells. A domed chamber with a pentagonal mihrab adjoins it. On the analogy of the tombs, it is called kubbâ. Adjoining it reached by a corridor is a mi'dâ 'a, with a basin in the centre for ablutions and latries. These three main parts of the building, sahn, kubbâ and mi'dâ 'a and usually
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a separate minaret, are found continually in a number of variations, usually dependent on the space available, which Maqriz, op. cit., ii. 504, divides into three groups. In Fes in addition to those mentioned there are other seven mederras of the xvi th century. With the mederras of Meke

nes, Sale, Taza and al-Awbd in Tlemcen we have in all eleven mederras of the Marinid extant (cf. the list in Maqriz, op. cit., ii. 504 sqq.). The most imposing and finest medera in Fes is the Bz Aina, founded by Abu 'Ain. 749—759 (1348—1358). With its madqul of two transepts at the end of the square court and two domed chambers in the central axis of the court it recalls the mosque of 1sAn in Cairo with its iwans. The façades on the court display the wealth of wall adornment usual in the Maghrib: tiles, stucco moulding and stalactites.

Mederras of the xvi th—xvii th centuries in Morocco: The Medessa of Ben Yiauf in Marrakesh is regarded as the largest in the Maghrib and stands on the site of an originally Almoravid (2) and next Marinid Medessa Abu '1-Ihsan. The plan seems to be old and in its regularity recalls the al-Hidri type of Arab palace and the palaces of the Omayyads and 'Abbasids built in this style in the desert (plan in Maqriz, op. cit., ii. p. 702). The Medessa al-Sharrati in Fes, begun in 1670, shows a similar plan but is smaller and simpler.

Mederras of the xvi th—xvii th centuries in Tunisia: In the xvi th century the Hasafs built a number of mederras here. Of the Turkish, the most interesting is the Medessa Bala-ya of Ali Pa5ha (1749—1755): a court with cells, madqul on pillars and mi6idin, but, like the Egyptian mederras, it has also the tomb of the founder and a public fountain. In Tunis, probably as the result of Egyptian or Oriental influence, it is common to find mederras and mosques associated with the tomb of the founder. The three varieties distinguished in Egypt by van Berchem, mosque-mausoleum, madrasa-mausoleum and monastery-mausoleum were also built in Tunis.

Saldjik empire in Rum, Armenia and Georgia. In Saldjik Anatolia (1457—706—1272) a great many of these were built. Of the courtyards one of the walls of the court within the madrasa and domed arcades are to be distinguished. The pierced wall was used as the large public mosque. On account of the colder climate the open courtyard with pillars was not found here. The pillars were sometimes of wood (Oshref Rm Djami), usually however of stone. The flat wooden roof rested directly on the piers or on the arches which connected them, which run sometimes parallel, sometimes perpendicular to the kibla wall. The Ul Djami in Wn has a vaulted roof resting on pillars, a system later often used in the Ottoman empire. Of more importance architecturally are the smaller (mosque-madrasas), which played a prominent part in the Saldjik empire: but they fell far behind the Persian madrasas in impressiveness and harmonious development. The model for the evolution of the Wn-madrasa was the Mesopotamian-Anatolian farra-house. From the latter came the bowers along the sides of the court which were placed in front of the Wn and the rows of cells. The combination of school and mausoleum in which the builders, usually high officials of state, were interred, was the rule. The domed madrasa consists of a domed hall with a water basin in place of the open court with living rooms, a lecture-room and a mausoleum adjoining it. The external ornamentation of these Saldjik madrasas and mosques is confined to the gateways. The façades of the gates, irrespective of the material used elsewhere in building (brick or moulding), were always covered with slabs and the portals then ornamented with strips of decoration or inscriptions, fantastic looking candle-labra of palmettes (Diwrigi), bundles of rods and convolutions in low and high relief and thus one of the highest points in Muslim decorative art was attained. The iwans along the court, interiors of the comparatively low domes (which here usually bridge over the corners on triangular consoles), the frizes on the wall and the nihabs are frequently adorned with glazed brick and mosaic frizes in a style which in pattern and colour is readily distinguished as an independent pattern from the Persian decoration. Here we find geometrical network patterns, which were not usual in Persia and a colour scheme which receives its special character from the much used black, alternating with bright and dark blue, although other colours are also found. The following is a list of the most important buildings, so far as they are known: 1. Piered mosques: 2. Court mosque: of A la al-Din in Konya, completed 616 (1200—1210), Djami Kebir in Siw, xth—xith century, madrasa-mausoleum, completing the highest, and great mosque 679 (1286—1281) in Diwrigi, Eshef Rum (Eski) Djami, xith century, in Beyshaher, Ulu Djami in Eshefir, xith century, all built in 1272 (1251) and the largest of this type.

The mosque of the Turcoman ruler Is 1 (1348—1590) in Ayasoluk (Ephesus) is an exception in Asia Minor; it was finished in 777 (1375—1376) and its architect is said to have been "Ah b. al-Dimshu. The interior is modelled on the mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus; the walls however are in the Turkish style of that period, as developed in the provinces of the Atabegs. The west façade is closely related to the façades of the mosque of 1sAn in Cairo, which also drew inspiration from Northern Mesopotamia.

The Ottoman empire. The Ottoman Turks further developed the types of mosque built by their predecessors, the Saldjiks. A second very important factor in the development was their expansion into Europe and the new model, the Byzantine domed churches, especially the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Here three main types of mosque may again be distinguished: the pierced hall, the cruciform domed mosque and the central or great domed mosque. The first and third were
commonly used for Friday mosques and mosques for the people, while the second type was reserved for the Sultan's Friday service and religious instruction, and was more used for private mosques. The Ottoman pierced hall mosque is distinguished from the Sa'djih, principally by its vaulting, rows of cupolas over the piers. The court is limited to a hypaethral water-basin of the same size as the dome above it. The Ulu Djam'i in Brussa for example is an undorned pillared hall, rectangular in shape with five aisles each with four domes in a row. The second group of four pillars in the central aisle was originally uncovered (now it has a glass dome) and contains the basin for ablutions, the rudiments of a court. The domes of the five aisles rise one above the other to the central row.

The most important buildings of this group are: Ulu Djam'i 1370–1420 in Brussa, Uc Sherefeli Djam'i 889–893 (1484–1487/8) in Adrianople, Ulu (Eski) Djam'i ca. 1403–1420 in Adrianople, Ulu Djam'i xvi century (1) in Manisa (Magnesia on Sipylus), Djumaya in Filibe (Philippopolis), old mosque (now museum) 882 (1477–1478) in Sofia, Sandjirifir Kuyu Djam'i ca. 1500, Ahmad Pasha Djam'i by Sinan ca. 1555 and Pasha Djam'i 1573, all in Constantinople, Eski Wulde in Scutari ca. 1570. The pierced hall as an annexed form became extinct in the xvi century. The Itekil Oghlu Djam'i in 1734 in Constantinople is a mixture of the latter with the great dome. The origin of the cruciform domed mosque is rightly sought by Wulzinger in the Sa'djih madrasim with courtyards which come in tune to be covered over with a dome. The centre which lies somewhat below the level of the rest, is occupied by a square roofed with a dome, again the rudiments of the former courtyard, and still often containing a fountain. The Kibla chamber is vaulted with a barrel or dome, the prying chambers to right and left are either like twins open towards the centre or have barrel-vaulting. The similarity of these mosques to Byzantine churches (in plan, not in structure) is involuntary and lies in the system. On the other hand, the open pierced outer court (köşvet) may go back to Byzantine stimulation. These outer courts however are very great in the east to give shade. The most important buildings of this type are according to Wulzinger's list (op. cit., p. 186): Mosque of Murad I 1359–1389 in Brussa, fin. end of xvi century, two storied, Mosque of Bayażid I Yıldırım (1389–1403), fin. after 1402, Yashil Djam'i in Brussa, fin. 1423, Mosque in the Koinames church in Isnik, beg. of xvi century, Nilufer Khatun 'imaret, end of xvi century, Piruz Bey Djam'i in Milas, fin. 797 (1394), Mosque of Murad II 1421–1451, fin. 1447 in Brussa, Mosque of Murad II in Adrianople, 'imaret Djam'i in Philippopolis 1359, Mosque of Hamza Bey before 1451 in Brussa, Ghazi Michal Djam'i ca. 1400 in Adrianople. The great domed mosque developed out of the more primitive single domed mosque which was very common throughout out Asia Minor and Turkey as the simple village mosque, private mosque etc. and continued to survive. (In Ayasoluk alone 14 small single domed mosques can be counted). This type of building was also used for the numerous turbines. The following are more important single domed mosques outside Constantinople: Yashil Djam'i 794 (1392) and Mahma Dželēb Djam'i about 1400 in Isnik, 

Masjīd of Khodja Vadygyar beg. 1369 in İnönü, Masjīd of Elias Bey fn. 806 (1404) in Balat (Mile). The development of the great domed mosque from this type took place in part through combination with cruciform domed types, but its aim was however the elimination of all minor domes which at first it had for constructive reasons to put at the sides. A. Gabriel's table gives a good idea of the different variations. He gives the mosques of Constantinople, which number 42 (with Scutari), under six main types (Les Mosquées de Constantinople, in Syria, viii, 1926, p. 352–495).

D. Square or oblong halls with one or more domes, sometimes flanked by secondary domed chambers: Mahma Pasha Djam'i 898 (1464). Murad Pasha Djam'i 870 (1466), Dâwâd Pasha Djam'i 890 (1485), 'Atık 'Ali Pasha Djam'i 902 (1497), Sultan Selim Djam'i 926 (1520).

E. Quadrangular single domed halls (continuing the list just given of the not yet very large single domed mosques from the city area of Constantinople): Firuz Ağa Djam'i 896 (1491), Diezen Kâsim Pasha Masjīd 921 (1515), 'Huseyî-ı Kurem Djam'i 946 (1539), Mehmed Ağa Djam'i 993 (1585), Châlî Djam'i 1050 (1649), Nûri 'Othmanî Djam'i 1169 (1755), Latifi Djam'i 1177 (1763), Wulide Djam'i 1287 (1790).

F. Square hall with a central dome, usually supported by two half domes: Sultan Bayazid Djam'i 906 (1500), Sultan Sulaiman Djam'i 957–964 (1550–1557), Kılıç Ali Pasha Djam'i 988 (1580).

D. Square hall with a central dome supported by four axial half domes: Şahzade Djam'i 965 (1548), Sultan Ahmad Djam'i 1026 (1617), Yeğen Wâlide Djam'i 1120 (1708), Sultan Mehmed Djam'i 867 (1463), reconstructed 1180 (1767); variants: oblong hall with a central dome supported by three half domes: Iskele Djam'i in Scutari 954 (1547).

E. Oblong hall with six domes of equal size (old type of people's mosque, cf. above): Zingirî Kuyu Djam'i xvi century, Filibe Pasha Djam'i 967 (1573).

F. Oblong hall with central dome and aisles.

Group a. Central dome with square plan and pendentives: Balk Pasha Djam'i middle of xvi (xvii) century, Mihrimâh Djam'i middle of xvi (xvii) century, Zâl Mahma Pasha Djam'i 958 (1551).

Group b. Central dome on octagonal basis: Ibrahim Pasha Djam'i 958 (1551), Rustam Pasha Djam'i middle of xvi (xvii) century, Eski 'Ali Pasha Djam'i 994 (1586), Yeğen Wâlide Djam'i 1120 (1708) in Scutari, Aştir Kapu Djam'i 985 (1577), Ayâb Sultan Djam'i founded xvi (xvii) century, rebuilt xvi (xvii) century, Nîshândîl Mehmed Pasha Djam'i 992 (1584).

Group c. Central dome on hexagonal basis: Ahmad Pasha Djam'i 962 (1555), Sultan Mehmed Pasha Djam'i 979 (1571), 'Atık Wâlide Djam'i 991 (1583) in Scutari, Ljebî Pasha Djam'i 1062 (1594), Hakim Oğlu 'Ali Pasha Djam'i 1147 (1734).

A survey of this list shows that the type given under A. is also the earliest. This was directly linked up with that in use in the older capital Brussa and already being built in Konya in the xvi century (Kara Tai Madrasa, Yıldırım and Yashil Djam'i) which seems to be continued in the Mahmud and Murad Pasha Djamis. But already the original Sultan Mehmed Djamis (rebuilt in the xvii century)
which forms a striking anachronism in Gabriel's list under D. with its date 1463 (only the second modern Mehmediya of 1767 belongs properly there), had made the first important step towards a single great chamber (cf. Agha Oghlu's reconstructed plan in Diez, Kunst d. isl. Volk, 2nd ed., p. 105) and this plan was repeated for the 'Atük 'Ali Pasha Djami', while the Dawud Pasha Djami' of 1485 had already used another variation (cf. the plans in Gabriel, op. cit.). This in brief is the historical development of the Constantinople mosque from the Anatolian Sajidijk-Ottoman type. The next important step to the gigantic domed mosques of Constantinople given under D. was completed by the greatest of Ottoman architects Sinan (1489-1588) in the Shah Mosque Djami', the Sultanâyye and the Selmici (1567-1574) in Adrianople. His guiding idea was, by thrusting the pillars of the domes as far back into the walls as possible, to get a single domed chamber of the largest possible dimensions, no longer interrupted by pillars: Sinan achieved this end in the Selmici in Adrianople.

**Persia, Turkestan and Afghanistan.**

Old mosques or remains of them have not survived in Persia, as in Egypt, the Maghreb and Syria, except perhaps for a few old parts still standing in the great complex of buildings, that formed the Friday Mosque of Mashhad, which is all that remains of the old Friday Mosque of Shiraz. We know however from literary sources that at the beginning of the Abbásid period large mosques were built everywhere in the towns and some must have existed even earlier. Abû Muslim, the celebrated general and Abbásid propagandist, built mosques in Merv and Nishâbûr. The latter was built on pillars of wood and similar structures are occasionally mentioned in Persia (e.g. at Rubâb in the province of Djiurdjân, Sirâf on the Persian Gulf etc.). In the ninth century, however, greater use began to be made of columns of brick or stone or marble columns taken from older buildings where they could be seen, as in Persian at Persepolis. 'Amr b. al-Lâthî (265-288 = 878-900), the second ruler of the Saffârid dynasty, renovated the Friday Mosque in Nishâbûr and among other mosques built the Djâmi' 'Atük in Shiraz, both mosques with columns of brick, of which parts are still standing in Shirâz. The Friday Mosque of Balkh destroyed by the Mongols in 1220, is said to have had splendid pillars, as Ibn Batûta records. An old mosque on piers of the fourth (tenth) century has survived in the remote desert town of Naiyûn, east of Isfâhân, and enables us to make deductions about the architecture of mosques in the lands of the east from the fourteenth century. In Balkh there were eleven barrel-vaulted aisles running perpendicular to the kibâ wall, of which the central one is broader than the others. The court is flanked by four-aisled riiâks which run parallel to the kibâ wall, only the wall of the entrance has an arcade. The plan is therefore similar to that of the mosques of the Maghrib. It is built on columns or piers of different forms. The part around the mihrâb is richly ornamented in stucco and has bands of inscriptions around it (cf. H. Viollet and S. Flury, *Un monument etc.*, *Syrie*, ii, 1921). How securely the pierced hall, as the type of Friday Mosque, maintained itself in the Sunni east, is seen from the rebuilding of Timâr's great mosque in Samarkand after his return from his raid on India in 1410, a mosque with columns, which was directly connected with the madrasa of Bibi Khanâm, but has now completely disappeared. The mosque had 460 columns of hewn stone, each seven ells in height. The vaulting was covered with large beautifully carved and polished slabs of marble. There was a minaret at each of the four corners of the mosque. The door was of bronze and the walls were covered inside and outside with inscriptions in relief (according to Sharif al-Dîn 'Ali Yâzîd). How far there was any Indian influence here cannot now be ascertained. In any case, the iwân and mihrâb court became established in Persia in the fifth (eleventh) century and as the above described Friday Mosque in Isfâhân shows, became structured with the pierced hall. The great Mosque of Herât (cf. Niedermayer-Diez, *Afghanistan*, p. 55 and figs. 149-153) shows a similar mihrâb court adapted to the (probably older) pierced hall. In the completely new building of the Timurid and Safavid period, the pierced hall completely disappeared and the hâmâr is extended by a central dome with vaulted halls at the sides, when the kibâ iwân itself does not fulfil the purpose. The mosque of the great sanctuaries in Kûm Muḥammad, Kerbelâ, the Masdjid-i Shâh in Isfâhân and many other urban mosques of Persia are built on this plan. Only in Eastern Khurâsân, as in the Turkestân-i Shahkh in Isfâhân, have we still an iwân with vaulted arches and a large dome in the centre of the hâmâr, all of which betrays Indian influence (cf. the plan in Diez, *Chauasische Baukunst*, p. 79).

Of the already characterised type of domed mosques may be mentioned: the "Blue Mosque" in Tabriz and the Masdjid-i Shâh in Mashhad, both similar in plan to a large central dome and two flanking minarets. The former was built during the reign of the Turkmân ruler Djihân Shâh (1437-1497), the latter by Mir Mâh Shâh, the architect being Ahmad b. Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad Tabrizî (cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, p. 113). The Tabriz mosque, however, is dated 1611 and is built directly from the domed area with a second smaller dome. Both domes were decorated with tiles, the larger with white tendrils on a black ground, the smaller with white stars on a black ground (Tavernier). Only fragments survive of the Blue Mosque, which show how splendidly it was once decorated; on the other hand, the Masdjid-i Shâh in Mashhad is still standing, although the dome has lost its decoration. To this group belong also the mosque on the citadel mound of Eriwan, the mosque of Shahk Lyûf Allâh in Isfâhân, the Kalîyân mosque used as a royal private mosque and the public Mosque of 'Abdul Mejid, both with high entrance iwâns and without a court. At largely attended common prayer, the people assemble in front of such mosques. This is particularly the case in Turkestan; for the iwân and niches were simply very large mihrâbs and nothing further was necessary. In Balkh also there is a similar, formerly domed mosque probably intended for the ruler with a towering iwân (xvth century) (cf. Niedermayer-Diez, *Afghanistan*, figs. 204-205). Besides these large main types, there were and are in these lands of eastern Islam hundreds of smaller mosques in the towns and villages, which sometimes show very interesting structures. Thus in Djiâdjarîn in the Isfâhân steppe (northern Persia) there is a mosque with a small
open court and domed chamber in front of the mihrab, and two triple yoked aisles, probably a reminiscence of Nestorian churches (cf. Dietz, Chauras. Bukan, p. 83). We also find everywhere small madrasas, which are simply little oratories, where the people can promptiy worship at the proper time: flat-roofed large halls on wooden pillars, which are frequently richly carved in Turkستان, Afghanistan (Kabul) and Central Asia (Kashmir etc.).

The Madrasa in Persia, Turkestan and Afghanistan. Shahi madrasas were built in the Abbasiid period in Nishapur (where Hafiz Abru counted 17), Merv, Bukhara, Amol, Tus and other towns. Nasr, brother of Malikshir of Ghazna, is said to have built the first state madrasa. Under the Saljuq, Nasir al-Mulk, vizier of Alp Arslan, and of Malik Shah, built three state madrasas in Nishapur, Tus and Shahbad. None of these pre-Timurid madrasas in Persia has survived; unless the ruined iwan in Khargird is what is left of a madrasa, which is very probable (cf. Dietz, op. cit., p. 71 sq.). The runs of the Timurid period however give us a picture of the Persian madrasa of the golden period of Muslim Persian architecture. The madrasa in Khargird near Kafh close to the Afghan frontier, completed in 848 (1444-1445), still shows a pure unmixed madrasa design: a quadrangular court with four barrel-vaulted large iwan, equal in size, at the intersection of the axes, each flanked by two or, with the upper storey, four cells, four vaulted corner-chambers, a narthex-like outer building consisting of three successive domed chambers; low confined mihrab façades with low flanking towers at the corners. The walls, especially of the court, were adorned with rich tiled mosaic, the walls of the domed chambers with ornamental frescoes (cf. Dietz, Chauras. Bukan, p. 72-76, pl. 31-34). In contrast to the low façade of Khargird built by a West Persian (Shirazi) architect are the Turkestan madrasas with their high iwans; characteristic of the cast in general, and gateways especially. In Samarkand we have the three Rigestan madrasas: Shir dar (c. 1610), Tillya Kari (c. 1610) and Ulugh Beg (c. 1434); also the Madrasa Bibi Khanum (about 1410) built by Timur, all large courtyards with mihrab courts and domed chambers, usually four mumaret at the surrounding walls. In Bukhara, the Madrasa Mir Arab of the end of the xvth century is related to the Madrasa Shir Dar. Of the madrasas in Herat, e.g. the celebrated Ekkadissiya, nothing has survived, nor do we have anything left of the madrasa of Turbat-i Shahi Djam in Eastern Khurasan (cf. Dietz, op. cit., p. 78). A twin architecturally inter-ting the state madrasa founded in the xvith century by Malik Hamza, the Gumbaz-i Surkh at Kafa-i Fath in Sindjistan (cf. Tate, Sictistan, fig. p. 78). The cells are vaulted with the typical Persian house and haras dome. The last fine Persian madrasa is the Mader-i Shah Sultan Husain in Isfahan built by the Safavid Shah of this name (1694-1722). The tiled decoration of the court is among the finest of its kind that has survived in Persia (cf. Sarre, Pers. Bikan., and Dietz, Kunst d. Isfahans, p. 106-107). The dome still shows the original glazed tiles with foliage patterns: dark blue and white, changing to black slabs and yellow leaves on a turquoise blue ground.

India. In India the history of Muslim architecture so far known does not go beyond the xvith century. The two earliest mosques of which the ruins still survive, the mosques of Ajmir and of Delhi, are large covered courts, built of pillars taken from Jaina temples. The domes on eight pillars found in all Jaina temples are here found ranged in rows. The richly sculptured pillars were simply cleared of any figures on them before being used. Vaulting on square piers continued in use after there were no more pillars to plunder (mosques in Kulbarga and Bidjapur). For the rest, Indo-Muslim mosque architecture developed in different ways according to varied traditions and local conditions. In towns completely islamised like Randa on the Nerbada, the capital of the sultanate of Malwa founded by Dilawar Shah at the beginning of the xvith century, or Dwarapur near Bicnur, which was founded by the sultan of Delhi in 1359, Muslim places of worship show a marked synthesis of Hinduistic tradition with the rigid forms of Muslim symbolism. Similarly in the Muslim towns of Gujrat, in Ahammadabad, Cambay, Dholka, Mahammadabad, the characteristic architecture developed out of the local Hindu art so that the demands made by Islam on the shape of a mosque, such as an entrance-iwan and minaret, were carried through by purely Indian means and only the arch gave the building a Muslim stamp. In Bengal again, where the curved bamboo roof prevailed, mosques were built with curved roofs from the bricks in use there, as is shown, notably by the ruins in Gaur on the Ganges. Instead of glazed tiles, the walls were generally adorned with richly ornamented slabs of stone. South of the Vindhy range also, in the Deccan and in India local adaptations have been made according to the same general principles. In Ahmadnagar, Golconda, Kulbarga, Bidar, Aurangabad and other capitals of Muhammadan principalities, the building of mosques was much cultivated. Architectonically, the most important city was Bidjapur, the capital of the state of the same name, which became independent in 1490 under Yusuf 'Adil Shah and survived down to the xvith century, when its great period of building culminated in the gigantic dome of the mausoleum of 'Adil Shah. The mosque of Bidjapur (second half of the xvith century) consists of a pierced hall with small domes over each group of four piers and a large dome in the centre. In the Moghul period little change was made in this mixture of Hindu and Muslim methods, although the Persian elements were often more marked. The huge mosque with courtyard built by Akbar in Fatehpur Sikri has the usual plan with slight variations. The Great Mosque of Agra built by Akbar still shows little Indian pavilions on the tops of the cornices. It was only under his successors that a Puritan reaction set in, which finds its fullest expression in the mosques of Delhi and Lahore. The process of assimilation thus attained its end.

China and Indo-China. From the Magrib to the Pamirs and southeast of them the general character of the country, plains and deserts, linked the peoples of Islam together by certain common features, which also secured the mosque its uniformity of structure in the early centuries. In China where Islam was only the religion of a few isolated groups of immigrants the mosque soon adapted itself to the well marked Chinese style of architecture and the mosques of the south and western
province, where Islam has established itself in places, are not distinguished externally from the Chinese temples or yamen and internally only by the absence of idols which are replaced by the mihrāb and minābr. Exceptions are the mosques in the seaports, where the colonies of Muslims kept up steady intercourse with the home of Islam and the mosques were at the same time built by native architects. This holds for example of the mosques of Ts'iu-an-tchen, province of Fu-kien, the Zaṭṭān of mediaeval writers, which was built in 400 (1009–1010) and restored in 710 (1310–1311) by an architect, a native of Jerusalem, who came from Turāz, as the inscription testifies. This mosque which is built of hewn stone consists of a hypostyle hall, such as we find in Asia Minor (e.g. Sivas) and has bulb-shaped niches (cf. G. Arnaiz and M. v. Berchem, Mémoires sur les antiquités musulmanes (1865), T'eng Pao, vol. xvi., 1911). The medieaval chief mosque of Canton also followed the western tradition and even has a minaret, which is never seen on the mosques of the interior. The same holds of mosques in Burma and the Indian Archipelago. They are usually built of wood and adapted to the native architecture.

Bibliography: The works quoted under MANIRA will also serve for Mosque and Madrasa. Special works are quoted in the text. For the Maghrīb the new, excellent Manuel d'art musulman of G. Marçais was mainly used, which deals only with the Maghrib (2 vols., Paris 1927). (Ernst 1922)

AL-MASJID AL-AKṢA, the mosque built on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem.

The name means the "remotest sanctuary" and is first found in the Qur'an, Surā xxvii. 1: "Praise Him who made his servant journey in the night from the holy place to the remotest sanctuary, which we have surrounded with blessings to show him of our signs".

As was explained in the article ISRA [q. v.], the older exegesis refers this verse to the journey to heaven [cf. MIRGAL] and sees in the name al-Masjid al-Akṣa a reference to some heavenly place (cf. Surah al-Māniṣiyya, Surā liii. 14).

This explanation had however in time to give way to another, according to which the expression is a name of Jerusalem. This explanation is connected with Maḥmūdī's "journey in the night" (istar). The combination of the istar and mirgall thus gives the story of the Prophet's journey by night to the Masjid al-Akṣa (Jerusalem) and his journey following it from Jerusalem to the heavens.

The question arises how Jerusalem came to have this name among the events of the Qur'an. According to Schröder [cf. ISRA] it is a result of the Omayyad tendency to glorify Jerusalēm at the expense of the holy land of Islam. Horovitz has challenged this explanation in his "Surahs" of the Korān. Jerusalēm was far from very early times regarded in Islam as a sacred place, the original Kîlā, which, although abandoned in favour of Mecca, still retained its sanctity as may be seen, for example, from the fact that ʿOmar had a Masjid built on the site of the Temple [see AL-KUDS, li., p. 1097].

The name al-Masjid al-Akṣa is now particularly attached to the mosque in the south of the Temple area, which according to some was originally a church built by justinian [cf. AL-KUDS, li., p. 1096].

According to late Arab writers the mosque was built by the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (785–805), a statement which might simply mean that Justinian's church was rebuilt. On this compare AL-KUDS, lii., p. 1093 sqq. where the further history of the mosque is given.

For a picture of the site and the mosque see Pl. v. to the article AL-KUDS; plan and description of the interior in Travels of A. B. B. London 1816, ii. 214 sqq.; Baedeker, Palastina und Syrien, p. 54 sqq.


AL-MASJID AL-ḤARĀM, the name of the Mosque of Mecca. The name is already found in the pre-Muhammadan period (Horovitz, Konvantsche Studien, p. 140 sqq.) in Ka'ba b. al-Khatūn, ed. Kowalski, v. 14. "By Allah, the Lord of the Holy Masjid and of that which is covered with Yemen stuffs, which are embroiled with hampen thread." (It would be very improbable if a Medina poet by these two references meant anything other than the Meccan sanctuary. The expression is also frequently in the Qur'an after the second Meccan period [Horovitz, Konvantsche Studien, p. 140 sqq.]).

In these passages masjīd ḥarām does not as in later times mean a building but simply Mecca as a holy place, just as in Surā xvii. 1 Masjid Al-As such "the remotest sanctuary" does not mean a particular building.

According to tradition, a ṣalāt performed in the Masjid al-Ḥarām is particularly meritorious (Bukhari, al-Sahih fi Madrasa al-Kabīr, bāb 1). The Masjid is the oldest, being forty years older than that of Jerusalem (Bukhari, Sahih, bāb 40).

This Meccan sanctuary included the Ka'ba [q. v.], the Zemzem [q. v.] and the Maqām Ibrahim [see KHAṬA], all three on a small open space. In the year 8, Muhammad made this place a mosque for worship, soon however it became too small and under ʿUmar and ʿUthmān, adjoining houses were taken down and a wall built. Under ʿAbd Allah ibn al-Zubair, the Omayyad and ʿAlāʾid caliphs, successive enlargements and embellishments were made. Ibn al-Zubair put a simple roof above the wall. Al-Mahdī had cypress trees planted around, which were covered by a roof of tiles. The number of minarets in time rose to seven. Little columns were put up around the Ka'ba for lighting purposes. The mosque was also given a feature which we only find paralleled in a few isolated instances: this was the putting up of small wooden buildings, or rather shelters for use during the ṣalāt by the imām, one for each of the four orthodox rites. The fact that one of these masajīms might be more or less elaborate than another occasionally gave
rise to jealousies between the Ḥanafis and the Ṣḥafiʿis. Ultimately the ground under the colonnades, which was covered with gravel was paved with marble slabs, in the maṭāf around the Kaʿba as well as on the different paths approaching the maṭāf.

The mosque was given its final form in the years 1572—1577, in the reign of the Sulṭān Selim II, who, in addition to making a number of minor improvements in the building, had the flat roof replaced by a number of small white-washed cone-shaped domes.

A person entering the mosque from the Masʿa or the eastern quarters of the town, has to descend a few steps. The site of the mosque, as far as possible, was always left unaltered, while the level of the ground around — as usual in oriental towns and especially in Mecca on account of the Sīl — gradually rose automatically in course of centuries (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i. 18—20).

The dimensions of the Ḥarām (interior) are given as follows (al-Batānī, Riḥa, p. 96): N.W. side 545; S.E. side 553 feet, N.W. side 824 feet; the corners are not right angles, so that the whole roughly represents a parallelogram.

Entering the maṭāf from the eastern side, one enters first the Bāb Bani Śheba, which marks an old boundary of the masjdīd. Entering through the door, the Maṭḥān ʿAbd al-Muʾmin is on the right, which is also the Maṭkān al-Ṣḥāfī, and to the right of it is the minbar. On the left is the Zemzem building. As late as the beginning of the sixth century, there stood in front of the latter, in the direction of the northeast of the mosque, two domed buildings (al-ʿAqbatat) which were used as store-houses (Chron. d. Stadt Mecca, ii. 357 sq.). These Kubbas were cleared away (cf. already Burckhardt, i. 265); they are not given in recent plans.

Around the Kaʿba are the maṭkāns for the imaḥs of the madhhabs, between the Kaʿba and the southeastern part of the mosque, the maṭkān (or musalla) al-Ḥanjabi, to the south-west the maṭkān al-Māḥkī, to the north-west the maṭkān al-Ḥanāfī. The latter has two stories; the upper one was used by the muʿṣalāghūn and the mabālīgh, the lower by the imaḥ and his assistants. Since Wāḥabī rule has been established, the Ḥanjabi imaḥ has been given the place of honour. The maṭkān al-Ḥanāfī stands on the site of the old Meccan council-chamber (dār al-nadwā) in which the course of centuries was several times rebuilt and used for different purposes. The maṭāf is marked by a row of thin brass columns connected by a wire. The lamps for lighting are fixed to this wire and in the colonnades.

The mosque has for centuries been the centre of the intellectual life of the metropolis of Islam. This fact has resulted in the building of madrasas and riwāks for students in or near the mosque, for example the madrasa of Kāṭī Bey on the left as one enters through the Bāb al-Salām. Many of these wakfs have however in course of time become devoted to other purposes (Burckhardt, i. 282; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecka, i. 17). For the staff of the mosque cf. Śheba (Hanū); Burckhardt, i. 287—291.


MAṢHAṬ. [See MUSHAF.]

MAṢHAF, GHIṢĀM HĀMADĀNĪ B. WALI MUḤammad, a distinguished Urdu poet, was born in Lucknow but went to Dilli in 1190 (1776), where he applied himself to the cultivation of Urdu poetry. His house was resorted to by the eminent poets of the capital. In 1201 (1786) he was appointed Lucknow and spent the rest of his life there under the patronage of Prince Sulaimān Shīkīh, son of Shāh ʿAlām. He died in 1240 (1824). He is the author of several Dīwāns in Persian and Hindustānī, and of biographies of Urdu poets, called Tadhkira-i Hindī. He also wrote another Tadhkira of Persian poets who flourished in India from the time of Muḥammad Shāh (1131—1161 = 1719—1748) to the reign of Shāh ʿAlām (1173—1221 = 1759—1806) entitled ʿIbād Thuraʿ, and a historical work in verse in which he entitled Shāh-Nāma.


MAṢHĀʾALLĀH, the son of Abūṣaʿīr or Sārīya, a celebrated astronomer, who, along with Nawbahkti fixed the day and hour for the foundation of Baghdād by order of al-Manṣūr. According to the Fihrist, he was a Jew whose original name was Miṣḥ (a corruption of Manashšū, i.e. Maṇasš); whether he later adopted Islam and for this reason took the name Maṣhāʾallāh is not recorded. The date of his birth is unknown, but it can hardly be later than 112 (730). He is said to have died in 200 (815).

In numerous works Maṣhāʾallāh covered the whole field of astrology, and also the making and uses of astronomical instruments. There has only survived in Arabic fragments of a treatise on the plan of various houses which was translated into Latin under the title Mensehlae Libelli de Motibus. Many of his astronomical works were translated into Latin by Johannes Hispalensis and others and later printed. Hebrew versions are also known. It may be safely assumed that Arabic originals will still be found in eastern libraries. The critical study of the Latin translations existing in manuscript and printed form is most desirable in view of the early date of the author.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Nadîm, Fihrist, ed. Flügel, i. 273; ii. 129; H. Suter, Das Mathematikerverzeichnis, 1892, p. 61—62; H. Suter, Die Mathemastiker und Astronomen der Araber, 1900. p. 5—6; Nachtrage, 1902, p. 158; M. Steinschneider, Die arāb. Litteratur der Juden,
Maskat, or Masqat, is one of the hottest towns in Persia. The maximum temperature was 45.8°C, the minimum 17.2°C. The rainfall varies between 75 and 150 mm. The high temperatures are caused mainly by the hot winds which at certain periods in the summer months usually blow from the Arabian desert and from the rocky hills for several hours in the night. From November to the middle of March the weather is however quite pleasant, but one must beware of malaria and the old poetry.

Horovitz (Kronanische Untersuchungen, p. 129) considers the possibility that it was taken over from the Ethiopians (masilh). Muhammad of course got the word from the Christian Arabs. In Arab writers we find the view mentioned that the word is a loan-word from Hebrew, Syriac, Turk-ex, or Aramaic. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the word was used as a name of the Redeemer. The linguistic origin of the word is not known.

In the Kur'ān the word is first found in the Meccan sūras, a. alone: Sūra iv. 170; ix. 30; b. with Ibn Maryam: Sūra v. 19, 76, 79; ix. 31; c. with a.b. Maryam: Sūra ii. 152. None of these passages make it clear what Muḥammad understood by the word. From Sūra iii. 49: "O Maryam, see, Allah promi-est thee a word from Him, whose name is Al-Masīḥ 'Isā b. Maryam" one might suppose that al-Masīḥ was here to be taken as a proper name. Against this view however is the fact that the article is not found with non-Arabic proper names in the Kur'ān.

In canonical Ḥadīth, al-Masīḥ is found in three main connections: a. in Muhammad's dream, in which he relates how he saw at the Ka'ba a very handsome brown-complexioned man with beautiful locks, dripping with water, who walked supported by two men; to his question who this was the reply was given: al-Masīḥ b. Maryam (Bukhārī, Liḥā'ī, bāb 68; Taŷīrī, bāb 11; Muslim, Ḥanāfī, trad. 302): b. in the descriptions of the return of 'Isā (q.v.): c. at the Last Judgment the Christians will be told: "What have you worshipped?" They will reply: "We have worshipped al-Masīḥ, the Son of God". For this they shall wallow in Hell (Bukhārī, Taŷīrī, Sūra iv., bāb 8; Taŷīrī, bāb 24; Muslim, Ḥanāfī, trad. 302).

In Ḥadīth also we frequently find references to al-Masīḥ al-Kādīdhālī and al-Masīḥ al-Dādīzīlī; see the article AL-DA'DIJALī.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(Al. J. Wenzel)

Maskat, 1. a seaport on the Gulf of Oman, on the east coast of Arabia in 25° 37' 26" N. Lat. and 56° 15' 26" East Long. Maskat is the only harbour between Aden and the Persian Gulf, which ships of any size can enter and next to Aden and Jidda, the best harbour in the Peninsula. The port is of considerable importance from its position commanding the entrance to the Persian Gulf. It lies at the end of a hor-se-shoed bay 900 fathoms long and 400 broad which is enclosed and sheltered from the winds by multicoloured rocks of volcanic origin, devoid of any vegetation. Behind the white town rises a series of extensive ranges of mountains on the highest of which, the Džabal Akhdār, 9,000 feet high, snow occasionally lies in winter-time. On the slopes we even find the Muscadel vine growing which is said to have been introduced by the Portuguese. The harbour is very busy; in the middle on the shore stands the sultan's palace, at the south end the offices of the British political agent. On either side the town is flanked by an old Portuguese fort, Marānī and Džallī. The chapel in one of them bears the date 1588. The bazaar consists of low buildings and is of little importance. The mosques are remarkable for the absence of the usual tall minarets.

The climatic conditions are by no means favourable. With Aden-Dhaka and Džallī, Maskat is one of the hottest towns in Persia. The maximum temperature was 45.8°C, the minimum 17.2°C. The rainfall varies between 75 and 150 mm. The high temperatures are caused mainly by the hot winds which at certain periods in the summer months usually blow from the Arabian desert and from the rocky hills for several hours in the night. From November to the middle of March the weather is however quite pleasant, but one must beware of malaria and the old poetry.

Maskat plays a considerable part as centre of trade with the nearer east. There are regular communications with India, Persia, East Africa and Mauritius. The ships of certain maritime companies call regularly at Maskat, e.g. the British India Steam Navigation Company on the route from London to India, the Bucknell Steamship Company and the Strick Line to Bayra, the West Hartlepool Steam Navigation Company on the Aden-Basra route, the Hamburg-America Line monthly to the harbours of the Persian Gulf, the Arab Steamers Ltd. on the Bombay-Basra route, and the Compagnie Rusee de Navigation à Vapeur et de Commerce. In 1912-1913 the total tonnage entering the port was 98 steamers with 127,885 tons and 63 sailing vessels with 5,021 tons and leaving it 86 steamers of 90,805 tons and 30 sailing ships of 2,379 tons. The ships in question were mainly British (86.73%). Maskat has a regular postal service with the rest of the world instituted by the British, as well as a cable connection which the Indian Government has laid to Džallī. The population, which changes a good deal, is about 10,000 souls, primarily Arabs but there are also Persians, Indians, Indian Muslims, Belgradja and a few Europeans settled here, mainly traders.

Maskat was at one time a flourishing centre of the silk and cotton trade but in recent years this has almost been destroyed by Indian and American competition. The gold and silver work done by Indians here is famous, notably richly ornamented bowls and daggers. The imports of Maskat in 1912-1913 were valued at £ 463,551 and the exports at £ 301,477. The former were mainly arms and munitions, cereals, dyes, precious metals, pearls, foodstuffs, textiles, tobacco, building materials, enamel, glass, porcelain, ironmongery, perfumes and soaps, the latter camels, horses and asses, weapons, cereals, dried and salt fish, dates, lemons and pomegranates, fruits and dragon's blood, pearls, melted butter (ghār), mussels, mother-of-pearl and tortoise-shell, textiles, hides and leather.

The chief importer was India, then Belgium, England and Aden, the exports went mainly to India, the Arabian coast, England, Persia, America and Zanzibar.

According to local tradition Maskat was founded at an early period by Himyar colonists. A. Sprenger has identified Maskat with the kāoffee Asīm of Patrolly, vi. 7, 12. As the harbour has only a narrow entrance on the north and is enclosed on
the east by rocky heights, it is, as a matter of fact, easy for sailors to overlook it, and the name 'the hidden' would be quite appropriate. Al-
Mukaddash (B.G.A., iii. 93 sq.) who mentions the port of al-Maskat, says that it is the first place which the ships from Yemen reach and is a fine town, rich in fruits. Ibn al-Fakih al-Hamadhanl (B.G.A., v. 11) says of Maskat that it is the very end of Oman, about 200 parasangs from Shirf, the starting point for ships sailing to India and to Külümāli, a month's journey beyond it. Ships take in water here and Chinese ships pay 1,000 drhams for it, the other 10-20 dinār. Idris briefly mentions Maskat as a densely populated town, Ibn al-Mu-
djāwir is fuller (in A. Sprenger's Post- und Reise-
reise, p. 145 sq.) and tells us that Maskat was originally called Maskat—so also Niebuhr, p. 296—and that it is a considerable centre of trade with Africa and the east coast of the Persian Gulf, whence the wares are forwarded to Sulfiānā, Khūsān, Fajrah, Chawr and Zābūlahān. In the beginning of the xvth century A.D., Maskat, whose history had hitherto been that of Oman, attracted the attention of European powers. In 1506, Alburquerque appeared before the town and demanded that it should submit to the Portuguese. At the first the people seemed to be peacefully inclined and willing to accept its terms, but this attitude changed and the Portuguese admiral decided to attack and destroy the town. Forty large and small ships and many fishing-vessels and the lāmān's arsenal were destroyed, the mosque pulled down and the town burned. The Portuguese occupied the place and returned in 1527 and built two forts, Marīnī and Ujilāyā, and factories; the present buildings of these names were however only built after the union of Portugal with Spain in 1580 by direct instructions from Madrid. The Portuguese had no easy position here. They were frequently at-
tacked by the surrounding tribes and in addition by the Turks; in 1526 a rising in Maskat was put down by Lopo Vaz, the governor of India. In 1550 a Turkish fleet under Pir Hey appeared before Maskat, attacked the town and took it by storm after eighteen days' bombardment. The Por-
tuguese commander and crew were carried off to be Turkish galley-slaves, but in 1553 the Por-
tuguese succeeded in destroying the Turkish fleet and re-establishing their sway in the Persian Gulf. Maskat was now fortified as a naval base. But after 1631 Portuguese prestige began to decline rapidly. At the end of 1649 Maskat was attacked by the Imam's army and had to surrender on January 23, 1650, as relief came too late. The town now lost much of its former importance, although under Dutch influence its commerce was still considerable. Towards the end of the xvth century it attained again considerable notoriety as a nest of pirates, in 1757 it was taken by the Persians, who were driven out by Ahmad b. Sa'īd, the founder of the dynasty still ruling in Maskat, who had been installed in 1741. Since 1793 Maskat has been the capital of the sultanate of Oman. After 1747 the French began to be influential in Maskat, the town played a prominent part as a base for attacking India in Napoleon's grandly conceived plan for destroying England's power; we need therefore not be surprised that England al-
though paid no serious attention to the town. In January 1806, Capt. John Malcolm was sent to Maskat by the Indian government and concluded a treaty with the Sultan by which an earlier agree-
ment with the East India Company was ratified and an agent of the company established at Maskat. In 1807 and 1808 the French made treaties with the Sultan and also sent a consular agent to Maskat. The town flourished under this sultan, Sa'īd b. Sultan, and became a centre for commerce with the Persian Gulf. Maskat repelled an attack of the Wahhābis with the assistance of the English in 1809, but in 1833 it became tributary to them. The change from sailing to steamships brought about a decline in the importance of the town. In 1863 Palgrave describes Maskat as an important harbour with 40,000 inhabitants, but in 1895, Bent puts the population at only 20,000 and at present it can hardly be more than 10,000. In 1830 how-
ever, the sultan was able to negotiate a commercial treaty with the United States, followed by a similar one with England in 1839; in 1844 France and Maskat drew up a commercial treaty by which France obtained the privilege of the most favoured nation and French subjects were given full freedom to trade in Maskat. The independence of Maskat, although expressly stated in the Anglo-French declaration of 1862, was however little more than nominal, for England, who had several times come forward to protect the sultanate, had through her political agent considerable control over the sultan. In connection with the slave-trade, which England was endeavouring to suppress, the sultan of Maskat had bound himself in various ways to England and in 1854 even ceded to England the Khargān-Māriān Islands of which France was endeavouring to obtain possession. When Sultan Sa'īd Sa'īd died in 1856, his kingdom was divided between his two sons Thwālān b. and Mājid of whom the former received Maskat, while the latter was given Zanzibar which had belonged to Maskat since the end of the xvth century. This division was negotiated by England through Lord Canning, the Viceroy of India. In 1861 Zanzibar was declared independent, but it had still to pay an annual tribute to Maskat, which England in 1873 undertook to pay in com-
penation for various concessions of the sultan of Maskat in connection with the suppression of the slave-trade so long as the sultan fulfilled his engagements and showed friendship towards England. The readiness of the English was also seen in a telegraph agreement of 1864. In 1891 Sultan Faisal concluded a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation with England in which the Sultan bound himself and his successors not to cede, sell or let land except to England. The French opposed this and in 1894 succeeded in obtaining a coal station five miles S. E. of Maskat. England raised objections and quoted the treaty with the sultan although France in the treaty of November 17, 1844, had secured the right to acquire land. Diplomatic negotiations finally brought about a settlement, by which France gave up the coal station in the Gulf of Oman, and in compensation was lent half the coal deposits of Maskat. As France in 1896 again lent this coal station to the English, the dispute was finally settled in favour of the English. A second treaty, was similarly settled, although for a time it caused grave diplomatic negotiations. The French consul of Maskat and Zanzibar had given French papers and flags to a number of ships belonging to Oman. The captains of these who often traded in slaves and smuggled arms, resented the jurisdiction of their sovereign, the
sultan of Maskat, and when the latter took steps to deal with them they were protected by France. The affair finally became so serious that in 1903 there appeared to be danger of a conflict between England and France, but in 1905 the question was submitted to the Hague Tribunal which decided that only those sailing-vessels which had received the French flag before January 2, 1892, had the privilege renewed and licences later issued were cancelled as invalid, in so far as they were not given to French protégés of 1863. As, in 1917, only 12 Oman sailing-vessels still carried the French flag, this privilege of France must soon die out. It was only natural that the active smuggling of weapons from Maskat not only to Persia and Afghanistan but also into the interior of Arabia, should cause anxiety to England. The flourishing trade in arms was put down in 1912 by the establishment of a depot for the sale of arms under government control, which alone could sell arms. It is true that the smugglers have now migrated to Birk, Shab#ain and Ruaisal, but the great decline in the import of arms into Maskat is best shown by the statistics of the year 1912-1913 when in the first half year 147,591 lbs. of arms were still imported while in the last five months the total was only 36,667. In 1913, the new ruler Sultan Taimur, who succeeded his father on October 4 and was recognised by England and France on November 15, 1913, met with serious opposition from the tribes in the south of Oman, who declared themselves independent under an imam whom they chose themselves. It is only England's power that keeps these rebels from Maskat and thus secures the existence of the dynasty, whose rule has long been quite nominal.

**Genealogical Table of the Imams of Maskat**

Ahmad b. Sa'id

(1154—1188 A.H.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sultan</th>
<th>Sa'id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1206—1219 A.H.)</td>
<td>(1188—1193 A.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sālim</td>
<td>Ḥāmid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1219 A.H.)</td>
<td>(1193—1206 A.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thuwaini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1273—1283 A.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sālim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1283—1285 A.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ṣa'īd b. Kāís</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1285—1287 A.H.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Maskat al-Ka'lin, a village on the road from al-Ba'ista to al-Niβāji.
3. Marke town on the Black Sea (Bahr al-Khazaz), said to have been founded by khūn-rāw Anūshīrwān.

Before this, he had very opportunely persuaded the caliph not to modify the order of succession to the disadvantage of Hishām. Yazīd was not long in finding fault with his brother, especially as he neglected to send him the taxes of his immense eastern vice-royalty. He recalled him to Syria, where Maslama endeavoured to combat the influence of favourites on this weak sovereign. Returning to the army in 108 he conquered Caesarea in Cappadocia. The following years were marked by Maslama’s great campaign in Armenia and the land of the Khazars. After partial successes in which the country was laid waste, the stubborn resistance of the natives and the Turkish tribes forced him to retire. The retreat was a disastrous one: with great difficulty Maslama succeeded in bringing back the remnants of his army to Arab territory by sacrificing all his baggage and equipment (115 a. h.). His intervention to support the claims of Walid b. Yazid [q.v.], heir presumptive to Hishām, compromised him at court. He died before this caliph and seems to have taken with him to his grave the fortune of the Marwānids, for they rapidly declined after his death.


MAŠMUDA (the broken plural Mašmūda is also found) one of the principal Berber ethnic groups forming a branch of the Barānis.

We set aside the Mašmūda elements mentioned by al-Iṣbārī in the neighbourhood of Būne' and the post-Islamic Mašmūda seem to have lived exclusively in the western extremity of the Maghrib; and as far back as one goes in the history of the interior of Morocco, we find them forming with the Šanhdā [q.v.], another group of Barānis Berbers, the main stock of the Berber population of this country. Indeed from the first Arab conquest in the seventh century to the importation of the Hālifs by the Almohad Sulṭān Yaʿqūb al-Manṣūr in 1190, it was the Mašmūda who inhabited the great region of plains, plateaus and mountains, which stretches from the Mediterranean to the Anti-Atlas to the west of a line from N. E. to S. W. passing through Meknās (Meknès) and Dīnārāt; the only parts of this territory which were not occupied by them were three small Šanhdā enclaves: the Šanhdāja of Tangier, of the valley of the Warghā and of Azamūr. To the north and to the west, the land of the Mašmūda was bounded by the Mediterranean and the Atlantic. To the east and south it was bounded by the lands of the Šanhdāja. To the north were the Šanhdāja of the region of Taza and those of
Wargha; in the centre, the Zanaga or Şanhadja of the Central Atlas, to which should be added the Zulfi of Fazaz; to the south, the Haskura, the Haha, and the Great Mountains.

It was from the presence of this Maşmuda bloc, extending continuously from Sus to the Mediterranean, that eastern Morocco generally must have received the name of Sus, a name found for example in Yāqūt (cf. Ma’jīyam, s. v. Sūs) who distinguishes a Hither Sus (capital Tangier) and a Farther Sus (capital Taifala) separated from the other by two months' journey. It is also to this racial unity that are due the legends according to which all the N.W. corner of Morocco was once inhabited by the people of Sus (ahl Sūs). Before the coming of the Hilālī Arabs, the Maşmuda peoples were divided into three groups:

1. In the north, from the Mediterranean to the Sahib and Wargha, the Ghamra [q. v.].

2. In the centre from the Sahib to the Wādi Umm Rabī′, the Baraghwata [s. BERGHAWA].

3. In the south, from the Wādi Umm Rabī′ to the Anti-Atlas, the Maşmuda in the strict sense of the word.

Like the majority of the Barānīs, who in this respect are a contrast to the Futr, who are inclined to be nomads, the Maşmuda were all settled; for if, in one passage, Ibn Khaldūn mentions two nomad tribes, the Lāghis and the Zaggen as forming part of the Maşmuda confederation of the Hilālī, he also points out that they were tribes of the Lamja, i.e. of the nomadic Şanhadja, who finally became incorporated in the Lhīwā Assān, Ma’kīl Arab nomads of Sus. Ibn Khaldūn further makes special mention of the fortresses and fortified villages (mazial wa-haṣīna) of the Maşmuda who lived in the mountains of Darān or the Great Atlas. Other Arab historians and geographers mention the many little towns (karya) in the plains occupied by the Dukkâla or the Baraghwata, a pastoral and agricultural people; but these were gradually ruined and destroyed in the course of the fighting which went on without interruption in their country from the establishment of the Şanhadja principalities of Şallal, Taddīl and Aqghmat: the Almoravids and Almohad conquerors, repeated campaigns against the heretical Baraghwata, the Hilālī occupation, the struggle between the Almohads and the Marinids, the rivalry between the Marinid kingdom of Fās and that of Marrākush and lastly the wars with the Portuguese. Exterminated as heretics, dispossessed of their lands and driven from them by the Arab or Zanata nomads brought into their territory, transported to a distance (region) of Fās by the Watâṣāli sultāns, for whose taste they showed to little hostility to the Portuguese, the central Maşmuda, the original inhabitant of Algīr, of Tāmnasā and of the land of the Duskala finally disappeared: their place was taken by nomads, Hilālī Arabs (in the north, in Habīt and Aqghmat, the Riyāḥ; in the south, the Djusam, Shufām, Khulīt, Banū Dāhār) and the Berbers (Zanata Hawwāra); in the xvth century the coming to power of the Shádi dynasty brought about the immigration of Maqīl Arab tribes to the same region: Abda, Aqhab, Rahāmīna, Barābush, Wālāya, Awlid Dulaīm, Zufa‘ir, etc.

From the xvth century onwards, as a result of the occupation of their central plains by the Arabs, Hilālī then Maqīl, the Maşmuda only survived in the mountainous regions which formed the northern and southern extremes of their old domains.

The Maşmuda of the north (or Maşmudat al-Sābili): "M. of the shores of al-Faysān were chiefly represented by the Ghamra group [q. v.]. But, alongside of them, we find two small groups having the same racial origin:

a. The Maşmuda of the Straits, settled between the district of Ceuta, which belonged to the Ghamra and that of Tangier, a Şanhadja country. It was they who gave their name to the fortified port of Kasr Maşmuda, also called Kasr al-Madījz, the modern al-Kasr al-Saghīr. Their presence here is attested in the tenth century, for it was while fighting here against them that Ibn-Mīn, the prophet of the Ghamra, was slain; al-Buki (xiii century) knows them in the same area corresponding to that of the modern Añjia.

b. Al-Bakri mentions another group of Maşmuda (tribe of the Asādā) settled in the land lying between al-Kasr al-Kaharib and Wāzzān; there is still a small Maşmuda tribe between these two towns.

The Maşmuda of the south, who inhabited the lands between the Wādi Umm Rabī′ and the Anti-Atlas, were divided into two groups: those of the plain and those of the mountain.

a. The Southern Maşmuda of the plain lived to the north of the Great Atlas. The chief tribes were the Dukkala, the Banū Māṣr (around Safi), the Hazīta; the Aqghmat, the Ilāha (to the south of the lower course of the Tānsīf). The chief town in this region was Safi (Ar. Asf), for the town of Azemmūl [q. v.] and the rība‘ of Tīq [q. v.] were in the enclave of Şanhadja; beside the port of Safi, we must also mention that of Kar (the Aqoz of the Portuguese) at the mouth of the Tānsīf, which gave Aqghmat access to the sea and had a rība‘, and that of Amāgdīl (the Mogador of the Portuguese) which served the district of Sus. Besides these three centres, there were, as in Tāmnasā, a large number of fortified little towns (karya) many of which survived down to the xvi century; the Portuguese chroniclers, Leo Africanus and Marmol have preserved for us many names of these places which have since disappeared, their very names being lost; the local laphigraphic collections and notably the Kihāb al-Tanīwawf of al-Tadīlī (xiii century) have preserved a good deal of valuable information on this subject. At the present day all the country to the north of the Atlas is aræbic-er and if the old Berber element has not completely disappeared, it is at least overwhelmed by Arabs of whom the majority seem to be of Maqīl origin. The Ilāha alone, between Mogador and Agadir, have remained almost intact and have retained the use of the Berber language.

b. The Southern Maşmuda of the mountains occupied the Great Atlas (Jubāl Daraw), the massif of Sarwā (anc. Suwān) and the Anti-Atlas or mountains of the N部分地区 (Beth. In Gist).

In the Great Atlas, the Maşmuda extended to the east as far as the upper course of the Tānsīf (a pass called Tizīn-Telwet). From east to west, the following were the chief groups: the Galuwa; the Hailīna (or Aidana); the Warika and the Hazāda, near Aqghmat; the Asādān, including the Maṣfīwa, the Māṣīfa and the Dughāgha or Banū Dughghā; the Hittūta, including the Ghaughīya; the people of Tin-Malāl, on the upper course of the river of Nafis; the Sāda or Zaunda, in the lower valley of the Assi al-Mai; the Gadmīwa and
Lastly in the west, the Gafsa, the chief tribe of which was the Saktowa or Saksawa.

The massif of Sirwa and the high valley of the Wadi Sna were inhabited by the Banū Wawasqat and the Saktowa. The N. E. part of the Anti-Atlas was occupied by the Hargha.

Further to the south, the Šūs, properly so-called, were inhabited by heterogeneous elements of Mašmūda origin (al-Idrisī, abīlīt mīn al-Farbar al-Mašmūd). Describing the road leading from Tārīdant to Aghmāt, al-Idrisī mentions between Tārīdant and the land of the Hargha, four tribes the names of which, corrupted by the copyists, are unfortunately hardly identifiable.

Besides these highlanders, who were strictly Mašmūdā, we must mention the Haskūra (or Hāsāıkīr). These were highlanders of Ṣanḥāda origin, brethren of the Lamta and Gazāla, who led a nomadic existence to the south of the Great Atlas and the Anti-Atlas. The Haskūra were settled in the high valley of Taissit and the Wādi al-ʿAbīd, on the two slopes of the mountain range which links the Great Atlas, the home of the Mašmūdā, with the Central Atlas, the home of the Zanāga (= Ṣanḥāda) of Taḍāl; their chief tribes were the Zamtanw, the Maghīmara, the Garmna, the Ghudja-dana, the Fatwā, the Mašūfa, the Ḥalțāna, and the Ḥanūfī, who, according as they lived on one slope or the other, belonged to the Haskūra al-Ṣibla (H. of the south) or to the Haskūra al-Dīl (H. of the north). Ibn Khaldūn, who calls attention to the Ṣanḥāda origin of the Haskūra, adds that as a result of their taking up the Almohad cause, it became customary to associate them with the Mašmūda tribes, but that they never enjoyed the same privileges as these latter.

History. In 682, ʿUqba b. Nāfi marched against the Mašmūdā of the Atlas with whom he fought several battles. On one occasion he was surrounded in the mountains and owed his safety solely to the help given him by a body of Zwata, in the same year he attacked and took the town of Naffis, which was occupied by ʿRūmī and Berbers professing Christianity. Thence he went to Ḥji, a town of Šūs which he also took.

Legend adds that he even thrust his way to the Atlantic where he rode his horse into the water, calling God to witness that there were no more lands for him to conquer. This first submission of the Mašmūdā does not however seem to have lasted after the departure of ʿUqba. In 707, Mīrā b. ʿUmar had to reconquer Morocco; he himself person took Tabira and Tāḍālīt and sent his son to the conquest of Šūs and the land of the Mašmūdā.

In 735, ʿAbd al-Malik b. al-Ḥabab was appointed governor of the Maghrib; he appointed his son Mūād an assistant to the governor of Morocco and gave him particular charge of the district of Šūs.

In 735, the same ʿAbd al-Malik sent Ḥābiš, grandson of ʿUqba, to make an expedition into Šūs against the Mašmūdā and the Ṣanḥāda. Ibn al-ʿArabī of 751, in his book concerning independent governors of the Maghrib, occupied Ḥji and built a camp there, the remains of which could still be seen in al-Ikkīr's time. It is to the same governor that is attributed the making of the well which supplies the road from Tāḍālīt to Awadāh through Wādiān, the modern Mauritania.

The land of the Mašmūdā then disappears from history till the ninth century. The conquests of Idrīs I did not extend in the south beyond the Tānsatā and the Tādālīt. But in 812 Idrīs II made an expedition against the town of Naffīs; on his death in 828, his son ʿAbd (or ʿUbad) Allāh obtained as his share of the kingdom, Aghmāt, Naffīs, the lands of the Mašmūdā and of the Lamta as well as Šūs. Al-Bakrī records that some of his descendants ruled as lords of Naffīs and among the Banū Lamāt, not far from Iglī. Other Idrīsīds, descendants of Yaḥyā b. Idrīs, were at this time lords of Darā.

With the decline of Idrīsīd power in the tenth century, the Mašmūdā again became independent and were ruled by elected chiefs or inğdārīn (= Arabic ʿāṣirī); al-Bakrī tells us that those of Aghmāt were appointed by the people for a term of one year. When at the end of the tenth century, Zanītā principalities became established in Morocco (at Fās, Shābīla and Tāḍālīt), Māǧrāwā established themselves at Aghmāt, but all we know of them is that they were attacked by the Almoravids. In 1057, after receiving the submission of Šūs and of the Mašmūdā (Zawāda, Shāfijīwā, Gānmīwā, Kagraqā and Ḥīffā), the Almoravid chief ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūsuf took Aghmāt; the last Mašmūdā ruler of which, Lagūt b. ʿAlī, fled to the famous Ḥafṣāwā, who was one of the Nafīzāwā, finally became the wife of Yūsuf b. Ṭasfīn whom she initiated into the fine art of diplomacy.

From 1057 Aghmāt was the capital of the Almoravids till 1062, when Yūsuf b. Ṭasfīn founded Marrakush (q. v.). In 1074 the same ruler, having divided his empire among several governors, gave his son Tamun the governorship of Marrakush, Aghmāt, of the Mašmūdā and of Šūs, then of Tāḍālīt and Tānsatā.

The Mašmūdā seem to have remained subject to the Almoravids till the rebellion in 1212 provoked by the Ṣuḥāl b. Tamart (q. v.) of the tribe of Hargha, who, supported by ʿUmar Intī, šākh of the Ḥintāta, and by ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin (q. v.), brought about the foundation of the Almohad dynasty (q. v.). The history of the Mašmūdā is henceforth involved with that of the dynasty which they brought to power and which was to last till 1269. The Mašmūdā, together with the Almohad dynasty, thus contributed to the rise of the Ḥifṣids (q. v.), who ruled over Ifṣkiyā from 1228 to 1274, through the descendants of ʿAbd Ḥajj ʿUrām Intī, šākh of the Ḥintāta.

During the first half of the xiiith century, the power of the Almohads, routed by the Christians of Spain at the battle of Ḥiṣna al-ʿUbbā (las Navas de Tolosa) in 1212 and vigorously attacked in Morocco by the Bandār Marīn, soon began to decline. The Mašmūdā of the Atlas, indifferent to the fate of the dynasty, took advantage of its plight to regain their independence. It was the tribes of the Ḥintāta and the Haskūra, which in 1224 at the proclamation of al-ʿAdīd assumed the leadership in the movement; frequently allied with the Ḥiḍī Arabs of the plains, Sāfīyān and Khūlūt, they found them fighting in all the civil wars and supporting various pretenders to the throne.

When in 1260, the Marinids had definitely crushed the Almohads, the Mašmūdā retained a certain amount of independence and lived more or less in submission to the central power, ruled by chiefs chosen from the great local families: Awdāl Yūmūn among the Ḥintāta; Awdāl Saʿd Allāh among the Gānmīwā, among the Saksawa, ʿUrām b. Ḥaddī
was an independent chief who went so far as to claim the Berber title agellid (=: king). In Sūs the Banū Yaddar founded an independent principality which lasted from 1254 till about 1340. As to the Ḥaskūra, the power among them was exercised by the Banū Ḥaṭṭāb.

Down to the xvth century, except during the first half of the reign of the Almohad dynasty of which they had been the principal supporters, the Maṣmūda of the Atlas were hardly ever under the direct rule of the Moroccan government; only the tribes of the plains, Ḍukkāla and Ḥaṭṭa in a position to dominate as a result of their geographical situation, were able to offer less resistance and had to submit. The later dynasties, Saʿdīan and ʿAlawī, were no better able to subdue the Maṣmūda of the highlands; but instead of gathering round local chiefs with temporal power, the latter now placed themselves under the leadership of holy men with religious prestige.

In the beginning of the xvth century, the land of the Maṣmūda was in a state of anarchy. Some ʿāghwiyāh of the tribe of the Ḥimāṭa held the lands of Marrakush; the most famous was Abū Ṣuqumūt; to the south of Tāsifft, the xvth century saw the rise of a group of Ṣūqumūt; Sūs: Tābnad. For about a century, the power of the mycēk an-Diẓūli [q. v.] spread among the Ḥaṭṭa. In the adjoining country of Darʿa, the Saʿdīan dynasty was rising, which after occupying Sūs imposed its domination on the whole of Morocco.

But it did not however succeed in subjecting completely the highlanders of the Atlas. The powerful Aḥmad al-Maṣnūr himself had to fight against a pretender who had proclaimed himself king of the Saksawa.

After the death of al-Maṣnūr, the Atlas and Sūs were all under the authority of local religious leaders of whom the most important were to be found among the Ḥaṭṭa and in Tāzaraṭ (family of Aḥmad U-Milā). It was the ʿAlawī Sulṭān Mawlāy Raḍīḥ who restored Sūs and the Atlas to the Moroccan empire. The only episode to note is the foundation in Tāzaraṭ, by a marabout Saiyīdi Ḥiṣḥān of a kind of independent kingdom, the capital of which was Ṭīghīt and which lasted from the end of the xvth century till 1856.

Henceforth the Maṣmūda disappear from history. The Atlas remained more or less independent, according to the degree of power of the ruling sovereigns, but all the important events in the region took place among the Ḥaṭṭa or in Sūs [q.v.].

The French occupation took the old Maṣmūda groups, since the death of the ʿAlawī Sulṭān Mawlāy al-Ḥasan, into three bodies each under the authority of a local family: the Glāwa in the east, the Gunṭafā in the centre, and the Mṭugga in the west. The only one now in existence is the Glāwa; as a result of the disappearance of their leaders, the two others were recently broken up.

The name Maṣmūda, still preserved in the north of Morocco in the name of a little tribe of al-Ḳāṣr al-Kabīr, seems to have completely disappeared in the south, where the former Maṣmūda peoples, continuing to talk Berber, bear the name of Ṣulṭān [q. v.]. It is probable that the name Maṣmūda, which is found so often in the Arab historians and geographers, was ever in regular use among the peoples to whom they applied it; it is, indeed, suggestive that it is not found in the long lists of ethnics given in the Kitāb al-Ansūb, published in the Documents inédits d'Histoire Almoravide.

Sociology. The Maṣmūda of the Atlas lead a settled life, living by a little agriculture and breeding a poor type of cattle; they live in villages or hamlets of stonehouses with clay roofs. Ibn Ḥaḍūd notes the existence among them of numerous little strongholds and fortified villages (māḍṣīl wa-ḥṣīn), the ancestors of the modern fitrens and agādīrs. There were no towns among the mountains; Tin Mallal, famous for the mosque where Ibn Ḥaḍūd was invited, was never a town. Before the Almavārīd ruler Yūsuf b. Tashfīn founded Marrakush in 1062, built moreover in the plains out of reach of the highlanders, whom it was to control, the only urban centres in the district were situated at the foot of the Atlas on its lowest slopes. The principal towns were in the north, the double town of Aghmāt [q. v.] and that of Nafisī on the river of the same name: in the south, in Sūs, Ḥiṣḥat and Tābnad; as places of less importance we may mention in the north, Shāfāwā (mod.: Shīfāwā), Aṣfān and Tamarūr; in the east, among the Ḥaṭṭa and in the borders of Shīshāwā. The great trade-routes which traversed the region started from Ṭiṣrīn and led to the port of Kūr (at the north of the Lānīfīt), Fās (via Ṭiṣrīn), Sīḍīmīsā (through the land of the Ḥaḍrāja and the Ḥaskūra), and Sūs (via Nafisī, the land of the Banū Māḡīs and Ḥiṣḥat; no doubt using the pass now called Tira-n-Ṭeṣṭ). Al-Bakrī particularly mentions the industry and application and the thirst for gain, characteristic of the Maṣmūda of the Atlas and of Sūs. The principal products of the country were fruits (nuts and almonds), honey and oil of argan (kargān, argān), a tree peculiar to the country, of which there were regular forests among the Ḥaṭṭa. The Maṣmūda could eat and work iron and also copper, which they exported in the form of ingots or "loaves" (Gangāl); they also worked and chased silver jewellery. In Sūs also the cultivation of the sugar-cane enabled sugar to be made.

From the intellectual point of view, the Maṣmūda seem to occupy a place of first rank among the Berbers. Each of their three principal groups has produced a reforming prophet, the author of sacred works in the Berber language: Ḥa-Mim of the Ghumar; Ṣāliḥ b. Ṣarīf of the Baraghāwā; Ibn Tūmar of the Maṣmūda of the Atlas. It may also be noted that, Sūs is one of those few districts in which books were written in Berber down to a quite recent date (cf. H. Basset, Études sur la littérature des Berbères, p. 73-81).

As regards religion, the Maṣmūda were converted to Islam in the viith century by ʿUkha b. Našīf, who left his comrade Shīkīr among them to teach the new religion. The latter died among them and was buried on the banks of the Tāṣīf where his tomb is still venerated. The place is now called Ṭirāb Saiyīdī Ṣūkār near the confluence with the river of the Shīshāwā. The Mosque of the town of Aghmāt of the Ḥaṭṭa was founded at the beginning of the eighth century in 704.

Ibn Ḥaḍūd describes the Maṣmūda of the Atlas as being not only the descendants from the first conquest, in which they suffered from their barbarous neighbours, the Berberes, who remained faithful to their heretical beliefs. At the beginning of the eighth century, several
of them accompanied Tarik on his conquest of Spain: the best known of these was Kuthayyir b. Wazîd b. Shamîl, of the tribe of the Abas, who settled in Spain and was the grandfather of Yalib b. Yahyâ, one of the rulers of the Musawwa; many others also settled in Spain and their descendants played important parts under the Omaysi.

In the eleventh century however, al-Bakri notes the hereditary among the Masmûda; these were the Banu Lamâs settled to the north of the Harqah and the town of Igli. In this district he also mentions the existence of idolaters who worshipped a ram: perhaps we have here a relic of the cult of the god Ammon among the ancient Berbers. The towns however formed important centres of Muslim culture, the influence of which was felt not only by the Masmûda of the district but also by the Shanâdja of the adjoining deserts: Lamata and Gazzala. We know that it was in the town of Naffis, with Wâggag b. Zollî, a learned jurist of Lamata origin and a pupil of Abû 'Irân al-Fâdi of al-Kaiaraîn, that in 1039 Yahyâ b. Ibrahim al-Guddâl recruited 'Abd Alâî b. Yâsîn al-Gazzali who was the promoter of the Almoravid movement. For the Almoravid period al-Taflî's hagiographic collection, entitled Kitâb al-Tadhqîqat al-wasif shows us the land of the Masmûda of the south full of wonder-working saints. Later the tribe of the Ragîga, settled on the lands now occupied by the Shajûma, was the cradle of a movement at once religious and charitable, the details of which are little known but the memory still alive. In the first half of the xivth century, religious activity seems to be concentrated in the south of Sîlah in Tawarqat where the descendants of the saint Sayîdî Ahmad U-Masjî carved themselves out an independent marabout principality.


G. S. Coats

Al-MAŞMUGHÂN, A Zoroastrian DYNASTY whom the Arabs found in the region of Dunbâwând (Dunbâwand) to the north of Rayî.

The origins of the Masmûghân dynasty. The dynasty seems to have been an old one though not particularly celebrated one as is shown by the legend recorded by Ibn al-Fâkih, p. 275-297 and in al-Biruni, p. 227. The title of masmûghân has been conferred by Farîdân upon Armaîl, Durâwârî's former cook (Zohâk), who had been able to save half the young men destitute of thrash in the wake of the tyrant's serpents. Armaîl (according to Yahyâ, ii. 606, a Nalataean, a native of the Zalî) showed himself to Farîdân in the mountains of Dablam and Shiriz, a whole nation of these refugees, which caused Farîdân to exclaim: "waâd dina adâd radârdâr, which is explained to mean: "What a large number of people of the house (alâšiq) that has saved that has saved''

The first historical reference to a masmûghân is found in Tabari's (i, 2658) account of the taking of Rayî by Naushir b. Ma'âshin in the years 18, 21 or 22; Marquart however puts these events as late as 98 (716-717). The King of Rayî, Siyyâwâd b. Mihrân b. Bahram-Cobin, had received reinforcements from the people of Dunbâwand, but when he was defeated, the masmûghân of Dunbâwand made peace at once with the Arabs and their position was at Farîdân's disposal (alâshiq naâdî naâdî la masmûghân) offering an annual payment of 200,000 dinars. The charter given by Naushir was addressed "to the masmûghân of Dunbâwand, Murad-dâjâh, to the people of Dunbâwand, of Khwâr, of Lâriz (Lâriqjân) and of Shiriz". This gives us an idea of the extent of the sway of the masmûghân. His possessions included the country round Mount Damâwând (q.v.) and stretched down the plains as far as the east of Rayî. The district of Dunbâwand (Dunbâwand, the land occupied by) the *Dunbâ clan* did not form part of Tabaristan. The Arabs mention it along with Rayî (Tabari, i., 2653-2656; Naushâhri, p. 209; Ibn al-Fâkih, p. 275-277) but as we have seen at the time of the conquest, Rayî and Dunbâwand were under different dynasties. The old capital of Dunbâwand may have been at Murad-dân, where, according to Ibn al-Fâkih, 'Armaîl had built a wondrous house of teak and ebony, which in the reign of Hârîn of Raishid was taken to pieces and transported to Baghâd. In the Arab period there were two towns in Dunbâwand: Wîmâ and Shâlamâra (the latter is marked on Stahil's map to the south of the modern town of Damâwând, which lies on the slopes of Mount Damâwând). According to Yâkût, the masmûghân's principal stronghold was called Durnâwân or Dunbâwand. This should be sought above the village of Reînâr, which must correspond to the old Kâryast al-Hâdâm, Ibn al-Fâkih's story of the shops (hawânî) in which worked the smiths, the noise of whose hammers excited the enameled Bûwâshâp must refer to the chambers carved out of the rock near Reînâ; cf. Crawshay-Williams, Rock-Dwellings at Reinâr, Z. A. S., 1904, p. 551; 1906, p. 217).

An attempt made by Abû Muslim in 131 to conquer the masmûghân was a disastrous failure: his general Mi'âb b. Kâ'b was attacked by the masmûghân's men and on account of the difficult nature of the country (lîdî lâlîdî) he was forced to return to Rayî (Ibn al-Âlibîr, v. 364; cf. Hâfiz Abîrî in Dorn, Antwerg, p. 441).

The principality was not conquered until 141. In this period there were dissensions in the family of the masmûghân. Abârâwî b. al-Âsâmûn b. al-Masâmûn quarelled with his brother and went over to the caliph al-Mas-âdîr who gave him a pension (Tabari, iii, 130). The Kitâb al-'iyân wa-l-haddîk, p. 228, testifies to his bravery in the rising of the Râwândiya and calls him "al-Masâmûn Maiîk b. Dinâr, Malik of Dunbâwand." This Abârwî (or Maiîk) had enjoyed considerable influence, for, according to Ibn al-Fâkih, the appointment of Omar b. 'Ali as commander of the army sent against Tabaristân was made on the advice of Abârwî who had known him since the trouble with Sumbâdî (on the partisans of this "Khurrami") in Tabaristân (cf. Reînâ, Reînâr, vi. 188) and with the Râwândiya.

In the year 141, the brother of Abârwî who occupied the throne of Dunbâwand was at war with his father-in-law, the ispaâhâd Khurshid of Tabaristân; but when he heard that the forces sent by al-Masâmûr were on their way to Tabaristân, he hastened to effect a reconciliation with his adversary (Tabari, iii, 136; Ibn al-Âlibîr, v. 386).
The stories of the campaign against Tabaristan directed by al-Mahdi by order of his father al-Mansur are very contradictory as is shown by their very detailed analysis in Vasmer, op. cit. After the defeat of the ispahbad, the Arabs conquered the masmughan and captured him and his daughters Bakhtariya (a) and Smyr (b) Shakla. Of these princesses one became the wife of Mahdi b. Mansur and the other the "num-wa-alad" of 'Ali b. Ra'i. According to a story in Ibn al-Fakih, p. 314, Khalid b. Barmaq (Vasmer, op. cit., p. 100) thought the expedition was sent especially against the lord of Dunbawand (the masmughan) and his wife and his two daughters to Baghdad, but in another passage, p. 275, the same writer says that the masmughan obtained "armâl" from Mahdi b. Mansur and came down from the mountain of al-Aiain (a). He was taken to Ray and there Mahdi ordered him to be beheaded.

After the death of the masmughan, the people of these mountain regions lapsed into barbarism (hawziya) and became like wild beasts (Tabari, iii. 136). According to Ibn al-Fakih (p. 276) however, the descendants of the masmughan (re Armâl?) were still well known.

Spiegel's and Marquart's hypotheses. Yâkût i. 244 interprets "masmughan as kalâr al-mugib" the 'great one of the magi" (mas, "great"; N.W. Iranian form). Spiegel thought of connecting this dynasty with the prince-priests of Rayi, whose existence is known from a well-known passage in the Avesta (Yâkût, ix. 15, transl. Darmesteter, i. 170; cf. Jackson, Zoroaster, p. 202—205). In spite of Marquart's criticisms, which says it is impossible to quote the authority of Avestan traditions which relate to much earlier state of affairs, Spiegel's suggestion is still of interest. We have certainly to deal with vague memories and not with actual facts. In the time of the Arab conquest the descendants of Bahram-Cobin were ruling in Rayi, but the Arabs (Tabari, i. 2653—2656) installed there a certain al-Zâinabi, son of Kûla and father of al-Furukhân. It remains to be seen if this family of Zainbad, "whom the Arabs call al-Zâinabi" (Balâghurt, p. 317) is connected with Dunbawand. Their stronghold in Rayi was called "Arin (c) which resembles the name of the mountain al-Aiain from which the last masmughan came down (cf. the note by de Goeje in Ibn al-Fakih, p. 275). Marquart wanted to connect the masmughans of the Bawand dynasty, the eponymous ancestor of which, Baw, a descendant of Kayils, brother of Khusraw I, is said to have lived in the time of the later Sásânians. This Baw was a man of piety and after the fall of Yazdâdird III had retired to his father's fire-temple. Marquart regards him as a "magus" and identifies him with the father of the Christian martyr Anastasius, who bore this name (829) and was a "master of magian lore". Lastly he quotes the fact that the Bawâinds appeared in 167 only after the disappearance of the masmughan (after 141) as if to continue their line. Unfortunately several details of the ingenious argument are not accurate: our sources (Ibn Isfandiyâr, Zahir al-Din p. 204—205) give not the slightest suggestion that Baw belonged to the priestly caste. According to Ibn Isfandiyâr (transl. Browne, p. 98), his grandfather's temple was at Kûsan, which Rabino, p. 160, locates a little distance west of Ashraf i.e. quite remote from Dunbawand. The passage in Tabari, iii. 1294, which Marquart quotes to prove the occurrence of the name Masmughan among the Bawand dynasty, refers to the cousin of Mziyâr of the Kârinid dynasty, which is quite different from the Bawand (cf. below).

The Kârinid masmughâns. It is curious that neither Ibn Isfandiyâr nor Zahir al-Din speak of the dynasty of the masmughân of Dunbawand, perhaps because they do not include this region in Tabaristan proper. On the other hand, they mention a masmughân (masmughân > masmughân) Walâsh, who was the marzubân of Miyan-du-rûd (Zahir al-Din, p. 42) and says that this canton was also the Sâri between the rivers Kalârud and Mihrubân and that on the east it adjoined Kâruughân; Miyan-du-rûd is thus quite close to where Rabino puts Kûsan!). This masmughân Walâsh (Ibn Isfandiyâr, p. 101; Zahir al-Din, p. 42) lived in the time of Djamâspid Farrukhân the Great (709—722) and belonged to the elder branch of the Kârinids descended from Zâmir b. Sûkhân. (We do not know why Justi, p. 430, takes this Walâsh as the son of the last masmughân of Dunbawand?). The Kârinid Wandâd Hurmuruz (of the younger line, descended from Kûrin, brother of Zâmir) in his rising against the caliph (cf. Mahdi, p. 153—159) had combined with the ispahbad Shâr- warned (772—797) and the masmughân Walâsh of Miyan-du-rûd. This latter (Ibn Isfandiyâr, p. 126; Zahir al-Din, p. 155) seems to have been one of the successors of the masmughân Walâsh mentioned above.

Under 224 (838) Tabari (iii. 1294) mentions a cousin of the Kârinid Mziyân, who was called Shâhriyâr b. al-Masmughân. According to this, al-Masmughân would be identical with Wandâd Ummid, uncle of Mziyân (cf. Justi, p. 439). On the other hand under the year 250 (864), Tabari, iii. 1529, mentions a Masmughân (re) among the allies of the 'Alî Hasan b. Zaid. Ibn Isfandiyâr, p. 165 calls him Masmughân b. Wandâd-Ummid. One must either suppose there is an error in Tabari's genealogy or admit that the title of masmughân was borne both by Wandâd-Ummid and his son, but the form of the designation of the former (مصادح) with the article) would rather show that the title had become a simple proper name (Brown is wrong in translating "the Masmughân").

To sum up then: Alongside of the masmughâns of Dunbawand, we have the masmughâns of Miyan-du-rûd. These masrûlûn, if we may rely on Zahir al-Din, belonged to the Zârânurí branch of the dynasty of Sûkhân (Sásânian governor of Tabaristan descended from Kûrin, son of the famous smith Kâwa). Later we find the title (or proper name!) of masmughân recurring in the younger branch of the line of Sûkhân (the Kârinid branch), which occupied a position in Tabaristan subordinate to the Bawandid ispahbads (Zahir al-Din, p. 154, 14).

Bibliography: Tabari, i. 2656; iii. 130, 136 (1294, 1529); Ibnûn, al-Azâr 'alâ al-bâhiya, p. 101 (transl. i. 109), p. 227 (transl. p. 213); Kitâb al-'Uyun wa-l-Hadâ'îd, ed. de Goeje and de Jong, p. 228; Ibn al-Athîr, ii. 18; v. 304, 386—387; Ibn Isfandiyâr, index; Yâkût, i. 243—244 ('Utûmawân); ii. 665—666 (Dunbawand); Zahir al-Din, index; Spiegel, "Iran. Alterkulturkunde", i. 152; Spiegel, "Uhr. Altr. Vaterland d. Avesta", Z. D. M. G., xxx., 1881, p. 629—645; Justi, Iran. Namensbuch, p. 350 (tables); Marquart, "Beiträge", Z. D. M. G., xlix., 1895,
MASSA (Berber MASSAT), the name of a small Berber tribe of Morocco of Sās, settled some 20 miles south of Agadir at the mouth of the Wādi Massa; the latter is probably the ḥumum masatat mentioned by Pliny the Elder (v. 9) to the north of the ḥumum Darat, the modern Wādi Darā, and the Massatas of the geographer would correspond to the modern aḥl Massāt.

The name Massa is associated with the first Arab conquest of Morocco; according to legend, it was on the shore there that, after conquering Sūs, 'Uṯman b. ʿAbdAllāh drove his steeds into the waves of the Atlantic calling God to witness that there were no more lands to conquer on the west. In any case, Massa appears very early as an important religious and commercial centre, Al-Yaḥyā b. ʿAbdAllāh (end of the third = ninth century) notes that the harbour here and mentions a ribāṭ already renowned, that of Bahālī. Al-Bakri and al-Idrisī mention the harbour of Massat; al-Bakri emphasizes the fame of the ribāṭ and the importance of the forts held there. Ibn Khaldūn devotes several passages in his Kitāb al-ṭabārīn to the ribāṭ of Massa, where according to popular belief the expected Mahdi or Fāṭimid was to appear; this belief induced many devout people to go and settle in this ribat and also sent many travellers there to raise rebellions.

Towards the end of the tenth century, the religious movement begun by al-Ḥarīrī made Massa one of the great masāyis of Sās. In the middle of the 15th century Leo Africanus describes Massa as a group of three little towns surrounded by a stone wall in the middle of a forest of palm-trees; the inhabitants were agriculturists and turned the rising of the waters of the Wādi to their advantage. Outside the town on the sea-shore was a very venerable "temple", from which the Mahdi was to come; a peculiar feature of it was that the little lagoons in it were formed of ribs of whalebone: the sea actually throws up many cetaceans on this coast and ambergris was collected there; local legend moreover says that it was on the shore of Massa that Jonah was cast up by the whale.

After the fall of the Ṣaḍānids, the development of the Marabout principality of Tāzarwāl again made Massa a commercial centre. The port was frequented by Europeans but it was soon supplanted by that of Agadir. The rapid decline of the principality of Tāzarwāl and the steadily increasing influence of the central Moroccan power finally destroyed almost completely any religious and economic importance of Massa.


MASʿUĐ, Abu Saʿīd, the eldest son of Sulṭān Ṭabāqta of Ghazna, was born in the year 388 (998). In 406 (1015-1016), Sulṭān Ṭabāqta nominated him his heir-apparent, and two years later made him governor of Herāt. In 411 (1020), at the command of his father, he led an expedition to Chūr and reduced the north-western part to submission. Shortly after this, he was disgraced and sent as a prisoner to Multān, but he was soon taken back into favour and was reinstated in his government at Herāt. When the province of Egypt was conquered in 420 (1030) Sulṭān Ṭabāqta placed it under Masʿūd who, after subjugating the outlying parts, conquered Hamadān and Ḩosain from their Buwayhid ruler, ʿAlī al-Dawla b. Kākawī, in the beginning of 421 (1030), and was making preparations for further conquest when news arrived of the death of his father and the succession to the throne of his brother Abīl Ṭāhir Muḥammad. Masʿūd hurried to Ghazna to claim the throne. In the meantime, the army tired of Muḥammad, deposed him, and had the ḥumma said in the name of Masʿūd. Muḥammad was blinded and sent to the fort of Manṣūrī, and Masʿūd ascended the throne in Shaʿwārī, 421 (October 1030), about 5 months after the death of his father. The Caliph al-Kādir b. ʿAbdAllāh conferred on him the titles of Naṣr b. ʿAbdAllāh, Ḥabīb b. Ṭāhir, Ḥusain, and Šahrizābāl al-Ṣāliḥīn. In 422 (1031), Sulṭān Ṭabāqta sent an army to punish Ḫusain, the ruler of Murrān, for his rebellion. Ḫusain was defeated and put to death, and his brother named Abu l-Muʿāṣkar was placed on the throne. In 424 (1032-1033), Masʿūd laid siege to a fort named Sarastī in the southern Kashmir hills, took it by assault and returned to Ghazna in the spring. After this he attacked Tabaristan, as the ruler of that country, named Abīl Kālimjīr, had adopted a hostile attitude, and captured Astarābād. Abū Kālimjīr was forced to offer submission and to promise to pay annual tribute. About the end of 426 (October 1033), Ṭabāqta b. Nīyālīgīm, the governor of Lahore, rebelled. Masʿūd sent against him one of his Hindī generals who was defeated and slain in battle. He then sent another Hindī general named Tīlak, who defeated Abīl Ṭāhir and forced him to fly to Sind where he was drowned while attempting to cross the river Indus. About the end of 427 (October 1036), Masʿūd led an expedition to India, took the forts of Hānṣt and Sūnpāt and returned to Ghazna, leaving his son Muṣṭāfī as the governor of the Punjab. In 430 (1039), Masʿūd crossed the Oξus to punish Pūṭīq, son of Ṭalḥīg, ruler of Bukhārā, for his hostility, but before he could accomplish anything he received news that the Saldžūqs were advancing to Bālḵ to cut off his retreat, and he immediately returned to Khurāsān.

Early in his reign, Sulṭān Masʿūd had been called upon to deal with the Saldžūqs whose power had considerably increased during the period of disturbance following the death of Sultan Ṭabāqta. They raided Herāt as early as 422 (1031) but were repulsed with heavy loss at Farāwāv and forced to take refuge in the Bālḵān Mountains. This however did not stop their activities, and by 425 (1033-1034) they had started to make systematic incursions into Khurāsān. In Shabān 426 (June, 1035) Masʿūd sent against them two of his generals, the Ḥādīj b. Baktrghūdī and Ḥusain "Ali b. Mikatāllī, who inflicted a crushing defeat on them, but while the Ghaznavid troops were engaged in plundering the camp of their vanquished foes, a body of the Saldžūqs under Dāwādīr issued from the hills, fell upon their disorderly ranks, and made fearful slaughter among them. Husain "Ali was taken prisoner, and
Bakhtoghdā managed to escape. Instead of marching against the Saldjūks, Masʿūd wasted his time in a fruitless expedition to India in 427, as stated above, and the result was that they became bolder and more powerful. In 428 (1036—1037), they captured Balkh, but retired to Marw at the approach of Sultan Masʿūd, and sued for peace. Masʿūd gladly consented to it, but it was only a shampeace and when Masʿūd started on his return march to Ghazna, the Saldjūks fell upon his rear and put many of his soldiers to death. Masʿūd turned round and took terrible revenge for this treachery. The Saldjūks redoubled their efforts against the Sultan, and won over the people of Sarakhs, Nasā and Baward to their side. Masʿūd now personally took the field against them. The Saldjūks advanced to meet him under their leader Tughrīl. The two armies met at Dandānakān on 8th Ramadān, 431 (May 23, 1040). Masʿūd fought bravely but being deserted by his generals and finding himself surrounded on all sides by the enemy, he fought his way out of the field of battle and managed to reach Ghazna in safety.

The Saldjūks had evidently become too strong for him, and he resolved to withdraw to India, possibly with a view to gaining a respite and preparing a large army there to retrieve his affairs. He left Ghazna with all his treasure, and accompanied by his captive brother Abu ʿAbd al-Muḥammad. At Ribāṭ-i Mārkalak, shortly after crossing the river Indus, his slaves rebelled against him, plundered his treasure, and, being joined by the rest of the army, they seized Masʿūd and proclaimed the blind Muḥammad as their sovereign. Masʿūd was sent as a prisoner to a fort where he was put to death on 11th Dhuʾl-Ḥijjah, 432 (January 17, 1041). His reign had lasted 10 years and three months.

Masʿūd was a man of strong build and great physical strength. He was brave and generous, but he lacked the wisdom of his father, and early in his reign, he lost the co-operation of his officers by foolishly attempting to bring about the ruin of the old servants of the House on the advice of his young and ambitious courtiers, and demanding the return of the money which Muḥammad had distributed among them at the time of his succession to the throne. Masʿūd was a great lover of learning, and numerous scholars had assembled at his court, one of whom was the famous ʿAbd Allāh al-Bīrūnī who dedicated some of his greatest works to him. Several poets sang his praises and were given manifold rewards. He adorned his capital with beautiful buildings, and the New Palace with its magnificent throne was one of the wonders of the times.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-ʿĀyān, ed. Wustenfeld, No. 731 (de Slane’s trans., iii. 356); Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, al-Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, xi., xii., passim; Weil, Gesch. des Chilifens, iii. 355, 394—396, 400 sq.; Recueil des historiens des croisades, Hist. or., index; de Zambuir, Manuel de géologie et de chronologie, p. 226 sq.; Lane-Poole, The Mohammedan Dynasties, p. 162 sqq. (K. V. Zettersten)

**Masʿūd B. Muhammad Abū l-Faḍl Shirvānī al-Dīn, a Saldjūk ruler in the ‘Ifrīqīy (529—547 = 1134—1152).** Like Muḥammad’s other sons, Masʿūd, when quite a child, was entrusted to an atābeg to be educated, namely the celebrated emir Mawdūd and when the latter was murdered, Ak ʿSonktor and Ali K ʿDjuvūsh Beg acted successively as Masʿūd’s tutors. The latter, an ambitious emir, in the beginning of Muḥammad’s reign tried to secure the sultanate for his protégé, then an eleven-year-old boy, but the attempt failed; in an encounter with Muḥammad’s troops he was put to flight and Masʿūd as well as his warī, the famous Arab poet al-Tughrī (q. v.), were taken prisoners (514 = 1120). On the fate of the poet see the article on him. Masʿūd was pardoned and later given Gandja by his brother, (534), his son Dāwūd was at first recognised as sultan but Sandjāl decided that Masʿūd’s brother Tughrī should be sultan. Masʿūd soon made peace with Dāwūd, after some fighting near Tabriz, and sought to obtain from the caliph al-Mustarshīd that the latter should mention him in the khaṭba in
Baghdad. The caliph, who had been approached with the same object by another brother of Mas'ud named Saldjük and his atabeg Karağaçlı, found himself forced to accede to both by having Mas'ud's name mentioned first, followed by that of Saldjük. He also collected his forces to go in alliance with them against Sandjar, but when he withdrew, so that Mas'ud and Saldjük had to continue the struggle against their uncle alone and they were routed by him near a hill called Pandy Anghuşht in the neighbourhood of Dinawar (1132). Sandjar however allowed Mas'ud to return unhindered to Gondja and at the end of the same year Mas'ud found an opportunity to go to Baghdad where Dāwūd also now was. Both princes were received by the caliph in public audience and given robes of honour and other tokens of esteem. Homage was paid to Mas'ud as sultan and to Dāwūd as heir-apparent. Thereafter he fought with varying fortune against his brother Tughrill and after the latter's premature death (528-539 = 1134) was generally recognised as sultan. Anushārwan b. Khash, the caliph's vizier, now was given the office of vizier to the sultan. Soon afterwards however, a number of Turkish emirs became dissatisfied with Mas'ud because they had felt themselves insulted by the advancement of Kara Sonkor, the powerful emir of Adharbādjan, and were able to win the caliph over to their party. In the hope that Dāwūd would join him, he went with some 7,000 horsemen towards Hamadān, where Mas'ud then was, but when the sultan's troops met him at Dāmarg, his own men left him in the lurch or even over to Mas'ud so that he and his vizier and other high officials were taken prisoners (529 = 1135). The sultan, it is true, treated him with deference, and began to discuss terms of peace, but he did not release him. He took him with him to Maragha, where in the same year (cf. the various dates given: Well, Gesch. der Chilījen, ii. 331, note 4) he was murdered by a number of ulama. The murderers were apparently hired by the sultan, on the advice of Sandjar, who had been stirred up against the Caliph by Dubaisi [q.v.]. The latter, who also was with Mas'ud, was soon afterwards treacherously slain by him. These deeds of violence naturally made a very bad impression on Dāwūd and Saldjük began again to bestir themselves; the new caliph al-Khash b. illah, a son of al-Mustaṣṣid, adopted a hostile attitude and other Turkish emirs, notably Zangl, the lord of al-Mawṣul, began to be inordinate; in a word, anarchy soon prevailed everywhere. But when Mas'ud returned to Baghdad with his troops they all retired. Mas'ud thereupon had the caliph, who had escaped with Zangl to al-Mawṣul, arrested by a force of the kadi's and jurists and approved the appointment of al-Maṭfa (530 = 1136). After peace had in this way been to some extent restored, Mas'ud thought he might now devote himself to his pleasures and remained the whole year of 1137 in Baghdad in comparative inactivity, without allowing his leisure to be disturbed by a demonstration by the mob of the capital, which was intended to remind him that it was his duty to wage war upon the unbelievers. Once again several Turkish emirs rebelled and tried to bring Dāwūd to the front again; among them the most dangerous were 'Abd al-Rāhmān b. Tughanyerek, lord of Kalkhāl, and particularly the prince Mingi-bars, whom Sandjar after Kara's death had sent to Fārs and who was vigorously supported by his deputy in Khuzistān, Buzāba. Mas'ud, it is true, sent troops against them under Kara Sonkor but they had to retire, and a battle was only fought when Mas'ud himself came up, at Kūshānbe near Hamadān (532 = 1138). The sultan was at first victorious and put Mingi-bars whom he had captured, to death; but when his troops were scattered plundering the enemy's camp, Buzāba fell suddenly upon them so that he and Kara Sonkor had narrow escapes and some twelve of the emirs with him were captured and all put to death by Buzāba. Fortunately for Mas'ud, Buzāba did not pursue him, but was content with occupying Fārs; the sultan was also able to make peace with Dāwūd, and the deposed caliph was murdered in Isfahan on Ramaḍān 25, 532 (June 6, 1138). The sultan's position however was not one whit better, for the different provinces of the empire were in the hands of powerful emirs, who not only paid no heed to the sultan, but occasionally appeared in open rebellion against him in the name of various Saldjük princes whose atabegs they were. The most powerful of these was still Kara Sonkor who began a war on Buzāba to avenge his son, who had been murdered by the latter. When he approached, however, Buzāba withdrew into an inaccessible citadel and when Kara Sonkor retired, he took prisoner the prince Saldjük whom he had appointed to rule over Fārs and then continued to rule in Fārs as atabeg of two sons of Muḥammad, Malikshāh and Muḥammad. After the death of Kara Sonkor, who died in 535 of a broken heart after the great losses he suffered in the terrible earthquake in Gondja in 533 (1138), Čawli al-Dānār took his place and like his predecessor was generally attached to Mas'ud. Buzāba's attempt along with another emir named 'Abbāb [q.v.], who had gained an influential position in al-Kay, to put the sultan's youngest brother Sulaimān on the throne therefore failed. Mas'ud invited this prince to come to him and when he came he was imprisoned in spite of the sultan's promise. Čawli died in 541 (1146) in the same year as Zangl and in the following year 'Abd al-Rāhmān and 'Abbāb were disposed of by assassination so that Buzāba alone remained of the enemies of Mas'ud. Buzāba now set out for Hamadān to attack the sultan, but not far from this city was taken prisoner in a fierce battle and executed (542 = 1147). The princes Muḥammad and Malikshāh who were with him escaped. Mas'ud afterwards sent for the latter, gave him his daughter in marriage and designated him his successor. In these negotiations the sultan followed the advice of his favourite beg Arslān b. Balangari, best known by the title Khāṣṣeg, who in this way disposed of all his rivals, but at the same time aroused great discontent so that even the aged Sandjar came once more to al-Raj to remonstrate with his nephew (544 = 1149). But all this was in vain; and when in 547 (1152) Mas'ud died, Khāṣṣeg put Malikshāh upon the throne; when in a short time the latter showed himself quite incapable, he sent for Muḥammad, who had Khāṣṣeg treacherously murdered.

Bibliography: In the article Seldjucks. — Ibn Khallikan's article on Mas'ud (Bulūk edition 1299, ii. 531) is of no importance. (M. Th. HOUTSMA)

MAS'UD b. SAD b. SALMAN, a poet in Arabic and Persian, was born in Lhore. His father
remained for a considerable time in the service of the kings of Ghazna and had become the possessor of great wealth and lands in Lāhore and other parts of India. After his father’s death these lands were confiscated by the Governor of Lāhore and Mas'ud was compelled to proceed to Ghazna to demand justice, but there also his enemies were able to put him to more troubles and bring against him a false accusation, which caused him to be imprisoned. He at last through the recommendation of Mas'ūd b. Sulṭān Ibrahim was permitted to return to India and take possession of his estate. When Saif al-Dīn Mūmādī b. Sulṭān Ibrahim came in India as viceroy, Mas'ūd attached himself to this prince as courtier and panegyrist, and became one of the special favourites of his court. But again, a false charge being brought against him, he once more fell upon evil days and loss of fortune. It was maliciously reported in 492 (1098) to Sulṭān Ibrahim b. Mūmādī that his son Saif al-Dīn Mūmādī intended to go to I‘rāq to Malikšāh. This report so much aroused the indignation of the Sulṭān that he ordered his son with all his courtiers to be arrested and put to prison. Our poet for the next ten years remained a prisoner. But on the intercession of Abu 'l-Kāsim Khaṣṣ, the Sulṭān pardoned him and released him from prison. He returned to India and was again placed in possession of his father’s lands and dignity.

He died in 515 (1121). He is the author of two diwāns, one in Arabic and the other in Persian.


(M. Hidvæt Hosain)

Al-Mas'ūdī, Abū l-Hassān al-'Abī al-Husain, Arab historian and geographer, and one of the most versatile authors of the fourth century A.D. Information about his life can only be gleaned from occasional references in his works; as his activity lay outside the lines of the regular schools of learning, he gets little mention from their representatives. The author of the Fihrist regards him as a Maqhlī. According to his own statement, however, he was born in Baghdad and descended from an Arab family which could trace its ancestry to a Companion of the Prophet. While still quite young he travelled through Persia where he spent part of 305 (915) in Isfahān. Next year he went to India and visited Multān and al-Maḥāran. He went by Kanbāya and Šāmīr as far as Ceylon, joined some merchants on a voyage to the China Sea and back to Zanbār from which he returned to Omān. We again find him travelling along the southern shore of the Caspian Sea and in 314 (926) at Tiberias in Palestine. In 332 (943) he visited Antioch and the Syrian frontier towns and after a brief visit to his native province of Baṣra, he was staying in Damascus in 334 (945). Afterwards he seems to have lived sometimes in Syria and sometimes in Egypt. He was in al-Fustā in 335 (947) and 334 (955) and he died there in Dūmādā II 345 (956) or 346.

His restless life is reflected in his literary activity. His travels were certainly stimulated not only by thirst for adventure but also by a strong desire for knowledge. But this was superficial and not deep. He never went into original sources, as did Burckhardt later, but contented himself with superficial enquiries and accepted tales and legends without criticism. Nevertheless we owe him a good deal of valuable information about the lands on the periphery of Islam. His method of presenting his material has the same faults as his scholarship. He is never able to finish a subject he has begun but continually diverges from his theme. His literary activity, in addition to philology and theology in the narrower sense, touched on almost all the fields of interest of his time, particularly natural philosophy, ethics and politics as well as heresiography. His works, a list of which is given by de Goeje in the Preface to the Kitiḥ al-Tanbih, p. vi., are for the most part lost because they were not of general interest. Posternity was only interested in him as a historian. In the year 332 (943) he began his great history of the world Kitāb Aḥkār al-Zamān wa-man ādālahu 'l-Hidūrīn mu'n al-Man al-Ma‘ṣūra wa-l-Ayyal al-khiliyya wa-l-Maran al-dāhīra, which is said to have filled 30 volumes. Burckhardt’s statement (Travels in Nubia, p. 527) that twenty volumes of it are preserved in the Aya Sofi in Constantinople is unfortunately not confirmed. Only a single volume, the first of the work, which A. v. Kremer obtained in Aleppo, is preserved in Vienna (see v. Kremer, S.B.W.A., 1850, p. 207–211; Fliegel, Die ar. pers. u. türk. Hs. der K.K. Hofbibliothek, ii. No. 1262; another MS. of the same part is in Berlin, see Ahlwardt, No. 9426) The work begins with the creation and after a brief geographical survey discusses the non-Muslim peoples and goes fully into the legendary history of Egypt. He reproduced extracts from this work in the Kitiḥ al-awṣat of which one volume perhaps survives in Oxford (see thr. Catalogus cod. MSS. or. i. 666). The substance of these two works he gave in a briefer form in the Muruḏī al-Dhahab wa-Murūḏī al-Dhāwīrī, which he finished in Dja-ˈmāhī I, 336 (Nov.–Dec. 947) but revised in 345 (956). In addition to the manuscripts used for the Paris edition, a number of others are in existence, e.g. in the Ambrosiana (R.S.O., iv. 97), in Fierz (Fihrist Masjid al-Karasīnī, n. 1208) and Mūsul (Dāwālī, Makhdūt al-Masjid, p. 122, No. 22; p. 173, No. 32); printed as Maçoud, Les prairies d'or (the more correct translation would be "Gold-washings"), as Gildemeister, W.Z.K.M., v. 202, Texte et Traductions par C. Barier de Meynad et Pavet de Courteille, 9 vols., Paris 1861–1877, Birkh. 1283. Cairo 1313, on the margin of Ibn al-ʿĀthir, Hādīk 1230, of Makkari, Noṣīḥ al-Ṭib, vol. 1–3, Cairo 1302. A synopsis of the Muruḏī al-Dhahab down to the fall of the Omanyads was made by İbrāhīm al-Nashtī in 1118 (1706) (MS. Vienna, Fliegel, No. 507). Another synopsis which we have is that of İbrahīm al-Maḥāran, which is placed in the same place as the two works on which it is based were not used in addition to the Muruḏī, with a continuation down to the year 638 (1248) was composed by İbrāhīm Ḍālāl ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b., Al-Shātibi of Tīra in Morocco under the title al-Džāmī ʿal-i Muḥāṣīr ʿAbd Allāh al-Zamān (wrongly ascribed by de Sacy, N. E., ii., 1787 to Makṣarī; MS. Gyanos, 64, fol. 31–195; see Asin Palacios, Escatologia, p. 374; other MSS. in Cairo and
MAŠYÄD, a town in Northern Syria on the eastern side of the Ḥablā al-Nuʿayrī. The pronunciation and orthography of the name varies between the forms Mašād, Mašāy (in official documents and on the inscriptions mentioned below of the years 646 and 570 A. H.), Mašāt and Mašāiy (on the march of Jand al-Shaibāy) (ed. Wustenfeld, Geschichtschreiber der Araber, vol. 119, Paris, 1897). The variants Mašāy (Yāḥyā, Muḥyīn, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 556), Mašāy (Khālid al-Zahrī, Zaḥdīa, ed. Ravaisse, p. 49) and Mašāy (al-Nabūsulb, in. v. Kremer, S.B. Ak Wien, 1850, ii. 331) are no doubt due to mistakes in copying (van Berchem, J.A., Ser. 9, iv. [1897], 457, note 2). At a later period, the pronunciation Mašāy, Mašāy became usual (al-Dimashqī, ed. Meher, p. 208; al-Kašshāshī, Sūbāl al-ʿAqīl, Cano, iv. 113; Abū al-Sūḥān, Bārīt, 265; cf. Mašāy on v. Oppenheim's map in Petermann's Mitteilungen, iv. [1911], i. Taf. 1). The name is perhaps a corruption of a Greek Μασφηδ (Μασφήδος) or Μασφίνα κατοικία, which presumably lay on the Mašāyam, the boundary river of the Nazerim (ancestors of the Nuʿaymi).

A number of ancient pillars and capitals built into the gates of the fortresses (some reproduced in G. I. Bell, Syria: The Decret and the Scan, pp. 217–220) are its only remains of antiquity. An old Roman road (rāṣf) from Hamāl to the west passed the town (according to Miss Bell, loc. cit.).

Mašāy is not mentioned in the early middle ages; the first mention of the fortress is probably in a Frankish account of the advance of the Crusaders in 1099: "tereminus gaudentis hostitari ad quaeam Arabum castrum (Anonymi gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanum, ed Hagenmeyer, 1890, p. 418 with note 29; Dussaud, Histoire et religion des Nazeris, Paris 1900, p. 21, note 4). When in 503 (1109–1110), the Franks advanced on Kafanyā, Ťughtakan set out to relieve it by the terms of the peace concluded between them, the Franks bound themselves to abandon all designs on Mašāyāh and then al-Akrād and in compensation these two places and Hīṣn Ṭūfān were to pay them tribute (Ṣibṭ b. al-D Jawār, Muḥāṣṣar al-Ṭūfān, in. Rec. Hist. Or. C. s., iii. 537). Before 521 (1127) the fortress was in possession of a branch of the Mirdāds, who sold it to the Banū Mū基īd. After the Nasirī citadels of Kādūns and al-Kāhī had fallen into the hands of the Ismāʿils in 527 (1132–1133), the latter also seized the fortress of Mašāyāh in 535 (1140–1141), by outwitting the commandant Sunkūr, a mamlūk in the service of the Banū Mū基īd of Shāizar, who was surprised and slain (Abū 'l-Fidāʾ, Muḥāṣṣar al-Ṭūfān, in. Rec. Hist. Or. C. s., i. 25; Ṭūfān al-Fal, Amīl ibid., i. 435; al-Nuwairī, ed. Leyden, 216, f. 222b, in. van Berchem, J.A., 1897, p. 564, note 1). Mašāyāh now became the residence of the Syrian Master of the sect (as we may call him, with van Berchem, to distinguish him from the Great Master in Alamāt, known as Shābyh al-Ǧabālī. After the Master (Muḥammad) Abū Muḥammad had gathered round him the members of the sect in the hills of Kādūns, about 557 (1162) Mašāyāh al-Dīn Sinān [q. v.] appeared in Syria, as envoy from the Persian Grand Master, took over command of the Assāsins [q. v.] there and displayed his unusual organisational ability, by raising the sect to be a well equipped and dreaded force, the terror of the Crusaders. Saladin, who wanted to punish them for two attempts on his life, invaded the land of the Ismāʿils in Muharam 572 (July–Aug. 1176), laid it waste and laid siege to Sinān in Kaṭar Mašāyāh. Through the mediation of Saladin's uncle Shābyh al-Dīn al-Hārimī, lord of Hamā, Sinān however succeeded in obtaining Saladin's forgiveness; in the beginning of August, he went with his army to Hamā (Abūl-Fidāʾ and Ibn al-Ǧalīr in. Rec. Hist. Or. C. s., i. 47, 626). Shortly before he raised the siege of Mašāyāh (about the 1st Šaṭar), he received from Usūma b. Mū基īd, who was in Damascus, a letter containing a panegyric of his great patron (Derenbourg, Vie d'Osmond, Paris 1893, p. 400 sqq.). Rāghid al-Dīn died in 588 (Sept. 1192). The Syrian Masters, as the official epithet al-Dūnāy wa-l-Dīn henceforth regularly borne by them shows, were raised by him to a position with power and privileges equal to those of sovereign rulers (van Berchem, op. cit., p. 470). While Sinān had completely emancipated himself from the suzerainty of the headquarters of the sect in Alamāt, in 608 we find the old conditions completely restored (Abū Shāma, al-Dīnī al-Kawāgam, in. van Berchem, op. cit., p. 475 sqq., note 1). According to an inscription in the inner gate of the castle (van Berchem, J.A., 1897, p. 482 = van Berchem–v. Oppenheim, Beitrage z. Assyriol., vii, 17, p. 17, No. 18), this building was restored by the Syrian Master Kamāl al-Dūnāy wa-l-Dīn al-Hāns b. Mašāy under the suzerainty of the Great Master of Alamāt ‘Ašr al-Ilm Mūḥammad III (618–653). The reference is probably to the al-Kamāl, who according to al-Nasawi (Hist. du Sultan Pydag al-Dīn Munkabirī, ed. Houdas, p. 132) was for a period before 624 governor in Syria for the grand master of the Ismāʿils. It is uncertain whether the commandant (mutawallī)
Majd al-Din, who received in 624 the ambassadors of Frederick I (Hamawi in Amari, Bibliotheca arabica-sciatica, App. ii, p. 30) was one of the Masters (van Berchem, J.A., 1897, p. 501, note 1) about 625/6 and still in 635, Siraj al-Din Mu'azzar b. al-Husain was Syrian Master (Na'awzi, op. cit., p. 45), inscription of al-Kahf, ed. van Berchem, op. cit., p. 488). A Persian from Alamut, Tadj al-Din, was in 637 mukaddam of the Syrian Isma'ili (Ibn Wasiil, Geschichte der Ayyubiden, Paris, MS. Ar. 1702, f. 333b in van Berchem, p. 466, note 2). As Tadj al-Din Abu'l-Futuh he appears in an inscription in Mayyad of Dhul-Ka'da 646 (Feb.-March 1249), according to which he had built the city wall of Mayyad and its south gate. The commander of the fortress under him was 'Abd Allah b. Abi l-Fadl b. 'Abd Allah (inscriptions A and B in van Berchem, J.A., 1897, p. 456 = van Berchem-v. Oppenheim, Beitr. z. Assyri., op. cit., p. 7. 10). Probably it was Tadj al-Din to whom the Dominican monk Yvo the Breton, a member of an embassy sent by Louis IX to the "Old Man of the Mountains" in May 1250, sent a naive and fruitful manuscript for a companion to Jean de Joinville's Chronicles, de St. Louis, ed. Wailly, p. 426 sqq.; van Berchem, J.A., 1897, p. 478—480). In the time of the Master Rid'ah al-Din Abu'l-Mus'lih in 658 (1260) the Tartars seized and held the fortress for a time, but after the victory of the Egyptian Sultan Chusuz at 'Ain Djalut, they abandoned it. About two years later Baibars began to interfere in the affairs of the Isma'ili and to demand tribute from them. He very soon deposed the Master Nadim al-Din Isma'ili and appointed his son-in-law Sarrun al-Din Mubarak in his place and took Mayyad from him. When the latter returned there, Baibars had him seized and brought to Cairo, where he was thrown into prison. Nadim al-Din was again recognised as Master for a brief period and then his son Shams al-Din, before the Sultan definitely incorporated Mayyad in his kingdom in Rasul 668 (1270) (Abu l-Fida', in Res. hist. or. cron., i. 153; Mafzadali b. Abi l-Fadl'ih, Geogr. d' Arabe, ed. Lochot, in Patrel. Orient., xiv. 445; van Berchem, J.A., 1897, p. 465, note 2).

Mayyad presumably at first belonged to the "royal province of fortunate conquests" the capital of which was Hisn al-Akrad, then to Tarabulus (after its capture in 688). It was later separated from this province and added to the niiya of Dimashq to which it still belonged in the time of Kalkashandi (Suhb al-Ashâr, Cairo, iv. 113, 202, 235) about 814 (1412). Khalil al-Zahiri (Zablat Khashif al-Mamalik, ed. Ravaisse, p. 49) includes Mayyad with Hamah (about 850) under Egyptian rule the position of the lands of the Isma'ili with Mayyad as capital was to some extent exceptional (Gaulier, Demombynes, La Syrie à l'Epoque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. 182, No. 1).

Abu l-Fida' (about 720 = 1320) described Mayyad as an important town, with beautiful gardens through which streams flowed; it had a strong citadel and lay at the eastern base of the Jabel al-Lukkam (more accurately Djabal al-Sikkun) about a farsakh north of Barr and a day's journey west of Hamah (not Hims, as Le Strange, Palestine, p. 507 erroneously says: Abu l-Fida', Geogr., ed Reinaud, p. 229 sqq.). As a result of its high situation, it has a more temperate climate than the low ground on the Nahr al-'Asi; the young Uzama

in 516 (1122—1123) brought to Mayyad the wife and children of the emir of Shaiizar, his uncle 'Izz al-Din Abu l-'Asikr Suljan, from the heat of Shaiizar which was causing the emir anxiety about their health (Derenbourg, Vie d'Ousma, p. 43). Ibn Batutah passed through Mayyad in 736 (1335) and al-Nabilusi in 1165 (1744). The latter mentions that the governor of the town then was a certain Sulaamit of the tribe of Tanik. An inscription of Mayyad of Ramadân 870 (April—May 1666) contains a decree about taxes of the Sultan al-Malik al-Zahir Khushkdam (van Berchem-v. Oppenheim, Beitr. z. Assyri., vii., p. 20, No. 23: No. 22 is perhaps of the same Malik al-Zahir).

Of a later date are two inscriptions of an emir Mas'ud b. Idris, one of the year 1203 (1788—1789) relating to the building of a well (sabil) (op. cit., p. 21, No. 24), the other (No. 25) of 1208 (1793—1794) to the building of the house of the Isma'ili emir.

The Isma'ili lived constantly in open or secret enmity with the Nusairis, although various tribes of the latter had offered their services to the Isma'ili Masters, for example as early as 724 (1324) to Râjâ al-Din (Gyanard, Les grandes Armées des Assassins au temps de Saladin, J.A., 1877, p. 165; Dussaud, Histoire et Religion des Nusairis, p. 86). A number of Nusairis of the tribe of Raslan, whom the emir of Mayyad had allowed to settle in the town under their Shâikh Mahmûd, in 1808 murdered the emir, his son and about 300 Isma'ili and seized the town. The other inhabitants, who had sought refuge in flight, applied for protection to Yüsuf Pashâ, the governor of Damascus. He sent a punitive expedition of 4—5,000 men against the Nusairis; Mayyad had to be surrendered by the Bani Raslan after three months' stubborn resistance and the fugitive Isma'ili returned to Mayyad in 1810 (Dussaud, op. cit., p. 32; Burckhardt, Reisen in Syrien, p. 258) in 1812 Burckhardt estimated the population of Mayyad at 250 Isma'ili and 30 Christian families. The population since then seems to have diminished still further. Burckhardt and Lammens found many of the houses in ruins and large gardens within its walls. According to Burckhardt, the land east of the town is a desert moor, while in the north at the foot of the hills the citadel stands on a high steep rock: on the west side is a valley, in which the inhabitants grow wheat and oats. The town, which lies on the slope of a hill is about half an hour's walk, in circumference. Three older gates have been incorporated in the present more modern walls. The mosque is in ruins. The citadel has an outer wall from which the inner defences are reached by a vaulted passage (G. L. Bell, Syria: The Desert and the Sown, p. 218) The old citadel is for the most part destroyed; only a few buildings have been roughly restored and in parts are still inhabited.

The Darawish cut the head of Yohannes and sent it to the Mahdi as a sign of their victory.

The battle of Matamārah however had no greater value for the Mahdi's followers than a successfulrazzias: they retreated to the Sūdān after pillaging some neighbouring countries and did not occupy any territory of Ethiopia. On the contrary, Matamārah caused the end of the Northern Abyssinian dynasties; and the southern region—the Shāwā kingdom—became the political centre of the Empire, when in the same year, 1889 A.D., King Menilek proclaimed himself Emperor (Negus Negast) as a descendant of the Salomonic dynasty.

The death of the Emperor Yohannes as a martyr during the battle against the Muslims, hereditary enemies of the Christian Abyssinians, has been celebrated in many songs and poems. The following is a very interesting example of the Abyssinian poetry in recent times:

"The Emperor Yohannes was a fool, and we all despise him!
They said to him: "Regain in the middle of the country!"
He answered: "I will be the keeper of the frontier!"

The Emperor Yohannes was a liar.
He said: "I do not like drink!"
And we have seen him drinking a drink which causes the head to turn around!"

(The last verses allude to the head of the Emperor sent to the Mahdi by the Darawish.)


ENRICO CERULLI

MATGHARA, the name of a Berber tribe belonging to the great family of the Batr; they were related to the Zānāia and brethren of the Matamārah, Kūmāya, Lamāya, Ṣaddāna, Mādīynā, Maghlīha etc., with whom they form the racial group of the Banī Fātim. Like the other tribes belonging to this group, the Matghara originally came from Tripoliания: the most eastern members of the Matghara, however, known to al-Bakri and Ibn Khaldūn were those who lived in the mountainous regions along the Mediterranean from Mīlāyā and Ténès to the north of Ḫudjā (port of Tāhshrīṭ); those of the western part of this zone were allied with the Kūmāya; their mountain rose not far from Nadrūn and the fortress of Tawunt was on their territory.

Three sections had reached the western Maghrib as early as the eighth century and there formed an important bloc. These were:

1. The Matghara of Fās and the cōlour of Tāzā; al-Bakri observes that the source of the Wādī Fāsh was on their territory, in the region where Leo Africanus still mentions the Sāk al-ḥamis of the Matghara "fifteen miles west of Fās".

2. The Matghara of the Middle Atlas in the Ḩijāl Matghara which Ibn Khaldūn locates S.E. (byll) of Fās and which Leo Africanus says is five miles from Tāzā (to the south?) The reference then is to the mountain region now occupied by the Ait Wārān: an important section of the latter, the Ait Djeellidās, represents the Banū Gallidāsān.
whom al-Bakri gives as a section of the Matghara, settled near Tenes in Algeria. We still find among the Ait Warrain several sections of the Maghila who represent the Maghila, brethren of the old Matghara.

In al-Bakri's time (vth = xiiith century) these two sections of the Matghara had as neighbours in the west, the Zawarga of Fazes and of Todla. 3. The Matghara of the oases of the Sahara settled in the region of Sirjimnassa and in the town itself, in which they constitute the main element of the population, in the region of Figgig; in Tuwen, Tamaninit and as far away as Wallan (Ouallen). At the beginning of the Arab conquest, the Matghara are represented by Ibn Khaldun as settled and living in huts built of branches of trees (khatâ';) those of the Sahara lived in fortified villages (khatrû); and devoted themselves to growing dates. In the time of Leo Africanus, the Matghara of the Central Atlas occupied about fifty large villages.

Like other peoples belonging to the group of the Banû Fatûn, the Matghara took an active part in the events at the beginning of the Arab conquest and weakened themselves considerably in the fighting. As soon as they had become converted to Islam, a number of bodies of Matghara went over to Spain and settled there. Later, like their brethren, the MA'támâ, they adopted the principles of the Sûfîya; one of their chiefs, Masa'm, provoked the famous schismatic rising of 740, which was the beginning in Morocco of the Baraghwâta heresy. In a list of the tribes which adopted this heretical teaching we find the MA'tamâ and Matghara of the Central Atlas, as well as the Banû Abî Naşr, the modern Ait Bû-Nejâ, the eastern section of the Ait Warrain.

With the rise of Idrsî, the chief of the Maghara, Bahâlî, declared himself at fist a supporter of the caliph of Baghâdâd, Harûn al-Rashîd, then rallied to the new dynasty. Later and down to the xvith century, the Matghara of the Central Atlas do not seem to have played any part in politics; they retained their independence at least. From the xvith century, they seem to have been supplanted on their territory by invaders from the south. As to the Matghara of the shore, settled in the region of Nadrâ'a, their alliance with the Kûmûyû gained them considerable political importance, when the latter became supporters of the Almohads. It was at this period that they built the fortress of Tawunt. They then rallied to the Marinids but this brought upon them the wrath of the ruler of Tlemcen, the celebrated Yaghmurûsâm, who finally crushed them.

Ibn Khaldûn uses the form Madghara instead of Matghara; in Moroccan texts of late date we also find Madghara.

Bibliography: al-Bakri and al-Idrisî, inscriptions; Ibn Khaldûn, Kitâb al-'Ulûm, transl. of Slane i. 237—241: Leo Africanus, Description de l'Afrique, ed. Scherer, ii. 54 and 342; iii. 71 and 225. (G. S. Colis)

MATHAL (A., pl. anathâl) is originally by etymology, like the Eth. metûl, metûâ, Arm. mathûl, and Hebrew mîshâl (see O. Eissfeldt, Der Marschal im Alten Testament, Beiträge zur Z.A.T.W., xxiv., Giessen 1913), simile, comparison; as popular sayings commonly appear in this form, the term was applied to them in general and thus obtained the general sense of proverb and popular saying. The fondness for similes and allusions, which is common to all primitive cultures, survived among the Semites and especially among the Arabs with great tenacity and therefore plays an important part, even in the higher forms of literature. The simplest form of metaphor usually draws parallels between man and beast. Of a sleepless man, one says bâta bi-talâtî anâdâ (or anâdâ); he spent the night like a hedgehog" (Abû Hûlâl al-'Askari, Mat'âmâ al-Anfûl, on the margin of Maidâni, Cairo 1310, i. 193, 15; Liân al-'Arab, iv. 437) and with the downrightness beloved by the Arabs the good example and educative influence of a leader or father is described as bâta kînâmâ fa 'taâlîbî al-âmîrâr; or bâta fâdîrân fa-bâta fâdîrû fâdâmâ (al-Maidâni, Mat'âmâ al-Anfûl, Cairo 1310, i. 64, 65). The comparison to animals is also used to indicate veiled mockery of unpleasant social conditions as ba-lughâthâ fi ar陷入 yastanîrû "here among us the sparrow plays the falcon" (al-Askari, i. 193, 20). Such proverbs are sometimes developed into regular fables (see Brockelmann, Fabel und Tiermarchen in der alten arabischen Literatur, i, 90—128). Among them we find much that is common to all nations, which is hardly ever possible to trace back to a single source (cf. the discussion on the "goat and knife": Z. D. M. G., xlvii. 737 sqq.; xlvi. 86 sqq.), unless the origin is as well known as that of the two bulls from the Kitâla wa-Dimna, which is given by al-Ashkari, i. 47, 16 sqq. and therefore 'Ali cannot have applied it to its relationship to 'Othmân.

But the circumstances of everyday life also provide material for similes which usually take the form of a'ain min, as in those which al-'Askari and al-Maidâni quote at the end of each chapter of their collections of proverbs arranged in alphabetical order. Even quite banal happenings may pass into proverbs (fa-ulahat or fâdîrân mâtâlân or durûba bihi 't-mathûl, as so many Arabic stories end), like the story of Khâis of whom we know no more than that his aunt once gave him as a surety and never redeemed him (al-Mufa'dal b. Sulama, al-Fâghîr, ed. Storey, p. 24, N°. 61); or the story of the poor woman selling butter of whom a mugger took advantage after inducing her to hold two skins of butter firmly together in her hands (al-Fâghîr, p. 79, N°. 147). But the memory of important historical events is also perpetuated in proverbial sayings, like that of the fratricidal war between the Bakr and Taghlib provoked by Ba'sîs (al-Fâghîr, p. 76, N°. 157); al-Mufa'dal in his al-Fâghîr, p. 217—231, and al-Maidâni, i. 38—47, therefore give most of the notable battles of the Arabs in their lists of proverbs and proverbial allusions. Many incidents of the Muslim period have attained equal renown, like Mu'âwiya's exclamation of joy on hearing that al-Ashâr had been poisoned (see above, i. 594; al-Maidâni, i. 8. 15) or the memory of the fine voice of the two singers of the bon vivant Caliph Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik (al-Maidâni, i. 137, 12). It is however not always epoch-making events that are handed down to posterity in this way, like the stormy night in the time of the Caliph al-Mahdi, which provoked him and his retinue to do such penance (al-Maidâni, i. 176, 12); or the story of the defeat and fall of the Khâkân, apparently that of the Khâlût, whom Asad b. 'Abd Allah conquered in the year 119 (737), which, according to Tâbarî, ii. 1616, made a great sensation at the court of Hishâm, while Mufa'dal in al-Fâghîr, p. 80, 11 sqq., refers it to the fighting
against the Khazars, but the historians record no event of the kind among them; or the story of Ma'awiyah's ambassador to the Emperor of Byzantium (Ibn Katlab. 'CYân, p. 238, and the proverb: "Askari, i. 76, 11 sqq.; Maidanî, ii. 72, 4"). Such historical memories are frequently preserved in the form of allusions like the famous sahîfat al-Mutahmainns and the gâsâ Sinimmâr. Many problems of this kind are of local origin, like the allusion to the two equally poor asses of the man from Hira (Maidanî, i. 72, 16) or to the Meccan dandy (Maidanî, i. 127, 1), such proverbial allusions are particularly numerous from Medina (ibid., i. 168, 6; 173, 26; 261, 18; 264, 4; 280, 25; 298, 1), but we also have them from Buya (ibid., i. 145, 26 and 30: a parallel from Kûfâ in DiBâgî, K. al-Hayyânîn, v. 153, 13). Kûfâ (ibid., i. 193, 23, as a rest of Sh骑行i, Wâqî (ibid., i. 97, 9) and Hîms (rubu', i. 190, 22). Men celebrated for particular qualities, as in other lands, are frequently commemorated among the Proverbs in prophetic sayings, but the popular imagination very often invents the representative of such virtues; when Hâlit has to share the reputation for liberality with the ljâd Kâb b. Mânî and Harîm b. Sinâm (Askari, i. 223 sqq.; Maidanî, i. 123 sqq.), this is due to tribal rivalry! There are therefore various typical representatives of liberality ("Askari, ii. 251 sqq.; Maidanî, ii. 231 sqq.), of percipacity (Maidanî, i. 210 sqq.), and also of stupidity (Dugha: al-fâkhr, p. 24, N°. 58; Maidanî, i. 147; Shâwla: al-fâkhr, p. 71, N°. 148: Gothamites of Arabia, the people of al-Hajjâr: Maidanî, i. 178, 10; Abû Ghâlîshân and others in Maidanî, i. 146 sqq., 150 sqq.), the best known is Dîwâb, around whom have crystallised the stories of a wandering rogue in the Arab literature (cf. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lvi. 237†), but we also have the Omâny governor of the 'Irâk, Wâsîf b. 'Omar al-Thikâfi (Maidanî, i. 99, sqi). Memories of Penelope seem to have found their way to Arabia in a completely perversion form ("stupidity is the woman who continually undid her weaving", which is found as early as Karân, vi. 94: cf. Askarî, i. 283, 7; Maidanî, i. 172, 4) and of Siyamsh b. "Abî Yâver than he who turned the rock" (Maidanî, i. 287, 15), among the typical representatives of stupidity and greed respectively.

But among Arabic proverbs there are a few the meaning and origin of which had already been quite forgotten at the time they were put on record, so that Arab writers invented all kinds of explanation for them from pseudo-history, with a particular fondness for the Amalekites; not infrequently a choice is given of several stories, as for the "wasner" (Maidanî, i. 34, 29), the "gatherer of acacia shoots of the tribe of 'Anazî" (ibid., i. 49, 37; 288, 17, "the repentance of al-Kusâ""). We also find widely disseminated motives, as in the story of Khûzâ'a which the Prophet is said to have told his wives (al-fâkhr, p. 157, N°. 280). In many cases the learned editors have gone so far as to invent stories because they passed over the simplest explanation as too easy. Thus saying hidâ, hidâ, midâlmi'uka probably only means "Hawk, hawk, the ball which was shot from the bow before the invention of fire-arms" is behind you".

1) The Vurâdî Dhûbâ al-Kubrâ, ed Hikmet Bek Sharîf, Cairo 1346 (1928) are for the most part from the Turkish Nasrûdîn.

which Abû 'Ubâda refers to a children's game; al-Kalbî and al-Shârîki however take Hidâ and Bûnûnâ as names of South Arabian tribes who had fought with one another (al-fâkhr, p. 38, N°. 93). Similarly the same writers invent stories of the time of the Amalekites in which Himûr is a proper name to explain forâkahuq gâsâ in hisâmîn, which al-'Asmâ'î rightly takes literally (al-fâkhr, p. 12, N°. 18).

The number of proverbs is naturally very large in which maxims of life, often very trivial, are laid down; they include same which owe their origin to social conditions in Arabia, like "assist thy brother whether he is right or wrong" (al-fâkhr, p. 119, N°. 259). They also include much that is the common property of all nations, the origin of which can rarely be demonstrated, as in the Arabic pendant to the definitely Roman Res veniet ad triarios in al-Akârî, ii. 32, 16. The subject can only be touched on here. To the references given by the writer in Ostas. Zeitchrift, viii. 66 sqq. we may add a few Arabic parallels to our proverbs: "Walls have ears" (Maidanî, i. 57, 32); "Speak of an angel and you hear his wings" (ibid., p. 57); "Hammer and anvil" (ibid., p. 58), "A liar must have a good memory" (ibid., i. 49, 23); "Festina lente" (ibid., i. 87, 22); "Out of the frying-pan into the fire" (ibid., ii. 25, 9); "To fall between two stools" (ibid., ii. 64, 7); "To be on tender-books" (ii. 74, 4); "Hoist with his own petard" (ii. 168, 12); "A bird in the hand is worth two in the hush" (nafîwar fi 'l-kafî fi khairun min kurbyâin fi'l-dawâwîl; al-Hamadânî, Rasîl, Bairût 1890, p. 44, 3).

Among sayings which are internationally in character those disseminated by religious communities occupy a special position. It is of course not an accident, but is linked with the importance which, is becoming more and more evident, of Christianity for the intellectual life of ancient Arabia, that New Testament sayings are common among Arabic proverbs, notably from the Sermon on the Mount, like Mt. 7, 2 = Maidanî, ii. 67, 17; Mt. 7, 15 = Maidanî, i. 192, 23; Mt. 7, 16 = Maidanî, i. 34, 336; Mt. 11, 2, 18; Mt. 11, 24 = Maidanî, ii. 68, 1; Mt. 7, 23 = Maidanî, ii. 67, 26; Mt. 23, 24 = Maidanî, ii. 259, 16; Mt. 6, 7 = Maidanî, ii. 73, 10. On the other hand, except for a few echoes of Proverbs and Eccles. in which the origin is uncertain, the only one from the Old Testament is Maidanî, i. 228, 90, which looks like a quotation from Deut. 13, 15. From Christian legend we have also the proverbial martyrdom of Dîrjús (al-fâkhr, p. 256, N°. 517) and the story of the Seven Sleepers which appears in various forms (al-fâkhr, p. 109, 239; Maidanî, ii. 196, 14; Kaîl, Anawî, i. 61; cf. M.S.S. O., v. 228). On the other hand, of Old Testament figures we find only Noah once in a late proverb, probably native to Möûd (Maidanî, ii. 250, 1). The Mandaean Creator-deity Fiḻâl must have gone into the proverb Maidanî, ii. 62 sq. from the verse of Rûbâ' quoted there, to whom it was welcome, like other foreign matter, to give an appearance of learning (see Aâhwart. Der Divine der Rûbâ', xv.). Later tradition also associated with Lûkân [q. v.], the wise hero of Arab antiquity, sayings attributed to Aâkâr and common to many nations.

Although the proverb is from its nature anonymous, learned tradition often tries to find authors. Many proverbial sayings are therefore attributed
to the Prophet and his Companions. The Amthāl al-Nābi, which circulated outside the canonical collections of Tradition, was collected by Ibn Khaldūn al-Rāmūsī (Fihrist, p. 155) and Abu Hillal al-Askari; al-Ma'dāīnī accuses the latter of being uncritical and quotes in his preface as an example of genuine Ḥadīth the parable of the good and bad companion in Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīh (ed. Khehī, ii. 17). This does not prevent him however from putting in his collection a series of sayings of the Prophet, as his predecessors had done, and at the end of his book compiling a special chapter of them, which also includes sayings of the first Caliphs. Special popularity was always enjoyed— not only among Ṣaḥīhis—by sayings attributed to ‘Ali. Ibn Ṭuṭalīn in his Čīra‘īn al-Ākhārīn, in the fifth book, K‘ al-‘Imāma ‘l-Bayān (cod. Kopr., fol. 155b), already uses a collection of this kind, such as was current in various recensions (ano- nymous in al-Tuhfa al-Sulaimānī, Stambul 1302, p. 107—114). e. g. in order by ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. Muhammad al-Āmīdī, entitled Ghuwār al-Ḥilāma wa-Durar al-Kalīm, lith. Bombay 1280 and also edited in Persian and Turkish (s. i. 209, and also W. Yule, Apeology of Asia the son of Aboob Talib [Mattīb bulk Tāliʿ] with an early Persian paraphrase and an Eng. translation, Edinburgh 1812; Sad Kūlīmānī Mushārī b. Muttabakīyān Amīr al-Muʿīminīn, Theran 1304; Nakhr al-ʿAllāī, the second coll. in Fleisher, with Turk, paraphrase by Muʿallim Nādīj entitled Amthāl ‘AI, Stambul 1313, with Turk. comm. by Nasīb entitled Rihātīyī Dāmāthī, Stambul 1257).

Numerous also are the proverbs which have a metrical form, while it is impossible to say whether the poets in whose ājaib they are, originated the idea or only gave it its form. Al-Sukkārī (Fihrist, p. 78) and ‘Uyayna b. al-Muʿātshī (ibid., p. 48108) collected such āvaʿa‘āla. A fine collection has been made by al-Iṣbāḥī in the Kitāb al-Mustaṱaf, Cairo 1320, i. 27 sqq. Among such metrical sayings are some by the greatest poets of the pagan period like Tārāfī (l‘Amīkhir, p. 254, 509; al-Ma‘ādīnī, i. 161), Imrā‘alākās (‘Aṣkārī, i. 255 = Maidaṇī, i. 153), Līdūb (‘Aṣkārī, i. 37) and by later poets like al-Farāzākī (l‘Amīkhir, p. 250, Nö. 48; al-‘Aṣkārī, i. 46) and Muṣ‘ī b. Iyäz, whose two palms of Ḥulāwān (‘Aṣkārī, i. 297, 452; Ma‘ādīnī, i. 297) are famous. From a misunderstanding of a verse of Farāzākī’s in which the way to ‘Usūlūn is mentioned (Maidaṇī, i. 38; quoted by Yākūt, iii. 736), this verse became typical of taking the wrong way. Al-Mutannahī’s verses that have passed into the language have become proverbial. When, after ʿĪsābī b. Tākālānī, d. 382/1574, 995 (Yākūt, Ittāhās, vi. 501—518; Suyūṭī, Ruyhāt al-Wulās, p. 35), in al-Amthāl al-‘āla‘a min Shīr al-Mutannahī (Fihrist, Cairo 2, ii. 23).

Proverbs excited the interest of the learned from the very beginning of Arabic literature; historians and philologists emulated one another in collecting and explaining them. Thus we find among the sources of the works that have survived to us the old historians and genealogists like al-Shārī b. al-Kūṭāmi (Wustenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, Nö. 23) and ‘Awānī b. al-Hakam (ibid., Nö. 27) and Abu ʿl-‘Iṣbā‘ī al-Ya‘zan (ibid., p. 36; al-‘Amīkhir, p. 255); the two former very often as authorities for Ḥishām b. al-Kalbī, to whom with the great monographist Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb (Wustenfeld, Nö. 59), Zuhāir b. Bakkār (ibid., p. 61) and al-Ma‘ṣūlīn (ibid., p. 47); we owe most of the legendary and historical material. Almost all the philologists of note have devoted special works to the subject. To their interest in language is to be ascribed the fact that the limits of the scope of the subject are extended to include phrases and idioms which have really nothing to do with the proverb and, as for example la‘ananik ʾīšā‘ā (al-‘Amīkhir, p. 7), do not seem to require explanation; but we owe, for example, to al-Mufaḍḍal the interesting note that it had become a habit with some Syrian Arabs to use the Greek χριμ, “says he”. The oldest work of the kind that has survived is the Kitāb al-Amthāl al-Mufaḍḍal al-Dabbī († 710 = 786), pr. Stambul 1300. The next oldest, that of Abū Ubaid al-ʿAskārī b. Sallām al-Harawī (d. about 223 = 837), is preserved in a number of Stambul MSS. (s. Rescher, Z.D.M.G., lxv. 517, Nö. 43; M.S.O.S.A., xiv. 6; M.O., vii. 123), and in the Escurial (Derenbourg, Lévi-Provençal, Nö. 1757), also the commentary by Abū Allāh al-Bakrī (d. 487 = 1094), ibid., Nö. 526 and Lālīlī, Nö. 1793, printed as No. 1 of the al-Tuhfa al-Bakrīya, Stambul 1302, p. 2—16; on the other hand, the work dealt with by E. Bertheau in his Diss., Göttingen 1836 (s. Freytag, Arabum Proverbia, iii., vii.—x.), is much more recent. The Kitāb al-‘Amīkhir of al-Mufaḍḍal b. Salama, a pupil of Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 231), has been edited by C. A. Storey for the De Goeje Found. 1 edyn. 1915. The specially numerous proverbs of the form af‘īb min were collected by Ḥamza ʿl-Iṣfahānī (d. between 450—460 = 960—970 in a work which only survives in a unique MS. in Munich (see Mittwoch, in M.S.O.S.A., 1909, p. 33 sqq.), which was used by later writers, and copied word for word by al-Ma‘ādīnī for the corresponding section of his book. Abū ʿĪsā b. ʿAskārī (d. after 295 = 1005) compiled the Qamārat al-Amthāl, extant in several MSS. in Stambul (see Rescher, Z.D.M.G., lxv. 513; M.F.O.B., v. 501; M.S.O.S.A., xiv. 36) and printed at Bombay in 1306—1307 as well as on the margin of Maidaṇī (Cairo 1310), in which an attempt was made for the first time to annotate every proverb from the philological and historical point of view, excluding all post-classical material, to which Ḥamza had allotted considerable space. Ma‘ādīnī [q. v.] collected the material compiled by his predecessors in his Madmūn al-Amthāl and expanded each section by an appendix on modern proverbs. This has since then been regarded as the standard work on the subject and not even Zamakhshārī’s Kitāb al-Muṣālikā b l‘Amthāl, although also much read (to the MSS. mentioned in G.A., i. 262, xiv.) could according to Ḥādījī Khālisf, Nö. 11421, permanently affect its popularity. Al-Mawardī’s [q. v.] book, including the different collections of sentiments made by al-Zamakhshārī, was from the first intended to deal rather with the literature than with the language of the people.

It was not till the sixṱth century that interest in the east was again aroused in proverbs under the influence of European scholarship. Almost all works on modern Arabic dialects contain collections of proverbs (cf. the lists which could of
course now be very much extended in A. Fischer, M.S.O.S. Am., i. 198—199 and E. Littmann, Arabie (Droste) collected by Mrs. A. P. Singer, Cairo (1919, p. ix); in addition to the works by modern Orientals there quoted we may mention: Ibrāhīm Sinārī, Lūbnānī, al-Durra al-zaytīna fī l-Anghāl al-adalma, Beirut 1871; Muḥammad Ef. Ṭalār al-Baṣīrī, Kītāb Anghāl al-mukalāfīn min 'Aqāma.[4a] Miṣrī (al-khomādānī ḥādāmānī fī ḫi-Mulqamar al-ṣārīn al-Dūnā bi-Bīlid al-Sūd wa l-.sequence of the Korān (single revelation and all revelation as a whole).

Spranger (Das Leben und die Lehre des Maḥmūd, Berlin 1801, i. 405 sq.) explains the word from the Hebrew ḥādānā to repeat" and the conception from Sūra xxix. 24, from which it would appear that the matṭănāt are part of the stories of punishment. This view has been adopted by D. H. Muller, Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form, p. 138 sq.; H. Grimm, M., p. 137, and Mohammed, ii. 77; N. Khodakulakik, in W. Z. M. M. xlv. 66 sq.; J. Horovitz, Keramicke Untersuchungen, p. 26 sq. This would imply that, at least when Sūra xv. 87 was revealed, there were seven of these legends of punishment.

Early evidence of the use of the word outside of the Korān is found in a poem of Abu l-Aswad al-Duṣālī (text and transl. by Nöldeke, in Z.D.M.G., xvii. 36 sq.; cf. theoren Bevan, in J. Res, of A., 1921, p. 584 sq.; Horovitz, op. cit.). Here the matṭănāt are mentioned along with the Mṭāna, “the seven verses” along with the “hundred verses” Sūras of the Korān. The exact content of these groups is unknown.

In conclusion it may be mentioned that Goldzīher (Z.D.M.G., i. 366 sqq.) has called attention to a term matṭănāt, which occurs in non-canonical tradition and is obviously a new formation modelled on the Hebrew mishānā. (A. J. Wensinck)

**MATHAWI**, a form of poetry in which each ḥaṭ (verse) is normally a self-contained whole, grammatically complete and with the two miṣrā's (hemistichs) rhyming with one another and not—except accidentally—with the verses that follow. In Persian, Turkī, and Urdu, poetic compositions of any length dealing with epic, romantic, ethical or didactic themes are of the mathnawi form, which probably originated in Persia. Dawlātshāh (ed. E. G. Browne, p. 20) relates a tradition that in the time of the Dāwalīmāt Aḏud al-Dawla (d. 572 = 982) there was still to be found inscribed on the palace at Kašr-i Shīrīn a ḥaṭ in "Old Persian" having the two hemistichs rhyming. There would appear to be no pre-Islamic Fahlawi verse of the kind extant, and the mathnawi form may be merely a development or expansion of the matṭā of the ḫūṣuda or ḥaḏādā. However that may be, in the oldest fragments of Muslim Persian literature that have come down to us, there are examples both for the mathnawi as of the other forms of verse. Of these fragments the oldest belong to the work of Abū Shukrūr al-Baḥrī, who is said, probably on that account, to have invented the genre. They appear to be parts of a series of narrative mathnawis (cf. Assai's Lughat-i Fura, ed. P. Horn, p. 29 of the Persian, and also p. 22 sqg.). Alongside of them are to be found sufficient portions of the work of Rūḍagī (a later contemporary of his), to indicate that he also used the same form
for a translation of the Kalila u-Dimna (Asadi, op. cit., p. 19 sqq. and Dawlatshah, p. 31). There is also a complete in the hazaf metre indicating an erotic mathnawi (Asadi, p. 8; cf. Ehs. Rudi, in N. G. W. Gutt., 1873, p. 735 sqq.).

The first complete poem that has survived of the genre is the Shab-nama, begun by Da'khi and completed by Firdawsi. Actually, apart from the arrangement of the rhyme, it is not of the regular mathnawi type. More characteristic is Firdawsi's Yüsuf u-Zalikha, composed in the same metre (the muta'far rib). It begins with a number of introductory sections of which the first is in praise of Allah and the rest are headed respectively, "In praise of the Prophet", "In description of the king of Islam", "On the cause of the revelation of the Sûra of Joseph", "On the reason for setting down this narrative", etc. Then comes the story proper, commencing with the description of Jacob's working for Rachel and pursuing its way through the various episodes of Joseph's career until he becomes the home of the viceroy Potiphar, whose wife Zalikha falls in love with the youth. When he refuses her advances she denounces him for wizardry to her husband. Here is introduced the often illustrated incident of the Egyptian ladies who, at a feast to which they had been invited by Zalikha, catch sight of Joseph and are so astounded by his beauty that, without being conscious of what they are doing, they peel the skin from their hands instead of keeping their knives for their oranges. Then comes the account of the imprisonment of Joseph, the events that lead to his release and exaltation, the confusion of the wicked brethren, the repentance of Zalikha, her reunion and marriage to Joseph, and the death of Jacob.

A contemporary of Firdawsi's, U'suri, is credited with a mathnawi romance which has not survived: Wânik u-Adhira. What purports to be a version of the story is given in a Turkish mathnawi by Lâmi (d. 940 = 1533), according to which, Wânik, a priest in a fire-temple, is described as having fallen in love with Adhira, a maiden devoted to the cult. They are forced to part; Adhira going to the frozen regions of the North and Wânik to the torrid lands of Ethiopia. They pine away in separation, and dying are turned into stars. The maiden becomes Virgo holding Spica in her hand, while Wânik becomes Arcturus. The story bears marks of being of Pahlavi origin, the Arabic names being only translations.

Of mathnavis which have survived there follow chronologically two works of Nasiri Khusrav, namely the Rawshâna-nâma and the Sâdâha-nâma, two ethico-didactic poems written in the hazaf metre and similar in time is usually put the romance of Wîs u-Râmî described by 'Abînâ to Fâkhr al-Din Gurghâni (d. 440 = 1048), who is said to have derived it from the Pahlavi. In the version which has come down to us (ed. W. N. Lees, Calcutta 1865), we have a tale of passion unrequited, which Pizii (Poeia Persiana, ii. 88) characterizes as a vulgar product of India in Akbar's time. In the tale, Wis or Wisa, the wife of Mabod, king of Merw, has for her paramour her husband's brother Ram or Ramin, who proves unfaithful to her but in the end marries her after Mabod has been killed. If the work is genuine, it marks a step in the differentiation of the romantic from the epic mathnawi, being composed in the hazaf and not the muta'far rib metre which had hitherto been common to both.

The true creator of the romantic mathnawi is Niazmi of Gandja, who, after beginning with the composition in that form entitled the Mushsân al-Asrâr — a collection of ethical and religious maxims interspersed with anecdotes, — wrote in succession the four other works which form his Khoomsa or Pandj Gandji. This quintet provided the model for all subsequent mathnawi writers. Strictly speaking, only the second, third and fourth of them are romances; namely (a), the Khusrav u-Shirin, the story of the love of the Sassanian prince Khusraw Parviz for the Christian princess Shirin, who is also loved by the mighty builder and engineer Farhad, and of the latter's betrayal and tragic end; (b), the Lâlik u-Mâdân-nâma, the scene of which is laid in the desert and which shows the two lovers prevented from union by the hatred of their families for one another; and (c), the Haft Paikar, which has Bahram Ghr as its hero and consists of seven tales, each told to the king by one of his seven favourite wves. The Sîkadur-nâma, which forms the fifth of the group, treats of the life of Alexander in epic style, but with a mystical touch in the later passages which makes him a prophet as well as a conqueror. Each of the five mathnavis is prefaced by introductory sections similar to those in Firdawsi's Yüsuf u-Zalikha, with the necessary changes for the names of patrons etc. and with a further section headed "On the mîrâ'î of the Prophet" added in the works which follow the Khusrav u-Shirin. Every imitator of Niazmi's mathnawi copies him in this respect as in others, so that even the 18th century Judeo-Persian Danâl-nâma (by Khojâda Bahâr, British Museum, Ms. Or. 4743) has this introductory matter, though Mose is substituted for Muhammad in the section devoted to the Prophet.

The chief imitators of Niazmi are, in Persian, Dzami in Turkish, Shâhî with his Khusrav u-Shirin and Fa'dlî with his Lâlik u-Mâdân-nâma; in Turki, Mir 'Ali Shir Nawârî with his Khamsa; and in Urdu, Amin with a Yüsuf u-Zalikha, Tabâdli with a Lâlik u-Mâdân-nâma, etc. (cf. G. de Tassy, Auteurs Hindoustanis, Paris 1885, p. 50 sqq.).

The Mathnawi par excellence, i.e. the Mathnavi-i Ma'nawi of Djâlî al-Dîn Râmi, is in a class by itself, being a long medley of the doctrines of Sufism combined with parables, allegories, and pseudo-historical narratives. It is without the preliminary sections characteristic of the romantic mathnawi.

Arabic contains no poems of the mathnawi genre, but poems having the two mîrâ's of each haft rhyming together independently of the rest are known. The arrangement of the rhyme is known as muzadderja. Short specimens translated from Persian are quoted in Tha'âlibi's Yatânat al-Dahr (iv. 23), and there are longer compositions, metrical grammars, by Hariri (Mu'âth al-Fârâbî) and by Muhammad b. Mâlik (Kitâb al-Alfiya) (for both of which see de Sacy, Anthologie Arabe, p. 134 sqq. and 145 sqq. of the Arabic text and p. 325, 356 of the notes).

The metres normally associated with the mathnawi form are those used by the masters in their compositions: e.g., in addition to those mentioned above, the sarr and khofû' used by Nizami for Mathnawân al-Asrâr and the Haft Paikar respectively;
and the rāmaḥ, used by Dījāl al-Dīn Rumi in his Mathnawī and by Farid al-Dīn Āṭār in the Maṭṭāk al-Ta'īr.

Bibliography: in addition to the works quoted above, cf. Ethé, in the Grundriss der iran. Philologie; F. Kuckert, Grammatik, Poetik und Rhetorik der Perser, ed. W. Pertzsch, Gotha 1874; E. J. W. Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry; and Agha Ahmad 'Ali, Haft Aṣma'n (Bibliotheca Indiae), Calcutta 1873. (R. Levy)

**Mathurā**, name of a city, situated in 27° 31' N. latitude and 77° 41' E. longitude, and of a district of the same name in Northern India. The site of the city was of importance in the Buddhist period, as is proved by the numerous inscriptions and pieces of sculpture that have been found there. In later Hindu times it attained sanctity as the reputed birthplace of the god Kūnāḍh and the temples erected there acquired great wealth and reputation. In 1017 Mahmūd of Ghazna [q.v.] captured the city and levelled all the temples to the ground; there is no further record of the city until the reign of Sikandar Lodi, Sułṭān of Delhi (1438-1516), who destroyed all the temples that existed in Mathurā in his time. The city was practically refounded in the reign of Akbar, who visited the sacred site and gave permission for the erection of four temples, the tuns of which still exist. In 1666 Awrangzēb destroyed a vast temple that had been built in the reign of Lūhāngār and changed the name of Mathurā to Islāmābād, but like many other Muhammadan designations of towns in India it failed to displace the original name of the city. With the breakup of the Moghul empire after the death of Awrangzēb, Mathurā suffered from the political confusion in which all the country between Delhi and Āgra was involved, and at one time or another passed into the hands of the Dāhips, the Mārathas and finally the British.

In the centre of the modern city stands the mosque erected in 1661 by 'Abd al-Nabi Khan, who was appointed governor of Mathurā by Awrangzēb in 1659. The Muslim number 13,475 out of a total population of 56,665 (in 1921).

M. M. Eliot and Dumoss, History of India, i. 44; iv. 447; Vincent A. Smith, Akbar, Oxford 1917, Index s. v.; F. S. Growse, Mathura, a District Memoir, 3rd ed. Allāhabād 1885; D. L. Duke-Bruckman, Mathura (District Gazetteers of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, vol. vii. Allāhabād 1911); al-'Uthī, Ta'rīkh Yamnī; Muḥ. Kāsim Ṣirīṣī, Qasīdāt-i Ṣirīṣī (Bombay 1932); Nizām al-Dīn Ahmad, Taḥdīḥat-i Akbarī, 'Abd al-Kadr Bāḍalī, Muntakhab-i Nisbāt—Ta'wilāt-i Qasīdāt, ed. and transl. by Ranking; Mufīḥ, 'Abd al-Hamād I_voidi, Pādshāh-i Nama, Muṣṭādī Khan, Maṭṭāk-i Allāhgarī, all in the Fitīl. Indica series of the As. Soc. of Bengal; Nawwāb lbnāmī Khan, Ta'rīkh-i Ṣirīṣī Khān, MSS. and transl. in Elliot and Dowson's History of India.

(Sh. W. Haig)

vi-MATIN. [See Allāhī.]

**Maṭṭāk**. Maṭṭāk, ascension. Two kinds of ascension are distinguished:

1. Ascension in the sphaera recta R. — Modern astronomers use the expression right ascension for all points of the heavens; the older astronomers only for those of the ecliptic. The right ascension \( R \) is found by drawing a circle of declination which is perpendicular to the equator through the corresponding points of the ecliptic. With us and as a rule with the Arabs the right ascension of the arc of the equator is between the beginning of Aries, the vernal equinox and the intersection of the circle of declination with the equator. Many Arab astronomers calculate the ascension \( R' \) from the beginning of Capricorn; then \( R' + 90° \) gives the degree of the equator which rises at the time at which the corresponding degree of the ecliptic culminates. The ascertaining of this is, according to Suter, of importance for certain astrological purposes. If in fig. 1, the point \( A \) or the star \( S \) of the ecliptic rises above the horizon, the point \( B \) of the equator, the poles of which are \( P \) and \( P' \), rises at the same time; \( \gamma B \) is therefore the ascension of the arc \( \gamma A \) of the ecliptic in the sphaera recta.

One also talks of the ascension of a sign of the zodiac; it is the arc of the equator which rises contemporaneously with the 30° of this sign. The longitude of the ascension generally varies with the signs, but from time to time is the same for those which are similarly situated at the beginning of Aries or of Libra, and for those which are at the beginning of Capricorn or of Cancer.

The maṭṭāk in the sphaera recta are therefore so important (for astronomical purposes also) because in stereographic projection they give the curves corresponding to the degrees of the ecliptic, according to which the ecliptic, which is projected as a circle, is to be divided on the astrolabe.

Tables for the right ascensions have been prepared by numerous Muslim scholars, e.g. by Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Khwārizmi, al-Battānī, al-Bīrūnī etc.

If the point being observed does not lie on the ecliptic, the maṭṭāk (often with the addition of al-buriyū = the sign of the zodiac): \( fi 'l-Falak al-mustak̲āb \) (M. in the sphaera recta); \( fi 'l-Burūdi fi Ḫaṭṭ al-Istiwa' \); \( M. fi al-Burūdi bi-Ḥaṭṭ al-Istiwa' \); \( M. fi Mafffī Ḫaṭṭ al-Iṣṭī'a \); \( M. al-Kura al-mustak̲āba \); \( M. al-Kura al-muntajibah \) or \( fi 'l-Kura etc \); \( M. al-istī'a'ya \), and al-falakīya.

If one calculates from the degree of Capricorn, the right ascension is also called maṭṭāk al-kubba (i.e. Kubbat al-Arj, "M. of the dome"; namely of the dome of the earth).
2. The ascension obliqua (fig. 2) of a point $A$ in the ecliptic at any point is the curve $\gamma B$ of the equator the poles of which are $P$ and $P'$, between the beginning of Aries and the horizon at the moment in which this point rises (for any particular star $S$ substitute "star" for "point of the ecliptic"); it is often also made to begin at Capricorn.

Tables for the ascension obliqua can only be given for particular places as they differ from place to place. The ascension obliqua however can easily be calculated from the ascension recta.

The ascension obliqua is called: \(\text{Maghāri}\) al-Balad, al-Balad, \(\text{M. al-Dālūm}\) (of the clime), \(\text{M. al-Midūm}\), \(\text{M. al-\text{alā}yim}\), \(\text{M. al-\text{al}f}^2\text{k}\), \(\text{M. al-\text{al}g}^2\text{k}\), \(\text{M. al-\text{al}i}^2\text{k}\), \(\text{M. al-\text{al}f}^2\text{k}\). We may also note the terms \(\text{M. al-Nāṣir}\) and \(\text{M. al-Wāṣit}\).

Ascension recta might perhaps be translated direct or spherical ascension and ascension obliqua by local ascension.

Arab astronomers, following Ptolemy, have proposed the following formulae for the ascension obliqua. If $e$ is the plane of the ecliptic, $d$ the declination of the point $A$ on the ecliptic, $a_1$ its right ascension and $r$ the number of parts (usually 60) into which the radius is divided (with the later Arabs and modern astronomers $r = \phi$) then according to al-\(\text{Khaw}^2\text{rīm}\) and al-Battānī, we have:

$$\sin a_1 = \frac{\sin d}{\cos e} \cdot \cos e, \quad r = \tan \phi \cdot \epsilon + \phi.$$

The ascension obliqua $a_2$ is for the latitude $\phi$.

The ascension obliqua $a_2 = \text{ascension recta} (\phi) \oplus \text{arc} \left(\frac{\sin \phi}{\cos \phi} \cdot \cos \phi\right) = a_1 \pm \arcsin \left(\tan \phi \cdot \tan d\right)$. At the same time it is to be observed that al-\(\text{Khaw}^2\text{rīm}\) (d. about 850) and al-Battānī, who published his book before 900, give the formula with sine and cosine, while Ḥabash al-\(\text{Hāsib}\), who made his observations between 825 and 835, uses tangents and cotangents.

To ascertain the ascension, the above formulae are used if tables are not available. But one can also use one of the many apparatus which are made for the mechanical solution of such problems.

The simplest of these is the armillary sphere (see Nolte quoted in \(\text{Kura}\)) and the globe with the earth (see Schnell quoted in \(\text{Kura}\)) as in both cases the heavens can be used as the largest circles. There are also the monographic methods, in which projections of the sphere of heavens are used, as in the astrolabe (s. J. Frank, \textit{Die Verwendung des Astrolabiums nach al-\text{Khaw}^2\text{rīm}}, Abhandl. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaft, etc., Hefi iii., 1922), the universal plane, the Zarkāt plane (see an article to be published later by Mittelberger), Werner's

meteoroscope (\textit{Ioannes Verani de Meteorographia}, publ. by J. Wirschmidt, \textit{Abhandlungen zur Gesch. d. Mathematik}, Heft xxvii., 1913) and the mukantarā quadrants. On the sine quadrants, the system of lines which enable the sine and cosine to be read off, the above formulae can be obtained with the help of the latter (on the quadrants see F. Schmalz, \textit{Zur Geschichte des Quadranten bei den Arabern}, Munich 1929).

Along with the maṭālī, the maghāri also were ascertained. If one is observing, not rising but the setting points, the corresponding curves are called magharib (a table for the latter is given by al-Bīrūnī in the Maṣūdī Canon).

\textit{Addendum.} Among the Greeks and Arabs and European astronomers of the xiiith-xvith century \(\text{apō}^2\text{pē}\) means: 1. the globe or geometrical sphere; 2. the space between two surfaces of two concentric spheres, a shell of a sphere; 3. the circle which corresponds to the assumed path of a heavenly body, i.e. the ecliptic, the epicycle, the eccentric circles. — The Arabic \(\text{kū}^3\text{a}\) has only the first meaning, the word \(\text{fatāk}\) the second and third, the second in the theory of Ibn al-\(\text{Hājī}^2\tilde{\text{m}}\) (see al-\(\text{Khā}^2\text{rā debería}\)).

The spherea recta, \(\text{al-fatāk}^2\text{al-muṭakīm}\) is the sphere of the heavens, i.e. for the inhabitants of the equator; in the Latin translation of the tables of \(\text{al-\text{Khaw}^2\text{rīm}}\) (table 59) it is said of the ascension in the spherea recta "horoscopus secundum terram Arum" (Arin is a corruption of Arin-\(\text{U}^2\text{d}^2\text{j}^2\text{a}^2\text{i}^2\text{n}^2\text{y}^2\text{i}^2\text{n}^2\) in Sanskrit, which was erroneously taken to be the \(\text{*bub}^2\text{b}^2\text{b}^2\text{a}^2\text{l}^2\text{b}^2\text{a}^2\text{r}^2\text{d}^2\) of the earth, the centre of the equator and of the inhabited world).

At all places which do not lie on the equator, there is a spherea obliqua so that these are innumerably.

\textit{Bibliography:} Ptolemy, \textit{Almagest}, ed. Heiberg; \textit{Pasast}, al-Battānī, \textit{Opus astronomicum} etc., ed. C. A. Nallino; H. Suter, \textit{Die astronomischen Tafeln des Muhāmmed ibn Mūsā al-\text{Khaw}^2\text{rīm}} etc. [cf. also \(\text{al-\text{Khaw}^2\text{rīm}}\) and numerous works on astronomy. — (I am much indebted to Prof. Nallino for a number of suggestions). (E. WIEDEMANN.)

\textbf{MAṬMĀTA, the name of a Berber tribe, belonging to the large family of the Butr, and brethren of the Maghāta, Kāmā, Lāmāyā, Sādana, Madyūna, Maghāla, etc. They formed with them the ethnic group of the Banū Ḥattīn who, like all the other Butr, seem to have had their original home in Tripolitania.

Our chief source of information about the Maṭmāta are al-Bakī and Ibn Kahlūn. As with the majority of the Butr Berbers, three principal divisions can be distinguished:

1. Elements settled in the eastern Maghārīb not far from their original home: these are the modern Maṭmāta in Southern Tunisia, some 30 miles S.W. of Gābēs.

2. Elements which have settled in the Central Maghārīb: first in the plateau of the Sāra in the N.E. of Mīnās; then having been driven out of this territory by the Žanāta Banū Tūdān, they sought refuge in the mountainous massif of Wānsārī (the modern Ouarsı̇nī).

3. Elements which have migrated as far as Morocco. In the fourth (tenth) century we find them in the country of the modern Kābdīna (to the S.E. of Melilla) and in the upper valley of the Molūa at Amāskūr. Ibn Kahlūn also mentions a little isolated group settled on the mountain
which bears their name between Fas and Sufiyū; there must also have been some of them in the coastal of Taza for a place between Fas and Taza still bears their name. Finally we owe to al-Idrīsī the record of the most western body: the Matmāṭa of Tamsanī.

The Matmāṭa played a fairly important part in the early centuries of Islam. Those of the central Maghrib had adopted Abāḍī doctrines: being conquered by the Sanhāda and Zanāta, many of them migrated to Spain. The most famous member of this people was Sāliḥ b. Salāmān, the famous Berber genealogist, so frequently quoted by Ibn Khaldūn.


**MATN,** (m.), a term with different meanings (cf. the lexic, s.v.), of which that of text, especially that of the text of a tradition, deserves to be mentioned here.

Main occurs in the sense of text already in pre-Islamic poetry and is used in this sense in Arabic literature up to the present day. It denotes especially the text of a book as distinguished from its oral explanation or its written or printed commentary.

In connection with traditions main denotes the contents as distinguished from the chain of traditionalists who handed it down (ṣanā‘).


**MATRAḤ, a town on the Gulf of Oman,** two miles west of Masqat on the east coast of Arabia. The town, which has about 14,000 inhabitants, is the starting-point for caravan traffic into the interior of Arabia and next to Masqat, the most important commercial centre in Oman. The town is beautifully situated in fertile surroundings, has a good harbour, easily entered but little sheltered, from which Masqat can be reached in an hour by boat. The sultan of Oman used to have wharfs for shipbuilding here and the textile industry was not unimportant (spinning and weaving) a fort built by the Portuguese still stands as a memorial of their rule in Oman. According to Wakil-Spell the town used to have 20,000 inhabitants.


(A. Grohmann)

**MATURIDĪ, ABU MAṢĪR MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD B. MAḤMūD AL-ḤANĀFĪ AL-MUṬAKALLIM.** Maturidī is the titular head of the Maturidite School of theology which, with the Ashʿarite School, forms orthodox Sunni Islam. The two schools are equally orthodox, but there has always been a tendency to suppress the Maturidī's name and to put al-ʿĀshʿarī forward as the champion of Islam against all heretics except in Transoxiana (Maʿṣūma al-Nakhiri) where his school has been, and is the dominant, representing the views of al-Ḥanāfī wa al-ʿĀshʿarī. Next to nothing is known of al-Matūrīdī's life, but he died at Samarqand in 333 (944), a contemporary of al-ʿĀshʿarī who died a little earlier about 330 (941), while al-Ṭāẖāwī [q.v.], another contemporary, died in Egypt in 331. All three represented the movement, which must have been very widely spread, to defend orthodox Islam by the same weapons of logical argument with which the Muṭazalites had attacked it. Matūrīdī or Māturīrī is a locality (maḥāl, kārva) in Samarqand. Its geographical reality and the identity of Abū Maṣūr al-Matūrīdī are assured by the article Māturīrī in the *Anrāb* of al-Samʿānī (fol. 498b, l. 4; cf. also Barthold, *Turkestân down to the Mongol Invasion*, G.M.S., p. 90, notes 9 and 10; p. 267, note 9, and the Russian references there). The books of Ḥanāfī Ṭabāḏkī give the names of his teachers, but to us they are names only (see Ibn Kuṭūbihāghā [ed. Flügel, Nº. 173] and Flügel's *Hänchen*, p. 271. 293, 295, 298, 513). The Sayyid Muṭraḍī in his little treatise on Māturīdī, inverted in his commentary on the *Ibhār* (ix. 6—14), complains that he has found only two biographies and that both are short (al-tāʿīgīr). Even Vāḥiṭ and his Muḥammad has no mention either of him or of Māturī. Ibn Khaldūn in his sketch of the origin and history of Kaṭāʾin (Maṭādalina, transl. de Slane, ii. 55 sqq.; ed. Quatremère, iii. 38 sqq.) has no place for him and speaks only of ʿĀshʿarī and the ʿĀshʿarites. For Ibn Ḥanẓl (d. 456 = 1064; Flügel, ed. Cairo 1320, ii. 111) the orthodox opponent of al-ʿĀshʿarī is Abū Ḥanīfa and he has no mention of al-Māturīdī. Similarly Shāhrastānī (d. 548 = 1153; Moll, transl. Haarbrucker, i., p. 159; text on margin of Ibn Ḥanẓl, i. 188) gives the views of Abū Ḥanīfa but does not mention Māturīdī. Abū Ḥanīfa, he says, inclined to the Mūṭalīṣites and his followers were even called the Mūṭalīṣites of the 'Arab, meaning, apparently, a form of Mūṭalīṣism consistent with orthodoxy. Similarly the Sayyid Muṭraḍī (loc. cit., p. 13 foot) says that the Mūṭalīṣites claimed Abū Ḥanīfa for themselves and rejected his authorship of one book because it was too fatally against their positions. The truth evidently was that Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150 = 767) was the first to adopt the methods of the Mūṭalīṣites and apply argument to the foundation of the Faith. Also, from the beginning, his standing was so high that it was simply impossible to call him a heretic. This status continued in the Māturīdite School.

All this goes back to the time before kalām had become a technical term and when fikhr meant both theology and canon law, with the difference that theology was called "the greater fikhr" (al-fikhr al-akbar); see article Kalām above, vol. ii., p. 6726). That was the title of one of Abū Ḥanīfa's books and we have a commentary on it ascribed to Matūrīdī (Haidarībād 1321), the only writing a-typed by him apparently in print. This does not occur in the two exactly similar lists which we have of his books (Saiyid Mataradā, p. 5; Ibn Kuṭūbihāghā, p. 43): 1. Kīlāb al-Tishāḥid; 2. Kīlāb al-ʿAṣīr; 3. Kīlāb Radīʾ al-Din al-Allāh li-l-Kābi; 4. Kīlāb Rāyān al-Wath al-Muṭalaṣī; 5. Kīlāb Tūʾūlāt al-Kūrān. Of these only the last is given by Brockelmann, i., p. 195, 4; the biographers praise it highly. The others suggest only anti-Muṭalīṣite polemic (for al-ʿAṣībī see Horien, *Philosophische Systeme*, by index). As a matter of fact it is only in one MS. of the com-
MĀTURIDI — MĀ WARA’ AL-NAHR

from the Arabian Nights, composed in everyday language an elegy on her old master and at the end of each strophe she said: "O my masters!" Whence the name of this kind of poetry.

From the point of view of metre, the mawāli, a popular form from mawāliya or mawāliyā, is a division of the kastī metre (first orīfe) of which the last verse of each hemistich is ḥālim, ḥālim or ḥālim. In its primitive form, the mawāli consisted of strophes, each of four hemistichs rhyming with one another. Later it was somewhat altered: the strophe contained five hemistichs in which the first, second, third and fifth, but not the fourth rhymed together or it contained seven hemistichs of which the first, second, third and seventh had the same rhyme and the fourth, fifth and sixth rhymed together. The red mawāli is used for war-songs while the green mawāli is used for love-songs. In all cases the mawāli must be in the popular dialect and make use of alliteration.


MĀ WARA’ AL-NAHR (Arab.) (that which lies beyond the river); the name for the lands conquered by the Arabs and subjected to Islam north and east were where the power of Islam ceased and depended on political conditions; cf. the statements of the Arab geographers on Mā wara’ al-Nahr in G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 453 sqq.; W. Barthold, Turkestan (G. M. S., N. S., v., London 1928), p. 64 sqq. The phrase Mā wara’ al-Nahr passed from Arabic literature into Persian. As late as the ninth (xvth) century, Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrāʿ [v. i.] devotes a special chapter (the last) to Mā wara’ al-Nahr in his geographical work. Under the influence of literary tradition, the phrase Mā wara’ al-Nahr was used down to quite recent times in Central Asia itself (Tābur, G. M. S., i., Index; the Orzeg Muḥī, Sīlim, Sprav. Knizh. Samark. Oblast, v. 240 et pass.)

Commentary on the Fīkh Akbar that this work is ascribed to al-Māturidī.

How the theological school of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥāfiz came to be known as that of al-Māturidī we do not know. The epithet al-mutakallim, applied to al-Māturidī, may mean that he was the theologian of the school of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥāfiz as opposed to those who were canon lawyers (ʿibāha). But the two tendencies to accept him and to suppress him still continue. The ʿAdīd of one of his followers, al-Nasaffī, fortified with the commentary of al-Ṭabīb, an Ashʿarī, is the theological text-book of the last two years of the Azhar course and is a final authority in Egypt. Yet when Muḥammad Abū ʿAbdī, the late chief Muftī of Egypt, a regenerator and reformer of Islam, put his views of the development of Muslim theology and of its final position into a course of lectures at Bairūt (Risālat al-nasrī: Exposé de la religion musulmane, traduite de l’Arabe . . . by B. Michel and Mou斯塔fă Abīl Kazīk, Paris 1925) he showed himself a Māturidīite with no mention of al-Māturidī.

The theological school in the two schools are commonly reckoned as thirteen in number; six, a difference in idea (ma‘na) and seven in expression (laṣa). For them in detail see the Siyād Murtaḍā, p. 8 sqq. and Abū Ḥalīfa, al-Kurṣān al-ḥalbī, Hādārābād 1904). They have been studied by Goldziher in his Vorlesungen, p. 110 sqq., and by Horten in his Philosophische Systeme, p. 531 sqq. It is frequently said that these points of difference are slight, but that is not so. The moral position of Abū Ḥanīfa is as plain in them as in his canon law. Al-ʿAshṣārī was concerned only to maintain the absoluteness of Allāh’s will; that he could do anything and that a thing was “good” because he willed it. Future rewards and punishments, therefore, had no “moral” basis. But Abū Ḥanīfa, and after him al-Māturidī and his School, recognizes that man possesses free-will (iḥrāf) actions for which he is rewarded and punished. No explanation is attempted of this fundamental attribution of predetermination and free-will; they are stated side by side as equal, if contradictory, facts. Similarly, while Abū Ḥanīfa admits that evil deeds are by the will (ihrāf) of Allāh—otherwise they could not happen—he cannot bring himself to say that they are by the “good pleasure” (rifq) of Allāh. Further, the Māturidīite School admits the doctrine of “assurance of salvation” and the Ashʿarī does not. A Māturidīite may say, “I am a believer, assuredly” (ḥākh), but an Ashʿarī must say, “I am a believer if Allah wills.” Because, then, of this essential difference in human and divine feeling the School of al-Māturidī has steadily penetrated the School of al-ʿAshṣārī and even the professed Ashʿarī at the present time is, to a greater or less extent, a Māturidīite.

Biography: has been given in the article. But cf. article KĀLĪM. throughout.

(D. B. MACDONALD)

AL-MĀ‘UN, title of Sūra cxvi. taken from Vs. 7 where mā‘un denotes the zakāt.

MAWALIYĀ, MAWALI, means a kind of popular song. Tradition says that this genre of poetry was invented by the people of Wahṣ, but that it was the people of Baghdad who after improving it made it fashionable. It is said that when Ḥārūn al-Rashīd had the most prominent Barmecced massacred, he forbade for lamentations them. One of the slaves of Ḥārūn, so well-known
although to the people of Central Asia the lands in question were on their side of and not across the river.

(W. BARTHOLOM)

ALMAWARDI, Abu 'l-Hasan Allah b. Muhammad b. Harib, a Shafi'i faqih, who on the conclusion of his studies taught in Bursa and Baghdad and after holding the office of chief faqih at Cstwua near Nasir, settled permanently in Baghdad. Here he often acted for the caliph al-Khadir (381–422 = 991–1031) in his negotiations with the Byzants, who then ruled al-Trak; when the Byzantines of Baghdad in 430 (1037–1038) asked the caliph al-Mukhtari to grant them the title of shah (muwali al-muwallid), he expressed his objections in a fatwa and thus earned the enmity of the Byzantines. He died on the 30th Rabi' I 450 (May 27, 1058) at the age of 86.

His works are said to have been collected and edited only after his death by one of his pupils. The following have survived: 1, Tusif al-Kirân or Kitâb al-Nukat wa'1-U'lamâ; MSS. in Kampur (s. Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, N.S., ii. xii.), Fez (Fihrist Madhî al-Karawiyyin, N1. 215) and Stambul (Kilic Sli, No. 90); 2, K. al-Hâdi' al-kullâr f.1 'Allâmâ; MSS. in the Brit. Museum U. 5829; S. Ellis and Edwards, Dict. Ist., p. 227, Cairo (Fihrist, ii. 215) and Stambul (Sulamianâ, No. 436); 3, his most celebrated work, dealing with constitutional law in purely theoretical fashion, disregarding the political conditions of the time (s. A. v. Kremers, Cultuurgeneesk. i. 396; M. Hartmann, Unpolitische Briefe aus der Türkei, p. 242), entitled K. al-Abhân al-Sultanîya, Constitutions politiques, ed. R. Enger, Bonn 1853; Pr. Cairo 1298, 1324, 1327. Translations: Public and administrative regla of the Îslam with an introduction reviewing the passions, in the Government of the Sultan, in the Netherlands-Indies by S. Keizer, s-gravenhage 1862; les constitutions politiques, trad. et commentées d'après les sources orientales par le comte L. Ostrogors, Paris 1900–1906; Les lois gouvernementales en règle de droit public et administratif trad. et comm. par F. Fagman, Algiers 1915; cf. II. A. Amedro, The Malazâim jurisdiction, J.R.A.S., 1911, p. 635–674; 4, K. Nasîbat al-Muluk, MS. in Paris, de Stange, No. 2447, 3, K. Tâbî'î al-Nâşir wa-Tâlîf al-'âsâfîr, on politics and the art of government; MS. in Germany, s. Fertisch, Fbr., No. 1527; 6, K. Kâdi in al-Subki, MS. in Vienna, Consularakademie, Kaff, p. 975, entitled Kânân al-Wâsir wa-Sayyid al-Muâq, MS. formerly in Lamberg's possession, s. Goldthorpe, Arch. xil, Philologia, ii, note p. 14 (the K. al-Wasir in Stambul. Top Kapu 2495) is however, according to Recher, R.O.S., iv. 710 perhaps only a part of No. 4); 7, K. al-'Imam al-Wa'ilûs; MS. in Berlin, Alexvayt, No. 2527; Cairo, Fihrist, p. 270; pr. Cairo 1310, 1330 (cf. Diet. Denkwürdheiten von Asien, ii. 382). Scheiner, in Klâfers Samste Studii, p. 502–513; S. K. Abd al-Âl-K, MS. in Stambul, Sulamiany, No. 581; K. al-Abhân al-Sultanîya, a collection of 300 traditions, 300 wise sayings, and 300 verses in 10 sa'f al-300 proverbs in Leyden, Catalogus, i. No. 582; 10, K. (al-Baghua al-wâlâ'î al-Fâhîm) al-Dûnî wa al-l-Dîn, a work still much read; pr. Stambul 1299, Cairo 1309, 1310, 1315, 1327, 1328, 1339; on the margin of al-Malik's Kâhiratu, Cairo 1316, in India 1315; Uways Wafa' b. 'Abd al-Azîznâni Khânzâde wrote a commentary entitled Minâhî al-Yahûm, pr. Stambul 1328. A synopsis was prepared by Ibn Liyûn a teacher of the vizier Liyûn al-Din b. al-Khâjîb (d. 776 = 1376), Madrid, No. 427. An anonymous synopsis entitled K. Madrîf al-Fadîlî is in the Escorial, s. Derenburg, ii. 748.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikân, Wafâyât al-Âyun, Cairo 1299, i. 410; Vâkiû, Irshad al-Ârîb, v. 407; al-Sibîki, Tabakât al-Shâfi'iyâ, iii. 303–314; Ibn Taghibirdî, ed. Popper, p. 718 (ii. 224); Wustenfeld, Schajîn, No. 305; R. Enger, De vita et scriptis Mawdu'd, Bonn 1851; Brockelmann, O.A.L., i. 386.

(From B. BROCKELMANN)

MAWdüD, Abu 1-Fath Muhammad al-Dawla wa-hûr al-Milla, ruler of Ghazna, was born about 412 (1021–1022). In Mahmarr 432 (September 1042) he was appointed to the government of Balkh with Khwaja Abu Nasir Ahmad b. Muhammad as vizier. A few months later, his father Sultan Marsâd was deposed and Muhammad, son of Sultan Mahmud, was raised to the throne. On learning news of this, Mawdûd left Balkh, took possession of Ghazna, and spent the winter in making preparations for a struggle for the throne with Muhammad. At the end of the winter, Muhammad marched from India to take Ghazna and Mawdûd advanced to meet him. A fierce battle took place on the 3rd Shaban, 432 (April 6, 1041) near Dunpur or Dinewar (modern Fathabad on the Peshawar-Kabul route) in which Mawdûd was victorious. Muhammad, all his sons except 'Abd al-Khâmî, Sulaimân b. Yûsuf, and Nâshîqûn of Balkh were taken prisoners and executed. Mawdûd returned to Ghazna in triumph, but he was not yet the undisputed master of the kingdom. His brother Malikdîd, governor of Multân, was advancing on Ghazna by way of Lahore, but three days after his arrival at Lahore, he died mysteriously on the morning of 10th Dhu 'l-Hijja, 432 (August 11, 1041).

In 435 (1043–1044) Sukhpal, alias Nawalâ Shâh, son of Dîpalî of the Hindusthani dynasty of Waihânî, formed a confederacy with some Hindî Râdja and laid siege to Lahore. Sukhpal was killed in action, and after his death the Râdjas quarrelled among themselves, raised the siege and retired to their respective kingdoms. The Muslims followed them in pursuit and laid siege to the fort of Sonjâst where one of the confederates named Dîpalî Haryâna had taken refuge. The fort was captured and given up to plunder but Dîpalî managed to escape. About 5,000 Muslims who had been imprisoned in the fort were released. The victors next attacked another Râdja called Tâhâ Bâri by Ibn al-Athîr, took his fort and returned to Lahore with immense booty. These victories restored for some time the waning prestige of the Ghaznavids in Upper India.

It was the ambition of Mawdûd to restore the greatness of his empire by conquering the provinces which his father had lost to the Saljûqs in Mahmarr 435 (August 1043) he attacked Khurâsân but was defeated by âlq 'Arslân b. Dâwîd. In the following month the Ghaznavids troops retrieved their reputation by inflicting a defeat on the Saljuq near Bâst, in spite of this reverse they became so powerful that Mawdûd found it difficult to overcome them single-handed. After protracted negotiations, he secured the assistance of the ruler of Isfahân and the Khân of Turkistan, and marched towards Balkh to join forces with the Khân of Turkistan, but he had not gone far
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when he was taken ill with colic and was forced to return to Ghazna where he died on 20th Rajab, 441 (December 18, 1049), at the age of 29 years.

Mawdūd was a good ruler and was famous for his generosity. Psakān-i Mawdūddi (the Arrow of Mawdūd) is called after him. It is stated that in his wars he used golden arrows so that if the victim was killed, the gold in the arrow would pay for his funeral, and if he was only wounded, it would defray the expenses of his treatment. He was a skilful general, and his premature death put an end to all hopes of crushing the power of the Saljuqs.


(M. Nāzīm)

MAWĐUDD b. ‘IMĀD AL-DIN ZANGI, KūTH AL-DIN AL-‘AḴRĀJ, lord of Mawlā. After the death of the elder brother Saif al-Dīn Ghāzā I [n.v.], Mawdūd was recognised as lord of al-Mawālī through the influence of the powerful vizier al-Djawād [q.v.] and of the commander-in-chief of the army Zain al-Dīn ‘Alī. A number of emirs negotiated with the third brother, Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who lived in Jālzāb and seized the town of Sindār, and Mawdūd began preparations for war. The vizier however, who feared not only Salābūn but also the Franks, succeeded in dissuading him, whereupon Nūr al-Dīn handed over Sindār to his brother and was given Ḥunṣ and al-Rūhba in stead. On other questions also Mawdūd followed his vizier’s advice; al-Djawād however fell into disgrace and in 558 (1163) he was thrown into prison and replaced by Zain al-Dīn Kāṭīk. In the next year Mawdūd joined forces with his brother Nūr al-Dīn in a war against the Franks, and in Ramaḏān (Sept. 1164) the latter defeated the Christian forces and stormed Kaftāt Hārm. According to the most usual statement, Mawdūd died on 22nd Dhu ’l-Hijjād 505 (Sept. 6, 1170) aged about forty. He is described by the Oriental historians as a just and benevolent ruler. He was succeeded in al-Mawālī by his son Saif al-Dīn Ghāzā II.


(K. V. Zetterstéen)

MAWḵĪF (A.), manum loci from κοίτη "to stand". Of the technical meanings of the term two may be mentioned here:

a. the place where the ṭāwāf [q.v.] is held during the pilgrimage, viz. ‘Arafāt [q.v.] and Muzdalīfah [q.v.] or Dhūn. In well known traditions Muḥammad declares that all ‘Arafāt and that all Muzdalīfah is mawḵīf (Muḥammad ibn Sa’īd, trad. 149).

Abū Dāwūd, Maḵṣūḥ, bāb 56, 64 etc.; cf. Handbuch of Early Mus. Tradition, s. v. ‘Arafāt.

Mawdūd has conjectured that these traditions were intended to deprive the hills of ‘Arafāt and Muzdalīfah of their sacred character, which they doubtless possessed in pre-Islamic times.

b. the place where on the day of resurrection several scenes of the last judgment will take place; cf. al-Ǧazālī, al-Durrā al-Ŷaǧīrī, ed. Gautier, p. 577, 683, 78, 513; cf. Kitāb ‘Aṣwād al-Ŷaṯīma, ed. M. Wolfl, p. 65 sqq.

(A. J. Wensinck)

MAWĻĀ (A.), a term with different meanings (cf. Layān al-Ŷarab, xx. 289 sqq.) of which the following may be mentioned:

a. Futur, trustee, helper. In this sense the word is used in the Kurān, Sūra xivv. 12: "God is the mawlā of the faithful, the unbelievers have no mawlā" (cf. Sūra iii. 143; vi. 62; xvi. 41; ix. 51; xx. 75; lvxv. 2). In the same sense mawlā is used in the Shi‘ite tradition, in which Muḥammad calls ‘Alī the mawlā of those whose mawlā he is himself. According to the author of the Liwān, mawlā has the sense of wālī in this tradition, which is connected with čhādīr al-Ŷaḥm (cf. v. c. V. a. C. v. Arondok. De ophokent van het Zuidtische imamaat, p. 18, 19). It may be observed that it occurs also in the Mawṣūl of Ḥayd b. Ḥanbal (i. 84, 118, 119, 152, 330 sqq.; iv. 281 etc.).

b. Lord. In the Kurān it is in this sense (which is synonymous with that of saiyd) applied to Allāh (Sūra ii 256; cf. vi. 62: x. 31), who is often called mawlānā ‘rādīnur Lord” in Arabic literature. Precisely for this reason in Tradition the slave is prohibited from calling his lord mawlā (Bukhārī, Qīḏāb, bāb 165; Muslim, Ḥadīth, trad. 15, 16).

It is not in contradiction to this prohibition that Tradition frequently uses mawlā in the sense of “lord of a slave”, e.g. in the well known Ḥadīth: “Three categories of people will receive twofold reward... and the slave who fulfills his duty in regard to Allāh as well as to his lords” (Bukhārī, Qīḏāb, bāb 31; Muslim, Amān, trad. 45).

Compositions of mawlā and suffixes are frequently used as titles in several parts of the Muslim world, e.g. mawdīyā (montār), “my Lord” especially in North Africa and in connection with saints; mawzūsit (moltā), “Lordship” (especially in India and in connection with scholars or sages).

The term mawlā is also applied to the former lord (patron) in his relation to his freeman, e.g. in the tradition: “Who clings to a (new) patron without the permission of his (legal) mawlā, on him rests the curse of Allāh” (Bukhārī, Qīḏāb, bāb 17; Muslim, Ḥadīth, trad. 18, 19).

c. Freed slave, e.g. in the tradition “the mawlā counts as the people to whom he belongs” (Bukhārī, Qīḏāb, bāb 24, etc.). In this sense mawlā, or rather the plural mawlāt, is frequently used in Arabic literature. The evolution of the idea as well as the position and the aspirations of the mawlā have been expounded by von Kremer (Gutlogschichte des Orients unter den Chasiten, i. 154) and by Goldziher (Muhammedanische Studien, i. 104 sqq.), by the latter especially in connection with the Ḥadīth [q.v.]. On the position of the
mawāli in the law of inheritance law cf. the art. MIRJAH.

Bibliography: in the article; also Douillé in *H.E.C.*, xli. 50 sqq.; Littmann, in *N.G.W.*, 1916, p. 102. (A. J. WENSKY)

MAWLAWI. [See MAWLAWI.]

MAWLAWIYA (Turkish pronunciation Mawlewīya), Order of Derwishes called by Europeans Dancing or Whirling Derwishes.

1. Origin of the Order. Its name is derived from mawlawānâ ("our master"), a title given par excellence to Djalal al-Din al-Rūmî (e.g. by the Turkish writers Sa'd al-Din and Pecewi, cited below), of which the Persian equivalent was called by the Munâshib al-'Arfîn (translated by Huwart in *L'Es. Sainte des Derviches Tourneurs*, Paris 1918-1922), bestowed on Djalal by Bulair [q.v.] by his father, with whom this biographical commencement commences. According to the same authority (i. 162), his adherents adopted the name Mawlawī, and indeed euphony of the *Mawlawâ* of the years 697 and 706 A. H. thus degenerate themselves (Nicholson's ed., i. 7 and ii. 11); yet Ibn Bâṭṭûta, who visited Konia after the latter date, asserts that they were styled Djalaliya, and the word Mawlawi seems to be used occasionally in the Munâshib in the sense of "scholar", which it ordinarily has in India. This work asserts that one Badr al-Dîn Ghiyârâsh (a historical personage, since he is mentioned in Ibn Bâdî's chronicle of the Seldjûks of Asm Minor) built a college at Konia for the children of Djalal al-Dîn's father, which was inherited by Djalal al-Dîn. The Munâshib (by Shams al-Dîn, Ahmad al-Alâkî 158-754 A.H.), however, so teem with anachronisms and extravagances of its statements must be used with great caution.

The European name is taken from the ritual of the dhikr, in which the derwishes revolve, using the right foot as a pivot, to the tune of various instruments. Djalal al-Dîn is said to have claimed that he had elevated the practice, but denied that it was an innovation (Munâshib, ii. 79). Certainly "dancing" ( lãq̇î) is mentioned as a Sîfi practice in works earlier by some centuries than Djalal al-Dîn's time, often with severe condemnation. The historian Sekhâr al-Tîbr al-Mawâshîd, p. 220, in recording an event narrated in 852 against the priests as well as in Egypt cites verses by one of the earliest Sâ'âdîs in which visions, which performers perform is compared to apes and are buttically reproached. Dancing is indeed a natural accompaniment of music (Aghâshî, x. 121) or poetry (Priásh al-Arzî, v. 151, 111), but the whirling of the derwishes would seem to have for its purpose the production of vertigo rather than the presentation of an idea in rhythm. Of the various reasons which have been assigned for it the most interesting is that recorded in the Munâshib (iii. 199) as the excuse of Djalal al-Dîn, viz. that it was a concession to the pleasure-loving inhabitants of Asm Minor, who might thereby be drawn to the true faith. The theory that the whirling was a reproduction of the motions of the celestial bodies is found in his *Mawlawâ* (ed. Nicholson, iv. 734), and the same view is offered in the much earlier *Akhla* of Ibn Thuâfîl (Caïro 1622, p. 75), where its hypnotic effect is emphasized. The same in the Munâshib are represented as able to maintain the exercise for many days and nights continuously, but the actual dhikr lasts only about an hour, with some intermission.

2. Relations with other Orders. Although the earlier mystics, such as Djuñâdî, Bištâmi and Hallâdî are mentioned in the Munâshib with profound reverence, the treatment of founders of orders who came near Djalal al-Dîn's time is very different. 'Abî al-Kâdir of Djalân is ignored, Ibn 'Arâbî mentioned with contempt, and Rifa'î with severe condemnation. Hâdîdî Bekîsh is represented as having sent a messenger to inquire into the proceedings of Djalal al-Dîn, and to have acknowledged the supremacy of the latter. At a later period the rivalry of the Mawlawi with the Bekâthi Order became acute.

It has been shown by F. W. Hasluck (*Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, Oxford 1929, ii. 370 sqq.) that the environment wherein the Mawlawi Order originated was in favourance of Christians, and that throughout its history it has shown itself tolerant and inclined to regard all religions as reconcilable on a philosophic basis. He suggests that the veneration of the Muslims of Konia for the supposed burial-place of Plato (in a mosque which was once the church of St. Amphilectus) may have been intentionally favoured by the Mawlawi derwishes, or possibly their founder, as providing a cult which Muslim and Christian might share on equal terms. In three other sanctuaries ofKonia, one of them the mausoleum of Djalâl al-Dîn himself, he found evidence of a desire to provide an object of veneration to the adherents of both systems. It is not, however, easy to accept his inference that some sort of religious compromise on a philosophic basis was devised between the Seldjûk Sultan "Alî al-Dîn, Djalal al-Dîn, and the local Christian clergy. It appears from the Munâshib that the Order was frequently exposed to persecution from the *famâsh* in consequence of the music and dancing; and they found an analogy in Christian services to the employment of the farmer. They are credited in recent times with having impeded the massacres of Armenians.

3. Spread of the Order. The Munâshib attributes its propagation outside Konia to Djalal al-Dîn's son and second successor, Sultan Bahâ' al-Dîn Walid who "filled Asia Minor with his lieutenants" (ii. 262). It would however appear from Ibn Bâṭṭûta's narrative (ii. 282) that its following was not in his time extensive outside Konia, and was confined to Asia Minor. The story told after Sa'd al-Dîn by v. Hammer (*G.O.R.*, i. 147) and others, that as early as 759 (1357) Sulaimân son of Orkhan received a cap from a Mawlawi derwish at Bulur, has been shown by Hasluck (ii. 613) to be a fiction. The historians make no allusion to any importance attaching to the Mawlawi chief when Murâd I took Konia in 1386; but when the city was taken by Murâd II in 1435, peace was negotiated according to Sa'd al-Dîn (i. 358) by Mawlânâ Hâmîrî, but according to Neshîr (quoted *vind.*) by a descendant of Mawlânâ Djalal al-Dîn al-Kumî, "Arif Celebî, "who united all the glories of worth and pedigree, and possessed mystic attainments"; the rebellious vassals supposed that a holy man of the family of the Mawla would inspire more confidence. The same person performed a similar service in 1442 (Sa'd al-Dîn, i. 371). According to V. Cunet (*La Turquie d'Asie*, i. 829) Selim I when passing through Konia in 922 (1516) in pursuit of the Persians (?) ordered the destruction
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of the Mawlāwīhānā, at the instance of the Shaikh al-Īslām; and though this command was repeated, the moral and religious authority of the head of the Order was gravely compromised. That the saints of Konia were highly revered in the Ottoman Empire later in the sixteenth century appears from the list of graves visited by Saiyid ʿAlī Kāpūdān in 1554, which commences with those of Ḥāṯāl ʿal-Dīn, his father and his son (Peschier's History, 1285, i. 377). In 1534 Murād IV assigned the kharājīh of Konia to the Čelbi. Yet the first reference to "dancing dervishes" in Constantinople which Hasluck produces, is from the time of the Sultan Ḥādem (1560–1568). Cuinet mentions three Mawlāwīhānā of the first rank and one Tekye of the second in Constantinople and the neighbourhood; he gives the names of the saints whose tombs they contain, without dates. He mentions seven other Mawlāwīhānā of the first rank, at Konia, Manisa, Kaɾaļiṣ-ār, Bāḥariyya, Egypt (Cairo), Gallipoli and Biusa; and as the more celebrated of the second rank that of Shamsī Tabrīzī at Konia, and those in Medina, Damascus and Jerusalem. To these Hasluck adds Tekye at Canea (Crete), founded about 1880, Karaman, Ramlı, Tatar (in Thessaly), and possibly Tempe (for we in Smyrna heard it was done in 1889 for one in Salonica see the work of Garnett, and for one in Cyprus that of Lukach cited below). It would seem then that the Order was confined to the limits of the Ottoman Empire, and indeed to its European and Asiatic territories.

By a decree of Sept. 4, 1925 all the Tekyes in Turkey were closed, and the library of the Mawlāwīhānā of Konia was transferred to the Museum of the city (Oriente Moderno, 1925, p. 455; 1926, p. 584).

4. Political importance of the Order. Reference may be made to Hasluck's work (i. 604 sq.) for refutation of the stories uncriedically reproduced by Cuinet and some less authoritative writers. In these "the Shaikh of the Mawlāwī becomes first the legitimate successor by blood of the Seljuq dynasty, and finally the real Caliph!" Hasluck supposes these tales to be based on the supposed "traditional right" of the Mawlāwī Shaikh to gird the new Sultan with a sword. This right cannot be traced earlier than 1648, and appears to have obtained recognition in the nineteenth century. It would seem that reforming Sultan ʿAlāʾ used the Mawlāwī Order as a make-weight against the Bektashis, who supported the Janissaries, and then against the ʿAlamā, who supported the treatment of the Muslim community as a privileged community against the dhimmis. In recent times the Sultan ʿAbd al-ʿAziz and Meḥmed Rūḥād were members of the Order.

5. The ritual of the Order has been described by numerous travellers, e.g. J. F. Brown, The Dervishes, 1889, p. 196–209; 1927, p. 250–258; W. Cuinet, loc. cit., p. 132; Garnett and Lukach in the Derwishes of the Eastern Turkey, (Curtius-W. Cuinet, Islamische Orient, 1910, iii. 12; S. Anderson, M. W., 1925, p. 191). The attire consisted of a cap called siba, a long sleeveless skirt called tevānür, with a jacket called desteq-gul, a waistband called elf-i-lām-end, and a cloak with sleeves called kherbe, thrown over the shoulders (in Lukach's description [Cyprus] "a violet gown worn over a black cassock"). The instruments employed according to the last report (dealing with Konia) are six: reed-flute, zither, rebeck, drum, tambourine, and one other. Cuinet enumerates four, of which three agree with the above, the last being hatil, vulgarly zil, a sort of small cymbal. Brown enumerates three: flute, violin, and kettle-drum. Those mentioned in the Manāṣik are rendered by Huayt, flûte, violon and tambour de basque. The service in Konia according to Lukach was held twice a month after the Friday prayer; in Constantinople, where there were several tekys, they were held more frequently, to enable the members of different tekys to join in.

6. Administration of the Order. The head of the Order, resident at Konia, had the titles Mullā Khânkūr, Ḥāfat-ı Pir, Čelebi Mullā, and ʿĀziz Efendi. A list of persons who have held the office is given by Hatimān (loc. cit., p. 192) after the Hâki-i Adhâkur-i Mawlānā, making 26 in all down to 1910; this list appears to be imperfect, and the Čelbi whom Lukach found in Konia was uncertain whether he was the 39th or the 40th. The head of the establishment at Manisa counted as second in authority. Cuinet enumerates seven officials subordinate to the Čelbi at Konia, but the names of several seem seriously mutilated. Others mention a secretary (sekkâ). An account of the discipline which those who assumed the title of Sharif had to endure is given by Huayt (Konia, la ville des Derviches Tourneurs. Paris 1897). They had to perform menial service for 1001 days, divided into periods of 40; when this was over, they were clothed in the uniform of the tekye, assigned cells, and instructed in the exercises of the Order; and they had to remain thus occupied till they believed themselves able to enter into relation with the Deity by means of whirling, meditation, and music.


MAWlid (A.) or MAWlid (pl. maawlid), time, place and celebration of the birth of any one, particularly of the Prophet Muhammad (Mawlid al-Nabī). From the moment when Islam in its attitude to Muḥammād abandoned the lines laid down in the Qurānic view of him and began to bring his personality within the sphere of the supernatural, the scenes among which his earthly life had been passed naturally began to assume a higher sanctity in the eyes of his followers. Among these, the house in which he was born, the ʿMawlid al-Nābi, in the modern Suq al-Lāl in Mekka, the history of which is preserved principally in the chronicles of the town (ed. Wustenfeld, i. 422), does not seem at first to have played a part of any note. It was al-Khāzuqānī (d. 173), the mother of Ḥārum al-Rūḥād, who first transformed it from a humble dwelling-house to a place of prayer. As the Prophet's birthplace in Mekka, the pious now made pilgrimages also to his mausoleum to show their reverence for it and to receive a share of its blessings (tīb i-tabarruk). In time also the reverence in which the house was held found expression in its development in a fitting architectural fashion (Ibn Djiqāl, ed. Wright, p. 114, 163; on the present state of the house: Snouck Hurgronje, Mecka, i. 106; ii. 27).

Records of the observation of the birthday of
the Prophet as a holy day only begin at a late date; according to the generally accepted view, the day was Monday, the 12th Rabi‘ al-Awwal. The story which Wustenfeld originated, according to which the pious Sha‘î ‘Iyâd bin Kâdîjî (d. 343) observed this day by breaking his fast upon it, which he only did on one occasion, is false. In his birthday lavish observance these solemnities were added, in the splendid veil festival of 13th Mawlid (487/515), p. 363 and pass. On the Jewish origin of fasting on Monday, see Weinsieck, Muhammed en de Joden, p. 126). But there on this day a special celebration was arranged, as distinct from private observation, one first learns for Mecca, where one would expect it earliest from the local traditions, from Ibn Dzhâbir (d. 614; Travels, p. 113), who however is obviously referring to a custom which has already been a considerable time in existence. The essential feature of the celebration is however only a somewhat considerable increase in the number of visitors to the Mawlid house, which was exceptionally open the whole day for this purpose. The visit and the ceremonies associated with it (mash etc.) are carried through entirely in forms which are characteristic of the older Muslim cult of saints.

But just as the later cult of the Prophet cannot be put on a level with the reverence shown to other holy men, so new and special forms developed for his birthday celebrations, which in spite of minor differences in time and place show the same general features everywhere and are comprised under the name Lu‘lî al-‘Aṣabî or briefly Mawlid al-‘Aṣabî. An anticipation of the Mawlid celebration is found in Egypt as early as the middle and later Fâtimid period. During the period of office of the vizier al-Malik (487—515), we hear that the "four Mawlid" were abolished but a little later revived in all their old glory (Maghrî, al-‘Aṣabî, i. 466; for the description of the festival: i. 433 sqq.). The celebration still took place in broad daylight and participation was practically limited to the official and religious circles of the city. There were not yet any preliminary ceremonies; but we already have a solemn procession of all the dignitaries to the palace of the caliph, in whose presence — he sits, covered with a veil on one of the balconies of the palace — the three khâtâba of Cairo (cf. above, ii., p. 928) in succession deliver a religious address, during which a special ceremonial is observed. As to the matter of the discourses, we only know that they were like those delivered on the nights of the illumination so that they presumably were quite mainly with the occasion of the celebration. It is interesting to note that the Mawlid ceremonies here are not confined to that of the Prophet but the Mawlis of ‘Ali, Fâtima and even that of the reigning Caliph, the Imam al-Hâ’ir, are similarly observed. As in the fundamental idea of these celebrations (Mawlid al-‘Imâm al-Hâ’ir), Shi‘a influence can also be traced in separate elements of it. It had not yet come to be a festival of the common people in the time of the Fâtimids. This no doubt explains why — except in Mâhrî and Kâla‘gândî, the great historians of Fâtimid Cairo — there is hardly any reference to these celebrations in the literature emanating from Sunni circles, not even when writers like ʻAli Paşa Muḥârak are dealing with features peculiar to Cairo and deal very fully with the history of the Mawlid festival.

The memory of these Fâtimid mawlîd seems to have almost completely disappeared before the festivals in which Muslim authors unanimously find the origin of the Mawlid, the Mawlid which we find first celebrated in Arabia by Ma‘rûf by Mu’tazâl-‘îb-‘în Kubârî, a brother-in-law of Saladin. The fullest account is given by a somewhat later contemporary, the great historian Ibn Khallîkân (d. 681) on whom later writers continually base their statements (e.g. al-Suyûtî, Hâfiz al-Mâkîrî [Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 157 and others). The personality of this ruler, his period so disturbed by the turmoil of the Crusades, and his milieu to which Ibn Khallîkân calls special attention, lead us to suggest marked Christian influence in the development of this celebration; his close relations with the Sûfî movement on the other hand suggest the possibility of influence of quite a different nature. This is clear from the description of the celebrations. Preparations are begun long before and people come in from remote districts. The prince takes special care that the visitors are housed in splendid wooden kubbahs specially built and they are entertained with music, singing and all kinds of amusements (shadow-plays, jugglers etc.). The streets of the town were, for weeks as busy as on the occasion of an annual fair. On the eve of the Mawlid night a torchlight procession took place from the citadel of the town to the khânkâh, led by the prince after the magrib ‘ârîf. Next morning the whole populace assembled in front of the khânkâh, where a wooden tower had been erected for the ruler and a pulpit for the wa‘îf. From this tower the prince surveyed not only the crowd assembled to hear the address but also the troops summoned to be reviewed on the adjoining maidân. We are told nothing of the substance of the address. On its conclusion the prince summoned the distinguished guests up to the tower to give them robes of honour. The people were then feasted at the prince’s expense in the maidân, while the notables were entertained in the khânkâh. The following night was spent by the prince like so many of the Sûfîs in samâ‘ (Ibn Khallûkah, Bâlîk 1299, ii. 559 sqq.).

In contrast to the Fâtimid celebrations, what is specially striking here is the large share taken in the festival by the Sûfîs and the common people, a circumstance which is all the more notable, as it is probably in this association with Sûfism that we have the reasons for the later great popularity of the mawlid. At the same time the torchlight procession, really foreign to Muslim sentiment, and borrowed from contemporary Christian customs at festivals deserves our attention; it is not found at the celebration in Cairo which was purely a day ceremony, while the lavish entertainment of all present, especially with sweets, and the addresses are found in both cases. In this remarkable ceremonial we seem really to have the foundation of all Mawlid celebrations. With the great political and religious movement, which we may call Salahî reaction, the Mawlid reached Egypt in Saladin’s time, where it is significant that Sûfism very quickly took deep roots, thus preparing the way for an observance like the Mawlid, which is essentially kept up by popular religious sentiment.

The observance of the festival spread sooner
or later from here to Mecca where its old form was transformed. Its further progress was along the coast of North Africa to Ceuta, Tlemcen and Fās to Spain but it also went eastwards to India, so that ultimately the whole Muslim world is united on this day in a ceremonial, frequently of unprecedented splendour, but alike everywhere in its main features. We have innumerable descriptions of the festival from all parts of the Muslim world, most fully for Mekka (Chronikten, ed. Wüstenfeld, iii. 438 sq.); Ibn Hadżar al-Haṭaimi, Mawlid ( Brockmann, G. A. L., ii. 389); for modern times: Snouck Hurgonje, Mekka, ii. 57 sqq.), where the celebrations have always been famous, for Egypt ( ʿUluḥ. Tawfiq al-Bakrī, Bait al-Sidfteh, Cairo 1323, p. 494 sqq.; Lane, Manners and Customs 5 (1871), i. 166 sqq.) and the Indies ( Snouck Hurgonje, Achehwezer, i. 207; do., Verspreide Geschriften, ii. 8 sqq.; Herklotz, Qamoune Islame (1832), p. 233 sq.; Goldziher, Coutte des saints (1886), p. 135; here it is frequently not the birth but the death of the Prophet that is commemorated). The Turkish element in Islām also has not resisted the advance of the celebration of the Mawlid (Turk.: Mevlid). Since Sulṭān Murād III introduced it in 996 into the Ottoman empire, it has enjoyed increasing popularity. Since the festival has been celebrated as a national festival. Accurate descriptions of the festival as celebrated in the older period of the court of Constantinople (Mouradgea d’Ohsson, Tohblan ginval, Paris 1787, i. 255 sqq; G. O. K., viii. 441) clearly reveal its relationship with the festivals of a more popular nature in other lands of Islām.

One element in particular is very prominent, and that is the most characteristic one of the later celebrators, namely the recital of mawlid’s i.e. panegyric poems or a very legendary character, which start with the birth of Muḥammad and praise his life and virtues in the most extravagant fashion. The origin of these addresses is already to be found in the religious addresses in Fī ḥalīd, Cairo, and in Arbe and perhaps in part at least goes back to the sermon usual at Christian festivals. The Ktaeb al-Mawlid al-Siraj fi Ḥasan al-Najla, which Ibn Dihya composed during his stay in Arbe at the suggestion of Kolburt was already famous as a mawlid at this period (Brockmann, G. A. L., ii. 310). It was not till later times however that mawlid became a predominant element in the celebration, along with torchlight processions, feasting and the fairs in the street, ever increasing in size. In Mecca, for example, at the present day they form the main feature of the celebration in the mosque among the pious they are the most popular evening entertainment for days before the celebration and teachers interrupt their lectures in order to deliver mawlids to the students and the people on the streets and in the coffee houses find edification and entertainment in listening to them. The number of such mawlids is quite considerable. Beside the famous but not very popular Bnāt Swādī of Kātb h. Zuhair of the older period, such as Būrda and the Hamziya of al-Huṣari and their numerous imitations, there are a whole series of regular mawlids, some of which are intended to instruct like that of Ibn Ḥadżar al-Haṭaimi, others purely edifying like a shorter version of it, and notably that of Ibn al-Djawi (G. A. L., i. 503) and al-Barzanjī (G. A. L., ii. 354). In addition to those in Arabic, there are a great many mawlids in Turkish (Irmlng. Engelke, Sulaymān Tschkleh’s Lobgedicht, 1926). It is significant of the part played by these poems, that they have passed from the mawlid celebrations to other festivals, so that the word has actually become a name for “festival” and particularly “feast” (Caṣima; cf. Snouck Hurgonje, Mekka, ii. 147, 154 and pass.; Becker, in Isl., ii., 1911, p. 26 sqq.). Quite apart from any festivals, the recitation of mawlids is popular, in Palestine for example in fulfillment of a religious vow (T. Canaan, in Journal of the Pal. Or. Soc., vi., 1926, p. 55 sqq.; cf. also the introductory anecdote in the mawlid alleged to be by Ibn al-Arabī [G. A. L., i. 441]). Like the substance of these mawlids, the form is very regular. Probe and poetry alternate, interrupted frequently by appeals to utter blessings on the Prophet. Dīkhts are usually added at the end.

The Mawlid as the finest expression of reverence for Muḥammad has found almost general recognition in Islām, as fulfilling a religious need of the people and as a result of the strength of the Sūfī movement. This must not however blind us to the fact that at all times there has also been vigorous opposition to it. This is found as early as the festival of Arbe and (al-Suyuti, Ḥusn al-Magjid). The celebration is a bida’, a religious innovation, which is in sharp contradiction to the tradition. Even ardent advocates of the festival confess this and the strictly orthodox, who adhere to the sunna, reject it most emphatically, but, as in so many other things, practice has here proved stronger than dogmatic theory. Once the festival had been thoroughly established in the religious life of the people, it was bound in time to find approval as an element of the iṯna’s. Its supporters found it easy to get this bida’ legitimated, in theory at least, as a bida’ alasana. When the festival had been accepted by the consensus of the community, the essential thing had been done and legitimate ground for opposition had been removed. While the opposition thus finds itself reduced to combating the outer forms of the festival and its developments, its supporters are never tired of calling attention to the merit that lies in feeding the poor, in the more frequent reading of the Qur’ān and mawlids, and in expressions of joy over the birth of the Prophet and all that the day brings with it. It is significant of the character of the opposition that the opponents object to those very forms which show the influence of Sūfism (dancing, samā’ī, ecstatic phenomena etc.) or Christianity (processions with lights, etc.). The most interesting document of this feud is a Sīrat al-Suyūṭī (d. 911; Brockmann, G. A. L., ii. 157: Ḥusn al-Magjid fi ‘Amal al-Mawlid) which gives a brief survey of the history of the festival, then discusses the pros and cons very fully and concludes that the festival deserves approval as a bida’ alasana, provided that all abuses are avoided. Ibn Ḥadżar al-Haṭaimi in his Mawlid and Kāṭb al-Din (Chronikten der Stadt Mekka, iii. 439 sq.) take the same view, while Ibn al-Ḥadžq (d. 737) in a more or less Miliki condemnation vehemently (K. al-Mawlid [1329], i. 152 sqq.).

Although the height of this struggle was apparently reached in the eighth—ninth century, it did not completely die down in later years; indeed it received new life with the coming of the Wahhabis. The cult of the Prophet is in such contradiction in their fundamental principle, the restoration of the ideal purified primitive Islām, that we can understand that they should completely
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Moiocco 813, the Moicco 813, the connection 13 the from 155 a the Fuciis) chief c 9 1SS7, the the 258, the famous precursor of their movement, against innovations which are contrary to the sunna (Ibn Tamiya against the holding of khutbas in the Mawlid night: Fatwā [Cairo 1326], i. 312). Similar ideas are still found to-day even where Wahhabism is rejected, notably in the school which Goldzifer calls "Kulturwahhābīmus", founded by the celebrated Muhammad 'Abdul (d. 1905), who in connection with the worship of saints condemns the Mawlid also, in the periodical al-Mawāsid (Goldzifer, Richtungen des islam. Koranauslegung, p. 369 sq.).

In the reverence shown to other Muslim saints, the Mawilds also play a great part. Although the success of an appeal to a saint does not depend on particular days, yet certain days and birthdays in particular are regarded as particularly favourable. These celebrations are often connected with places, to which a certain sanctity had been attached from pre-Islamic times (the Mawlid of 'Abd-Allah Hasan al-Badawi in Taṣa: Goldzifer, Mūs. Stöud., ii. 318 sq.). There are also Mawilds of nameless saints. In the devotional orders, next to that of the Prophet, the Mawlid of the founder is held in particular popularity. 'Alla Fāsha Mubātak (Khitab Qudwā, i. 90; iii. 129 sqq.) mentions a large number of such festivities in modern Cairo, the characteristic features of which, he says, are the brilliant illumination of the town, the ceremonial procession (Mukhtal: at the Mawlid al-Nabi: mawâkāt; cf. P. Kahle, in Isl. vi., 1916, p. 155 sq.) and the great feasts. One cannot now imagine the popular religion of Egypt without these feasts.


H FECHT

AL-MAWSIL. [See MOSUL.]

MAWSIM (v. from the root w-s-m "to stagnate"), market festival. In this sense the term is used in ǧaith, especially in connection with the markets of early Arabia, such as those which were held in 'Uqād, Madānna, Dhu'l-Mudāq, 'Altā, etc. (Bukhāri, Ḥadīṣ. b. 150; Tāhirih, sūra 2, b 34). At these markets the worst elements of Arabia gathered (al-mawsim yaḍrūr râbī' al-nās, Bukhāri, Ḥadīṣ. b. 31). Advantage was also taken of these assemblies to make public proclamations and inquiries, e.g. in order to regulate the affairs of deceased persons (Bukhāri, Khūnas, b. 13: Munākib al-'Arūs, b. 27). As the pilgrimage was at the same time one of the chief markets of early Arabia, the term mawsim is often combined with it (mawsim al-ḥajj; Bukhāri, Ḥadīṣ. b. 150: Ḥaqq, b. 1; Abū Da'ud, Munākib, b. 6).

Upon this basis the term mawsim has developed chiefly in two directions; it has acquired the general meaning of (religious) festival (Dousy, Supplement, s. v.) and that of season. In the Lebanon mawṣim denotes the season of the preparation of silk (Bistān, Mawṣīs, s. v.).

In India and in European terminology referring to these parts of the world, it has acquired the meaning of season in connection with the weather-conditions special to those regions, such as the regularly returning winds and rainperiods. This usage and the Mawānīn, mawṣīn, mawṣīn and other corruptions of the term are found in this literature.


MAWWĀL. [See MAWLĪYA.]

MAWZŪNA, a small silver coin struck by the Shāhīs of Mūsācc in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. It was the smallest silver piece and equivalent to 24 copper fulls or a quarter dirham. Another name for the mawzūna was ǧiṣ. In 1911 (1330) copper pieces of the type of 10, 5, 2 mawzūna were issued, the mawzūna being now the equivalent of a centime. On recent issues the name mawzūna has disappeared and its place is taken by sīt, i.e. 25 centimes.


AL-MAYURKI, nisba of three Arabic authors, belonging to Majorca (Mallorca), the largest of the Balearic Islands.

1. the poet Abu'l-'Hasan ʿAll b. Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Tūnāz, d. in 475 (1082), according to others in 477 at Kāzima near Baghādād; poems by him are preserved in the MS. of the Escorial in Derenburg, No. 467, 2; cf. al-Suyūtī, Būqayt al-ußālī, S. 327; Yāḥū, Msq. iv. 722.

2. the traditionalist Abu ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Abī Tānṣī Fustūlī b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh of Arabia, cf., for example, i. 3, where the sources should be added Yāḥū, Ḥadīth al-Arābī, vi. 58–60 and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Dīhlawi, Bustān al-Muhaddithīn, p. 81. In addition to the works there given, the following still exist: 1. al-Qāsim al-Ṣāḥibānī, al-Sūrī, al-Mulakābāt; MS. in Cairo, Fibrist, ii. 325 and Msīlīs, s. Dāwūd, Makātīb al-Mawṣīl, p. 194, 16 (fragment); Yahyā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Huhnār al-Wādir (d. 560 = 1165) wrote a commentary on it; MSS. in Berlin, Ahlwardt, No. 1192; Leipzig, Volek, No. 313 and in the Brit. Museum, No. 1603. b. Tafsīr ʿārābī mā kī l-Sūrī, al-Masānīd, in the possession of A. Tāmirī Fāsha in Cairo, K. A. A.D., iii. 340. 3. Tafsīr al-Salāḥī to al-Turī il-Tamīrī al-Munāthūf al-Wādirī al-Mushābāt; MS. in Scamb, Top Kapu, No. 231; photograph in Cairo, s. Fibrist, ii. 62.

3. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Tardjamān, born in Majorca of Christian parents, studied in Lerida and Bologna, then went to Tunis on the advice of Bishop Nicolaus Martell, who was himself a Muslim in secret, there adopted Islam and in 823 (1420) wrote a pamphlet against Christianity entitled Tafsīr al-ʿArābī (Adīb) b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣāḥīb; MSS. in the Brit. Museum Or. 5942; Ellis and Edwards, Descriptive List, p. 131 in Stambul, Khālīs, No. 5275 (with Turkish translation); Fāth, No. 2999, Asād, No. 1147–1148; pr. Cairo
fortress there except the old ruined tower (al-Buraidja). The difficulty of entering the port of Azammar led the Portuguese to establish a more accessible base at Mazagan. During the summer of 1514 under the direction of the architects Diego and Francisco da Arruda, a square castle flanked by towers at each of the four corners was built. One of these bastions was formed by the old tower, al-Buraidja, the name of which survived among the natives as that of the Portuguese town. This early castle still exists almost in its entirety. Particularly striking is a magnificent subterranean hall, the vaulting of which is supported by 25 pillars. It was probably, rather than a salle d'armes, a huge granary built to hold the contributions in grain paid by the tribes subjected to the Portuguese protectorate. It was at a later date used as a cistern to hold supplies of drinking-water for the garrison, when the place blockaded by rebellious tribes had no longer any taxes in grain to collect, which happened in 1541. For ten years before, the situation of the Portuguese stations on the coast, in view of the religious and anti-foreign movement stirred up by the coming and successes of the Sa'dian Sharifs, had been so bad that the king of Portugal thought of abandoning several of his fortresses. The taking of Mazagan, at the Cape of Guer (Agadir) by the shahf (March 12, 1541) was a warning. John III decided to evacuate Safi and Azammar and to concentrate on Mazagan, a more favourable and more easily defended position, all the Portuguese forces he wanted to leave in the south of Morocco. The operation was carried through in the autumn (before Nov. 6). From the month of April onwards the work of putting the town in a state of defence had been going on. The work was actually pushed on during the last months of the year (1541) under the direction of the great architect João da Castro, who used plans prepared by an Italian engineer, Benito da Ravenna. This was when the walls of Mazagan were built as they still stand to-day.

In retaining Mazagan the Portuguese wanted to keep a base on the coast to secure protection for the route to India. They also hoped that the fortress would serve them as a base for the conquest of Morocco, when a favourable conjuncture should arise, which however never happened. In fact for the more than two hundred years in which the Portuguese retained it, the possession of Mazagan only served them as a pretext to obtain from the Pope bulls of Crusades, which supplied the Popal Treasury with appreciable revenues. The tribes kept the town so closely blockaded that the inhabitants could not go outside its walls without military protection. The collection of wood and the cultivation of a few gardens, continually devastated by the natives, gave rise to continual skirmishes. The Muslims of the country around had built two little towns, a few miles from Mazagan, Fatḥ al-Samarrī and Fatḥ Awlād Ṣawārī, where they entrenched themselves to keep up the blockade and where the devout, desirous of acquiring merit from participation in the holy war, used to come to discharge a few shots at Mazagan.

Badly supplied by sea, often a prey to famine and epidemics, the garrison and population however lived in sufficient security under their powerful walls, against which the tribes could do nothing. On several occasions however, they had to resist vigorous attacks. In April 1562 Muhammad, son
of the Sa'dian Sultan, 'Abd Allah al-Ghālib bi'llah, at the head of a vast horde of tribal warriors laid siege to Mazagan. Two assaults were repulsed and the besiegers lost heart. On Aug. 4, 1623, the place, attacked by 3,000 Muslims during the absence of the governor, who was led into an ambush, owed its safety to his wife who ordered the gate to be shut, organised the defence, distributed arms to the whole population, women as well as men, and sent them on to the walls. During the disorder which accompanied the decline of the Sa'dian dynasty, the governors of Mazagan seem to have succeeded in raising the blockade and resuming relations to some extent with the tribes. The mujahid Sidi Muhammad al-Ayād, to put an end to this, attacked the Portuguese in 1639 and inflicted some losses on them. Mawlāy Isma'il, occupied with the siege of Cauta, never seriously tried to take Mazagan. The honour of retaking it belonged to his grandson Sidi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh. The Sultan came to besiege it in person at the end of Jan. 1769. The place held out successfully for five weeks but, the order to abandon it having arrived from Lisbon, the governor surrendered on honourable terms. The garrison and civilian population returned to Portugal with their arms and baggage. On March 10, 1769 the Portuguese exploded mines which did great damage; the sultan entered a ruined town which he repopulated in part but it remained in so miserable a state that it was called al-Muḥādina "the ruined", until, in the reign of Sidi Muhammad b. Ḥiṣṭān in 1240 (1824–25) it was restored by Sidi Muhammad b. al-Ṭayyib, Ḥaḍī of Dukkan and Tāma-na, who gave it the name of al-Dżafūra by which it is generally known to Muslims.


The name of Gurgan to the Iranians was the "land of the wolves" (wūshkānīa) the region to its west was peopled by "Mazānian dhaws" (Bartholomea, Alter, Wörterbuch, col. 1169 under mazānīa dāči). Darmesteter, Le Zend-Avesta, ii. 373, note 32, thought that Mazandarān was a "comparative of direction" (Mazam-tārā'c. cf. sīrāh and Shi'āh). But Noldeke's hypothesis is the more probable (Grunds. d. iran. Phil., ii. 178) who thinks that Mazān-dār = "the gate of Mazān" was a particular place, distinct from the part of the country known as Tapuristān. [A village of Mesderan (?) is marked on Stahl's map 12 km. south of Fīrūzkuh!] In any case the name Mazāndarān seems to have no connection with "Mazādārān" (Bouhais and Mazāndaran, Monatsberichte Ab. Berlin, 1877, p. 777–781) with Mazār-dūrān, a station 12 farsakhs west of Sarakhs; cf. Ibn Khurādābīhī, p. 24; Mukaddasī, p. 351. cf. however the late source of 881 (1476) quoted by Dorn, Melanges asiat., ii. 42.

The Avestan and Pahlavi quotations given by Darmesteter, loc. cit., show to what degree the people of Mazāndarān were regarded by the Persians as a foreign group and little assimilated. According to the Buñuel, xv. 28, transl. West, p. 58, the "Mazāndarān" were descended from a different pair of ancestors to those of the Iranians and Arabs. The šīh-nāma reflects similar ideas (cf. the episode of Kal-kā's war in Mazāndarān and esp. Vullers ed., i., p. 332, v. 290: the war is waged against Ahirmān; p. 364, v. 792–793: Mazāndarān is contrasted with Iran; p. 374, v. 993: the holiest appearance of the king of Mazāndarān). On the other hand the mountains (north of Šīnna-nān) and the Amardes (Amsādī) who according to Andreas and Marquart have given their name to the town of Amol (although the change of rd to t is rather strange in the north of Persia). These two peoples were defeated by Alexander the Great. The Persian king Phra-dates I (in 176 n. c.) transplanted the Mazdes (Amardes) to the region of خاپس (Khār or the east of Warāmīn) and their place was taken by the Tapurīs, whose name came to be applied to the whole province.

The Arabs only know the region as Tabaristān (Tabaristan, on the Pahlavi coins). The name of Mazāndarān only reappears in the Sajjād period of Ibn al-Athir, x. 34, in speaking of the distribution of fiefs by Alp Arslān in 458 (1065) says that Mazāndarān was given to the emir Inānī Baγhū. Ibn Isānāydārī, p. 14, and Yākūt, iii., p. 509, think that Mazāndarān as a name for Tabaristān is only of fairly modern origin (in Arabic?) but according to Zakariyā Kāzīmīnī, p. 270, "the Persians call Tabaristān Mazāndarān". Hamdalāh Mustawfī distinguishes between Mazāndarān and Tabaristān. In his time (1340) the 7 tuman of the "wiltayat of Mazāndarān" were: Bīrdjān, Mūrāštūk (i.), Astarābād, Amol and Rostāndār, Dīhrān, Rughād and Sīyah-rustāk (ii.); on the other hand the diyār-i Kūms wa-Tabaristan included Šīmān, Dāmghān, Fīrūzkuh, a town of Dāmāvand, Firīrm etc. We find a similar distinction in Khwandamīr, ed. Dorn, p. 85.

Geography: The actual extent of Mazāndarān (Rahān) is 200 miles east to west and 46 to 70 miles from north to south. Except for the strip along the coast — broader in the east than the west — Mazāndarān is a very mountainous country. The main range of the Elburz forms barriers parallel to the south of the Caspian, while the ridges running down to the sea cut the country up into a multitude of valleys open on the north only. The principal of the latter ridges is the Mazār-čāb, which separates Tabaristān from Tūn-kuš. The latter is bordered on the south by the chain of the Elburz in the strict sense, which
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separates it from the valley of the Shahrud (formed by the waters of the Alamut and Talakan and flowing westward into the Safid-rud).

To the east of Mazār-Čâbī, a number of ranges run out of the central massif of the Elburz: 1. to the east the chain of Nūr which cuts through the Harāz-pey and 2. to the S.E. the southern barrier which forms the watershed between the Caspian and the Astrakhan plateau. Between the two, rises in isolation the great volcanic cone of Damavand (9,900 feet).

To the east of Damavand the southern barrier rejoins the continuation of the Nūr and the new line of the watershed of eastern Mazandaran is marked by the ranges of Band-i-pey, Sawād-kūh, Shāh-mirzād (to the south of Simnān), of Harāz-darab (to the south of Dāmgān), of Shāh-kūh (to the south of Shahrūd) etc.

The rivers of Mazandaran are of two kinds. A hundred short streams run straight down into the sea from the outer mountains of Mazandaran. Much more important are the rivers which rise in the interior and after draining many valleys form a single great river when they break through the last barrier. Such are (from west to east): the Saradābūrd; the Čàllū; the Harāz-pey, which drains the region of mount Damavand and then runs past Amol: the Bābūl (the river of Bāfrūsh); the Tālār (river of Allābfād); the Tījīn (river of Sīrī) and the Nikā (or Aspānyaz) which flows from east to west, its valley forms a corner between the southern chain (cf. above) and the mountains which surround the Gulf of Astarābād on the north.

MAZANDARAN

The Arab geographers distinguished between the plain (al-sakhla) and the mountains (ad-djabaltya) of Tabaristan (Istakhri, p. 211, 271). The important towns of Tabaristan were in the lowlands: Amol, Nāṭīl, Shāhīl (Çallūs), Kalā (Kalār), Mila, Tārdī (Tūdīj, Bardīj); ‘An al-Humm, Māmār (= Bārāpur), Sārī, Tāndā (cf. Istakhri, p. 207; cf. Mukaddas, p. 355). The principal town (madīna) of Tabaristan in the time of Yağūbi, p. 276, still was Sīrā (p.-r.), but in the time of Masūdī, Tūbālī, p. 179. Istakhri, p. 211, and Ibn Hawkal, p. 271, the principal town (shāpāk) and the most flourishing one in Tabaristan was Amol (larger than Kāzin).

The mountain area was quite distinct and its connection with the plain is not very clear in the Arabic texts; cf. the confused summary in Istakhri, p. 204. Tabari, iii., 1295 under the year 224 (838) distinguishes three mountains in Tabaristan: 1. the mountain of Wandā-Humruz in the centre (waṣāf); 2. that of his brother Wandāsbandjī (fic) b. Alandā b. Kāzin and 3. that of Shārwin b. Surkhāb b. Bāhī. Now according to Ibn Rusta, p. 151, (the Kārinīd) Wandā-Humruz lived near Dūnbāwand. On the other hand, the same writer, p. 149, says that during the rule of Tabaristan by Djarīr b. Yazīd, Wandā-Humruz had bought 1,000 qārīb of domain lands (pawīf) outside the town of Sīr. Those alf qārīb seem to correspond to the region round the sources of the rivers Tūdīj and Nīk which in Persian is called Hānārgār. Later, the lands of Wandā-Humruz included the greater part of eastern Mazandaran. Wandāsbandjī seems to have ruled over the greater part of Mazandaran for his capital Muzz was the rallying point from which expeditions were set out against Dailam. Finally the mountain of Shārwin comprised the S.E. part of Mazandaran, for according to Ibn al-Fāqih, p. 305, it was close to Kūms.

In the time of Iṣṭakhri, the three divisions of the mountains specified are: the mountains of Rūbandjī, of Pādūbān and of Kārin. “They are high mountains (qārīb) and each of them (qārīb) has a chief.”

Rūbāndjī, according to Ibn Hawkal, lay between Raiy and Tabaristan. Barthold, Oiler, p. 155 emends the name to Rūyandjī and identifies it with Rūyān. Ibn Rusta, p. 149 says that Rūyān, near the lands of Raiy, did not form part of Tabaristan but formed a special kūra with the capital Kadjjī which was the headquarters of the Waṭ (cf. Kafarustāk in the būlūk of Kudjīlp). According to this, “Rūyān = Rūyān is to be located in the S.W. part of Mazandaran (north of Teheran). In the Mongol period, Hamdallāh Kazwīnī, p. 160, is the first to mention Rustāmdār (on the Shāhītūd). As Vasmer, loc. cit., p. 122—125, has shown, Rustāmdār later included all western Mazandaran between Saghnasr (Gīlān) and Āmol.
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Rustandar therefore included Ruyan, without the two terms being completely synonymous.

Djibal Karin had only one town Shahrmar, a day's journey from Sari. The local chiefs of the Karin lived in the stronghold of Firrim which must have stood on the western branch of the river Tidjin, which later flows past Sari. The modern budak of Firrim is in the Hazar-Djarib (more accurately in its western half which is called Duhang). According to Ibn Isandwy, p. 95, the persons of the Karins included the mountains of Wandakummil (i.b., p. 25; the water supply of the mountains of Amol came from this mountain). Amol, Lsfr (on the eastern source of the river Bbul which runs to Befursah) and Firrim, "which is called Kuh-i Karin". According to Vest, iii. 283, the lands of the Karins included Djibal Sharran (cf. above) which Timad al-Saltana, Khitn al-Tadwin, p. 42, identifies with Sawad-khfirst known as the sources of the Talur (river of Alehâd between Amol and Befursah); the pass leading to Sawad-kh first is still called Shaflin < Sharrin.


History. The local dynasties of Mazanderan fall into three classes: 1. local families of pre-Islamic origin, 2. the Alid sayyids and 3. local families of secondary importance: 1. The king of Tabarestan and of Padshahvar (Marquart, Erzähler, p. 130: "the district opposite the region of Kharār"; Farbzwergler is a misreading of the name, which is also found in the Bawandids, xii. 17) was Gushnasp, whose ancestors had reigned since the time of Alexander. In 529-536 Tabarestan was ruled by the Sassanian prince Kayûs, son of Kâwat. Anişhirvan put in his place Zomir, who traced his descent from the famous smith Kawa; His dynasty ruled till 645 when Gil Gabhara (a descendant of the Sassanian Djamasp, son of Peroz) annexed Tabarestan to Gîlan. These families, on whom whose coins might throw some light (cf. below), had descendants ruling in the Muslim period.

The Bawandids (who claimed descent from Kayûs) provided three lines: the first 45-597 (665-1007) was overthrown on the conquest of Tabarestan by the Ziyârid Bâdîs b. Washmgir, the second reigned from 666-1073 to 666 (1210) when Mazanderan was conquered by Muhammed Kharâimshâh; the third from 655 (1237) to 750 (1349) as vassals of the Mongols. The last representative of the Bawandids was slain by Afrasiâyîb Čulâw.

The Karins (in the Kûhi Karin) claimed descent from Karin, brother of Zarmir (cf. above). Their last representative Mazyar [p. v.] was put to death in 224 (839).

The Padâsânids (Ruyan and Rustandar) claimed descendent from the Dâbîyids of Gîlan (their eponym was the son of Gil Gabhara: cf. above). They came to the front about 40 (660) and during the rule of the Alids were their vassals. Later, they were vassals of the Bawandids, who deserted them in 566 (1190). The dynasty, restored in 666, survived till the time of Timur; one of its branches (that of Kûwâna B. Kayâmshâh) reigned till 975 (1567) and the other (that of Iskândar B. Kayâmshâh) till 684 (1574).

II. Alongside of these native dynasties the Alids were able to establish themselves, principally in Tabarestan. In 250 the people of Ruyan, revelling against the governor, sent to Rayy for the Zaidi Sayîd Hasan b. Zaid, a descendant of the Caliph Alî in the sixth generation. This (Hasanid) branch ruled in Tabarestan till 316 (928). The Husainid branch ruled from 304 to 333 (7). Another dynasty of Marâqshây sayyids ruled in Mazanderan between 760 (1358) and 880 (1475). The founder of this dynasty was Kâwat al-Din, a descendant of Alî in the twelfth generation. A third family of Muradâli sayyids is known in Hazar-Djarib between 760 and 1005 A.D.

III. The noble families who enjoyed considerable influence, mainly in their feuds, are very numerous. Râhino mentions the Kiyâ of Čulâw (at Amol, Tâlân and Rustandar) between 795 A.D. and 909 A.D.; the Kiyâ Djâlâli of Sari in 750-763; the house of Rûzaftân of Sawâdkhû between 897 and 923; the Dîw in the period of Shâh Tahmâsp in certain parts of Mazanderan; the Bânu Kâfûs between 857 and 957; the Bânu Iskândar over 857 and 1006 and the different princes of Tamîsha, of Miyanârûd, of Lîrdjân, of Mâmîr, of Iftây etc.

Besides this confusion of feudal dynasties, a series of conquerors from outside has ruled in Mazanderan: the Arabs (their expeditions began in 22 = 644; the final conquest took place under al-Mansûr in 145-144 [cf. the article TABARISTAN]; in the following dates and facts given are contradictory as Vasmer has shown), the Tâhîrîs, the Safarîs, the Samânis, the Ziyârids, the Ghazarîs, the Saljuks, the Khwarizmshâhs, the Mongols, the Sarbodârs, Timûr and his descendants, the Safawîs. Shâh Ismâ'il sent an expedition to Mazanderan in 923 (1517) but it was under Shâh âbîs that the land was definitely incorporated in Persia in 1005 (1596). This monarch claimed hereditary
rights there from the connection of his family with the Saiyid Kiwan al-Din Marashi (Ham-
sh. Tehran, p. 354). Farahabad was founded in 1020 (1612) and in the next year Ashraf was
built with its famous palaces.

Fahd; Dorn, Cog. pers. Alex; Dorn, Russ., p. 156–161; Marquart, Alexander's
Marsch von Perspolis nach Herat, in Unternehm. z. Gesch. von Iran, ii., 1905, p. 45–63; Stahl,
Notes on the march of Alexander the Great from Helapata to Hysrcana, J. R. G. S., Oct. 1924,
p. 312–319. On the Arsacid and Sassanid period: Darmster, Lettre de Tenar à Jaffar, roi de
Tabaristan, J. F., 1894, i. p. 185–250 et 552–555 (‘Tanar [Thars’], the priest of the Sassanid
Ardashir I exhorts Juggernaut to submit; the document translated from the Pahlavi into Arabic is
given by Ibn al-Mu‘allim in Persan in Ibn Isfandiyar); Justi, Fränkische Namenswürdigkeiten, 1895, p. 430–
435 (German); Justi, in Gesta d. d. Iran. phil. ii., 1922, p. 529; Maryncky, Erinnm. 129–126.

For the Muslim period: Haldahli, p. 334–340; Tabari, Ιστορία, Ya‘kub, Historien, ed. Housnuts,
502–516, 520–523; Ibn al-Fakhri, op. cit.; Ibn al-`Ashir, index, as well as the local histories
given below: an asterisk marks the works which seem to be lost: 1. `Ali b. Haslan ‘Ali b. Muhammad al-Mahdami
(birth 225). 2. Kitab Fatih Djibah al-Tabaristan; Mazandaran (written for Shahrizor b. Karim who
reigned from 496–503 = 1072–1109). 3. Abul-Hassan Muhammad Yazdzi, ‘Ukhd al-Sure wa-
Karzad al-Durar, Muhammad b. al-Hassan b. Isfandiyar, Tabaristan (written in 616
[1216], abbr. transl., by F. G. Browne, G. M. S., 1905; the manuscript mentioned by Dorn has
been continued to 842 (1458); Badr al-Masli Fulayla`-Allah Amoli, ‘Arzhi-yi Tabaristan (written for
Fahd al-Dawla Shahr-Ghuri, 761–780 = 1359–
‘Arzhi-yi Tabaristan (written for Shahrizor, 1359).
616, ed. Dorn, St. Petersburg 1260
(1850); Dorn’s German translation was printed in 1885
but only a few copies are known; Ibn al-Musallah,
Tabri`ki Mazandaran (late unknown); Kitab-
Gilan wa-Mazandaran wa-`Astara`ivd wa-Simn-
wa-Dargamgh wa-Daward (Pers MS of 1275 [1859],
cf. Dorn, Bericht); Muhammad Hassan Khan Zinmard
al-Salatana, Kitab al-Ta’riski fi Abolqoli Djibah
Shah, Tehran 1311 (geography and history of
Sawad-khul, lists of the Kowrdads, Paldpln etc.). Cf.
also the local histories of Gilan: Zahir al-Din Marasti, Tabri`ki Gilan wa-Daward-
stan (to 1489), ed. Rabin, Rasht 1530 (1912);
(Annex p. 476–498; correspondence of Khan Ahmad Gilani); Abul-Hassan al-Din, Tabri`ki
Gilan (to 1620), ed. Dorn, 1839; ‘Abd al-Fattah
Hamami, Tabri`ki Gilan (1525–1538), ed. Dorn,
1858; and the local histories of ‘Abasd al-Rahman b. Muhammad al-Mirdisi (405 =
1014); Tabri`ki Astarabad, continued by Ibn al-
Ashraf Hamzah b. Yusuf al-Sahmi al-Durjandu (d. 427
= 1036) who is the author of a Tabri`ki Durjand
(perhaps = Kitab Marjat ‘Ulama` Abi Djurjand,
written by Abu l-Kasim Hamza al-Sahmi in 689 =
1290, cf. the Catalogue of the Bodleian, Oxford
1787 [Urb], p. 165, Arabic MSS, No. 746); ‘Ali b.
Ahmad al-Durjandu al-Idrisi, Tabri`ki Durjand
(date unknown). A large number of Muhammadan
sources relating to Mazandaran have been collected
by Dorn, Die Geschichte Tabaristans und der
Serdare nach Chendermir, Mún. de Palacios
St. Petersburg, 1850, vol. viii, and Auswahl aus
deutsche, Schriftsteller ten herausgegeben von
dem Gesch. und Geographie, St. Petersburg 1858 (extracts from 22 works). For Timur’s campaigns:
Zafarnama, i. 348, 358, 379, 570; ii. 577; Münichjimbashi (1630–1702), Sabah al-Abdheer, Stambul
1285 (1686) (dynasties of Mazandaran; cf. Sachau’s
translation, Ein Verschiedenes von muhamman Dynasten,
Berlin 1923: Die Kaisischen Fürstentümer, No.
3–15).

European works: d’Ohsson, Hist. des Mongols, 1835, iii 2, 10, 44, 48, 106–109 (Continu-
mor governm Mazandaran), 120–122, 193, 414–
418 (Abaka); iv, 4, 42, 44–45 (Mazandaran
Persian, Houtsma, Karki’s gazette) 160, 164, 155, 159,
(‘Abd Sa‘id in M., 613, 622 (road of the port of
Suez).(Abd Sa‘id in M., 613, 622 (road of the
Zohra, 685 (Hassan b. Cohen in M.), 730, 760 (Tughra
Timur, q.v.), 739 (the Sarbadas, q.v.); Melgunov,
op. cit. (lists of the dynasties and governors of
Mazandaran); Rehatsek, The Banu and Gahabrah
sephendaha, F. Bombay branch R. A. S., 1876, xii,
p. 410–445 (according to Zahir al-Din, Mirkhond
and the Munkakb al-Tarabur); Haworth, History
of the Mongols, index (publ. in 1927); Horn in the
Grundr. d. Iran. phil. ii., 563 (‘Alids); Lane-
Poole, The Muhaman Dynasties, cf. the additions
by Barthold in the Russ. transl., 1899, p. 290–
293; Casanova, Les Ishevohd de Firdun, in A
Volume... presented a E. G. Browne, Cambridge
1922, p. 117–126 (the identification of Firdun
with Firuz-khan is wrong); Hurt, Les Zvirides,
Mén d’Asie des Inter., xlii, Paris 1922, index;
Barthold, La place des provinces caspiennes dans
erhistoire du monde musulman (Russ.), Baku 1925,
p. 90–100 (Timur in Mazandaran); Rabino, Les
dynasties avouedes du Mesdaran, J. A., 1927,
ecc. 253–277 (lists without references); Zambuir,
Manuel de généré. et de chronol. et Hanover
1927, ch. ix. and tables C and P, Vasmer, Die
Erörterung Tabaristans durch die Araber z. Zeit
der Chalifen al-Mansur, Islamica, 11, 111, p.,
86–150 (very important analysis of the Mu-
mammedan sources); Rabino, Mesdaran und Asia-
Naf, p. 133–149 (lists of dynasties and governors
detailed but without references); Vasmer, Die
Munus d. Ishevohd und der Statthalter von Tabaristan
(in preparation). On the Russian expeditions to
Mazandaran see Dorn, Custia; Koutoumov, Bunt
Stenki Razina (1668–1699), in Sobranie sovietski,
St. Petersburg 1904, Kniga I, vol. ii. 407–505
(Persian sources call the Cossack chief Stenka Razin
‘Iustin Gurzidi’); Butkov, Sur les événements qui
current lieu en 1782 lors de la fondation d’un
établissement russe sur le Golfe d’Astara‘bad (Russ.),
Zorn. Mus. Vnitr. deli., xxxi, 1839, p. 9;
Butkov, Materiali dlya novoi istorii Kavkaza,
St. Petersburg 1869, index (in the Persian sources
the leader of the Russian expedition of 1781
Count Woinowik is called ‘Karaighb [Gurzid]’).

Archaeology. Bode, On a recently opened tumulus in the neighbourhood of Astarahab, Archéo-
Logique, London 1844, xx, 248–255 (on the circum-
stances of the find made at Türcing-tap). Cf. Bode,
Anonymous coins were also struck. The issue of these coins with Sasanian types ended in the year 143 Tabaristan era (794, anonymous) but we have a coin of 161 (812) on the obverse of which in place of the king's head — as earlier on the coins of the governor Sulaiman (136–137) there is a rhombus with the puzzling Arabic letter چ and on the margin al-Fadl b. Sa'd Ibn-Kiyāsatan (in Arabic) is named; on the reverse, instead of the altar with its guardians are three parallel designs like fir branches, between them an inscription in four lines giving the Muhammadan creed in Kufic and the date and mint in Pahlavi (Tissaeu-hausen, "Zap. rest. old arch. obsch.", ix. 224).

We know diehams of Tabaristan mint of the Caliphs of the years 102 (Lavoix), 147 (Brit. Mus. with the name of the governor Rakh), 190–192, copper coins of the years 145 and 157 (Zambaur, "Numism. Ztschr.", xxvi., the latter with the name of Omar b. al-Ala). At a later date, coins were struck there by the diehams of the Alids (Amul, 253 A.H., 300 A.D. and A.H.), the Ḥiyād and Zayāris (Amul, Saniya and Fīrīm), the Bāwandāris (Fīrīm, 353–357, 401 A.H.), sometimes by the Sāmānids, (Amul A.D. 341, 353–355, 360) and Khurshid (Khurshid I., 357–359) by the Hulaguids, Berberdāris, Tinārids (Amul, Sār) and Shakhs of Persia (Amul, Sār, Tabaristan, Mazandaran). In Amul anonymous copper coins were struck from the xvith century onwards. On several pieces of this period the mint Tabaristan occurs. As these are all very rare, the issue must have been an occasional one. The dates are not preserved on any specimens. More common are copper pieces of the value of 4 Khābēk (18–22 grammes = 280–340 grains) with the lion and sun and mint Mazandaran, which belong to the xvith century. During the Russian occupation of Gilān in 1723–1732, to meet the shortage of currency provoked by the financial crisis in Russia at this time, Persian copper coins were overstruck with a Russian die (double-eagle) and circulated in the occupied provinces in place of Russian money.

These coins are often called Mazandaran pieces but this is not correct, as only Gilān and not Mazandaran was occupied.

tomb which is still standing (the first is said to have been destroyed by Čingiz Khan), was built in 836 (1431-1432). The masār does not seem to have been of any particular importance during the time of the Ozbeks and is hardly mentioned although several Ozbeks Sultans were buried there. In the first half of the sixteenth century, the place is usually simply called masār by travellers, the name Mashriq Sharif seems only to have arisen within the last hundred years. Abd al-Karim Bughāri (ed. Schefer, p. 4) does not mention Masār at all among the towns of Afghanistan: in 1832 when A. Buresh passed through it, it was a little town with about eight hundred houses. In 1860, the Afghan governor Na'il Abīn Khan, a Shī'ī, chose Masār Sharif as his residence; since then Masār Sharif has been the capital of Afghan Turkestan. In 1873 it was described by the Russian general Matveyev as one of the best towns in Northern Afghanistan with about 30,000 inhabitants (Kostenko, Turkestan, Kayi, ii. 157).


Masār, a name borne by over twenty Afghāni writers or men celebrated for their piety, among whom may be mentioned Abū 'I-Qubā Sulamīn b. Yākhfā al-Masār, a pupil of Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhāmmād b. Bakr. Celebrated for his learning and his virtues, he spent all his time in study and teaching and died in 474 (June 11, 1051—May 31, 1052) in a little town of the Banū Wissā (Wīsā, a clan of the tribe of Masār, which in those days occupied the lands between Gābeh and the south of Tippūn. He wrote a book on the principles of law (fusūl) entitled al-Muhaṣa.


Masād, the apostle of a religion, which was founded two centuries before him by Zādūqī, son of Khurshāh, but spread in Persia only after his propaganda; it had great political influence in the country in the time of Kāwād (488-531 A. D. with an interregnum). The latter adapted it and even made arrangements for putting its teaching into practice but after his restoration he put Masād and a large number of his followers to death. The best known feature of his teaching was the endeavour to remove every cause of covetousness and discord among men, and this to the point of, by making women and possessions common property.

It is not possible to reconstruct from the sources the Mazdaean doctrine in detail nor to settle its relations with the other religions or sects of Persia. The main features will be indicated here.

The sources. Detailed narratives of the reign of Kāwād and some important references to Masād and his teaching will be found in the contemporary Syrian and Byzantine writers (Joshua Stylites, Agathias, Procopius, Malalas, Theophanes). In Pahlavi literature there are few references to Masād. The bulk of our information about Masād and his relations with Kāwād comes to us from Arab and Persian writers and go back mainly to the Khvādīnāmâ or Royal Sasanian Chronicle, of which the best known Arabic version was that of Ibn al-Muqaffâ. Baron Rosen has shown that the other Arabic versions were not all dependent on this one, some of them having been prepared directly from the original. Some compilers also inserted historical or legendary episodes taken from other Pahlavi works and others attempted to harmonise different narratives and did a certain amount of retouching in their reconstruction of the original. The Persian and Arab writers who had these different versions or compilations at their disposal only very rarely mention their sources and endeavour in turn to reconcile the statements made. Noldeke has already distinguished two "Hauptquellen" for the various Arabic and Persian narratives (the first followed by Ibn Kūtībā and Eutychius and a part of Tabāri, the second by al-Ya'qūbī and another part of Tabāri). Christensen in his fundamental study thinks he can distinguish four lines of the tradition of the Khvādīnāmâ found by the Arabic and Persian authors in the form of narrations. Noldeke's two "Hauptquellen" correspond to the first two; a third is represented by al-Duwa'ari (Noldeke thinks his story is a harmonising of the two "Hauptquellen") and the Niyyāt al-ah hajj al-'Arab (J. R. A. S., 1900, p. 195 sq.); the fourth presents features of its own, some of which are legend in character and are found again in the Siyūsāt-Nāma of Niyyāt al-Mulk, which is independent of the Khvādīnāmâ. The common source of all these legendary features would be, according to Christensen, the Book of Mazdak, a Pahlavi work of fiction (like the Kūhīta wa-Dīnma), which enjoyed great popularity and was translated into Arabic by Ibn al-Muqaffâ and into Arabic verse by Abūn b. Abd al-Hamīd al-Laḥfī. The elements of this fourth line of tradition are, according to Christensen, found in the Kābīb al-'A伊斯兰, al-Hālibī, Firdawsi, al-Brījī, Ibn al-Muḥīr and Abū 'I-Fadī. Some references in al-Maṣādī and al-Khāṣṣānī can also be traced to the book of Mazdak.

Independent traditions would also be preserved elsewhere, for example by the Arabs of al-Iṣra. Al-Shahrestānī's notes (to which some critics deny any historical value) might go back to books of the sect now lost. These are not found elsewhere and their immediate source was Muhammad b. Harān Abū 'Iṣra al-Wārâq, a Zoroastrian converted to Islam. The source of the notices in the Fīriṣṭ is not known (it calls the Mazdakīs Zoroastrians); the Persian work of the xviith century called Daftār-i-Maṣādīhī, v. probably a mere compilation of no value, from sources already mentioned and the pretended Mazdakī book Daftār, which it quotes, is not genuine.

Doctrine. The fact that the majority of these sources emphasise the social aspect of the Mazdaean reforms and do not mention special doctrines or beliefs of the sect (some like the Fīriṣṭ and Ibn al-Muḥīr connect it with Mazdaitism) has convinced the majority of Orientalists who have studied this subject (e.g. Noldeke, Nicholson, v. Wesendonck) that the reforms must be considered as a social movement which aimed at purifying the Mazdæan religion: a communist system of which the precepts regarding women and property and those of an ascetic nature (like the prohibition of slaughtering
animals and eating their flesh) had however a religious aim, and were clearly distinguished by this character from modern social communism.

Christensen, in his work already quoted, comes to the contrary conclusion that Mazdakism was above all a religious movement and that its social precepts were originally a very secondary feature; it was, he says, a reform of Manichaeism, already preached by Zaradust, two centuries before Mazdak. Christensen supports his argument by two well known passages in Malala, of which the first deals with the doctrines propounded at Rome under Diocletian by the Manichean Bundos in opposition to official Manicheism. The second passage, which have afterward gone to Persia and spread his doctrine there, which was called *taut sa'artatū* (from the Pahlavi form *dirist-danem* = followers of the orthodox faith). The other passage calls king Kavadh *b' sa'artatū* (an inaccurate form for *b' sa'artatūs*), an epithet which contains an allusion to the Mazdaki faith. A popular form of *da'ītū* is said to be the origin of the very corrupt forms of this surname, which are found in the Arabic texts and are due to the similarity of certain Arabic letters (al-Tha'alib translates it “may his heard fall” which presupposes a form *da'ītū*).

Christensen thinks these links sufficient to identify Zaradust with Bundos (Bundos would be an honorific title of the reformer, “the venerable” from the Pahlavi *budāzg*, *bundūz* ) and defines Mazdakism as a Manichean ḍarštūzā. This theory is supported by al-Shahrastānī’s rūsūm, which gives us, along with the general character of the religious history of Iran, the best argument for this thesis, and those who hold the other view are forced to deny any force to the evidence of this historian of sects. Christensen also concludes that it is with good reason that the Byzantine historians call the Mazdaki Manichaean: but it must be added that their classification of a doctrine so little known in the west (where on the other hand Manicheism was well known and was, so to speak, the typical heresy of Persia) is not of much value.

According to al-Shahrastānī’s exposition, Mazdak's system resembled that of Mani; except that he said that the dark spirits did not act of their own will and without restraint (*l'kham wa l'khāthyār*), but blindly and by chance (*l'kham wa l'ittifāk*); that mixture is produced also *l'kham wa l'ittifāq* and liberation will be produced *l'kham wa l'ittifāk*. In this connection we must remember that the same author in his survey of the Manichaean testifies that the views of the Manichaean on the cause of mixture were divided and that some of them said that it was produced *l'kham wa l'ittifāk* the opposite of what was laid down in the original cosmogony. Other Muslim writers allude to this point in dispute among the dualist sects: Al-Mu'tahhar b. Tahir Al-Makdisi says, for example, that mixture *l'kham wa l'ittifāq* is taught by the Sabians, a name which is sometimes applied to the Manichaean. All this gives the impression that the mention of the Mazdaki teaching in this connection is quite in keeping with the conditions of polemic among dualists. Perhaps the practical teachings of Mazdakism should be connected with the doctrine of mixture *l'kham wa l'ittifāq*.

Al-Shahrastānī also gives from another source other details on Mazdaki cosmogony (the four forces, which surround the object of worship as court dignitaries surround the king of Persia; the seven virgins, the twelve spiritual beings, the three elements, the director of good and of evil), details which have their parallels in other gnostic and dualist cosmogonies, which should be studied with their names from the point of view of the latest studies in Iranian syncretism.

Al-Shahrastānī finally alludes to certain cabalistic speculations on the letters of the supreme name and mentius Mazdaki sects (like the Abū Muslimīya) still in existence in his time in Persia and as far away as Sogdiana. We may conclude that it is at least premature to deny all connection between Manichaeism and Mazdakism; it seems that rather than put the question in the form of a rigid alternative between Mazdaean or Manichean influence, it would be better to regard Mazdakism as a form of ignorance upon which two powerful religious forces have exerted an equal influence, the official religion and the Manichaean heresy, and some other elements also (just as Manichean gnosticism owes much to the national religion).

In any case, the feature which appears most clearly from the sources and which struck contemporaries was the general body of Mazdaki precepts with communist and humanitarian tendency and especially those which relate to community of women and property and were actually put into practice for a short time. The ascetic prescriptions are quite in keeping with a gnostic character of the sect (the prohibition of slaughtering animals and eating their flesh) which with communist teachings would be the elements forming the path to gnosis and liberation.

The presence of an ascetic strain in Mazdakism, as in Manichaeism, is probable. The people naturally seized on these principles and eagerly attempted to put them into practice on a large scale. Thus excesses resulted which, at least in origin, were very far from the intentions of the reformer and the elite of his adherents. This explains also why the religious character of the sect was forgotten and memory of its social teachings retained. Whether the founder and his leaders also abandoned themselves to the excesses of which the sources accuse them, one cannot say; we know that very frequently the initial good faith of reformers is disturbed by contact with reality.

It was natural to give a more practical value to this body of teaching, if we regard Mazdakism as a Puritan reform remaining within the Mazdaean religion and not becoming an independent religion.

Contemporary sources also tell us of a bishop elected by the Mazdakists, named, according to Malala, Indaraz (which Noldeke connects with the Pahlavi word *andaraz* = to advise; cf. the *imda* or *episkopos* of the Manicheans) who was slain with the other Mazdakis on the day of the massacre; according to Christensen, it is possible to identify him with Mazdak. During the persecution which followed the massacre, all the Mazdaki books were destroyed. The Persian work of the seventh century, *Dabistāni- Mazdakī* quotes a book called *Dinā* which is usually regarded as a forgery: all the notices of the sect professing to come from this book are
taken from the text of al-Shahristānī and other sources, like the rest of the book. The Book of Mazdak which enjoyed a great popularity and was translated in Arabic by Ibn al-Mukaffa’ and into Arabic verse by Abān b. ‘Abd al-Hamīd al-Lāhikī was a work of entertainment and not of religious teaching (cf. above).

History of the Mazdaki movement in the reign of Kawadh — The Massacre.

We know very little about the life of Mazdak (also written Mazdak). His father was called Barnādāh (a Persian name like Mazdak) and according to Tabar, they came from a town which Constantine compares to Tabard. Christensen is inclined to identify with Mādharaaya. L-pakhr and Tabriz are mentioned as the birth-place of the reformer. According to some sources, he had been a Zoroastrian priest (mādhādā); al-Bīfānī who sometimes follows a romantic tradition (cf. above), calls him mādhān mādhārā. The details of his doctrine are not known but it is certain that he developed and spread the teaching of his predecessor Zādū-ḵūt of Pāsā, who lived two centuries before him. It is evident that the disturbed condition of Persia after the victories of the Hepthalites facilitated the spread of revolutionary doctrines; but it is difficult to see why the king (whose reign began in 498) should have been converted to the new faith (and this is a question which also puzzled the ancients), and how he became connected with Mazdak.

The necessity of crushing the power of the nobility and higher clergy which he found annoying may have caused the king to use for his own ends a sect which aimed at destroying the privileges of these classes Nolderke (who thinks Kawadh was a man of strong will) credits him with this plan. Christensen (who had accepted this thesis) now sees in the allusions of some of the sources proof of the sincerity of Kawadh (whom, as he says, the contemporary sources do not credit with a “Machiavellian character”). Kawadh, he thinks, was moved almost entirely by religious motives and was attracted by the religious element in the new teaching, while ready to take advantage of any political advantages that the sect might be likely to gain for him. In any case it is evident that in his wars he was not restrained by any humanitarian prejudices, although one Arabic source with a hostile bias says that the king as a cantīf feared to spill blood. Christensen likes to compare his attitude with regard to Mazdaki morality with that of Constantine with regard to Christian teaching. In any case it is difficult to give a verdict on Kawadh, in view of the varying prejudices of the sources and the tradition of the time of Khusraw which in general tends to elevate the figure of Anisharwān at the expense of the others. There were numerous conversions among the upper classes; proselytising among the common people was facilitated by the wretched conditions in which they lived and of course also by the nature of the teaching which in every age has seduced the masses. Mazdakism thus became a remarkable force and permeated all the machinery of government. The practical effect of the king’s favour was seen in the measures alluded to in contemporary sources; but we do not know to what degree they realised the Mazdaki ideal, either as regards community of women (perhaps this was only an extension of regulations already existing in the Sasanian code?) or community of property (only taxes on the rich)!

But what is certain is that Khusraw at the beginning of his reign had to take important steps to remedy the disastrous results to property and the organisation of the family; such abuses were however not the direct result of the legal measure adopted by Kawadh but rather of the violent application of communism which was a later development.

The philo-Mazdak policy of the king and the growing power of the sect provoked a revolution in the palace and Kawadh was dethroned and imprisoned. Djamasp, his brother, was put on the throne in his stead. Kawadh succeeded in escaping and took refuge with the Hephalites and regained his kingdom with their assistance (498 or 499).

In the meanwhile, in spite of the dethronement of the king, the sect had grown more and more and its power became disquieting. The people, urged on by their leaders and more alive to the practical advantages than to the religious elements of the reform, naturally abandoned themselves to all sorts of excesses and disorder broke out everywhere.

The estates of the nobles were plundered, the women carried off, which, with a horror of communist principles, explains the violent language used by contemporary and Arabic and Persian sources against the sect. All this must have frightened the king on his return. Having revenged himself on his principal enemies immediately on his restoration, he now found it necessary to come to an agreement with the majority of the nobility and clergy in order to face the war with Byzantium. Prince Khusraw seeing his rights to the succession threatened by the activities of the sect, which, taking advantage of its power, was endeavouring to secure the election of Kawadh’s eldest son Padshahwār Shāh (Phthasuaran). It is also said (in the sources of the fourth line; cf. above) that Khusraw was eager to avenge himself on Mazdak, who had refused to take as his wife the mother of Khusraw (offered to him by Kawadh in recognition of the principles of the sect) until the prince humbled himself before him, then Khusraw, who had already begun to display his remarkable political abilities, must have had considerable influence with his father, who was persuaded to have Mazdak and his followers massacred, after inviting them en masse to the court on the pretence that a theological disputation was to be held (or according to another story, for the public proclamation of Padshahwār Shāh as heir to the throne). The massacre took place in 528 or at the beginning of 529. Arab writers wrongly put it at the beginning of the reign of Khusraw; this exploit earned him the title of Anisharwān. The number of slain is unknown. Kawadh died in 531 and after him Khusraw took special steps to restore order in the ownership of property and in the social organisation which had been upset by the application of communism. The surviving Mazdakis were persecuted in a blood-thirsty fashion and their books burned.

Mazdakism after the massacre. It is not probable that Mazdakism disappeared with the persecution; perhaps the survivors sought refuge in the mountains, in different parts of Persia where we later find sects (e. g. the Khu vamia) whom Muslim writers do not hesitate to connect with the Mazdakis. Nizām al-Mulk, who in his manual on the art of government attributes great political importance to a knowledge of the various sects, is very clear on this point. According to some
orientalists Mazdaki elements can be discovered in Bātinism and Isma'ilism. But the whole question of the relations between these sects (of which very often insufficent is known) and the old Persian religious forms must be examined thoroughly with a knowledge of the progress made in the study of Iranian gnoses and syncretisms. It cannot be dealt with here; cf. the articles ISMA'ILITA, KHURRAMIYA, MU'AYYIDA, MUHAMMARA, MU'AYNADYA, SINBAD etc.


**MAZHAR, Mirza DAIYUDIN, a n. Urdū poet and prominent play writer, also a dramatist, was born in 1110 (1699) or 1113 (1701) in Kālábāgh, Mālwā. His father Mirza Lījan, an officer of Awrangzīb [q.v.], who, when the news of his birth was conveyed to him, said his father was Mirza Lījan and hence his son should be called Dāyūddān; though his father afterwards named him Shams al-Dīn, yet he is known by the name which the emperor had selected for him. He was received into the Naḍjdabandhi order by Sayyid Mir Muhammad Badhdūnī and into the Kādīrī order by Muhammad 'Abd Sumāntī. He died in Dhihīlī on the 10th of Muharram 1195 (January 6, 1780) from a pistol shot fired at him by some Shī'īs fanatic. His memoirs with some letters, called Na'amāt Maṣḥāri or Labīf al-Ḥanasa are edited by Muhammad Beg b. Rahīm Beg, Dhihīlī A. H. 1301, A. D. 1882. His biography, together with notices of his disciples, has been written by Muḥammad Naʿīm Allāh Bahdrūdi in Bihārī al-Maṣḥāria.**

**Bibliography:** Shahī, Gulṣān Bītār, fol. 142b—143a; Azād, Aʾṣā Hayāt, Lahore 1913, p. 137—148; Karīm al-Dīn, Turāḥīki Shuʿābdī-ʿUrdū, Dhihīlī 1848, p. 105—107; Hololik al-Ḥanasiyya, Lucknow 1801, p. 453; Sprenger, Oude Catalogue, p. 488; García de Tassy, Hist. Hind., i. 297; and Rieu, Cat. Persain Miss. Br. Mus., i. 363a. (M. HAYADER HOSAYNY)

**MAZĪN, the name of several Arab tribes who are represented in all the great ethnic groupings of the Peninsula; this finds typical expression in the anecdote recorded in Aḥānī, v. 141 (= Yākūt, Irākād, ii. 382—383), according to which the Caliph al-Ḥārīm asked the grammarians Abū Qumān al-Māzin, who had come to his court, to which Mazīn he belonged: — if to the Mazīn of the Tamīm, to those of the Kāsa', to those of the Rabi'a or to those of the Yemen. The first are the Mazīn b. Mālik b. Amr b. Tamīm (Wustenfeld, Gener. Tabellen, L. 12); the second, the Mazīn b. Manṣūr (D. 10) or the Mazīn b. Fazāra (H. 12); the third, the Mazīn b. Shābān b. Dhuḥil (C. 19); the last, the Mazīn b. al-Nāḏīrī, a clan of the Khaḍrāz Anṣār (19, 24). But alongside of these, many other tribes and clans bore this name. The Djamharat al-Ansārī of Ibn al-Kalbī gives no less than seventy, of whom the best known are: the Mazīn b. Saʿd b. ʿUdhā (Ibn Kutāba, K. al-Maʿārīf, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 36; more accurately according to the Djamhara, MS. Br. Mus., Add. 23, 297, fol. 134r: Mazīn b. ʿAbd Manāt b. Bakr b. Saʿd b. Dhuḥil; not given in the Tabellen); Mazīn b. Saʿdā b. Muʿāwiya b. Bakr b. Haṣān (Ibn Kutāba, p. 42; Tabellen, H. 14); Mazīn b. Raʿīsh b. Qaṭafān (H. 10); Mazīn b. Raḥif b. Zuḥayr or Mazīn Madīhī (7, 18); Mazīn b. al-Azd (11, 11). The large number of tribes named Mazīn and their distribution over the whole of Arabia makes the hypothesis that we have here a single tribe that had been broken up into small sections impossible and we are led to suppose that the name Mazīn, is a descriptive rather than a proper name; since the verb mazāna means to “go away”, one might suppose that Mazīn originally meant “the emigrants” and was used in a general way as any ethnic group which became separated from its own tribe and was incorporated in a strange tribe. This etymology, like almost all those of the names of Arab tribes, is of only a small value.

The sources give a certain number of geographical and historical references to different tribes called Mazīn; but they are generally very scanty, none of these tribes having attained sufficient importance to make it independent of the larger body to which it was attached. We have a few details about the Mazīn b. al-Nāḏīrī, a fairly important group of Madinese Khaḍrāz (on the part played by them at the beginning of Islam see Castani, Annali dell’ Islam, Index to Vols. i.—ii.), as well as about the Mazīn b. Fazāra who took part as members of the tribe of the Dhubyān, in the war of Dāyūs and al-Qabilia (cf. Dhihīlī, and Aḥānī, xvi. 27). Ibn Maiyāda, himself a Dhubyān, directed a violent satire against them at the end of the first century a. H. (Aḥānī, i. 90, 102). As to the Mazīn b. al-Nāḏīrī b. Dhuḥil, to whom the grammarians Abū Qumān Othman belonged, we know from the anecdote above quoted that in their dialect, m (initial?) was pronounced like b (ba'smuka for ma'smuka, what is thy name?), a peculiarity which does not seem to be recorded of the dialect of other Rabi'a. Lastly the Mazīn b. al-Azd, whom tradition makes migrate to the north, their changed name to Ghassān [q. v.] under which they became celebrated.

It is only of the Mazīn b. Mālik b. Amr b. Tamīm that we have fairly full information. Legend, which has developed with unusual detail around the sons of Tamīm [q. v.] gives Mazīn a part in the story of his uncle 'Abd Shams b. Saʿd b. Qaʿit Manāt b. Tamīm's fight against al-ʾAnbar b. Amr b. Tamīm (cf. al-Mufaddal b. Salama, al-Fāıkī, ed. Storey, p. 233 and the references given in the note). This tribe of Mazīn never left the great group of the 'Amr b. Tamīm to which they were around the well of Safārī near Dhī Kār (Vančík, ed. Bevan, p. 48, note to line 17; Yākūt, ii. 95; Bakrī, p. 724. 1; 787—788); their principal subdivisions were the Bani Ḥurṣūs, Khuṣūs, Rūzām, Anār, Zabīna, Ḫūthā and Raʿīsh. In the Dḥāliya, the Mazīn followed their parent tribe and we find them sharing in the
MAZIN — MAZYADIS

wars of the latter; in rotation with the other Tamimi tribes they held the office of ḥakīm at the fair of ʿUkāṭa (Aḥadīdī, p. 438). At the coming of ʿɪl-am their chief was Muḥammad b. Shūḥāb, known as a poet (cf. especially al-Dhahībī, Bayānī, ii. 171; al-Kalī, Anāḥī, iii. 50; Ibn Ḥadjar, Ḥāfiẓ, Cairo 1325; vi. 156). Without being particularly zealous partisans of the new religion, they did not take part in the ṭīdās with the other Tamīmī tribes (11 a. 1.) and they even drove away the messengers sent them by the prophetess Ṣaḍjaḥ [q. v.] and made one of them prisoner, the Taghtībī al-Ḥuḍḥūlī b. ʿIrām; the latter waited for his revenge till the troubled period that followed the murder of the Ḥalīf ʿOṯmān (35 = 656), of which he took advantage to ravage the district of Safārī; but the Mazīn met him and slew him and threw him into the well (Ṭabārī, i. 1911, 1913; cf. Aḥānī, xix. 145—146, transl. in Caeter, Annāl dell'Islam, x. 552—553; in the last passage the expedition against the Safārī appears to have been a private affair). In the event of this downfall.

At a late date, the Mazīn settled in large numbers, like the rest of the Tamīmīs, in Khūrasān and took part in the conquest of Central Asia; among the Mazīnīs who distinguished themselves there were Shūḥāb b. Muḥkājī, son of the chief already mentioned (Ṭabārī, i. 2569, 2707); Ḥilāl b. al-ʿĀṯwāz, who in 1020 (720) slew the members of the family of Yazīd b. al-Muḥallab after the defeat of the latter (Ṭabārī, ii. 1912—1913); ʿUmar b. ʿṢūnān, who killed the Persian chief Ṣuthīl (Ibn al-Kalbī, Nastaʿl-qāhī, p. 30, note to lines 3—4). We also find many of the Banū Mazīn among the khurābd of the ʿAbīdīd army in the time of the rising against the Umayyads. But a no less number went to swell the ranks of the Khāḍījīdīs, the celebrated chief of the Azākīs, ʿAlī b. al-Fudāfī [q. v.], belonged to the Mazīnī clan of Kūwāya b. ʿUṯrīs. Very few of the remarkable number of poets produced by the Tamīmīs belonged to the Mazīn. We may note however Ḥilāl b. Asʿār of the Omayyad period (Aḥānī, xii. 186); Mālik b. al-Raḥbī, poet and brigand, contemporary of al-Ḥadījīdī (Aḥānī, xix. 162—169; Ibn Kutābā, al-Shībaw ʿl-ʿSwhāwa, ed. de Goeye, p. 205—207); Zuhāb b. ʿUrwa al-Sakī (Aḥānī, xix. 156: the few verses are not, however, often quoted. They are also attributed to his father, ʿUrwa b. Ḥiḍhām, and even to ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ḥassān b. Ṣuṭḥī: cf. Muḥajīfayat, ed. Lynell, p. 249, note y). Lastly it may be mentioned that the Mazīn have given to Arab philology two of its most illustrious masters: Abū ʿAmr b. ʿAlī [q. v.], d. 154) and Naṣr b. Ṣumāl whose genealogies are given in Wustenfeld, Tabellen (1.).


MAZYADIS, a Muḥammadan dynasty in al-Ḥilla. The Banū Mazīn belonged to the tribe of Asād and lived west of the Tigris, from Kūf to Hit. In the southeast, on the Ḥijjāzīst frontiers, the Banū Dubaisi settled. When Abū ʿl-Ghānāʾim Muḥammad b. Mayādī, who was related to the Banū Dubaisi, slew one of their chiefs with whom he had quarrelled, a war broke out between the two tribes (401 = 1010—1011). Abū ʿl-Ghānāʾim fled to his brother Abū ʿl-Hāsan ʿAlī; the latter set out against the Banū Dubaisi with an army, but was defeated and Abū ʿl-Ghānāʾim fell in the battle. In 403 (1012—1013) ʿAlī was recognized as emīr by the Būyid Sulṭān al-Dawla. In Muḥarram 405 (July 1014), he undertook a campaign against the Banū Dubaisi, to revenge himself for the defeat he had suffered and slew Ḥassān and Nābān, the sons of Dubaisi, but in Djiwādā of the same year (Oct.—Nov. 1014) he was routed by his brother Muṭar. After ʿAlī's death in Dhu ʿl-Kaʿdā 408 (March—April 1018), his son Dubaisi succeeded him. The latter's brother Abū-Ḥakamād with the help of Turkish mercenaries in Baghdād, endeavoured to seize the power for himself; but order was soon restored and Abū-Ḥakamād went to al-Mawṣil to the ʿUkāṭīs. In a few years Dubaisi became involved in war with Karawan b. al-Muḳallād [q. v.] and he had also troubles within his borders. In 412 (1022) the troops of al-Kādījīrā and Dījālāl al-Dawla invaded the brother's territory. Dubaisi had to take to flight and the land was laid waste. Peace however was soon arranged. Dubaisi was allowed to retain his lands but had to pay Dījālāl al-Dawla a considerable sum. The third brother ʿAbīḍī allied himself with al-Bāṣāsīrī, the military governor of Baghdād, and in 424 (1032—1033) they advanced against Dubaisi. The latter sent an army to meet them; but his troops were routed and he himself had to take to flight. After receiving reinforcements he advanced against ʿAbīḍī; they met at Dījār-ṣarī and after a fierce battle, Dubaisi had to cede a part of his possessions while al-Bāṣāsīrī, who arrived too late to take part in the battle, returned to Baghdād. In Radjāb 446 (Oct.—Nov. 1054) the Banū Kūfādā invades the country but were soon driven out with the help of al-Bāṣāsīrī. Two or three years later war broke out between al-Bāṣāsīrī who was joined by Dubaisi, and the Sāliḍī Sulṭān Toghrī Beg and his follower Karawan b. Badrān [q. v.], Dubaisi died in Shawwal 474 (March—April 1082) at the age of 80. His son Mansūr succeeded him but died in Rabi 1, 479 (June—July 1086). In the reign of his son and successor ʿṢadāka [q. v.] the power of the Mazīdīs spread over almost the whole of the ʿIrāq. At first he was a stout supporter of Bakhtyārīdī [q. v.]; in 494 (1100—1101) however he turned to his brother. The towns of Hit, Ṭaw, Basra and Talʿīt fell successively into his hands but, as the commander-in-chief ʿṢadāka in Basra did not prove fit for his task, Muḥammad seized the suzerainty of the town and installed a new governor. In ʿṢadāka's reign the capital al-Ḥijmān was extended and fortified, and given the name of al-Hilla (495 = 1101—1102). His steadily increasing power however aroused Muḥammad's misgivings and in spite of long negotiations, a rupture finally occurred between them. At the end of Radjāb 501 (Febr.—March 1108) Muḥammad himself set out from Baghdād against ʿṢadāka. A section of the Arabs allied with him fled and ʿṢadāka fell in the battle. His son Dubaisi was taken prisoner but the latter's two brothers escaped and were only able to return home after Muḥammad's death
In [511 = 1118], in [529 (1135)] he was treacherously murdered [cf. the article Dubais] and succeeded by his son Sadaka. In the war between Sultan Mas'ud and his nephew Dawud, Sadaka declared for the former. After Mas'ud's victory, the troops scattered to seek booty and several emirs including Sadaka were surprised and captured by the enemy and at once put to death ([532 = 1137—1138]). Sadaka's brother Muhammad was thereupon recognised as lord of al-Hilla. In [540 (1145—1146)] however, the third brother Ali went to al-Hilla, because he was afraid of the Sultan and drove out Muhammad. After he had taken the town, he drove back the Sultan's troops and it was not till 542 (1147—1148) that Salerkerd, one of Mas'ud's generals, was able to expel Ali but in the same year he was defeated by the latter and had to abandon the town. In [544 (1149—1150)] Ali endeavoured to induce the caliph al-Mu'tafid to abandon Mas'ud but, as the caliph refused and summoned the Sultan to his help, Ali had to submit and the rebels who had joined him dispersed. Ali died in the following year and al-Hilla was given as a fief to Salerkerd by Mas'ud. On Mas'ud's death in 547 (1152), the town fell into the hands of Mas'ud's illal, the commander of Baghda; the latter however was driven out by the caliph's troops who occupied al-Hilla. When in 551 (1157) Sultan Muhammad took the field against al-Mu'tafid [q.v.], they had to withdraw and Muhammad sent a garrison in the town. The Mazyadis submitted to his deputy but in 558 (1162—1163) the caliph al-Mustansird sent an army against them with an end to their power. 4,000 men were slain and the remainder outlawed so that they were scattered in all directions.


**Mazyar, [Bālādhir] gives the former Māzh-yāzd-yr, the last of the Kārīnīd rulers of Tabaristan, leader of the rising against the caliph al-Muttaṣim.**

**Origins.** The Kārīnīd dynasty claimed descent from Kārin b. Sūkhra, whom Khusrav Anuṣhirwān had established in Tabaristan and who was descended from the legendary smith Kāwa, who saved Farīdūn. The hereditary fief of the dynasty was the “mountain of Kārin” [or of Windād-Hurmuz], Tabarī, iii, 1295. The capital of this region was probably Lapīra (cf. Lafa'īn on the eastern source of the river Fābul which later runs through Bārfūrūsh). The Kārīnīd were subordinate to the Bāwandid ispakhabads (capital Firīm). The genealogy of the Kārnīds given by Zahrī al-Dīn, p. 167 and 321 is fantastic. The first Kārīnīd known is Windād-Hurmuz (138—190—755—805?) who raised a coalition of local chiefs against the Arabs (the Bāwandid Shawrīn, [the] Mās-muḥāfūz Wallāth of Mīyānūrd, the Fāḍūspān Shahrīyār b. Fāḍūspān) and defeated the generals sent by the caliph al-Mahdī (first Sālim Farghānī, then Fīrāsā; Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 128; Zahrī al-Dīn, p. 155—159). Windād-Hurmuz then submitted to Hādī, the son of the Caliph, and accompanied him to Bagdād. Soon he returned to his native mountains and resumed an independent attitude (ibid., p. 160). According to Ibn al-Fakīh, p. 304, Windād-Hurmuz came to the court of Hārūn al-Rashīd, who appointed him ispakhabad of Khurāsān. He died in the reign of al-Maʿmūn. His son and successor was Kārin (a contemporary of the Bāwandid Shahrīyār). According to Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 145, he accompanied al-Maʿmūn on his campaign against the Byzantines but this does not agree with the dates given for his successor.

According to Zahrī al-Dīn, p. 321, Māzīyar b. Kārin ruled for 30 years (194—224 = 809—839) but on p. 167 the same writer says that his (tyrannical) government lasted 7 years (217—224). Tabarī, iii, 1015, under the year 201, speaks of the conquests in Tabaristan of ἄbd Allāh b. Khuradbah (sic!) as a result of which the Bāwandid Shahrīyār b. Shawrīn had to leave the mountains and Māzīyar b. Kārin was sent to al-Maʿmūn. According to late sources,
Mazyr

Mazyr b. Sharwin had deprived Mazyr of his possessions. Mazyr sought refuge with his cousin Wind Ḫumid b. Windād-aspān, who handed him over to Shahryār. Mazyr however managed to escape, sought refuge with al-Ma'mūn and became a Muslim, assuming the name Muḥammad. After the death of Shahryār (210 = 825; Tabari, iii. 1093), Mazyr, returning to Tabaristan, slew Shahryār b. Shahryār and seized the mountain (Tabari, iii. 263). [Ibn al-Fāqih's story, p. 305—306, about the "son of Sharwin b. Shahryār", whom Mazyr assassinated treacherously seems to refer to Shahryār, the ally of the Muslims. Mazyr had built a mosque in Fīrān.] Mazyr assisted the Arab governor Mūsā b. Ḥāfṣ b. ʿOmar b. al-ʿĀli to subjugate the mountain of Sharwin and al-Ma'mūn appointed him governor of Tabaristan. Kūyān and Dunbawand with the rank of ispahbād (Istāḥlāl, p. 229; Ibn al-Fāqih, p. 309). At this time (Yaḥyā, Historie, ii. 582), Mazyr boasted the title of Ṭālī Ṭalīn, ispahbād ispakhbādān Bihār-Khurāsān (read ʿIṣbārak-Khurāsān), Muḥammad b. Kārīn, ummāli (sic) amīr al-muʿāmmalā (i.e. "ally" instead of masāʾili "client"). When Mūsā b. Ḥāfṣ died, Mazyr paid no heed to his son Muḥammad b. Mūsā. Complaints against Mazyr were taken to Baghdad by the Bawandids and by devout Muslims. But as al-Ma'mūn was setting out against the Byzantines (expedition of 210—213) Mazyr felt himself free from any control. In his turn he charged Muḥammad b. Mūsā with intrigue with the ʿAbīs and on this imaginary pretext besieged Amul. The town capitulated at the end of 8 months. Mazyr executed his enemies and imprisoned all the notables, including Muḥammad b. Mūsā, first at Ṭūd-bāt and then in his principal stronghold of Hurmuz-ābād. To judge from Tabari, iii. 1289—1292, the place must have been in the valley of the ʿIdrā, above ʿArum (Arum) at a distance of 3 farsākhā from Amul and from Sārī [cf. the article Mazândârân].

In the sixth year of the reign of al-Mu'tāsîm (218—227), Mazyr openly rebelled (Baladhuri, p. 229: Ṣafīrā wa-tarādārā). The šāh-āb Allāh, governor of Khurāsān, had denounced to the Caliph the "misdeeds, tyranny and apostasy" of Mazyr. When al-Mu'tāsîm's ambassador arrived, Mazyr would not listen to him. Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 152, even accuses him of having conferred honours "on Bābak, Mazdak and other Magians who had ordered the destruction of the mosques and the obliteration of all traces of Islam".

Mazyr's schemes. It is difficult to reconstruct Mazyr's programme from the sources, which are hostile to him, but the narratives of contemporary witnesses which Tabari, iii. 1268—1303, gives under the year 224 contain a number of curious and important details.

The extension of Mazyr's power (after the assassination of the Bawandid Shāhīr and the occupation of the mountain of Sharwin) had brought him into conflict with the Tāhirids to whom he refused to pay kāfara. It may be noted that Mazyr's very title ispahbād of Khurāsān (this variant is given in Yaḥyā, B. G. A., ii. 276) must have displeasing the Tāhirids. On the other hand the celebrated Afsīnī, who after his victory over Bābak was at the height of his glory, coveted Khurāsān. He therefore secretly encouraged Mazyr's resistance to his rivals and according to Tabari, iii. 1269, played upon his sentiments as a man of noble Iranian blood (yastamūlū bī ʾl-dāštunātī).

From the national point of view, Mazyr could recall the precedent of his grandfather Windād-Hurmuz to whom late sources attribute the organisation of the massacre of the Arab garrisons. Mazyr, who came out of "the mountain" where he had only an almost unknown town (lā-šahrī, p. 206: al-Asābīmār) must have looked askance at the urban elements of the great towns of the "plain" among whom Arabs and their clients (ḥabībī) predominated. The landowning class was certainly hostile to him, as in order to weaken and even exterminate them, he had relied on the support of the peasants. Mazyr's actions were certainly very violent, for ten centuries later, Zahir al-Dīn, p. 167, quotes the proverb: "so and so has done an injustice such as not even Mazyr could have done".

Coming out in open rebellion (probably before the year 224 under which Baladhuri and Tabari relate the dénouement) Mazyr had homage paid to himself, took hostages and levied kharrād at once. The doings of his governor Shūkhāstān in Sārī are characteristic. He transferred all the inhabitants of Sārī to Amul, where he shut them up in a fort; as to the people of Amul, he took 20,000 of them away into the mountains of Hurmuz-ābād (cf. above). The walls of Sārī, Amul and Šamīs were razed to the ground "to the sound of fītes and drums".

Mazyr had given orders to the peasants to attack and plunder their masters (Tabari, iii. 1269).

The next passage (iii. 1270) seems to indicate that a cadastral survey was ordered (amara an yamīnaḥ ʾl-balad) and the lands were let out, the rental being 50% (of the produce). As to Surkhūstān, he collected 260 nobles (ohnaʾ ḵešānaḏ), the bravest he could find, and on a pretext that "the ābānī were favourable to the Arabs and to the ʾAbbāsids", handed them over to dangerous individuals to the peasants, who slew them at his suggestion. He even tried to provoke a massacre of all the imprisoned landowners, saying to the peasants that "I have already handed over to you the houses of the landowners and their wives", but this time the peasants refused from following his advice.

The later sources retain the usual accusation of apostasy against Mazyr ("he once more assumed the garb of Zoroastrianism"), says Ibn Islāfīyār, p. 150 quoting the kādi of Amul). Baladhuri, p. 229 and Ibn al-Fāqih, p. 309 also say that Mazyr "renounced the faith and committed treason", but this point is more obscure in Tabari, where it only occurs in the list of charges made against Afsīnī, iii. 1311 (transl. in Browne, Lit. Hist of Persia, i. 334). The tone of the letter which Mazyr had addressed to his representatives, ibid., iii. 1351, is respectful to the Caliph, in form at least. But there is no smoke without fire, if we may believe the authors who mention the existence of a Māzūrīya in the 5th century connected with the Alwī Shāhīr. The yāʾsūr or Muḥammārī [q.v.] (i.e. followers of Bābak). Cf. al-Baghdādī (d. in 429), Fisṭ bain al-frak, p. 251—252; Tāhir al-Isfārānī (d. in 451), Taḥṣīr fī ʾl-dīn [quoted in Flugel, Baghēk, Z. D. M. G., 1869, p. 533] and Šamānī, G. M. S., fol. 501a.

Mazyr's end. 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir sent against Mazyr his uncle Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn to operate from the direction of Dūrjīn as well as
Hajýa b. Djabala, who went with 4,000 horses via Kãmis towards Djabal al-Šahrîn (= Sawâdkûh; cf. the article Mâzânîrân). At the same time the caliph al-Mu'tâsîm sent considerable forces under the command of Muḥammad b. Ibrâhîm who entered Rûyân (western Šabāristân) by Shâlamba and Ruḏbâr (Tabârî, iii. 1264). Mansûr b. Šaḥân, "lord of Dunbawanâd", attacked from Raîy while Abu l-Sâdî advanced via Lâriz and Dunbawanâd.

The Arabs very skilfully exploited the rivalries and enmities in the entourage of Mâzâr. First of all his nephew Kârin b. Shâhrîyâr (his representative in the mountain of Šahrîn = Sawâdkûh) went over to Hajýa, who marched on Šârîn and began to negotiate with Mâzâr's brother Kûhîr. In the meanwhile Šurchâstân's army which occupied the Šâmîzha front dispersed and allowed Šaḥân, b. Ḥusain to advance. Kûhîr, who had been promised Mâzâr's place, submitted to Ḥusain Mâzâr seems to have lost his courage when he found himself surrounded by the Arabs and betrayed by his follower. He trusted Kûhîr, who had promised him the amân, and came with him to Ḥusain (Tabârî, iii. 1288—1291, dramatic story by an eye-witness) but Ḥusain did not even acknowledge his greeting. Mâzâr was handed over to Muḥammad b. Ibrâhîm and sent to Sâmrârâ. Here he was confronted with Afsân and seems to have denounced the latter. The caliph ordered him to be given 400 lashes, under which he died and his body was exposed beside that of Bâlak in 214 = 839.

Kûhîr's treachery served him little. He was slain as a traitor by his cousin Shâhrîyâr b. Mâzûn who commanded the Dâlamîs in the service of Mâzâr.

Šurchâstân was betrayed by the soldiers after the defeat at Šâmîzha and the other of Mâzâr's generals, al-Durî, who was fighting against Muḥammad b. Ibrâhîm on the Rûyân front, died while attempting to reach Dâlam (Tabârî, iii. 1300).


(Y. Mînorsky)

MECCA.

I

On the eve of the Hîdîrâ. It is with the birth of Muḥammad — between 570—580 A.D. — that Mecca suddenly emerges from the shadows of the past and thrusts itself upon the attention of the historian. The geographer Ptolemy seems to know it under the name Mâzâbû; but it must have been in existence long before his time. Mecca was probably one of the stations on the "incense route", the road by which the produce of the East especially valuable perfumes, came to the Mediterranean world. It owes its importance to its position at the

Intersection of great commercial routes. The town that had grown up around the well of Zamzam and the sanctuary of the Kâ'ba was advantageously placed at the extreme ends of the Asia of the whites and the Africa of the blacks, near a breach in the chain of the Sarât, close to a junction of roads leading from Babylonia and Syria to the plateaus of the Yemen, to the shores of the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. By the latter it was in communication with the mysterious African continent. What advantages were offered by this situation at the boundary between civilisation and barbarism, at the point of contact of two societies, brought together by necessities more pressing than political ambitions or the quarrels of race and religion! This was the part played by the Palmyrans, situated between the Romans and the Parthians. It demanded an adaptability and diplomatic skill beyond the ordinary. The two societies were frequently at war; it required wits to deal tactfully with them. But if the position had its risks, it had the advantage of being able to fix the price for its services to the belligerents. In the delicate role of intermediary and broker between two worlds, the strength of will of the Ishmaelites and the tenacity that lay beneath his apparent complaisance assured his success from the first. Civilisation and barbarism might conclude peace for a time or be at war; he was able to trade on their agreement or exploit their dissensions with equal satisfaction to himself. Ambiguous and ambivalent, the Meccan was able to have a foot in both camps without it being possible to discern where his sympathies really lay.

At an early date we see the Meccans opening negotiations with the states adjoining Arabia: they obtained from them safe conducts and capitulations, permitting the free passage of their caravans. This is what their chronicles call the "guarantee of Caerar and of Chosroes". They also concluded agreements with the Negus of Abyssinia, with the principal shâhîks of Nâdîr, the kâ'î of the Yemen, with the phyarchs of Ghassân and of Hira. In the negotiations with the Greeks and Persians the principal of the "open door" was not admitted. Commercial transactions were carried through at posts on the frontier or in towns specially designated for the purpose. In Palestine these were the ports of Aila and Ghazza and perhaps also Jerusalem. In Syria, Boṣrâ was their principal outlet, their great market.

Siûr c. v. 2 mentions as a permanent institution "the double caravan of winter and summer". The masábû, genealogists, record the names of the Kurâsh chiefs who had succeeded in obtaining by negotiation permits to trade. The countries open to commerce in this way were called waḏīh, direction, maṭîgâr, region of trade. There were innumerable restrictions, limiting the extension of the privilege. Eastern governments did not permit free trade. Distrustful of merchants even when her own subjects, Byzantium showed herself still more
The verses of a Medinese poet, Ḥāṣān b. Thabit-
The office of "pavilion and reins" has nothing to do — as has been supposed — with the art of war. This dignity, which was an ancient one and no longer understood, was a memory of the ritual processions held in pagan Arabia. The ḫubbah was simply the pavilion or portable tabernacle, containing the fetish of the tribe and solemnly carried on the back of a camel. The chiefs and notables took turns at holding the reins of the animal bearing this precious burden. It is taking nothing from the glory of Khalīl b. al-Walīd to say that he had not a monopoly of this privilege. Behind the legend of the Arabic dignities, we perceive the intention of glorifying the cradle of the Prophet. In giving it administrative institutions, an attempt was made to conceal the modest beginnings of the Ḥāṣimīs and no less those of ʿAbū Bakr and ʿUmar. The onerous office of ḥiznākh, which had to pay compensation for murder and injury, was far beyond the financial resources of the modest citizen called ʿAbū Bakr. The entrusting to ʿUmar of the safāra or diplomatic missions cannot be reconciled with his extreme youth and plebeian origin.

I have elsewhere, for lack of a better term, called Mecca "a merchant republic". If ʿAbī Suʿyān is called "Ṣaḥīḥ and chief of the Kuraish", several of his contemporaries are given equally high sounding titles. There is not the slightest reason to think that he was a kind of Kuraish doge. The manner in which the events of the first eight years of the Hijra are recorded produces the fallacious impression that he held the power in Mecca in his hands. In reality he was only the ablest and most intelligent of his peers, the chiefs of the Kuraish clans. As al-Fāṣīr pertinently observes, all were equal: "no one exercised authority unless delegated or kindly permitted to do so by them". Did their chiefs constitute a regular official body? Yes, says tradition. Mecca is even said to have had a kind of Senate or Grand Council, the dīr al-nadwā. It met only in extraordinary circumstances. Usually however, we find that it is in the madālīs, family groups or clubs, the Nādī Kaum opening on the square of the Kāba — the forum and bourse of the town — that affairs of general interest were dealt with.

The Ḥurān cannot conceive of authority without a council of notables, without the maṭla. This institution is so frequently mentioned in the Ḥurān that the Prophet must have seen it working before his eyes. We think then that Mecca was ruled by the oligarchy of the maṭla', the equivalent in the town of the madālīs of the nomad tribe. This was an assembly of the chiefs of the wealthiest and most influential families. This is why Umayyads and Maḥkūmīs are most usually mentioned as composing the maṭla'. Neither election nor birth could necessarily open the way to a seat on it, but rather the fame of services rendered, the prestige of ability and wealth. Thus it welcomed to its counsels the very wealthy Ibn Djdān, a member of the humble clan of Taʾim. An assembly of elders or if you like of senators, in conformity with the principle of seniority among the Arabs: its authority, purely moral, was limited to advising, studying, looking ahead and giving to the merchant community the benefit of the experience of its conscript fathers. In the absence of any coercive
powers, persuasion was the only force it had to make its wishes obeyed. Hence the importance of eloquence in a milieu like this, where every family and every clan claimed autonomy. The cause of peace was in continual conflict with their claims. Without infringing their prerogatives, the *mala* was able to exert moral pressure when the general good required it. The system recalls, though remotely, the organisation of Palmyra and of Venice.

**Site and climate.** In the form of an elongated crescent with its points turned towards the flanks of the Kaʿbājīn, the town was hemmed in by a double range of bare and steep hills. The centre of this ill-ventilated couloir coincided with a depression in the soil. The early town occupied the bottom of this; this was the *wadi*, the valley, the *batn* Makkah, the hollow of Mecca. The centre, the lowest part of this depression, was called *at-Batā* (cf. above). Some buildings in this quarter were so close to the Kaʿba that in the morning and in the evening their shadows were merged in that of the sacred edifice. Between these houses and the Kaʿba [q. v.] a narrow esplanade *(fina)* lay below the level of the surrounding soil. This open area formed the primitive masjid, a sanctuary open to the heavens. The pre-Islamic *Batba* knew no other. The ends of the little streets opening on this open space were called the "gates of the ḥaram or of the masjid". The so-called gates or openings took their names from the clans settled around the Kaʿba. Thus one regularly spoke of the "gate of the Banū Dūmāl". The walls of their houses served to mark the boundaries of the masjid. It was on the ground floor of the buildings facing the sides of the Kaʿba that the *mafflis* or *nāṭi* of the chief families met, those that formed the *mala* (cf. above).

In the suburbs *(ważāḥir)*, and at a later date in the ravines *(zhō)* which had been dug by erosion out of the flanks of the hills, was a confusion of poor houses, low and ramshackle hovels. The unpleasant features of a town of this kind are obvious. The geographer Makdisī has summed these up strikingly: "suffocating heat, deadly winds, clouds of flies*. The continual difficulty was the dearth of water. The population was dependent on the variable output of the Zamzam. There were other wells, mainly outside the town. Those inside had a doubtful reputation. The scarcity of drinking-water is evident from the amount of precaution taken, when some thousands of pilgrims had to be supplied. In such deplorable conditions one can imagine what suffering the long days brought, *ramlī* Makkah "the burning of Mecca"; why the great families preferred to send their children to be brought up in the desert; why the *Sira* only incidentally mentions the plague of Mekka *(wahb* Makkah). Smallpox is mentioned only in connection with the enemies of the Prophet.

Rains are few and far between. Droughts sometimes last for four years. But when the winter season is wet, the rains may sometimes attain an unheard-of degree of violence. To the east of Mecca a rocky wall raises its steep barrier, a succession of strata and summits merging into the chain of the Sarāt. These jagged hills collect on their flanks the surplus rains of the monsoon which brings fertility to the Yemen. All along these slopes, where no shrub interrupts the fall — at the bottom of each a *sail* is formed — the cataracts augmented by all these tributaries fall into the hollow of Mecca, *batn* Makkah, of which the Kaʿba occupies the bottom. The waters rush to this depression they force a passage through the "gates of the masjid" and flow over the area around the sanctuary. They fill it and rise to attack the Kaʿba. Before the Hidjra, the Kurāish syndicate seems to have paid no heed to the flooding or said they were powerless to prevent it. Efforts made by the caliphs yielded "only mediocre results".

This is why the misdeeds of the *sail* fill the annals of Mecca. On several occasions their violence has overthrown the Kaʿba and turned the court of the great mosque into a lake. As a result of the floods, epidemics broke out. The deposit of filth brought by the waters polluted the wells; bodies left unburied formed centres of epidemic infection. The annalists avoid dwelling on this, troubled by the Tradition which says that the plague never reaches Mecca. The absolute sterility of the soil brought another scourge, that of famine. The slightest irregularity in the convey of grain from Syria or the Sarāt was enough to cause it. It continues to figure along with the ravages of flood and plague in the monotonous annals of the town.

**Economic life and finance.** On examining closely the picturesque literature of the *Sira* and *Hadith*, one receives the impression of business, of intense activity bursting out of the narrow and sterile valley of Mecca. The Kurān only strengthens this impression. All his life the Prophet retained the impress of his Kuraish education and training. This fundamentally mercantile character is revealed at every turn.

**Writing and arithmetic.** One is amazed at their importance in the economic life of the town. Relying on the Kurānic epithet *ummī*, i.e. pagan, gentle, and on biased writers like al-Balādhūrī, it has been held that, except for some fifteen individuals mentioned by name, all the pre-Hidjra Kurāish were illiterate. Alongside of the "book" of accounts, the scales always figure in the Meccan shops: not so much to weigh goods as to verify and check payments of all kinds including cash. Now, coins were not plentiful on the Meccan market; they were supplemented by the precious metals, ingots of gold and silver, by *tbr*, gold dust. Only the scales could determine the value. In the more delicate cases, recourse was had to the services of a *wassāin* or professional weigher.

It would be difficult to imagine a society in which capital enjoyed more active circulation. The *fadjar*, business man, was not engaged in hoarding, in gathering wealth into his strong boxes. He had a blind faith in the unlimited productivity of capital, in the virtue of credit. Brokers and agents, the bulk of the population lived on credit. The sleeping partnership was much in favour (mudārāb), especially the "partnership for the half", which supposes 50% participation in the profits by the sleeping partners. Thanks to the development of the institutions the humblest sums could be invested, down to a gold dinār or even a *maṣhik* or half dinār. Such a flexible organisation stimulated even the humblest to take his share in commercial enterprises.

The coins brought to Mecca were of very different kinds: the *denarius aureus* of the Byzantines
and the silver drachm of the Sasanids and Hīmyāns. These pieces often wore, ruderly engraved, very unequal in weight and form, came from the most varied mints. Only the money-changer had the requisite flair, the eye sufficiently trained to deal with the confusion of currencies, to determine accurately the standards, values, and the kinds in circulation. In addition there were the complications caused by the difference of standard and the oscillations of exchange. The Byzantine provinces, Syria and Egypt, were among the ahl al-dhahab or countries with a gold standard. Babylonia was ahl al-zarātī, a land with a silver, the Sāsānian, standard. On the eve of the departure of the caravans for Syria, there were regular battues in search of dinārs. The Meccan ṣāḥib was not distinct from the financier. His first article of trade was money. When occasion arose, he invested his capital in business, in the organisation of large caravans. To the leaders of the caravan, to the traders and to the factors, he advanced the funds necessary for their operations.

Primarily a clearing house, a banking town, Mecca had customs and institutions peculiar to this kind of transaction and to finance. Sometimes it is rībā, usury, in all its ugliness: dinār for dinār, dīthām for dīthām, i.e. 100% interest. To the condemnation of rība in the Qur'ān, the Kuraish objected that they saw in it only "a kind of sale" (Qūr'ān ii. 275), of letting out capital for a rent. Speculation too was rampant, on the rates of exchange, the load of a caravan which one tried to buy up, the yield of the harvests and of the flocks and lastly the provisioning of the town. Fictitious assessorates were formed and loans were made on which loans were borrowed. "Every Arab", says Strabo, "is either a trader or a broker". In Mecca, the hādīth "he who was not a merchant, counted for nothing". In setting out on a military expedition the citizens always took merchandise along with them. This is what they did when going to relieve the Bādhr caravan. The first thing the Meccan mubārakār did on arriving in Medina was to ask the way to the market-place. The women shared these commercial instincts: Abū ʿUbayl's mother ran a perfumery business. The activities of the mūdhirāt al-khālid are celebrated in Ḥadīth [q.v.], the wife of Abū Sufyān, sold her merchandise among the Kālibāt of Syria. Like their husbands the Meccan women had financial interests in the caravans. On the return of the convoys they gathered round Abū Sufyān to know what their money and their contributions had earned and to get their share of the profits.

The caravans. The organisation of a caravan was the subject of interminable palavers in the nādi around the Ka'bah. Its departure and return were events of public interest. The whole population was associated with it. En route it remained in continual communication with the metropolis through Beduins met on the journey or special couriers. Abū Sufyān sent one of these messengers to describe the critical position of the Bādhr caravan. It contained 25 dinārs, an enormous sum, but one proportionate to the value of the convoy in which Mecca had 50,000 dinārs invested. The Meccan caravans were of considerable size. Neither horses nor mules appeared in them. The number of camels on occasion rose to 2,500. The men (merchants, guides [ṣāhil] and guards) varied from 100 to 300. The escort was strengthened on approaching areas infested by bandits (ṣafā) or when traversing the territory of hostile tribes. The Bādhr caravan may be taken as typical. We do not know of another in which the capital invested attained such an amount. The greater part was supplied by the important Umayyad firm of Abū Uqbah, i.e. the family of Sa'd b. ʿAbd-Allah. This firm had formed a company of the family, adding to their own considerable reserves the contributions of its sleeping partners. To their 30,000 dinārs the other Umayyad houses added 10,000. Four-fifths of the capital of the Bādhr caravan was therefore of Umayyad origin. We can understand why the direction and supreme control of the convoy was entrusted to Abū Sufyān, who was personally interested in the enterprise.

In the first place a caravan from Mecca carried skins and leather, sometimes also the saḥīb of ṭayf, a kind of currant; then ingots of gold and silver partly from the mines of the Bānū Sulaim and tihr, gold dust from Africa. The texts frequently call it ḥattima, i.e. a convoy laden with perfume and rare spices. Of the perfumes, the most esteemed came not from the Ḥudayjār, but from southern Arabia, the "land of frankincense", or even from India and Africa. To these might be added aromatic gums and medicinal drugs, like the scents of Mecca, all objects of small bulk and purchased at higher prices by the luxury of the civilised countries.

From the Yemen the Meccan caravans brought back the products of India, the silks of China, the rich 'adānt cloths, so called from 'Adan. Besides gold dust, the main exports of Africa were slaves and ivory. In Mecca recruited her labourers and her mercenary soldiers, the Ḥajjābī or Abyssinians. In Egypt and in Syria, the Kuraish traders bought luxury articles, products of the industry of the Mediterranean, mainly cotton, linen or silk stuffs and cloths dyed in vivid purple. From Ḍuฤr and the Ḥarāt (Syria) came arms, cereals and oil, much appreciated by the Beduins. The pace of the caravan was slow but the articles transported, leather, metals, scented woods, feared neither damage nor the delays of long journeys. The expenses were confined to the hire of the animals, the payment of the escort, the tolls and presents to the chiefs of the tribes. With such an economical organisation, the profit of 100%, ascribed to our authors was quite usual. This was the case with the caravan of Bādhr "each dinār having brought back a dinār". Two years after this brilliant affair, the Companions of the Prophet who had sought refuge in Medina were able to carry out as profitable a transaction in the same field "since each of their dirhams gained a second dirham", that is to say a profit of 100% again.

Fortunes in Mecca. We can now imagine how money had gradually accumulated in the chests of the Meccan financiers, who were naturally of a saving disposition. This explains Pliny the Elder's ill-humour when he recalls "the millions of sesterces which the Arabs take annually from the Roman Empire giving nothing in return, nihīl invicem redimendībus" (Hist. Natur., vi. 28). This last statement is an exaggeration, but it should be remembered that the Meccan caravan carried only articles of high value, and that with regard to the Empire the Arabs were mainly importers, so that the trade balance was always very much
in their favour. The 30,000 dirhams invested by the one house of Abū Uhaiṣa in the Bādīr caravan suggests that H. Winckler is quite right when he tells us to think of the Palmyra of Zenoins if we wish to get an idea of the financial capacity of Mecca. The fortunes of the Makhlūmīs were no less than those of their Umayyad rivals. The Taimī ʿAbd Allāh b. Djūdʿān must have been a millionaire if the poet thought of comparing him to Caesar. The principal organizers of the Bādīr caravan were also millionaires. The thousands of dirhams subscribed by them did not even represent all their fortune. Other portions of their capital were out at interest or put in other speculations. Among other millionaires we may mention the Makhlūmīs Walīd b. al-Mughira and ʿAbd Allāh, father of the poet ʿUmar b. Abī Rabīʿā.

Next to these representatives of high finance come the well-to-do Meccans, like ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf who had a capital of 8,000 dirhams and al-Ḥārīṭī b. ʿAmīr and Umayyā b. Khalaf. Of the latter two, the first had 1,000 and the second 2,000 dirhams in the Bādīr caravan. Lastly there were the small trade owners, shop-keepers who formed the petite bourgeoisie of the town. To their commerce a number added the supervision of some industry like ironwork or carpentry. The most typical representative of this class is given us by the future caliph Abū Bakr, a bāṣraʾī, retailer of cloth. He belonged like Abū Djūdʿān to the plebeian clan of Taim, rich in men and women of initiative, like ʿAbd Allāh b. Abū Bakr. He seems to have had a capital of 40,000 dirhams. ʿAbdās, the uncle of the Prophet, is also mentioned among the rich bankers of Mecca, but we have no details about him. The other Hāshimīs lived in circumstances bordering on poverty. Those Meccans most certainly must have been wealthy who paid without a murmur the enormous ransoms demanded for their relatives after the defeat of Bādīr. After this sacrifice — it cost them not less than 200,000 dirhams — the Meccan chiefs gave up their share of the profits in the Bādīr enterprise — some 25,000 dirhams — to prepare for the revenge. They did this faiyībaʿiʿansīs “with a good heart”, with the easy grace of opulent financiers, used to running the risks of speculations on a large scale. One touching detail is recorded. They refused to touch the modest shares of the small contributors. This example shows how at Mecca, “the strong”, ʿabī al-ḥawwa (Wāṣīkī), i.e. the patricians, were able in critical circumstances to realise a spirit of solidarity and of sound democracy.

Mecca before the Hijra had neither ships nor a port. It was only exceptionally that foreign ships cast anchor in the little bay of Ṣuḥaila off a desert shore. It was here that the Byzantine ship was wrecked, the wood of which went to build the terrace of the Kaʿbah. It was to Ṣuḥaila that the first Muslim emigrants for Abyssinia went, no doubt on hearing that two merchant ships had touched there. More rarely sailings took place from the desolate shore of Djidda, which was nearer Mecca. From the time of ʿUthmān, Dijdā took the place of Ṣuḥaila and became the port of the Kurābā metropolis. When Muḥammad settled in Medina and cut their communications with Syria, the Meccan leaders never thought of taking to the sea but resigned themselves to the enormous detour through al-Najdī. The creation of an Arab navy was the work of the caliph Muʿāwiyah.

2. After the Hijra. We need not rehearse the events of the first eight years of the Hijra. They are summed up in the struggle with the Prophet. This struggle and the ridda, the surrender of Mecca, were fatal to its economic prosperity. One after the other, the great families migrated to Medina, now the capital of Islam. This tendency increased under the first three caliphs, who made their headquarters among the Ansār. ʿAli definitely left Arabia to settle in Kufa. Richly endowed by the state, the leading Kūraish, becoming generals and governors of provinces, lost interest in commerce. No more is heard about caravans or fairs in the Hijāz. It was only at the period of the pilgrimage that Mecca became alive again and saw the caliphs reappear at the head of the pilgrims. The conquest of the Ṣarḥ dealt the last blow to the economic decline of western Arabia. The Indian trade resumed its old route by the Persian Gulf and the valley of the Euphrates. Direct communication was established by land with the markets of the middle east. The Umayyad period. The situation improved with the coming of the Umayyad dynasty. Muʿāwiyah took an active interest in his native town. He erected buildings there and developed agriculture in the environs, dug wells and built dams to store up the water. Under his successors, especially the Marwānīs, Mecca became a city of pleasure and ease, the rendezvous of poets and musicians, attracted by the brilliant society formed by the sons of the Companions of the Prophet. Many people returned to live in Mecca after making their fortunes in the government of conquered provinces. Contact with foreign civilisations had made them refined and fastidious. They had become accustomed to baths, a luxury which presupposes an abundant water-supply. Water had to be procured from the hills of the Sarāt. Khalīl al-Kasrī's [q. v.] name is associated with this undertaking which changed the aspect of the town. To meet the scourge of flood, the caliphs ʿUmar and ʿUthmān had called in the aid of Christian engineers, who built barrages in the high-lying quarters. They also secured the area round the Kaʿbah by making dykes and embankments. The Umayyad caliphs continued and completed these works. They dug a new bed along the course of the sarīb and endeavoured to break its violence by barriers built at different levels. Their great anxiety was to protect the depression of the Baḥr where the Kaʿbah stood. The skill of the engineers of the period did not succeed in overcoming the topographical difficulties nor in averting the ravages of the winter rains, regular cloudbursts. They were frustrated by the steep slope of the ground, still further aggravated by the unusual shape of the Baḥr, a basin with no outlet. The houses on the bank of the sarīb were taken down and the alleys adjoining the Kaʿbah removed. Each modification of the old plan meant the sacrifice of more buildings. These clearances in time changed the traditional aspect of Mecca, where the sarīb continued to sow destruction.

Along with these precautions against flooding an endeavour was made to enlarge the exiguous court around the Kaʿbah. Islam desired to possess a temple in keeping with its worldwide claims. Successive expropriations begun by ʿUmar and finished
by Walid I prepared an esplanade. The plan of the great mosque [cf. AL-MASJID AL-HARĀM] with its galleries, a vast courtyard with the Ka'ba in the centre, is the work of the Umayyads. He had the assistance of Christian architects from Syria and Egypt to carry it out. The important governorship of the Hijāz with its three cities, Medina, Mecca and Ta'if, could in principle be given only to a member of the ruling family. Among the most celebrated of these Umayyads may be mentioned Sa'id b. al-As' and the two future caliphs, Marwan b. al-Ḥakam and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz. When no Umayyad was available the choice fell upon an official of tried capacity like Ḥādīdā and Ḥālid al-Kassī. At first they were given Ta'if and then transferred to Mecca. It was only after this probation that the three towns were entrusted to them. But even then the centre of government remained in Medina, which under the Umayyads eclipsed Mecca by its political importance and by the fact that it was the home of the new Muslim aristocracy.

Under Yazid I, the rising of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair [q.v.] brought Syrian troops to Mecca. The rebel had made his headquarters in the court of the great mosque. A scaffold of wood, covered with straw, protected the Ka'ba. The carelessness of a Meccan soldier set it on fire. Ibn al-Zubair rebuilt the edifice and included the Ḥijār within it [see KA'BA]. When Ḥādīdā had overthrown the Zubairids anti-caliph, he restored the Ka'ba to its former dimensions which have since remained unaltered. In 747 a Ḥārīrī rebel from the Yemen seized Mecca without meeting opposition. He was soon defeated and slain by the troops of the caliph Marwān II. In 750, Mecca passed with the rest of the caliphate under the rule of the 'Abbāsidas.


II

1. Mecca under the 'Abbāsidas down to the foundation of the Sharī'ī法治 (750—961).

Although the political centre of gravity in Islām now lay in Baghādād, this period at first presents the same picture as under Omayyad rule. The Ḥarammān are as a rule governed by 'Abbāsid princes or individuals closely connected with them (Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 181 sqq.). Sometimes Mecca and Ta'if were under one ruler, who was at the same time leader of the Ḥādījī, while Medina had a separate governor of its own.

Arabia had however from the first century A.H. contained a number of 'Alīd groups, who, as was their wont, fished in troubled waters, lay in wait as brigands to plunder the Ḥājādī caravans and from time to time hoisted their flags when they were not restrained either by the superior strength or by the bribes of the caliphate. We find al-Mansūr (756—774) already having trouble in Western Arabia. Towards the end of the reign of al-Mahdī (785—795) a Ḥasanī, Ḥusain b. 'Alī, led a raid on Medina, which he ravaged; at Fākhkhh near Mecca, he was cut down with many of his followers by the 'Abbāsid leader of the Ḥādījī. The place where he was buried is now called al-Shuḥādā. It is significant that he is regarded as the "martyr of Fākhkhh" (Tabari, iii. 551 sqq.; Chron. Mekka, i. 435; 501 sqq.).

Ḥārūn al-Rašīdī on his nine pilgrimages expended vast sums in Mecca. He was not the only 'Abbāsid to scatter wealth in the holy land. This had a bad effect on the character of the Meccans. There were hardly any descendants left of the old distinguished families and the population grew accustomed to living at the expense of others and were ready to give vent to any dissatisfaction in rioting. This attitude was all too frequently stimulated by political conditions.

In the reign of al-Ma'mūn (198—218 = 817—833) it was again 'Alīd, Ḥusain al-Āfīs and Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā, who extended their rule over Medina, Mecca and the Yemen (Tabari, iii. 981 sqq.; Chron. Mekka, ii. 238), ravaged Western Arabia and plundered the treasuries of the Ka'bā. How strong 'Alīd influence already was at this time is evident from the fact that Ma'mūn appointed two 'Alīd as governors of Mecca (Tabari, iii. 1039; Chron. Mekka, ii. 191 sqq.).

With the decline of the 'Abbāsid caliphate after the death of Ma'mūn, a period of anarchy began in the holy land of Islām, which was frequently accompanied by scarcity or famine. It became the
regular custom for a number of rulers to be represented at the Ḥajjīj in the plain of ʿArafāt and to have their flags unfurled; the holy city was rarely spared fighting on these occasions. The safety of the pilgrim caravans was considerably affected; it was very often ʿAlids who distinguished themselves in plundering the pilgrims.

The ʿAlid cause received an important reinforcement at this time by the foundation of a Ḥasanid dynasty in Tabaristān (Tabari, ill. 1523–1533, 1533 sq., 1605–1685, 1693 sq., 1840, 1880, 1884 sq., 1940). In Mecca the repercussions of this event was felt in the appearance of two Ḥasanids (Chron. Mekka, i. 343; ii. 10, 195, 229 sq.), Ismaʿil b. Yūsuf and his brother Muhammad, who also ravaged Medina and DJidda in the way that had now become usual (251 = 865–866).

The appearance of the Karmatians [q.v.] brought still further misery to the country in the last fifty years before the foundation of the sharifate (Tabari, ill. 2124–220). Hard pressed themselves at the heart of the empire, the caliphs were hardly able even to think of giving active support to the holy land, and, besides, their representatives had not the necessary forces at their disposal. From 916 onwards the Karmatians barred the way is the pilgrim caravans. In 930, 1,500 Karmatian warriors raided Mecca, massacred the inhabitants by the thousand and carried off the Black Stone to Bahriyah. It was only when they realised that such deeds were bringing them no nearer their goal — the destruction of official Islam — that their zeal began to relax and in 950 they even brought the Ṣaf. It ended a period Mecca was relieved of serious danger from the Karmatians. The following years bear witness to the increasing influence of the ʿAlids in western Arabia in connection with the advance of Fāṭimid rule to the cast and with the Bayyid rule in Baghdād. From this time the Meccan ʿAlids are called by the title of Sharif which they have retained ever since.

2. From the foundation of the Sharifate to Katāda (c. 350–598 = 960–1200).

a. The Mūsāwīs. The sources do not agree as to the year in which ʿDjafar took Mecca. 966, 967, 968 and the period between 951 and 961 are mentioned (Chron. Mekka, ii. 205 sqq.). ʿAlids had already ruled him in the holy land. It is with him however that the reign of the Ḥasanids in Mecca begins, who are known collectively as sharifs, while in Medina this title is given to the reigning Ḥusainids.

The rise and continuance of the Sharifate indicates the relative independence of Western Arabia in face of the rest of the Islamic world from a political and religious point of view. Since the foundation of the Sharifate, Mecca takes the precedence possessed by Medina hitherto.

How strongly the Meccan sharifate endeavoured to assert its independence, is evident in this period from two facts. In 976 Mecca refused homage to the Fāṭimid Calif. Soon afterwards the Calif began to besiege the town and cut off all imports from Egypt. The Meccans were soon forced to give in, for the Hijāz was dependent on Egypt for its back supplies (Ibn al-ʿĀhir, Kamiil, viii. 491; Chron. Mekka, ii. 216).

The second sign of the Sharifs' feeling of independence is Abū ʿl-Futūḥ's (384–432 = 994–1039) setting himself up as Calif in 1011 (Chron. Mekka, ii. 207; Ibn al-ʿĀhir, Kamiil, ix. 233, 217). He was probably induced to do this by al-Ḥakīm's heretical innovations in Egypt. The latter however was soon able to reduce the new caliph's sphere of influence so much that he had hurriedly to return to Mecca where in the meanwhile one of his relatives had usurped the power. He was forced to make terms with al-Ḥakīm in order to be able to expel his relative.

With his son Shukr (432–453 = 1039–1061) the dynasty of the Mūsāwīs, i.e. the descendants of Mūsā b. ʿAbd ʿAlīh b. Mūsā b. ʿAbd ʿAlīh b. Hasan b. Hasan b. Ali b. Abī Ṭālib came to an end. He died without leaving male heirs, which caused a struggle within the family of the ʿAlids with the usual evil results for Mecca. When the family of the Banū Shāiba (q. v.; the ʿShebīns) went so far as to confiscate for their private use all precious metals in the house of Allāh, the ruler of Yemen, al-Ṣulāḥī (Chron. Mekka, ii. 208, 210 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿĀhir, Kamiil, ix. 422; x. 19, 38), intervened and restored order and security in the town.

This intervention by an outsider appeared more intolerable to the ʿAlids than fighting among themselves. They therefore proposed to al-Ṣulāḥī that he should instal one of their number as ruler and leave the town.

He therefore appointed Abū Ḥāṣim Mūḥammad (455–487 = 1063–1094) as Grand Sharif. With him begins the dynasty of the h. Hawāshīm (455–598 = 1063–1200), which takes its name from Abū Ḥāṣim Muhammad, a brother of the first Sharif ʿDjafar; the two brothers were descendants in the fourth generation from Mūsā II, the ancestor of the Mūsāwīs.

During the early years of his reign, Abū Ḥāṣim had to wage a continual struggle with the Sulaimānī branch, who thought themselves humiliated by his appointment. These Sulaimānīs were descended from Sulaimān, a brother of the Mūsā II above mentioned.

The reign of Abū Ḥāṣim is further noteworthy for the shameless way in which he offered the suzerainty, i.e. the mention in the khūṭba as well as the change of official rite which is indicated by the wording of the adhān, to the highest bidder i.e. the Fāṭimid Calif or the Saldʒūq sultan (Chron. Mekka, ii. 253; Ibn al-ʿĀhir, x. 67). It was very unwelcome to the Meccans that imports from Egypt stopped as soon as the official mention of the Fāṭimid in the khūṭba gave way to that of the Calif. The change was repeated several times with the result that the Saldʒūq, tired of this comedy, sent several bodies of Turkomans to Mecca.

The ill-feeling between Sulānī and Sharif also inflicted great misery on pilgrims coming from the ʿIrāq. As the leadership of the pilgrim caravans from this country had gradually been transferred from the ʿAlids to Turkish officials and soldiers, Abū Ḥāṣim did not hesitate occasionally to fall upon the pilgrims and plunder them (Chron. Mekka, ii. 254; Ibn al-ʿĀhir, x. 153).

The reign of his successor is also marked by covetousness and plundering. The Spanish pilgrim Ibn ʿDjauari, who visited Mecca in 1183 and 1185, gives hair-raising examples of this. Even then however the Hawāshīm were no longer absolutely their own masters; as over ten years before, the Aiyūbī dynasty had not only succeeded to the Fāṭimid in Egypt but was trying to get the whole of nearer Asia into their power.
Katada's life ended in a massacre which his son Hasan carried out in his family to rid himself of possible rivals (Chron. Mekka, ii. 215, 263 sqq.; Ibn al-Atir, Kamii, xii. 262 sqq.). The Ayyubid prince Mas'ud however soon put a limit to his ambition and had Mecca governed by his generals. On his death however power again passed into the hands of the sharifs, whose territory was allowed a certain degree of independence by the rulers of the Yemen as a bulwark against Egypt.

About the middle of the xili century the world of Islam assumes a new aspect as the result of the advent of persons and happenings of great importance. In 1258 the taking of Baghhd by Hulagu put an end to the caliphate. The pilgrim caravan from the 'Irak was no longer of any political significance. In Egypt power passed from the Ayyubids to the Mamluks; Sul tan Balbars (658–676 = 1260–1277) was soon the most powerful ruler in the lands of Islam. He was able to leave the government of Mecca in the hands of the sharif, because the latter, Abi Numaiy, was an energetic individual who ruled with firmness during the second half of the xili century (1254–1301). His long reign firmly established the power of the descendants of Katada.

Nevertheless the first half century after his death was almost entirely filled with fighting between different claimants to the throne. A'dlan's reign also (1346–1375) was filled with political unrest, so much so that the Mamluk Sultan is said on one occasion to have sworn to exterminate all the sharifs. A'dlan introduced a political innovation by appointing his son and future successor Abu-Mandes co-regent in 1361 by which step he hoped to avoid a fratricidal struggle before or after his death.

A second measure of A'dlan's also deserves mention, namely the harsh treatment of the Mu'tahibin and Imam of the Zaidis; this shows that the reigning sharifs had gone over to the predominant rite of al-Shaffi and forsaken the Zaidi creed of their forefathers.

Among the sons and successors of A'dlan special mention may be made of Hasan (1396–1426) because he endeavoured to extend his sway over the whole of the Hijaz and to guard his own financial interests carefully, at the same time being able to avoid giving his Egyptian suzerain cause to interfere.

But from 1425 he and his successors had to submit to a regular system of control as regards the allotment of the customs.

From the time of Hasan, in addition to the bodyguard of personal servants and freedmen, we find a regular army of mercenaries mentioned which was passed from one ruler to another. But the mode of life of the sharifs, unlike that of other Oriental rulers, remained simple and in harmony with their Arabian surroundings. As a vassal of the Egyptian Sultan the sharif received from him every year his irawdij [r. v.] and a robe of honour. On the ceremonies associated with the accession of the sharifs see Snouck Hurgronne, Mekka, i. 97 sq.

Of the three sons of Hasan who disputed the position in their father's lifetime, Barakat (I) was chosen by the sultan as co-regent; twenty years later, he succeeded his father and was able with slight interruptions to hold sway till his death in 1455. He had to submit to the sultan's sending a permanent garrison of 50 Turkish horsemen under an emir.
to Mecca. This emir may be regarded as the precursor of the later governors, who sometimes attained positions of considerable influence under Turkish suzerainty.

Mecca enjoyed a period of prosperity under Barakât's son Muḥammad (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 344 sqq.; iii. 230 sqq.), whose reign (1455—1497) coincided with that of Kâthib [q. v.] in Egypt. The latter has left a fine memorial in the many buildings he erected in Mecca.

Under Muḥammad's son Barakât II (1497—1525) who displayed great ability and bravery in the usual struggle with his relatives, without getting the support he desired from Egypt (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 342 sqq.; iii. 244 sqq.), the political situation in Islam was fundamentally altered by the Ottoman Sultan Selim’s conquest of Egypt in 1517.

Although henceforth Constantinople had the importance for Mecca that Baghdad once had and there was little real understanding between Turks and Arabs, Mecca at first experienced a period of peace under the shāris Muḥammad Abū Numaïy (1525—1556) and Ḥassan (1566—1601). Under Ottoman protection the territory of the sharifs was extended as far as Khobar in the north, to Hāli in the south and in the east into Najd. Dependence on Egypt still existed at the same time; when the government in Constantinople was a strong one, it was less perceptible, and vice versa. This dependence was not only political but had also a material and religious side. The Ḥijāz was dependent for its food supply on corn from Egypt. The foundations of a religious and educational nature now found powerful patrons in the Sultan’s of Turkey.

A darker side of the Ottoman suzerainty was its intervention in the administration of justice. Since the sharifs had adopted the Shāfī madhhab, the Shāfī Kādji was the chief judge; this office had also remained for centuries in one family. Now the highest bidder for the office was sent every year from Constantinople to Mecca; the Meccans of course had to pay the price with interest.

With Ḥassan’s death a new period of confusion and civil war began for Mecca. In the language of the historians, this circumstance makes itself apparent in the increasing use of the term Dhawī . . . for different groups of the descendants of Abū Numaīy who dispute the supremacy, often having their own territory, sometimes asserting a certain degree of independence from the Grand Sharif, while preserving a system of reciprocal protection which saved the whole family from disaster (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekkâ, i 112 sqq.).

The struggle for supremacy, interspersed with disputes with the officials of the suzerain, centred in the eighteenth century mainly around the 'Abādīla, the Dhawi Zaid and the Dhawi Barakāt. Zaid (1631—1686) was an energetic individual who would not tolerate everything the Turkish officials did. But he was unable to oppose successfully a measure which deserves mention on account of its general importance. The ill-feeling between the Sunni Turks and the Shi‘ī Persians had been extended to Mecca as a result of an order by Sultan Muṣār to expel all Persians from the holy city and not to permit them to make the pilgrimage in future. Neither the Sharifs nor the upper classes in Mecca had any reason to be pleased with this measure; it only served the mob as a pretext to plunder well-to-do Persians. As soon as the Turkish governor had ordered them to go, the Sharifs however gave permission as before to the Shi‘īs to take part in the pilgrimage and to remain in the town. The Sharifs likewise favoured the Zaidis, who had also been frequently forbidden Mecca by the Turks.

The further history of Mecca down to the coming of the Wahhābīs is a rather monotonous struggle of the Sharifan families among themselves (Dhawi Zaid, Dhawi Barakāt, Dhawi Maṣ‘ūd) and with the Ottoman officials in the town itself or in Dîjda.

4. The Sharifate from the Wahhābī period to its end. The Kingdom.

Although the Wahhābīs [q. v.] had already made their influence perceptible under his predecessors, it was Ghalib (1788—1813) who was the first to see the movement sweeping towards his territory like a flood; but he left no stone unturned to avert the danger. He sent his armies north, east and south; his brothers and brothers-in-law all took the field; the leaders of the Syrian and Egyptian pilgrim caravans were appealed to at every pilgrimage for help, but without success. In 1799 Ghalib made a treaty with the emir of Dar‘iya, by which the boundaries of their territories were laid down, with the stipulation that the Wahhābīs should be allowed access to the holy territory. Misunderstandings proved inevitable however and in 1803 the army of the emir Sa‘ūd approached the holy city. After Ghalib had withdrawn to Dîjda, in April Sa‘ūd entered Mecca, the inhabitants of which had announced their conversion. All kubbas were destroyed, all tobacco pipes and musical instruments burned, and the adhān purged of praises of the Prophet.

In July, Ghalib returned to Mecca but gradually he became shut in there by enemies as with a wall. In August the actual siege began and with it a period of famine and plague. In February of the following year, Ghalib had to submit to acknowledging Wahhābī suzerainty while retaining his own position.

The Sublime Porte had during all these happenings displayed no sign of life. It was only after the Wahhābīs had in 1807 sent back the pilgrim caravans from Syria and Egypt with their mallams, that Muḥammad ‘Ali was given instructions to deal with the Ḥijāz as soon as he was finished with Egypt. It was not till 1813 that he took Mecca and there met Ghalib who made cautious advanced to him. Ghalib however soon fell into the trap set for him by Muḥammad ‘Ali and his son Tusun. He was sent to Salonika, where he lived till his death in 1816.

In the meanwhile Muḥammad ‘Ali had installed Ghalib’s nephew Yaḥyā b Sarûr (1813—1827) as sharif. Thus ended the first period of Wahhābī rule over Mecca, and the Ḥijāz once more became dependent on Egypt. In Mecca, Muḥammad ‘Ali was honourably remembered because he restored the pious foundations which had fallen into ruins, revived the consignments of corn, and allotted stipends to those who had distinguished themselves in sacred lore or in other ways.

In 1827 Muḥammad ‘Ali had again to interfere in the domestic affairs of the sharifs. When Yaḥyā had made his position untenable by the vengeance he took on one of his relatives, the viceroy deposed the Dhawi Zaid and installed one of the ‘Abādīla,
Muhammad, usually called Muhammad b. Awn (1827–1851). He had first of all to go through the traditional struggle with his relatives. Trouble between him and Muhammad b. ‘Ali’s deputy resulted in both being removed to Cairo in 1836.

Here the sharif remained till 1840 when by the treaty between Muhammad b. ‘Ali and the Porte the Hijāz was again placed directly under the Porte. Muhammad b. Awn returned to his home and rank. Ottoman suzerainty was now incorporated in the person of the wali of Djidda. Friction was inevitable between him and Muhammad b. Awn; the latter’s friendship with Muhammad ‘Ali now proved of use to him. He earned the gratitude of the Turks for his expeditions against the Wahhābī chief Faisal in al-Riyād and against the ‘Aṣir tribes. This raids on the territory of Yemen also prepared the way for Ottoman rule over it.

In the meanwhile the head of the Dhawi Zaid, ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib (1851–1856), had made good use of his friendship with the grand vizier and brought about the deposition of the ‘Abādīl in favour of the Dhawi Zaid. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib however did not succeed in keeping on good terms with one of the two pasha with whom he had successively to do. In 1855 it was decided in Constantinople to cancel his appointment and to recall Muhammad b. Awn. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib at first refused to recognise the genuineness of the order; and he was supported by the Turkophile feeling just provoked by the prohibition of slavery. Finally however, he had to give way to Muhammad b. Awn, who in 1856 entered upon the Sharifate for the second time; this reign lasted barely two years. Between his death in March 1858 and the arrival of his successor ‘Abd Allāh in October of the same year took place the murder of the Christians in Djidda (June 15) and the atonement for it (cf. Djidda, and Snouck Hurgronje, Een rector der meekansch university, in Bijdragen t. d. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned.-Indië, 5e volgr., deel ii, pp. 282–292, 1873).

The rule of ‘Abd Allāh (1858–1877) who was much liked by his subjects, was marked by peace at home and events of far-reaching importance abroad. The opening of the Suez Canal (1869) meant on the one hand the liberation of the Hijāz from Egypt, on the other however more direct connection with Constantinople. The installation of telegraphic connections between the Hijāz and the rest of the world had a similar importance. The reconquest of Yemen by the Turks was calculated to strengthen the impression that Arabia was now Turkish territory for ever.

The brief reign of his popular elder brother Husain (1877–1890) ended with the assassination of the sharif by an Afdhā. The fact that the aged ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib (see above) was sent by the Dhawi Zaid from Constantinople as his successor (1880–1882) gave rise to an obvious supposition.

Although the plebs saw something of a saint in this old man, his rule was soon felt to be so oppressive that the notables petitioned for his deposition (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecka, i. 204 sqq.). As a result in 1881, the energetic Othmān Nūrī Pasha was sent with troops to the Hijāz as commander of the garrison with the task of preparing for the restoration of the ‘Abādīl. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib was outwitted and taken prisoner; he was kept under guard in one of his own houses in Mecca till his death in 1886.

Othmān Pasha, who was appointed wali in July 1882, hoped to see his friend ‘Abdallāh, one of the ‘Abādīl, installed as Grand Sharīf alongside of him. ‘Awn al-Raṭīfī (1882–1905) was however appointed (portrait in Snouck Hurgronje, Bilder aus Mecca, p. ). As the wali was an individual of great energy, who had ever done much for the public good and ‘Awn, although very retiring, was by no means insignificant, any eventuation, trouble between them was inevitable, especially as they had the same powers on many points, e.g. the administration of justice and supervision of the safety of the pilgrim routes. After a good deal of friction Othmān was dismissed in 1886. His successor was Djamal Pasha, who only held office for a short period and was succeeded by Saflat Pasha. Only Ahmad Rāṭīb could keep his place alongside of ‘Awn and that by shutting his eyes to many things and being satisfied with certain material advantages. After ‘Awn’s death ‘Abdallāh was chosen as his successor. He died however before he could start on the journey from Constantinople to Mecca. ‘Awn’s actual successor was therefore his nephew ‘Alī (1905–1908). In 1908 he and Ahmad Rāṭīb both lost their positions with the Turkish Revolution.

With Husain (1908–1916–1924), also a nephew of ‘Awn’s, the last sharif came to power. But for the Great War his sharifate would probably have run the usual course. The fact that Turkey was now completely involved in the war induced him to declare himself independent in 1916. He endeavoured to extend his power as far as possible, first as liberator (muḥāfīz) of the Arabs, then (June 22, 1916) as king of the Hijāz or king of Arabia and finally as caliph. Very soon however, it became apparent that the Sultan of Najd, ‘Abd al-Azīz Al Sa‘ūd, like his Wahhābī forefathers, was destined to have a powerful say in the affairs of Arabia. In Sept. 1924 his troops took Taif and in October Mecca. King Husain fled first to Akaba and from there in May 1925 to Cyprus. His son ‘Alī retired to Djidda and afterwards to this town and Medina for a year, avoiding bloodshed and complications with European powers. Both towns surrendered in December 1925.

Since January 1926, Ibn Sa‘ūd has been king of the Hijāz; the official title of his kingdom now is Hijāz, Najd and dependencies. A political unit has thus been formed which covers a larger area than the sharifs ever ruled and possesses greater internal strength than has been seen in Arabia since the end of ‘Abbasid power.

By the organisation of the Najd warriors (iḥkāwān) as agriculturists also, by the maintenance of a strict discipline among the Beduins, by the creation of a military police, which is held in awe, security has been created such as Arabia has perhaps never known and secure foundations laid for traffic, especially of the pilgrims.

With the representatives of foreign governments in Djidda the king maintains friendly relations. Recently several states have raised their consulates there to the rank of an embassy. Treaties have been concluded with a number of states.

By making use of modern technical skill, the king is endeavouring to counteract the natural poverty of the land. The automobile has become of importance for the pilgrim traffic, agricultural machinery is being imported and cisterns built to hold the rain water. A project for examining the
ground to prospect for minerals has been drawn up as well as a plan for a quay in the harbour of Djjida.

Wahhabism — or as they prefer to call it in Arabia: Islam according to the Ḥanbali rite — is the state religion. But it has advanced cautiously in comparison with its attitude at the beginning of the xixth century. The external symbols of veneration for saints and the dead have been removed; Muhammad's tomb in Medina has however been spared. The mahmal [q.v.] no longer comes to the hajj; the new covering for the Ka'ba is made every year in Mecca. The pilgrim traffic again shows high figures and even Shi'is are admitted again to the pilgrimage.

The religious and economic life of the city has from the earliest times centred round the pilgrimage (cf. the article حرم) and the Mosque (cf. AL-MASJID AL-ḤARAM). The character of Mecca as the metropolis of Islam is reflected in the great variety of its population. Besides the original Meccan nucleus we have numerous Arab elements — among which the Ḥadrāmis are particularly prominent on account of their energy — and colonies of foreigners from all parts of the Muslim world who have out of worldly or religious motives taken up their abode permanently in the capital. Among these, special mention must be made of those from the Malay Archipelago who are known collectively as Djawa; with them is it exclusively religious motives that have caused them to take up permanent residence in Mecca.

Even at the present day, slaves mainly African, form an important element in Meccan society. Abyssinian slave girls have always been highly esteemed as concubines. The slave-market however is no longer of the importance it once was. Freedmen rise from the slave caste and their dwellings, huts put together of every conceivable material, are on the outskirts of the city.

Artisans are, or at least down to the end of the sixteenth century were, organised in gilds. Among these gilds, those of the Muhammadids (muhawwaris, q.v.), who have agents in Djidda and outside Arabia, is the most important; it lives entirely on the pilgrim traffic.

This is true in a way of the whole population, which has arranged to let houses to the pilgrims for a considerable portion of the year. By the eighth month, tens of thousands of these visitors are in the town. Their number increases till the twelfth. In Muḥarram, Mecca resumes its usual appearance.

During the last few hundred years — except for the first Wahhabi period — the cult of saints in Mecca has steadily increased. Numerous places have sacred merit that of Muhammad and his family, the most prominent muḥāḍarāt and later saints: numerous kubbas were built over their graves and āwals and mōlids were celebrated in their honour. The Wahhabis have done away with a great deal of this, how much is not exactly known.

Mecca is the seat of the government, although the king's residence is in Riyād. The official gazette Umūr al-Kārūr appears weekly. There are also printing presses, which mainly print Wahhabi or Ḥanbal literature.

List of the Sharifs of Mecca (ca. 961—1916).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dżafar</td>
<td>ca. 961—ca. 980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isl.</td>
<td>ca. 980—994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu 'l-Futūḥ</td>
<td>994—1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shukr</td>
<td>1039—1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sulaiman 1 or Banū Abī 'l-Fa'īyib, from 1061, at constant feud with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Hawāshīm (1063—1200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Katāda and his descendants (1200—1916)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katāda</td>
<td>1200—1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His sons.</td>
<td>till 1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Numa'ī I.</td>
<td>1254—1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His sons.</td>
<td>till 1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAdīlān</td>
<td>1346—1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His sons.</td>
<td>till 1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥasan I</td>
<td>1396—1426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barakāt I</td>
<td>1426—1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
<td>1455—1497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barakāt II</td>
<td>1497—1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Numa'ī II</td>
<td>1525—1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥasan II</td>
<td>1566—1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His sons.</td>
<td>till 1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>1631—1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'd I</td>
<td>1666—1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhawī Barakāt</td>
<td>1672—1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'd II</td>
<td>1684—1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhawī Barakāt</td>
<td>1704—1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhawī Zaid.</td>
<td>1711—1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarūr</td>
<td>1773—1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḡālib</td>
<td>1788—1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Sarūr</td>
<td>1813—1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
<td>1827—1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib</td>
<td>1851—1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
<td>1856—1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd Allāh</td>
<td>1858—1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥusain I</td>
<td>1877—1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib</td>
<td>1880—1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAwīn al-Rafīk</td>
<td>1882—1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḡabdīlāh</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī</td>
<td>1906—1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥusain II</td>
<td>1908—1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography:
al-Arsak.; Oriente Moderno, passim (especially v. 143 sqq., 302 sqq., 413 sqq., 660 sqq.; vi. 219 sqq., etc. s.v. Arabia; treaties; vi. 14 sqq., 42 sqq.; vii. 6 sqq., 474—479; x. 105 sqq., 122; constitution; vi. 530 sqq.; assumption of regal title; vi. 101 sqq.; cf. vii. 172 sqq.).

(A. J. Wensinck)

MEDEA, a town in Algeria (department of Algiers), 60 miles S. of Algiers, in 56° 15' 50'' N. Lat. and 2° 45' E. Long. (Greenwich). Medea lies at an altitude of 3,070 feet on the northern border of the mountainous massif which divides the high plateaus from the Mitidja. Down to the French occupation, it could only be reached by a bridle-path over the Muzala pass (3,270 feet). The building of a road through the gorges of the Chiffa, alongside of which a railway now runs, has made access to it easier. The town itself is built at the foot of slopes covered with vineyards which yield wines of superior quality and orchards in which, as a result of the temperate climate, fruit trees grow very well. In the neighbourhood a number of European villages have grown up in which the cultivation of cereals is combined with that of the vine. There is also a fairly busy market but it is losing in importance since the railway has been extended to Djelfa at the southern end of the high plateaus. The population (census of 1926) is 13,816 of whom 2,225 are Europeans, almost all French and 11,591 natives.

Medea occupies the site of the Roman settlement of Lambidia, on the ruins of which Boluggin b. Ziri in the tenth century built the modern town. The district in which it was built was, according to Ibn Khaldun (Barber, ii. 242), inhabited by the Sanahidja tribe of Lendia, whence no doubt the name Lendani taken by natives of Medea. Of the history of the town itself we know hardly anything. Leo Africanus (Bk. iv., ed. Schefer, iii. 66) and following him Marmol (Africa, ii. 394) only tell us that after having belonged to the sultans of Tlemcen who kept a garrison there, it passed into the hands of the sultans of Tenes, and then of the Turks when the Barbarossa established themselves in Algiers. Under Hasan Khair al-Din, Medea became the capital of one of the three provinces (beyliks) of the Regency, the beylik of the south or of Tilleri, to which at a later date was added the lower valley of the Sebou in Kabylia. Down to about 1770 we therefore find the key of this province living alternately at Medea and Bordj-Sebou. It was not till this date that, the region of Sebou having been incorporated in the Dar al-Sultan governed by the bey, the bey of Tilleri settled permanently at Medea where he was in a better position to control the nomadic tribes of the plateau. He had however no authority over the inhabitants of the town itself, who were under the authority of a hâkim appointed by the agha of Algiers. The population, which did not exceed 4,000—5,000 among whom there were many Turks, retired from the service, became wealthy through its trade with the south. Caravans brought thither the produce of the Sahara and also negro slaves who were sold to the citizens of Algiers.

During the years which followed the capture of Algiers, the French on several occasions (Nov. 1830—May 1831—April 1836) occupied Medea, without taking permanent possession. 'Abd al-Kâdir however placed a bây in it and had his ownership of it recognised by the treaty of the Tafna [cf. 'Abd al-Kâdir]. The outbreak of hostilities again between the Emir and the French led to the final occupation of Medea by the latter on May 17, 1840.


(G. Vyer)

MEDINA. The Arabic word madina "town" [cf. al-Madinat] has survived in Spain in a number of place-names. The principal are Medina de las Torres in the province of Badajoz, Medina del Campo and Medina de Rioseco, in the province of Valladolid, Medina de Pomar, in the province of Burgos, Medinaceli, in the province of Soria and Medina-Sidonia, in the province of Cadiz. The Arabic place-names Madinat Walid and Madinat al-Farâdî correspond to Valladolid [v.q.v.] and to Guadaljara respectively (from the second Arabic name of this town: Wađî 'l-Hisâra) [cf. above ii. 177, and it may be added that the town took its name from a known individual, Mâlik b. 'Abd al-Rahmân Ibn al-Farâdî, according to Ibn al-Kâhil, Fijiata, MS. in the Escorial, i. 189].

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

MEDEINACELI, a little town in the N. E. of Spain on the railway from Madrid to Saragossa, about halfway between these two towns, some 3500 feet above sea-level on the left bank of the Jalón. In the Muslim period it was called Madinat-Sâlim, which is not to be confused with Madinat Ibn 'l-Sâlim, in the Sewith district (Idrisî, Desers des l'Espagne, 174/208 and note 5, 177/215), the modern Grazalema in the province of Cadiz.

The Arab geographers give brief descriptions of Medinaceli. According to Idrisî, it was a large town built in a hollow with many large buildings, gardens and orchards. Abu 'I-Fidaî says that this town was the capital of the Middle March (al-thâbar al-awsat); Yâqût adds that Târîk [v.q.v.] found the town in ruins at the conquest of Spain but it was repopulated under Islâm and became a prosperous town.

Through its geographical position, Madinat-Sâlim was of considerable strategic importance for the Umayyads from the fourth century onwards. It was on many occasions, as the last stronghold on Muslim territory, the point from which forces assembled at Cordova finally started for expeditions against the Christians of the N. E. of the Peninsula and to which they retired. Though somewhat decayed down to the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâsir, it was rebuilt, if we may believe the detailed evidence of a chronicler quoted by Ibn 'l-Andalusi, in 335 (946); this ruler put the work in charge of his client, the general Ghâlib, and all the garrisons of the country lent their aid in the work.

This Ghâlib remained governor of Medinaceli and all the Middle March until the power was seized by al-Mansûr Ibn Abî 'Amir [v.q.v.]. It was in Medinaceli that this famous hâdîdî died on 27th Ramadân 392 (Aug. 10, 1002) on returning from his last expedition against Castile. In the following century Medinaceli was frequently taken by the Christians and retaken by the Muslims, before being finally incorporated in the Kingdom of Castile.

Bibliography: Idrisî, Sifat al-Andalusi, ed.
THE
ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

A DICTIONARY OF THE GEOGRAPHY, ETHNOGRAPHY AND BIOGRAPHY OF THE MUHAMMADAN PEOPLES

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY
M. TH. HOUTSMA, A. J. WENSINCK
H. A. R. GIEB, W. HEFFENING and E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL

NUMBER 44

MEDINACELLI — MIRATH

LEYDEN
BRILL
1921
LONDON
LUZAC & CO.
Abb. G. W. Gött. = Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
Afr. Fr. RC = Bulletin du Comité de l’Afrique française

AM = Archives marocaines
AMZ = Allgemeine Missionsschrift
Anth. = Anthropos
AQR = Asiatic Quarterly Review
ARW = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft
A. Fr. B = Bulletin du Comité de l’Asie française
BAH = Bibliotheca Arab.-Hispan.
BGA = Bibliotheca geographorum arabicorum ed. de Goeje
BIE = Bulletin de l’Institut Egyptien
BIFAO = Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale au Caire
BSOS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution
BTLV = Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned.-Indie
BZ = Byzantinisches Zeitschrift
CIA = Corpus inscriptionum arabicorum
EC = L’Égypte Contemporaine
GAL = Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur
GGA = Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen
GJ = Geographical Journal
GMS = Gibbs Memorial Series
GOR = Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches
GOW = Babinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke
Gr.1 Pb. = Grundriss der iranischen Philologie
GSAI = Giornale della Soc. Asiatica Italiana
HOP = Gibb, History of ottoman poetry
IG = Indische Gids
IRKM = International Review of Missions
ISL = Der Islam
JA = Journal’Asiatique
J Am. O S = Journal of the American Oriental Society
J Aslhr, 1 = Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Bengal
JE = Jewish Encyclopedia
JPHS = Journal of the Punjab Historical Society
JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review
JRAS = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
JRGS = Journal of the Royal Geographical Society
KR = Koloniale Rundschau
KS = Keleti Szemle (Revue orientale)
Mach. = Al-Machriq
MDPV = Mitteilungen und Nachr. des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins
MFOB(eyrouth) = Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth
MGG Wien = Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Wien
MGMN = Mitth. z. Geschichte der Medicin und Naturwissenschaften
MGWJ = Monatschrift f. d. Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Indentum
MI = Mir Islama
MIEgypt = Mémoires de l’Institut Égyptien
MIFAO = Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Inst. de Frang. d’Archéologie Orientale au Caire
Mitt. D = Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
Mitt. VAG = Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatische-ägyptische Gesellschaft
MMAP = Mémoires de la Mission

MO = Le monde oriental
MOC = Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte
MSL = Memoire de la Société Linguistique
MSOS As. = Mitteilungen des Sem. für oriental. Sprachen, Westasien, Studien
MTM = Mitt. tethbèlèlèr medjum’asf
MW = The Moslem World
NE = Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliotheque du Roi
NO = Norsk orientale
OA = Orientalisches Archiv
OC = Orienten Christieus
OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
OM = Orientle Moderne
PEFQS = Palestine Exploration Fund. Quarterly Serum
PELOV oder P. Ec. Lang. Or. = Publication de l’école des langues orientales vivantes
Pet. Mitt. = Pettermans Mitteilungen
QDC = Questions diplomatiques et coloniales
RAfr. = Revue Africaine
REJ = Revue des Études Juives
REJ = Revue des études islamiques
RHR = Revue de l’histoire des Religions
RI = Revue Indigène
RMM = Revue du Monde Musulman
ROC = Revue de l’Orient Chrétien
ROL = Revue de l’Orient latin
RRAH = Rev. della R. Academia de la Historia, Madrid
RRAL = Rendiconti della Reale Accademia della Lin Classe di sc. mor., stor., e filol.
RSO = Rivista degli studi orientali
RT = Revue Tunisiene
SBAK = Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wiss. zu Heidelberg
SBAK Wien = Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wi in Wien
SB Bayr. Ak. = Sitzungsberichte der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
TBGKW = Tijdschrift van het Batavisch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen
TOEM = Tijdschrift van het Oostindiens Medjum’asf
Revue Historique publiee par l’Institut d’Histoire Orientale
TTLV = Tijdschrift v. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde
Verh. Ak. Amst. = Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam
WI = Die Welt des Islam
Wiss. Veroff. DOG = Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
WZKM = Wissensch. Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZA = Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie
Zap. = Zapski
ZATW = Zeitschrift f. alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZDPV = Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins
ZGEBU. Berl. = Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Ur- und Früh historie in Berlin
ZI = Zeitschrift für Indologie und蛮erkunde
ZIK = Zeitschrift für Völkerkunde

MEDINÁ-SIDÓNIA, a little town in the S.W. of Spain, in the province of Cadiz, almost equidistant from Algeciras and Jerez de la Frontera. Under the name of Shāhda it was in the Muslim period the capital of the district of this name; its territory formed part of the province of Seville and adjoined that of Morón.


MEDJELLE (a. medjelle). Under this name the Civil Law Code of Turkey; is generally known It is an abbreviation of Medjelle-i akhām-i adīyya. The elaboration of this Civil Code took place between 1869 and 1876 and was a part of the legislative programme of the Tanzimat (q.v.). It had been preceded by a Penal Code (1858) and Commercial Code (1861), but, while these two codifications had been based in a large measure on the laws of European countries, the Medjelle was a codification of that part of Hanafite fikr, which treats of obligations (miakhirāt). The codification was done by a commission of seven members, having as president Ahmed Bajewdet Pasha (q.v.). In a preliminary report (madbāṭ), dated 18 Dhū 'l-Hijja 1285 (April 1, 1869), this commission explains the reasons why a codification of this matter had become necessary. The Medjelle was a codification, that is to say, a code. In it the judges did not know much, as a rule, about fikr; it had, therefore, been thought wise to appoint the president of the so-called religious tribunal at the same time president of the secular tribunal. This, however, did not prove satisfactory and so it was necessary to put the main points of the law of obligations into a code that could be more easily consulted than the voluminous fikr-books. Among the previous endeavours to bring Hanafite law into this form the commission mentions expressly Ibn Nudjaim (q.v.); the biography of this jurist is to be found at the end of the first part of the Cairo edition of 1334 of his Al-Baṣr al-rāfi (communication of Dr. C. van Arendonk). The editors have followed as a rule those opinions of Hanafite doctors, which are most in harmony with the exigencies of modern life and business. It is, however, expressly stated that the Introduction (makaddime) and the first Book have been approved by the Shāikh al-islam and other prominent jurists.

Though the different parts were successively sanctioned by Imperial kharīj, with the formula mudjibrughe 'amāl olim', the Medjelle cannot be said to have had an exclusive authority in the matter regulated. The judges were perfectly free to form their own opinion as a result of the study of the Hanafite law books and their decisions were really used.

The makaddime of the Medjelle contains in 100 articles a number of principles (kawāsit) as already elaborated by Ibn Nudjaim and his school; then follow sixteen books (kitāb), beginning with the Kitāb al-Bayān; the last four books deal with process matters. The whole has 1,801 articles. The first part of each book gives definitions of the technical law terms used, and most of the articles are followed by examples taken from the collections of felāwān. The introduction and the first book obtained the imperial sanction on the 8th Muḥarram 1286 (April 20, 1869) and the last two books on the 26th of Shāhān 1293 (September 16, 1876).

The text of the Medjelle is to be found in the big code collection Dostur (the introduction and book i.—viii. in vol. i.; book ix.—xiv. in vol. iii.; and books xv. and xvi. in vol. vi.). It has been published several times with a commentary, as the Medjelle-i Akhām-i adīyye sharḥ by E. M. Dyaly al-Din (Der-i Se'ādet 1311) and a work under the same title by the in his time famous jurist 'Aṣif Bey (Der-i Se'ādet, in different parts from 1328 to 1339; most parts had a second and the first part a third edition); the latter commentary, however, does not go beyond art. 1448. A full French translation is found in G. Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman, vol. vi., Oxford 1896, p. 170—446.

Since the Great National Assembly has adopted, on February 17, 1926, a new civil code (Kânun-i mivānd; cf. Orient. Moderne, vol. 134, 192), which is substantially the Swiss civil code, the authority of the Medjelle has disappeared.

(J. II. KRAMERS)

MEDJİDİYE. In February 1844 (Muḥarram 1260) in the reign of 'Abd al-Medjid the Turkish coinage was entirely re-organised on European models and this currency is known as the Medjidiye. The name Medjidiye was also given to the largest silver piece in the new coinage: the 20 piastre piece of this new issue; it weighed 372 grains (24.08 grammes). (J. ALLAN)

MEHEDJA [See Kamanhaya.]

MEHMET, MEHMETMED, MEHMETMED. (See Muhammed.)

MEHMED MEDİHA. [See Karanmehmed Medihmed Pasha.]

MEHİR 1), the language of the Mahra country in Southern Arabia, which with Ṣawwar (spoken in the mountains northeast of Zafar) and the dialect of the island of Sokotra forms a separate branch of South Semitic; the relation of this branch to the new extinct languages found in the inscriptions of the Sabaeans, Minaeans and Hadhramauts has not yet been accurately defined. Mehire itself as a spoken language in South Arabia is seriously threatened by the steady advance of northern Arabic. The Mahra people are already almost all bilingual and their native idiom is very much influenced, especially in vocabulary, by northern Arabic; for example, of its old numerals it has preserved only the first ten; all higher numbers have been replaced by the northern Arabic forms. It is therefore not always easy to distinguish with certainty old words which are also found in northern Arabic from later borrowings.

As regards Phonetics, the Mehri consonants are in general agreement with Arabic and Ethiopic. Of the laryngeal loss of 'ain, which still sur-

1) In this article the author's system of transliteration is retained for philological reasons.
vives in Shḥawri, is characteristic of Mehri. The
uplar plosive t seems always to be voiceless; of
the palatals the t\h\ which still survives in Shḥawri,
is always liquidated, as in northern Arabic, to t.\h.
The case of the schilants is particularly characteristic.
The original Semitic gh has been preserved as
such, but in many words, as in northern Arabic,
the original Semitic gh has coalesced with it. This
sound, which is preserved in Shḥawri as well as in
Canaanite and Aramaic, has often been replaced by h in genuine Mehri words, initially for example in
kina (he) "heard" (compare mingha "ear-
muscle") and medially in nehā "forgotten"; in
the final position it may be dropped, as in tay
"a little goat", hār "head". But when we find
alongside of kina "to obstruct" sma "to carry
over, to come to an agreement", which is con-
ected with the Arabic salād "straight, correct", the
latter can only be regarded as borrowed from the
Arabic. This s however is also found in words like līfas (he) "put on" and in the pronoun of the third
persons fem. se, sen, etc., in which any such borrowing is highly improbable; these must therefore belong to a dialect for which the phonetic law gh → d did not hold. The primitive Semitic gh has also survived where a following t was
assimilated to it, even when the consequent doublet
was dropped, as in the prefix to the causative
reduplicated sdn. A primitive Semitic sound seems
also to have survived in the sin, to which Jahn
gives the name "lateral", and which is trans-
literated in the Vienna texts by s; it corresponds
typologically to the Arabic sin, and therefore to the
sin in Canaanite and old Aramaic. Whether the
position of articulation was exactly the same cannot
of course be decided; but the description of the sound
as "lateral" probably means the same as the pronuncia-
tion with flattened tongue which is assumed
for Canaanite and Aramaic. Among the dialects
we find alongside of d and t also the fricatives dh
and th in native as well as loanwords; but in
both groups the fricative pronunciation has fre-
quently been dropped, e.g. in the case of dh
regularly in the demonstratives; alongside of the ab-
dative 300, we have tätibin 30. In "behind" s ap-
pears instead of the th in the Arabic athār
"track", probably under the influence of r, like dh
in the Eth. athār instead of the athār which
we should expect. So also in the case of z; the
fricative has in many cases become a plosive t under
conditions still to be explained, as in fahr
"moon", aṣām "great" = Arabic aṣār, ṣārīn. The
voiced d has a lateral articulation differing from the
Arabic. In the labials, as in Arabic, the voice-
less fricative f corresponds to the voiced explosive t
of the languages, n. when in proximity to velar
and palatalts, is frequently more nasal than in
Arabic. b and t before consonant-frequently lose
their own sound and merge in the preceding
vowel, as marīt, t slām from fətru, údī, údī,
the cursive t is from fəunu (by dissimilation in lef
"night", kīlīr "every night"), kār t > la ṣām "horn",
kwāt > kōw "belly".

The vowels are frequently prefixed with the
laryngal fricative instead of the laryngal plosive, i.e.
we often have hār for ḥār. As in Ethiopic
and probably also in primitive Semitic, only two
short vowel sounds, a and e, are distinguished.
while long vowels we have a, e, and i. The
old dahiphons are contracted to e and ə. These
base vowels are however more strongly affected
than in Arabic by the predominant articulation of
consonants. The distinction between a and e is
thus frequently obliterated. Stress brings about
the disappearance of short vowels in accented
syllables and lengthens them in accented ones,
whereas if they are not retained by laryngal
emphatic (i.e. pharyngalized) consonants, become
a (which often passes into i), open sounds ad-
joining it however become i, ì (matra). Assimilation
of vowels in adjacent syllables is frequent. Original
long vowels after laryngals and emphatic consonants
become au, at and e, e, i.

Of the phenomena of sound-shifting and
sound-change in combination, a characteristic
feature is the tendency, paralleled in the vowel
assimilation just described, to bring voiced and
unvoiced sounds into agreement (Jahn, Gramm.
p. 8). On this is based the transformation of Arabic
al-qādūr "of others", the root of which poetic
language retains in wākīl to be delayed", into
ghāsher with metathesis of the initial sound (hom.
being replaced by h) (cf. meğābīr "thereupon", while
the ghāir of the Arabic, which Bittner,
Studia, i. 15 compares with this, is to be regarded
the primitive Semitic "as the assimilation of
n is, as in Arabic, usually counteracted by the
necessity of maintaining the verbal system. Although
the disappearance of vowels produced by such
sounds sometimes produces double consonants initially, this
is frequently avoided at the ends of words by the
insertion of an epenthetic vowel, e.g. arof along side
of ar and earth. Such additional vowels are found
medially also before sonants as in the sub, yikdīf
(cf. yikdīf), after laryngals as in yikabīr and velar-
as in yikhabīr, yikhabēz, etc. Dissimilation, especi-
ally between sonants (panīt " idol" from zamūn, sabūn <
zamūn "time"; Hem., p. 117,35), haplography as in
�ātīl > fātīf, fātīf "one" (fem.) and strong metathes-
se like kātāl > l. tāk "he slew", kāhām(l) > kāmīt
> kītān, kītēn, "heavens" also contribute to give
the Mehri vocabulary its special features
becomes.

The pronoun has pre-erved very archaic forms.
The first personal pronoun hā, hā can probably
not be equated (as Bittner, Studi., n. 17 suggests)
to hā in Accadian antāku, as the change k → h
is not found elsewhere in Mehri, but must be
connected with the primitive Semitic *ā (with
aspiration of the initial vowel — see above). It is
also improbable that the 2nd pers. pronoun sg. kēt,
plur. m. fem. f. tin, should pre-erve in the singular, with
assimilation of the n, the initial syllable *ān found
in the other Semitic languages, but reject it in
the plural. It is perhaps more probable that the initial
sound of the 2nd pers. has been assimilated to
that of the 1. and 3. The 1. plur. nāhā reveals
a corruption of the primitive Semitic nāhā. The
3. pers. has. alone among Semitic languages pre-
erved the original difference in the initial sounds.
m. hā, f. hā, plur. m. hām, fem. f. tin; on the other
hand, the double distinction through the vowels
has been dropped. Among the suffixes may be
noted the distinction of genders, found also in
some North Semitic dialects, in the 2. pers. m.
k. s, with palatalization from k. as in shāmā
hāsilāt (Muller, u. 141, 14) and Sakk. zābihā (Muller,
n. 227, 208), "liver". In place of the suffixes,
the independent pronouns may also be used
with the genitive particle as mōād dī-hā, "my farm",
hāmān lihēt, "thy sheep".

The demonstrative pronouns end in the
sg. m. d (in place of dh) and distinguish the
The feminine ending at takes the accent in nominatives with short stem vowels; and therefore appears as at, or with assimilation to close front vowels as et, as in *salāmit "rain"; *fajūt "heal", *ḥājirī "chamber"; after long stem vowels however, it is unaccented, as in *alādīt "flag", *ḥādīt "tube", *ḏāfarīt "palm-wood", especially in loanwords from the Arabic, while in true Meheri vowel-longing the vowel at is lost; the stem vowel then disappears and the vowel of the new closed root syllable is abbreviated, as in *jafrīt (a Yemeni "town", "village", "full", "good") from *jafrīt (from *jafrīt) "noble lady" from *sherīf. The endings of the nominative likewise end in this way in infinitive "egg" from *ēfīt, *lāmit "conson" from *īmīt, *sāfīt "curtain" from *saft (alongside of the usual ending as *hāzīfat "head", *wajīfīt "date-palm") as in Tigre and Tigraí, these are really feminine of adjectives of relation, which in their original meaning preserve the full form *īfāt (see Rhodokanakis, cp. cit. p. 6, 7).

Of the dual only a trace remains in *fīrūz; perhaps however also in the ending of nouns before this numeral, like *kārhītā "his", if this is not simply an epenthesis vowel before the double consonant. *Ghīfīt, borrowed from the Arabic al-sawārīt, *takāfīt "at the time before the 'air'; *haṣīfīt "at the time before the 'air'.

The sound plural of the masculine with the ending in *iin "is", before suffixes is still in use to a greater extent than in Arabic. The plural of adjectives of relation in *fāzīm is still found alongside of the contracted form in, frequently in names of trades like ḥammānt-un, *wuṣārīn (Rhodokanakis, cp. cit. p. 9). The ending of the fem. pl. is ēt, sometimes ṣet, which does not, as Bittner thought, maintain the nominative which survives in Meher (as modern Arabic and in Hebrew and Ethiopic) only in adverbs. The suffix syllable is the plural ending of the masc. in unaccented syllables (Grundr., t. 442), just as the fem. sg. if takes the masc.

...
ending (see above), or it may be, as Rhodokanakis (op. cit., p. 8) suggests, the other plural ending *an, as in Accad. *kullatin “all”. In the formation and usage of the broken plural, Mehri adopts a scheme between Arabic and Ethiopic. Characteristic are number of formations from plurals of the plural, such as are found also in Arabic, e.g. *surk “a piece of wood”, plur. *surrik, then *sirdiyik and thence *sryak (Rhodokanakis, p. 11 sqq.). Double plurals also arise through the addition of the masc. pl. ending in *rik *wind”, *hjem-in “tails”, *shimin “bows”, to which the original plurals *rik, *shenn, *shin are then taken as singulares (Rhodokanakis, p. 9). And again with vowel reduction after the accentuated syllable in *kiltım “bitches”, *kohastun “daughters”, in which however Rhodokanakis (p. 15) sees the ending *an.

The case-infections, except for a few remains of the accusative in some adverbs, have completely disappeared. The genitive is expressed by the simple juxtaposition of two nouns, more frequently by the relative, sometimes with a demonstrative suffix, as in *geliden de *ghelsh *hibri di *begrett “the skin of the steer, the young of the cow”. Hein, p. 15, 16, alongside of *hbr *tich *the young of the bull"; ibid., p. 5, 17.

The prepositions of Mehri are for the most part new formations, some of uncertain origin. Of the Old Semitic prepositions, only hi (ba, b), *beh, *bad “after”, *bt < *dtu and *tlu, and min have survived; *ka, *kr has come to mean “with”. The place of *lì has been taken by *ka, *ke, which Bittner traces to the first syllable of *lul “dust”, but this is not very probable. The other prepositions have been replaced by words indicating place, like *fenwen “in front”, *chaven “behind”, *negbren “later”.

In the treatment of the verbal infinitives, as in the causative *hakdt “to cause to write”, in the reflexive *ketteb, *ketti, *ketti, in the caus. refl. *shogfer and *shakhem. From these imperatives is formed the affective mood (Bittner’s subjunctive), like yitker “that he crush”, yitkab “that he put on”, *yitser “that he travel”, yitkabeb “that he write”, yiketteb, *yiketteb, *yiketteb, *yshogfer, *yishakhem. Next there is expressed the progressive aspect, which presents the action as in progress, often with limitation to the present and future, a form which doubles the second radical in the simple verb but, as in the intensive, has replaced the reduplication by lengthening the vowel as in *yitber “he crushes”, so also in the causative *yikabeb, but in the intensive and sometimes in the reflexive shows an ending corresponding to the Arabic energics, as in yinfe in “the travels”, refl. *yikettleb and *yikettleb, caus. refl. *yishakhem. In the intransitive simple verb, the affective mood serves also to indicate that an event is happening at the present time (as a so called indicative); on account of the relations of the intrans. to the caus. and refl. already referred to this formation, but now for the indicative only, is transferred to these forms in *yikabeb (alongside of *yikabeb), *yishef and *yiketteb (from ketteb).

As the so called perfect in active verbs, the stress remains on the second syllable in the exception of the 3rd fem. sg., the ending of which *p is, as in the noun, attracts the emphasis to itself (teber). The 3rd pl. has lost the endings and replaces them only in the masc. by *em, which comes from the pronoun. The consonantal terminations have lost their vowels, but the double consonant at the end of a word is separated by the insertion of an epenthetic vowel only before the sonant *n of the 1st pers. plur. (teberron); after other terminations these are maintained. As in Ethiopic the initial of the 2nd pers. is assimilated to that of the 1st (-d); as in the suffix, the 2nd fem. sg. appears in the palatalised form *th. The intransitives with the exception of the 3rd fem. sing. retain the stress on the first syllable of the stem, the vowel of which is assimilated to that of the second (titer). In the intensive the lengthening of the a to o is found only in the forms which do not add a termination.

In the imperative in the transitive simple verb as well as in the causative there is no distinction of gender in the singular. In the intransitive form however, the vowel of the second accented syllable of the stem was assimilated to the feminine ending *i, so that even after it was dropped the distinction between m. teber and f. tebr was retained, similarly in the reflexive *featm, *fehim.

Accordingly, in the intensive and its reflexive and in the causative reflexive the distinction of gender is expressed also by changing the accented vowel: m. *teber, f. *tebr, m. *tebed, f. *tebed, m. *tebedef, f. *tebedef. In the plural the genders are distinguished by the endings in -em, f. -en. In the intransitive simple form however, the vowel change is transferred from the singular to the plural, m. *tebedem, f. *tebeden and in the reflexive of the scheme *ketteb, with peculiar change of function m. *ketteben (assimilation to the indir. imp. *yketteben, pl. *yketteben), f. *ketteben. The same change of function is also found in the perf. of the causal: 3 m. pl. *hakdetem, f. *hakdetem.

Out of the imperative arises the so-called subj,
of the impf. by means of the same personal prefixes as in all Semitic languages and with the endings for the 2nd sg. and m. -em, f. -en for the plural of the 2nd and 3rd pers. In the corresponding indicative the distinction of gender is expressed in the second person by internal vowel change, m. tiberen, f. tiber and on the addition of the plural endings the short vowel (yitiberen etc.) is restored. In the intransitive simple verb the moods are not distinguished, the genders of the 2nd pers. sg. are distinguished by the same vowel change as in the imperative; this vowel change is also transferred to the plural (m. tiberen, f. tiberen) and with exchange of functions also to the 3rd pers. (m. yitiberen, f. tiberen). In the intensive, distinction of gender in the second person is expressed only in the singular (subj. tefter, f. tefter, indic. m. tefteren, f. tefteren); before the endings, the vowels are short and the mood endings give way to the plural endings so that the 3rd pers. f. sg. and pl. are the same.

The participles are in the simple form active seboren, f. tevite (see above), pass. metguren; in the derivative stems as e.g. intensive mekhate, m. mekhetere, caus. mekhake, m. mekhateketer; in the passive they follow the model of the simple verb, makkis "deshatched" (in the intensive only when borrowed from the Arabic like meqadam "chief").

The infinitives are in the simple verb of the form tiber (more rarely like gadol: "to carry"), mitol "to be ill") or gahfis "to take" (frequently with med. lar.), with prefix like maimul "work", or with ending like gashon "to forgive"; in the intensive mohid "to cool down", in the causative and the reflexives (kehul, yikheul, sometimes with lengthening: kahser "get up"), yanadyer, zah [Jahn, p. 113, 29] "give heed", yighadh.

The medial u and i verbs are, as in Ethiopic, to a great extent assimilated to the plan of the strong verbs, ya and wad being treated as consonants. Only in the simple form of the med. u is the old Semitic inflexion retained in principle. But the old form yinuit (frequently yininit) has become indicative, and a new subj. has been formed with vowel change, yiniet, followed by the imperative miet. As in the infinitives, the ending of the 2nd sg. f. reacts on the stem in the indicative: temit, whence also the fem. plur. temiton to the m. temiten, and the 3rd pers. with these reversed: simiten, temiten. In the perf. mid<7<ewna is retained but abbreviated before consonant suffixes, as metet; the participle from it is mete
ten. But the pass. part. is quite strong in formation as makk
"feared". Some verbs, probably formed from nouns, follow the strong paradigm throughout the simple form like tawil "to be finished", hawel "to be mad". This is always the case in the reflexive of the base, e.g. tekhek "to long for home" and in the causative, as kete
ten "turned" and its reflexive, e.g. khekoh "warmed himself", as well as in the med. ya verbs e.g. seyor "travelled".

The intensive stem shows a peculiar formation, e.g. acaid "returned", impf. i. ya
dvin, subj. ye
dvin, imp. awad, part. ma
dvad, inf. awadet (from the simple verb, elsewhere however like tata
dry) and arit "called aloud" following the formation of the doubled verbs.

The bilateral roots with short vowel (the so-called med. gem. or doubled verbs) have retained the primitive Semitic inflexion with doubling of the second radical only in the perfect of the simple form; in addition the consonantal endings take an epenthetic vowel: 3rd m. temm "was at an end";
The suffixes are added to the 3rd pers. sg. m. of the perf. with the "bound vowel" ḫ which as in the similarly constructed forms of the Syr. imperf. (e.g. ʾḥušša) may have been an originally independent particle, which in Arabic is expanded to ḫ and which ḫašša has released, but in other respects follows the pattern of the verb ḥašša. Only before the 2nd pers. sg. m. it appears instead of unknown reasons. T may also appear in association with the element t found in North Semitic (Hebrew ʾt, ʾt etc.) probably abbreviated from the verb ʾtaša ʿto come", which with the 2nd pers. sg. m. it also shows t. These independent suffixes however may also appear after all the other verbal forms, which otherwise take the suffixes direct or with an epithetic vowel.

The vocabulary shows the closest affinity, apart from later borrowings, to northern Arabic, but possesses, in addition to many characteristic new formations like ḥašša "mouth" (cf. Arap. ḫurūba "mouth"), many old words which otherwise survive only in outlying regions, like ḥušša "foot" as in Panic, instead of the phonetically inconvenient rṯ. so ḫušša, ḥušša. Sok. teen, etc. Muller, iv. 170, 37, 1, 2. "sheep = ḥašša" Aram. and Manda. ḫašša (see Liebscher, Ersk. ii, 1907, 256: ḫašša) in 213 notes ṭašša "together", cf. Arab ḫašša "to assemble". The language of the Bermins and that of poetry has in addition many special features, particularly in its vocabulary.


Verstudien zur Grammatik und zum Worterbuch der Semitisch-Sudarabischen Sprache, i, ibid., vol. clxix./3, 1913; N. Khodokanakis, Zur Formenlehre der Meḥrī, ibid., vol. clx., 1910. — The Vienna Academy possesses a wealth of material for a dictionary of the Meḥrī language from material left by the late W. Hein; V. Christian is expected to edit it. (C. Brockelmann, MEKNES = Meknès and Meknez, in Arab. Al-Zar(t)y, a town in Morocco, one of the residences of the Sultan. The old French name Mogenes or Maghenes has not prevailed against the form inspired by the ethnic.

Situated in 5° 39' W. Long. (Greenw.) and 35° 53' N. Lat. at an average height of 1,700 feet above sea level, Meknes is 80 miles east of Rabat and 40 west of Fès. It occupies the centre of the transitional zone which lies between the Middle Atlas, 30 miles to the south, and the Schil. It commands the exit towards the Gharb of the depression ("south Rifian pass") which separates the massif of the Zerihoun from the plateau of el-Hd phá. At Meknes intersect the roads from Rabat to Fès, from Tafnìt through the land of the Beni Mrzîf and Aẓrû, from Marakhûn through the Tafnìt. Meknes at the present day is economically connected with Kenīra.

The temperature rarely exceeds 36° C. or falls below 5°. The rainfall (491 mm. in 1929) is remarkably equal from one year to the other. The excellent water supply of the plain of Meknes and the quality of its light soil, resting on a subsoil of permeable limestone, makes it one of the best agricultural districts of Morocco.

The population at the last census was 30,000, of whom 16,000 were Muslims and 6,000 Jews. Canal in 1902 put it at 20,000 of whom 9,000 were Ḥaṭhîrîs and 5,000 Jews.

Meknes is built on the flank of a mountain spur. The ruins of the Kasba of Mawlavî Isâ citation to the S.T. of the native town, and give to the old town, surrounded by wall of clay, a considerable extension, of which the madina itself covers about a third. Beyond the ravine dug out by the Wâdî el-Fekra the European town has been laid out and is being built. The appearance of the native town, dominating this ravine and placed upon a verdant plateau, is striking. The houses of the madina, often sub-terminal, are always very simple. There are only fifteen or so houses of an artistic interest. They date for the most part from the reigns of Sultan Muhammad b. Aʾl-ʿAl-Khâmîn and Mawlavî el-Hâson. The suburbs of the town look like the streets of a country village. The selîs, which lie between the Madrasa
Meknes

Bu Inania and the Djami al-Nadijdjarin (shops of the jewellers, carpenters and curiositvs shops) have no remarkable features except the covered Qujarita [q.v.] the booths of which were ornamented a few years ago with shutters of painted wood. The melah [q.v.] of Meknes is to the south of the medina; it seems to have been here since the reign of Mawlai Muhammad b. 'Aid Allah. A new melah of Meknes is one of those which have retained their native character most unaffected. Only one street, the Kauthaa street, is accessible to European trade and traffic. The centre of the town's activity is the Hedim square. In the evening the 'story-tellers and balloonists, who usually call themselves shafi' of Mawlai Abd al-Kadir al-Hadi, are surrounded by a crowd, the animation of which is exceeded only by that which fills the Lynam al-Fina at Marrakush. To the S.E. lie the vast ruins of the ksar of Mawlai Isma'il. They now reveal nothing but chaos and disorder. The only buildings still kept in repair are the Lynam b. Almadani, which have certain parts of which have made a charming garden, and the Dar al-Ba'itah which is now a school for native officers. In the Dar al-Mekheen live the last surviving women of the family of Mawlai al-San and sometimes it is used as a royal residence. Begun at the end of the sixteenth century this palace was built in several periods. The old Dar al-Makhzen dates from 1589. In the ruins of the Dar Khara live the families of the Hasani shafi', near the abode of the naab of the shafi'. Mawlai Kabir b. Zalim 'To the Lynam al-Akkher and mosque the ksar of shafi' and principal officials go every Friday and on the occasion of solemn prayers. In the old Agdal of Mawli Isma'il, among waste lands, an ornamental farm, the origin of which goes back to Mawlai 'Abd Allah has been laid out, beside an experimental garden. Farther on there is a horse-breeding establishment. The remainder is nothing but ruins. The visitor goes along miles of measure walls and finds enormous ruins: the Harfi al-Masaf used as a stable and storage house for forage, the walls, the granary and the ornamental water left to dry.'

There is very little industry in Meknes: carpentry and particularly weaving, already noted by al-Iddri, is the most notable artistic industries are the many coloured embroideries of large irregular point lace and painted wood. The public services are a great deal of business. In Meknes as elsewhere, some classes of artisans, like the tailors, smiths and potters. The building trades, on this side, are flourishing, Siqiq is held outside the town and are attended by the country people. The Siqiq of the Bi-dhyl, before the gate on which the heads of rebel mobs are displayed for the edification of the tribes, the Siqiq al-Khamas and that of the Lanterns. There is no native commercial house of any importance. The market of Meknes does not extend beyond the environs of the town: it exports nothing except in years of abundant harvest. The region was already famed in the tenth century for its fruits, its vines, its gardens and its vegetables. The mills, four or five of which are still working, date from the same period. Since the French occupation, colonization has developed considerably. The colonists, most of whom have come from Algeria, cultivate mainly wheat, of which they are obtaining increasing yields. The cultivation of the vine is increasing each year. The region of Mawlai Idris is one of the principal centres of olive-growing in Morocco (400,000 trees); 330 farms are laid out in the district, covering 85,000 hectares. Official colonization which has now disposed of almost all the reserved lands been out-distanced since 1927 by private colonization. The native farms (130,000 hectares) tend to disappear from the plains to become themselves to mixed farming in the mountains. Prospecting for minerals has only been done piece-meal. Traces of petroleum have been found beside Petritane and of lead in the Central Atlas.

The government of Meknes, which is a moharbatina town, is in the hands of a Beibeh. He is also faqih of the Bakkher, who have retained a relic of their past greatness in a special statute and edict till 1912 provided the garrison of the town (500 men according to I. C. Chatelain). The beibeh of the Hasani shafi' exercises a jurisdiction independent of that of the beibeh. In the administrative organization of the province, Meknes has been made the capital of a very considerable area. It was from it that the military operations in the Central Atlas were directed. Although this active part is now over, Meknes is still a military command, and its administrative region, although greatly reduced, still stretches to Mulek, situated in the centre of Morocco at the junction of important roads. Meknes is marked out as one of the strong places of the country in the future: a military camp is being laid out at el-Haajeb.

The population consists of many distinct elements: Shafi', Bakkher, Berbers and Jews. The Hasani shafi', who have played their part in the history of the town and retain privileges (of the numerous descendants of Mawlai Idris, only the families residing in Fas and Meknes are allowed to share in the income of the zawiya of Fas) and the Hasani shafi', who have many privileges of their own, form a kind of aristocracy, generally penurious. The Bakkher, descendants of the 'Abd of Mawlai Isma'il, up till 1912 formed an unreliable element, which was always a nucleus of trouble. Since that date they have been taking up the trades of mat-makers and farriers. The have close to the town of old kasbas and gardens which belong to the Makhzen, and in the old kasba of Mawlai Isma'il in the 13th Mithqal quarter. Their houses, framed with thatch, look like African encampments. But it is the Berber (Afghani) element which predominates at Meknes and gives it its desire for independence, a feature of which has for centuries been a jealousy of Fas. It is the Berbers of the mountains who give it its tone; when they come down to the town, their women give colour to the streets of the medina with their short skirts, their leather gaiters and their wide-brimmed hats. The Berber elements of the plain are much more mixed, having undergone many vicissitudes since the day when Mawlai Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah inaugurated the policy, considerably practised by his successors, of transferring tribes.

A considerable part of the population of Meknes consists of floating elements who come, usually between harvests, to work as artisans. These immigrants, almost all, come from the south, from Tafilalet in particular (potters, tanners and porters).
from Sis (grocers), from Tütt (oil-makers), from Figgig and Dar'a (masons). The Rifans and Jbala supply most of the agricultural labourers. A small number of Fibis, who have in recent years merged into the population of the town, are cloth-merchants, old-clothes-dealers and shoemakers.

Jews form a quarter of the native population. Foucault estimated the mellah of Meknes to be half that of Fas. Chénier remarked on its prosperity. It has increased since his day as elsewhere and the position of the Jews is greatly improved since the establishment of the French Protectorate.

Religious Life. From the presence of the Idrisids and Hasanids shoffa, the proximity of the sanctuary of Mawlāi ʿIdrīs and the religious event of the celebrations of his miʿṣūr (class, mawṣūn, q.v.) every year, Meknes is one of the most important centres of Sufism. At the same time for the Berber population it is a centre of marabout rites of the most elementary kind. All the brotherhoods that have ṣawāja in Morocco are represented in Meknes. The most important are those of the Kadiyīya, Ṭidāniya, and especially Ḥanāḍhā and the largest, the ʿĪṣaw, to which half the population are attached. Meknes, whose patron saint is Sīdī Muhammad b. Ṣāqī and which has its tomb under the kubba erected by Mawlālī Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, is the capital of the order. This saint came here at the end of the xvth century. His teaching at first met with a vigorous resistance, which he overcame so completely that, when the governor of the town sought to take steps against him, the people protected him. Before his death he acquired an estate, constituted it kubba and set it aside as a cemetery. It is still used and many men of religion are buried there. The celebration of his miʿṣūr on the first day of the mīlīd (masculid) festival is the great event of the year. The preparations for it begin forty days before and become all-absorbing ten days before the festival. On the day before or the preceding day delegations flock in from all parts of Morocco, following the traditional routes. The most generous hospitality is given to the pilgrims by the descendants of Ṣaḥḥārī al-Ḵāmilī, who have the mīlīd (Brunel). The excesses committed on the occasion of this pilgrimage have been frequently described. Many other special cults are observed in Meknes. Bu Ṣerī is the patron of the graziers, and Mawlālī ʿIdrīs of the Zāhrīn is the patron of the tanners, weavers and butchers (Maʿṣūnū). There is even the cult of a living holy man, Mawlālī ʿAhmād Wazzānī. As it was his custom to sit in the public way in a very simple costume, he was in 1917 granted clothes and a kubba at the request of Mawlālī Yūsuf. The kubba is at the entrance to a dispensary and the admirers of the saint come there daily to keep him company.

History. We know nothing certain about the history of the region in the Roman period nor in the centuries which followed. The most advanced Roman stations were on the slopes of the Zāhrīn guarding the plain, out of which the warriors of the Central Atlas might debouch, and perhaps throwing out a screen as far as the plateau of el-Hādegb.

We do not know at what date the people here had their first contact with Islam, nor even if it was not till the Hīdlah invasion that Islam became securely established here. The Berber tribes of the Sātis and Sebū made the most of the fertility of their country. A tradition records that a fire destroyed the gardens there in 917. It was at this period that the country was covered, from Tāzā to Meknes, by the migration of a Zanita tribe, the Mīnkāša, a section of whom, who received the name of Mīnkāša al-Zatān to distinguish them from the Mīnkāša Tāzā, who lived farther to the east, established themselves securely in the plain. The Idrisids met with a vigorous resistance from the Mīnkāša. They always found in them opponents whom they could not overcome in spite of several campaigns, and who were the medium of Umayyad intervention.

The Kirfi records that a governor of the district, al-Mahdī b. Yūsuf al-Kazānī, having joined Yūsuf b. Tāshfin, was assassinated by the tribesmen, but the terrified citizens hastened to disown the murder. At this date a few villages stood on the site of Meknes. One cannot say at what date, perhaps in the tenth century, they were grouped together to form the Tuzaḍa as mentioned by Idrīsī (Ṭagrāt, according to the Khāb al-Idrīṣī). The population seems to have been more numerous in the Anosara period than later, and prosperous. Enclosed by a wall, Meknes looked like a pleasure resort, with its gardens, cultivated fields, its mosques, its baths and water channels. It had become the capital of the district of Meknes and was the residence of the governors of the country.

The Mīnkāša vigorously opposed the Almohad onslaught. When passing through this region in 1120—21, Ibn Tūmār preached here but he was not well received. Twenty years later, 'Abd al-Maʿmūn laid siege to Meknes but it was not he who took it. He left it to enter Fas, leaving the conduct of siege in the hands of Yahyā b. Ẓaghūr. The Kirfi says the siege lasted seven years. The town fell in 1150. It was plundered, the defences dismantled, a part of its wealth confiscated and all its garrison put to death, except the governor Yaddīr b. Uqlūq, who is said to have gone over to the Almohads before the surrender in order to save his head. On the site, or beside the ruins, Meknes rapidly rose again under the shelter of the fortifications built by the Almohads. At the end of the century, it had regained some importance and the mosque of al-Najīḍīrīn was finished. This is the oldest monument in Meknes: in 1756—1757 Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh had it restored and built the present minaret. The Almohads brought water hither from Tādžennā, five miles away. In 1182 the khāba was said in five different places in Meknes and there were six gates in the wall which surrounded the town.

In the course of the following century, the intrigues of the Banū Ṣaḥḥār (q.v.) disturbed the country, where the fighting that accompanied the fall of the Almohads was particularly lively. In 1231—1232, al-Maʿmūn had to intervene against the Banū Ṭāzā and Meklāta, who were ravaging Meknes. In 1236—1237, as a result of the Marinid success in the battle in which al-Saʿīd's son was slain, Abū Bakr entered the town. This occupation was only temporary but the Almohad restoration was not secure. In 1245—1246, the governor left there by al-Saʿīd was slain in a rising in the town in favour of Abū Zakariya the Ḥafsid. Al-Saʿīd again returned victorious, causing Yahya b. 'Abd al-Haṣān to fly to Tāzā. The Marinid had only two years to wait; after the death of the Almo- had governor, he returned to Meknes to occupy it definitely.

The first period of greatness for Meknes dates from the Marinids. They set out to make it beautiful
like Rabat and Fas. Abū Yusuf moved from Fas to Djedid to Meknes, which owed to him a kāša and a mosque (1276). Abū l-Hasan improved its water-supply, built bridges on the road to Fas and began the Madrasa Djidida which Abū l-Insān was to finish. It bears the latter's name and is still the most notable building in Meknes, in spite of the indiscreet restorations carried out in 1917-1922. Other madrasas, Aṭṭārīn and Fisīhā, were built by the Marinids.

During this period the political organisation of the country was developing in quite a different direction. The Idrīsīd shorfa, having assisted the Marinids to gain power, prepared to take advantage of the organisation which the latter had given them. Thus the foundations were laid for the movement which was to end in the partition of Morocco in the last years of the 13th century into practically independent divisions. The shorfa were numerous in Meknes. When the weakening of the Marinids and the decline of their prestige made it possible, they supplied leaders. History has preserved the name of Mawān Zayyān. The Waṭṭasids only once intervened, it appears, when at the beginning of the 13th century Masā'id b. Aḥmad al-Nāṣir, having rebelled against Muhammad al-Burtugallī, found an asylum at Meknes. The Sultan besieged the town, took it, then instated his brother al-Nāṣir al-Kiddīlī there, who however did not prove faithful to him. The few years of independence enjoyed by Meknes were not particularly glorious. They mark, however, an epoch in the history of the town destined at other periods to be only the prey of anarchy or the plaything of a tyrant.

The rise of the brotherhoods of the 14th century found a favourable soil among the Mīknāsī. The Sā'īd ibn Zayyān was established there, as in several places in Morocco. A few years later, Muḥammad b. Isā was teaching there. Meknes was thus well prepared to welcome the Sa'diyya. When Muḥammad al-Sha'iḥī approached in 1548 he entered the town without much trouble. The Marinids al-Nāṣir al-Kāšī was said to have agreed to hand over the town in return for the liberty of his father Aḥmad Bu Zakariyya, and the marabouts to have demanded the conclusion of such an agreement. Muḥammad al-Sha'iḥī however took a sufficiently sure method to establish his authority; when the Khatīb Abū ʻl-Ḥasan ʻAlī b. Ḥaẓīz began to preach against him, he had him sentenced to death. When he returned two years later, he was welcomed with gifts. The estimates of travellers of this time put the population of the town at 6,000 hearths. It was the only town in the region. The Sā'īdīs took little interest in Meknes which never attracted their attention. The country was well in hand and the Berber tribes peaceful to such a degree that the road from Marrākkush by the Taŷla was regularly used. It was the practice to make Meknes the residence of one of the sons of the Sultan. There was however no important command attached to it. Leo Africanus credits it with a revenue equal to half that of the viceroyalty of Fas, which is astonishing. Under Aḥmad al-Mansūr, Abū ʻl-Ḥasan ʻAlī lived there and then after the second partition, Zadīn and, lastly Mawlawī al-Sha'iḥī, but as a prisoner in the last years of his father's life.

The civil war which broke out on the death of al-Manṣūr placed Meknes at the mercy of the Berber risings and marabout intrigues. Mawlawī Abū Allāh b. al-Sha'iḥī lived by brigandage and often found a refuge in al-Kaṣr al-Kabīr. In 1619, his brother Muḥammad defeated him near Meknes. After that Aḥmad also mentions for the next year the rising of an individual who called himself the Sharīf Aḥmād. In the midst of this disorder an authority gradually made itself felt, that of the Sā'īdīs, and especially the Sā'īdī ibn Dīlā. In 1640-1641, Muḥammad al-Hāḍidī was even able to seize the sovereign power and get himself recognised by Fas and Meknes after his victory over Mawlawī Muḥammad al-Sha'iḥī b. Zadīn. He gained over the Berber tribes, and Mawlawī al-Rashīdī in 1666 found the Bāb Mīr against him, allied with the Dīlā. Abū Aḥmad Allāh, and he had to fight them again in 1668.

Mawlawī al-Rashīdī seems to have been interested in Meknes, the Kāša of which he restored. In burning him in the mausoleum of al-Majdallī, Mawlawī Ismā'il said he was fulfilling the last wishes of the deceased. But the most important event was that al-Rashīdī sent Mawlawī Ismā'il to Meknes. The latter lived before his accession in the Almohad ka-ba, as a landed proprietor managing his estates.

In his choice of a capital, we see the attraction of a rich district like this. He wished to have in his own image and realisation of his desire. For fifty years Meknes was simply the framework for his splendid, the scene of his extravagances.

He at once decided to build himself a palace and at once a grandiose scheme was projected. He began by clearing a space. The houses adjoining the Almohad wall east of the town were destroyed and their owners forced to carry the debris off to a site which has retained the name of Hedām, then to rebuild on a site which the sharīf enclosed by a wall to the N.W. of the mādina. The site which he chose for himself was also separate from the town. His palace was built, and one even more splendid for his women. This first edifice, Dār Khiṣa, was finished in 1679. It was a series, without intelligible plan, of three or four apartments, embellished with fountains, paved with marble, surrounded by galleries which were supported by columns of marble; the apartments opened on to three galleries. The sovereign's palace was in two suites, that of his ladies in four and larger than his. His four wives and his favourites were equally splendidly housed. The other environs of whom he had 500 of all nations, were housed in rooms along the passage. At the end was a common hall, on a higher level, which gave a view over the gardens through iron grilles. The reception pavillons were planned on the same scale; one of them had forty rooms. The palace contained in all 45 pavilions and twenty kubbīs. The whole was surrounded by a crenelated wall pierced by twenty gates. It was triple in the N.E. with a road round it and it could be defended equally well against the interior of the kābra. The bastions supported batteries of guns and mortars. The women being subject to rigorous confinement and Mawlawī Ismā'il being very meticulous in the performance of the duties of religion, a mosque was set aside for them. Another had been begun in 1672, communicating with the town by the Bāb ʻIsā. Lastly the palace with its dependencies contained four mosques; two are still in use, the Dīlā al-Aḥkār and in the quarter of the mews, very broken down, the Dīlā al-Rwāā. To the south was a garden, the area of which is equal to that of the present mādina, an
orchard in which olive trees predominated. Further on were the stables to which the Sultan admitted only picked horses, to the number of 1,200: two parallel rows of arcades about 100 feet apart. In the centre ran running water. Each animal had its stall and a shelter for its equipment. Opposite was a storeroom, the kör or, which supported a supplementary palace with twenty pavilions. Between the palace and the stables was the granary, forty feet high and big enough it was said, to contain the whole harvest of Morocco. At the side was a pool for irrigation purposes and also subterranean reservoirs of water in case of a siege.

The buildings did not stop here. To the south-west of the town lay a city of pleasure, Mamlàt al-Rìyāq, where the officials had palaces, where Mamlàt Ismà'il himself had his mosque, his hammam, his fondos, and the offices of the uma of the Treasury, with the shops of the Shīrāzi tailors. In 1732–1733 Mamlàt 'Abd Allāh, on returning from an unsuccessful expedition into the Sāh, had the Mamlàt al-Rìyāq destroyed by Christian slaves. There is nothing left of it to-day except the 'Aib al-Shāh, dated 1667, one of the finest and best preserved gates in the city.

Lastly a site was reserved for the troops. To the west of Meknes a large garden was settled with kush and their families. To the east of the Dār al-Makhen, free kush for the 13,000 men of the gish were gradually incorporated in the great kush.

After fifty years of unorganized but superhuman effort, the buildings were not yet completed. It was in 1732–1733 that Mamlàt 'Abd Allāh finished the surrounding wall and the Bab Mānsūr, the most finished example of the Ismā'īlī gateway, proportions of proportions by no means perfect but imposing, of which the Bab al-Baṣr in the city and Bab al-Nār are the two other finest examples at Meknes at the present day. This name of a renegade, Mānsūr 'Abd Allāh, is no doubt that of a keeper of the gate. Mamlàt Ismà'il directed all the operations himself. During the first twenty-four years of his reign he never spent twelve months on end at Meknes. But he returned there after each expedition; in proportion as his ambition and his power increased, his despotism and the needs of his government, his army and his family grew; his scheme became more and more grandiose: the work done was unsatisfactory, modifications were made, buildings taken down and the work begun all over again. The result certainly was symptomatic and imposing but also odd and varied.

All the country helped in the work. Mamlàt Ismà'il collected materials wherever he could. Voutelles, Chella, Marrakech were plundered. If he destroyed the Bab, it was perhaps out of jealousy of Syrián work, or perhaps simply to get materials. Like Ahmad al-Mansùr, he procured marble from Fustat. One day when a caravan ship had stranded near Tangier he ordered the Khumpà to bring the stone from it by means of manual labour. Where he died the columns of marble which were still on their way were left at the roadside.

Labour was recruited by similar means. The Sultan impounded days of labour on the tribes, levied forced labour as he pleased, sent his ministers to the workshops, but relied mainly on renegades and Christian slaves who were his permanent workmen. From 1689 the work was pushed on frenziedly. All the Christians in Morocco were collected there. The Trinitarians of Fas joined them. The slaves were at first housed in sheds near the building-yards, then they were moved to the Dār al-Makhen, then to near the stables, under the arches of a bridge, where their lot was particularly miserable, finally to the interior of a ruined bordj, east of the town along the north wall of the Dār al-Makhen. They were able to organise themselves a little there, to build themselves a church, to have chapels, a convent and infirmaries. A pharmacist monk made up a medicine, the "Christian deconcoction"; this was the means by which humane relations were established with the natives, even with the dwellers in the palace. Their last historian has reduced the number of Christian prisoners in the service of Mamlàt Ismà'il to its real figure: they did not as a rule reach a thousand and the Sultan, in the course of over fifty years, himself killed only one hundred and nine (Koehler).

The emperor revealed in his palaces his extravagance and his cupidity; he accumulated wealth as he did buildings, but only to hide it. The consuls and ambassadours who came to negotiate the ransom of captives he received with a mixture of beneficence and cupidity. Frequent mention is made of the cruelty and the terror which this ruler inspired; he loved to torture his women and cut off heads to show his skill. His amusements were of a similar character; he liked to shoot with his kush at the deer in his menageries then to finish them off with spearthrusts. "Let us avert our eyes from all these horrors which make nature shudder," says Chénier. Following his example his household inspired terror in the town. He had six hundred children, a nursery of slaves, who might have had a happier lot if he had loved them as much as his horses. On the approach of any of them, "every one bid all that he might take a fancy to", and the &l;àdib in their turn, negroes rebel in bright colours, went about bullying, in the name of their master at first and then in their own.

All his work was to collapse at his death, but he was able to keep it up in his lifetime. From the troubles that broke out when he disappeared from the scene, one can judge of the energy of this man of eighty who maintained order among his horde of negroes and in this country destined by God to anarchy. The kush of Zarfīn, the kush of Aũī in the middle of the Central Atlas, defended Meknes on North and South. He was able also to preserve it from other scourges; when an epidemic of plague broke out, the &l;àdib were simply given orders to kill any people who came from Fas. Mamlàt Ismà'il was buried like his brother in the mausoleum of Sa'id 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Majdūlī, a moralist saint of the xvmth century. His son, the rebel Mamlàt Muhammad, killed at Tûrīn in 1706, and Mamlàt Zidan in 1707, had already joined Mamlàt Rashīd. In 1859 the ashes of Mamlàt 'Abd al-Rahmān were also deposited there.

On the death of Mamlàt Ismà'il, the Braghers and the soldiers of the gish stirred up a palace war which lasted twenty years. Mamlàt 'Abd Allāh lost and regained his throne six times. But however great this danger was, the other threat was still more disturbing; having got rid of the garrisons of the Ismā'īlī kushas, the Berbers, armed, came down from the mountains. The problem for the sultans was to choose the lesser evil; they
declined to disband the 'abid and in the struggle which naturally arose between these and the Berbers relied more on the former. The civil war extended to the tribes of the plain and the garrisons of Fès, especially the Cidhār; pretenders stirred up the flames, readily giving the signal to plunder and, in the rivalries of races and tribes, easily finding a party to support them. Gradually the Berbers sank in misfortune. It was in vain that Mawla'i 'Abd Allāh and his sons expended the blood of Mawla'i Iṣāmī for them. The worst of it for Meknès was that every one ceased or began by plundering it.

Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh almost re-established order and restored to the town its past glory. He did a great deal for it; his palace of Dār al-Balāda, the severe architecture of which, not without charm, can still be seen in a part of the olive-grove of al-Hamriyya; in the Kaṣba, he built the Dājūn al-Anwar and in the suq, the mnemor of the Dājūn; al-Nahījah, the ka'bah of the Prophet in Morocco, the Ummayyad mosque of al-Ŷarūb, al-Bawāṭīkhī: Mālay Berrima and Sidi Ūmmūn. It was he who made the 12,000 books of the library of Mawla'i Iṣāmī available for the benefit of all the mosques of Meknès. As regards the tribes his policy was to break them up. He transplanted many of them and tried several repressive measures. The end of his reign was marked by the success of the Berbers whose attacks had been resumed about 1775.

Soon nothing was to be left of the work of Mawla'i Iṣāmī. The Christian community lost its Franciscan mission in the reign of Mawla'i Yūsuf and did not survive the persecution of this shah. The earthquake of 1755 had destroyed their church, convent and hospice. The renegades, who had gathered together at Kaṣba Āzūrāni, were gradually absorbed.

The Berber crisis was again acute from 1811. Communication with Fès was continually being cut and it was something to boast of for the Meknès of Meknès, in the person of Ūmmūn b. 'Alī, who had undertaken to restore the Kaṣba and rebuild the bridges on the road to Fès and who would have liked to get rid of the Berbers, decided to settle in Fès. His walls were his only defence at Meknès, which was blockaded by the tribes. Mawla'i Abū al-Rahmān, whom Delcroix saw there and who built a ka'bah in Dājūn b. Ḫalīma, left the Berbers in semi-independence and Ūmmūn disbanded the 'abid without even granting those who remained in Meknès the character of Maghreb troops. His son carefully avoided all quarrels.

Mawla'i al-Hašāni revived the tradition of the great 'ajīb and made his authority felt. He was able to enter Meknès after his accession by crushing the power of the tribes. In 1879 he conducted a campaign against the Beni Mšur. In 1887 he forced his way through the country of the Beni Mšur in his campaign against the Xin. On his death the Berbers regained their independence. If they retained their ka'abs it was because the latter cast off their allegiance to the Mekhān. After the fall of Mawla'i Abū al-'Arīf, Meknès recognised all the competitors in succession. It was Meknès that proclaimed Abī al-Ḥafṣī, who had come via the Berbers of Taṛā in 1908, in 1909 it summoned the shāhīr al-Kītānī and in 1911 rallied to Mawla'i Zain. It was in this year that General Mounier entered Meknès and two years later Colonel Henrys took the direction of General Lyuthey pacified the Beni Mšur country.


b. European sources: Marmol Carvajal, Descripción general de África, 1555; Monseñor, Relation de la captivities des Siciliens, 1683; Mission d'Étude de Marruecos, etc. by Fr. de San Juan de el Puerto, 1708; Windis, A journey to Morocco, 1725; Bunret, Histoire de la régence de Moyou al-Isalām, 1751; Haringman, Téqêkch anais lalaw naî Marâbba, 1805; Castries and Curvis, Six Voyages dans les pays du Maroc, in course of public; Champion, Tanger, Fès, Meknès, 1824 (gives the French transl of the passage of Windis relating to the siege of Meknès; Peréqny, du Maroc, Catalunya, Kabūt, Meknès, 1919; Central, La mission franciscaine du Maroc, 1927; Souillé, La pénétration chrétienne au Maroc, La mission franciscaine, 1914; do., Briefあげ on some traits d'histoire ayant trait aux captifs chrétiens du Maroc, in Rev. du genre, 1921; du, Quelques points d'histoire sur les captifs chrétiens de Meknès, in Hesperia, 1928; Maqrīzī, Manuel d'islamisme, 1926—1927; Naullin, Les portes de Meknès d'après les documents envoyés par M. le Captaine Emonet, et La grande mosquée de Meknès, in Bull. archéol. du Com. des Travaux hist., 1916 and 1917; Ricard, Pour comprendre l'art musulman en Afrique du Nord et en Espagne, 1924 (give a plan of the Dār al-Makhzen); Poucault, Reconnaisance du Maroc, 1904; Segonzac, Vaghez du Maroc, 1905; Maquin, Le Maroc, dans les trois premiers dix ans du XIX siècle, Tableau d'après Ibn al-Afdāl, 1906; du, Enquête sur les corporations musulmanes d'artisanat et de commerce au Maroc, 1925; Le Chatelier, Notes sur les villes et tribus du Maroc en 1890, 1902; Bruneau, Essai sur la conférence religieuse a l'Aïd al-Adhā au Maroc, 1926; Bel, Histoire d'un saint musulman vivant actuellement à Meknès, in Rev. hist. des rel., 1917; Luns, Pertuis de la vallée maroc, 1922; Bel, Description du genre musulman, 1925; Arnaud, Monographie de la région de Meknès, 1914; Beaups, and Jobeaux, Essai statistique de la région de Meknès, in Bull. Soc. de France, 1922; Memoriale d'Étude sociographique de l'Arabie, Description géographique en M., Fas et d. Meknès, 1926.

(F. F Ranck-Bretnano)
agents and often gave them valuable financial support. All the towns of Morocco, even the large ones, did not necessarily have a mellah. Thus at Tangier there are certain quarters particularly inhabited by Jews but they are not set aside for them and we also find Muslims there. As to Rabat, its present mellah was established only in 1865 by Sultan Mawlay Sulaiman; formerly the Jews lived together in the al-Bahaira quarter (el-Bajara) where there were also Muslims. When he founded Fas in 805, Idris II compelled the Jewish refugees who flocked into the capital to reside in the northern part of the 'Adwat al-Karawaiin (Aghlan quarter as far as the gate called lâb III-Sulihan); this was undoubtedly the first Moroccan ghetto; and the present Fondak el-Khândi ("the Jew's warehouse") apparently preserves its memory. But at the end of the xii th century the Marinid [11, v.] dynasty, wishing to create a new capital, founded alongside of Old Fas (Fas al-Bâdi) "New Fas" (Fas al-Jâdil) or "White City" (al-Mâlakat al-Ba'diyya). In the first half of the xiv th century, the town of I'imsâ was built close beside Fas and at first occupied by the Ghuzz archers who formed a part of the regular Marinid army; after the suppression of this force in 1320, I'imsâ became the quarters of the Christian mercenaries, whom we find there in 1561. Later, probably at the beginning of the xv th century, and no doubt as the result of massacres, the Jews of Old Fas were ordered to settle in I'imsâ; this town was built on a site known as al-Mellah, the "salt spring", or "salt marsh", and the new ghetto became known by this name. From a proper, this became a common noun, and passed from Fas to the other towns of Morocco as the name for the quarter assigned to the Jews. The etymology proposed by Dozy in his Supplement (al-Mellah < al-naâhalla "quarter") is therefore to be rejected, as are the explanations as "salted, accursed land", or "quarter of the Jews who were forced to salt the heads of decapitated rebels". In Morocco instead of al-mellah, in speaking, the expression elmellahs (class. al-mâatû) is often used by anti-Pharisees, lit. "salted".

The mellah of Fas is therefore the oldest in Morocco in every way. For a long time it was also the most important; in the middle of the xith century, al-Bakri says that Fas has the town with most Jews in the Maghrib, which has given rise to the proverbial saying: Fas balad bi-tâ nás. "Fas, a town where there are no people (worth mentioning)". But the constitution of Marrakush in 1663 resulted in the foundation in southern Morocco of a new Jewish centre which was to attract to it the Jewish and pseudo-Jewish peoples of the Atlas. The term el-mellah however appears for Marrakush only in the second half of the xv th century (cf. E. Fagnan, Extraits inédits relatifs au Maroc, p. 486). At the present day the mellah of Marrakush and the Jewish town of Mogador form the most important Jewish centres of Morocco.

The name el-mellah is peculiar to Morocco; there, however, it is applied not only to the Jewish quarter in a town but also to little mountain villages exclusively inhabited by Jews. At Tlemcen the term dar el-clâsil (class. dar el-sâkîd) is used; at Constantine ejl-châra and in Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli: el-hâra.

On the interior organisation of the present day Moroccan mellah see E. Aubin, Le Marrac d'aujourd'hui:

MELLİLLA (in modern Arabic: Milya, Berber Temilti, "the white", in the Arab geographers: Mellila), a seaport on the east coast of Morocco on a promontory on the peninsula of Gêliya at the end of which is the Cape Tres Forcas or the Three Forks (Triâl Hûrk of the Arab geographers, now Triâl Work). Mellilla probably corresponds to the Russudir of the ancients (cf. Rhyssadir oppidum et portus Pliny, v. 18), Russudir Colonia of the Antoninian itinerary. Leo Africanus says that it had belonged for a time to the Goths and that the Arabs took it from them, but in reality we know nothing of the ancient history of the town.

It is only at the beginning of the xith century that Mellilla appears in the Muslim history of Morocco. In 930, the Umayyad Caliph of Spain, 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Nâşir li-Din Allâh succeeded in detaching from the Fatimids the famous Mîkânas chief Mâsâ b. Abî l-'Afïya, who had established his authority over the basin of the Moluya and the district of Tlaa; having seized Mellilla; al-Nâşir built ramparts around it and gave it to his new ally, who thus had at his command a base of defence (wâqit) against the Fâtûnids of Ifriqiya and a port which made communication with Spain easy. Later on, the descendants of his son, al-Bâri Mâsâ, rebuilt the town, which remained one of the strongholds of the Mîkânas in Morocco down to the time of the decline of the power of the tribe, who were definitely defeated and scattered by the Almoravids Yusuf b. Tâshfîn in 1070.

But the Mîkânas must have abandoned it before their dynasty was crushed by the Almoravids; for al-Bakri shows us that by 1067 a descendant of the Hamadhân Idrisids of Spain had been summoned to Mellilla and recognised as ruler by the people of the district.

At the period when al-Bakri wrote (1068), Mellilla was a town surrounded by a wall of stone; inside was a very strong citadel, a great mosque, a hammâm and markets. The inhabitants belonged to the tribe of the Banû Wattâdi (or B. Wattardâ), a branch of the Şanhâla group of the Bâtîya. Mellilla had a harbour which was accessible only in summer. It was the terminus of a trade route which connected Sidjilmassa with the Mediterranean through the valley of the Moluya and Agarsif (French: Guercif). The trade must have been considerable; the principal exports were no doubt those mentioned by Leo Africanus: iron from the mines of the mountains of the Banû Sa'id and honey from the Kabdâna country; we may also add pearls which were taken from oysters found in the harbour itself. Al-Bakri notes that the inhabitants made money by granting protection to merchants. The environs of the town were occupied by the Banû Wattâdi (who also occupied the stronghold called Kûlû Gâre), the Maţmahâ, the Ahi Kabdân, the Marnasa of the "White Hill" (al-Kudrît el-bôdîya) and the Chassasâ of the massif which ends in Cape Tres Forcas (Triâl Hûrk). All this region was then independent and had no political
link with the kingdom of Fás or that of Nakīr.

But in 1680 the Almoravid sovereign Yüsuf b. Tāshfin took Melilla and added its territory to the Almoravid empire. In 1141-1142, in the course of the Almoravid pursuit of the Almohads, a body of the latter set out from Tamsman to lay siege to Melilla, which was taken and plundered. In 1272, the Marinid Sultan Ya'qūb took Melilla from the Almohads and Ibn Khaldūn simply mentions it as a fortified place. It seems in fact that these three captures of the town had destroyed its commercial importance to the advantage of another town on the west coast of the peninsula of the (Gellās) also called Al-Kudayt al-hājaz, the Alcudia of the Portolans; in the eighteenth century it is this latter town that appears as the Mediterranean port of Fás and Tāzā, and it was through it that political and commercial relations with eastern Spain and Italy (Genoa and Venice) were carried on.

Leo Africanus says that in 1490, hearing that an attack on it was planned by the Spaniards, the inhabitants abandoned the town and fled to the mountains of the Ḥassān; to punish them for this the Wantsūl Sultan had the town burned down; when in Sept. 1497 the Spaniards arrived they were thus able to disembark without resistance and occupied the town, abandoned and destroyed. The occupation of Melilla enabled the Spaniards to attack the port of Ḥassān and it was taken in April 1506. The Moroccans recaptured it in 1533 but the dangerous proximity of Melilla henceforth deprived it of importance. The commercial activity of this region was moved farther west to the port of al-Marlima (Spanish: Alhucemas, Fr. Alhucema), and the central position of Muslim resistance in this part of Morocco was henceforth the stronghold of Tāzā, which after having been the capital of the Marinid sultan of the Banū Wāṭṭas became that of a practically independent leader of a holy war. After passing into the hands of the Spaniards, Melilla was continuously besieged by the Muslims, mainly by the forces of the leaders of holy war established at Tāzā and at Mijāu (the Mezgeo of Leo Africanus). Occupied by the Christians, the town naturally became one of the places in Morocco in which Muslim pretenders and rebels found asylum and support against the central authority, especially at the beginning of the Saʿdīan dynasty. In 1549, it sheltered the dispossessed Waṣṣād Abū Ḥassān, "king" of Bādis; in 1550 it welcomed with his family the Mawlāy Amār, "king" of Debū. It was from Melilla that in 1595, the pretender Naṣir b. al-Qādīh bi'tlāsh set out against his uncle Sultan Ahmad al-Mansūr.

Later Melilla only appears in history in connection with sieges which it had to suffer: sieges by Mawlāy Ismāʿīl in 1637 and 1655; sieges in 1774 by Mawlāy Muhammad b. Abū Allāh; Spanish-Moroccan war of 1893 (Sūd Waryāsh affair). From 1903 to 1908 the region of Melilla was the scene of struggles between the pretender al-Djilāl al-Rūgī, established in the ǧāba of Selwān, and the troops of the Sultan Abū al-ʿAzīz; defeated and receiving no support, the latter had to take refuge in Spanish territory and be repatriated. Still more recently in 1921, the same district witnessed the sanguinary battles between the Spaniards and the Rifians under Abū al-Kārim (Awāl disaster). Melilla is for Spain a "place of sovereignty" like Alhucemas, Peñó de Velez and Ceuta. Before the establishment of the French protectorate, Melilla, constituted a free port, was the landing-place for all the European merchandise (cotton, sugar, tea) intended not only for eastern Morocco but also for the Saharan regions of Morocco and Spain. It has now lost much of its commercial importance.


**Mendrez, the name of two rivers in western Anatolia:**

1. Büyük Mendrez (called by al-'Umari Menderes), by Piri Reis, Mendrez or Menderor), the ancient Maeander, the Mandra of the Crusaders. It rises in the district of Germiyan in a little lake, the Huveiran Golou (Sani) above Diner (according to Abū Bakr b. Bahām in a spring called Buḫār bāgh, a day's journey from Ioma), flows past Homa at some distance off, then through the plain of Ḥalāf and the kaṣās of Ḥalāf and Cāl. In the kaṣā of Carshamba (capital Buldān) it is joined by the Banāz Cā (called Mainār Bahgī Suwā in Abū Bakr b. Bahām whose statement that it flows past Ḫalafī is wrong), which rises in the Murūd Daḡ and flows past Banāz. Farther down its course, in the plain of Denizli, it receives the Čūrük Su, the ancient Lycus Fl. Farther on a ruined bridge called Dormtash Kupūsu marked the frontier between the two old liwa of Germiyan and Aḏīn; according to Abū Bakr a warm spring rising in its foundations had contributed to the destruction of this bridge.

2. In the territory of Aḏīn the Büyük Mendrez flows past at a distance the villages of Ortekol, Nazılı, Sultānmehr, Korkar and Gureštjār Aḏīn, breaks up into several arms in the plain of Balat (Palatia, the ancient Miletos) and feeds a lake full of fish (al-'Umari there, which is now called Bavi Delezi (Lake of Palatia, the ancient λήστης Λυθηος). A little below Balat, it enters the sea.

Al-'Umari who, generally speaking, is inaccurately informed about its course (he puts Delezi and Birgi on it, i.e. brings the Caspian into its basin and makes it flow into the Black Sea) compares the Maeander for its șenti at low level with the Nile, in flood however with a sea. According to him, it is navigable and the people on its banks sail from its mouth on military or commercial enterprises. Western writers also speak of the trade borne on the Maeander in the later middle ages. The main centre of trade on the Maeander and also on the land routes through the valley was Palatia (Balat, the ancient Miletos); in later times, however, the caravan route down the Maeander valley ended in Scalanaova (Kush Adasi).

2. Kecik Mendrez, the ancient Caiustus. The central part of its course runs in a wide plain on the northern edge of which is Birgi, on the southern edge Tire, the old capital of the liwa of Aḏīn. A little below Ayasolough, the ancient Ephesus, it enters the sea.

In the middle ages the centre of trade with the hinterland reached by the Caspian was Altuluogo (from "Αλτουόγος), the ancient Ephesus (Turk. Ayasolough, now called Seljuk); later Scalanaova (Kush Adasi). In the Ottoman period Smyrna attracted all the trade of the Aegean Sea with the Anatolian hinterland. The caravan routes which
MENDEREZ — MENTESHE-OGHULARI

MENTESHE-ELI, a little principality in Anatolia. The boundaries of the territory of the Menteshe-oghul's (q. v.) are given by Madoğ-
djim-bashî (cf. Fr. Babinger, G.Ö.W., p. 234 sq.) on his Sâbehî al-Ahâsî (Stambul 1285) as marked by Mughba, Bâhk, Baz-Cyuk, Mila, Lâoğan, Marin, Çine, Tâvâs, Bornaz, Makri, Gardbi, Foca and Mermere. They thus correspond approximately to those of the ancient Caria. The origin of the name is uncertain, but it can confidently be asserted that the opinion, presumably first put forward by F. Menticus (Lexicon, i.e. 737) and still quite recently upheld, that the district takes its name from the Myndus (Μυνδώς in Strabo) of the ancients is not worthy of credence. Several of the places above mentioned play a not unimportant part as centres of scholarship and literature in the earlier period of Ottoman intellectual life. Thus in the time of the Menteshe-oghul Mehmed (1775-1777) a certain Mahîmdî b. Mohammed of Bağdûn composed a Fâl<sq>ûlû which was published by J. v. Hammer-Purgstall under the title "Falkenschwe" (Pes 1849) from the Milan MS. and rightly described as one of the earlier documents of the Ottoman language. In many of these places there were academies where an active intellectual life flourished, so that the share of the district of Menteshe in Ottoman literature is strikingly large.

(Fe. Babinger)

MENTESHE-OGHULARI, a petty dinsyasty in Anatolia. The princes of Menteshe first appear in history after the break up of the Seljûk empire. The founder of the family is said to have been a certain Menteshe b. Bâbhân al-Îibîn Kûnû. He had his main seat Mila (Milyas) in the ancient Caria, and not far from it his stronghold Pusûn (Petaona). His descendants also lived in Mila until they moved their court to Miletus. The son of Menteshe was Urkhan Beg, who is known from an inscription on a building in Mila and from Ibn Bâbhân who visited him in 1334 in Mila (cf. Ibn Bâbhân, Fugades, ed. Defrémery, Paris 1854, p. 278 sq.)Urkhan's successor was his son Ilbrîm, who built a mosque in Mughla in 733 (1344) and left two sons, Ahmed Ghâzi and Mehmed. The second succeeded him in 755 (1351), but succumbed in the struggle for the throne to his brother Ahmed, who took Eskî Heşrî in 755 (1351). In 1375 founded an academy at Bâdijî and at the end of Dönümâ II, 328 (Oct. 1378) completed the Liû Laţiî in Mila. Ahmed Ghâzi died in Sâhîn 793 (July 1391) and was succeeded by his nephew Ilhas. The Ottomans had in his reign already taken possession of several principalities in the neighbourhood of Menteshe-oghul, such as that of the Germûtan-oghul (q. v.) and of the Hamûdî-oghul (q. v.) and now seriously threatened the existence of the Menteshe. Immediately after the accession of Ilhas Beg, Hayazî I., who had just become Sultan, deprived the lords of Menteshe of the last vestiges of independence. They sought refuge with the ruler of Sûndî, Bağdûn Kûnû, and later with the conqueror of the Ottomans, Timûr-Lenk. Ilhas Beg, who built a mosque in Miletus, regained possession of Menteshe-oghul in 1402. On 21 July 1403, he concluded a treaty with the Count of Crete, Marco Falieri (publ. by M. Iatthe at the end of his essay, Comptes d'Ephèse et de Milet mouen ât; in the Bibl. de l'École d. d. Carits, Ser. v. Vol. vi. Paris 1864, p. 226 sq.) and with
the admiral Ser Pietro Civano on 17th Oct. 1414 (cf. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, ii. 305, 293 and W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, ii. 553 sq.). The reign of Ilyas Beg, filled with fighting and activities of all kinds, ended in 824 (1421) when his lands passed to the Ottomans. Mehmed I had struck coins as early as 818 (1415) on which he calls himself lord of Menteshe. Among the children of Ilyas Beg, mention is made of Laith Beg, but the shadowy part he played is quite uncertain. The year 829 (1426) saw the end of the princes of Menteshe. A certain Bahban was appointed as Ottoman governor of Menteshe-eli and henceforward the district forms a part of the Ottoman empire. The chronology of the dynasts of Menteshe is still uncertain and essential points have still to be cleared up, which will require a systematic study of the many monuments in Menteshe-eli with their important inscriptions, especially in Milas, Milatos, Bardjam, Mugla, etc.

The following genealogical table shows the relationship of the various princes and is based on coins and inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyas</th>
<th>Hostatics</th>
<th>Milas</th>
<th>Fatima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laith (\text{d.'\text{A'la\text{a}}\text{d.}})</th>
<th>Ahmed (\text{ibi\text{a}})</th>
<th>Mehmed</th>
<th>824 (1421)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Fe. Babinger)

MERDAWIDI. See MAHDAWI.

MERIDA, At. Merida, from the Latin Emerita, a town in the southwest of Spain, in the modern province of Badajoz, where it is the capital of a partido, on the right bank of the Guadiana. Now somewhat decayed, it has only 11,150 inhabitants. It is on the Madrid-Badajoz railway and is also connected by rail with Cáceres in the north and Seville in the south.

The ancient capital of Lusitania, Augusta Emerita, was founded in 23 B.C. and under the Roman empire attained remarkable importance and the splendour. Numerous remains of Roman buildings still testify to the position it held in the Iberian peninsula in those days: a bridge of 64 arches, a circus, a theatre, and the famous aqueduct of Malagon, of which there are still standing ten arches of brick and granite. Merida under the Visigoths became the metropolis of Lusitania and according to Rodrigo of Toledo was fortified and strongly defended, which explains why the Muslim conquerors led by Mūsā b. Nūsair [q.v.] had some difficulty in taking it. The Arab leader on landing in Spain in Ramāḍān 93 (June 713) first took Medina-Sidonia and Cármona, then Seville. He next had siege to Merida, before which he stayed for several months; but the inhabitants in the end capitulated and the town surrendered on 1st Shawwal 94 (June 30, 713). From Merida, Mūsā b. Nūsair continued his advance to Toledo. Under the Arab governors, Merida seems to have soon become a really strong fort for a large number of rebels of Arab and Spanish origin. It was there that al-Fāhrī endeavoured to organise a movement against that organised for his own benefit by 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Raqqī in 141 (758). At a later date, a Berber named Aṭhayb b. 'Abd Allāh b. Wāṣā was rebelled there against al-Hakam I in 190 (805) and the emir of Cordova had for the next seven years to undertake summer campaigns against him before bringing him to reason. Another rebellion broke out in Merida in 213 (828) and the town had to be besieged in 217 and again in 254 (868). In the reign of Emir 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir when it submitted in 316 (928) to the ḫālid Ahmad b. Alyās.

From the 10th century, Merida began to decline in favour of Badajoz, especially when the latter town became the capital of the independent little kingdom of the Afisids [q.v.]. It remained in the hands of the Muslims till the beginning of the 12th century. In 1228 it was taken by Alfonso IX of Leon but never recovered its former importance.

The Arab geographers who mention Merida, describe its Roman ruins in detail; they also mention the Muslim citadel, the foundation inscription of which has been preserved. It was built in 220 (835) by the governor 'Abd Allāh b. Kulaib b. Thālabīa by order of the Umayyad Emir 'Abd al-Raḥmān II.

Bibliography: The Arabic historians of

MERINIDS (Bañû Mârîn, a Berber dynasty, which ruled over the extreme Magrib (Morocco) from the middle of the xith to the middle of the xive century.

The first references we have to the Bañû Marin show them living a nomadic life in the Sahara between Figûig [q. v.] and Tâfîlît [q. v.]. Like the other groups who claimed to be Zenîts, they must have been driven to the west by the nomad Arab Bañû Hilal in the second half of the xivth century. Like their brethren, the Bañû ‘Abî al-Wâl, whose lands joined theirs, they had attempted in 1115 to revind the conquest of the Central Magrib by the Almohads and had been defeated. While the Bañû ‘Abî al-Wâd entered the service of the conquerors, the Bañû Marin took refuge in the desert. The weakening of the Almohad empire gave them a chance to take their revenge. In the course of their periodic movements in the valley of the Muluya, they learned of the weakness of the defences of the extreme Magrib, the best forces of which were engaged in Spain, and the Bañû Marin therefore made a formidable razzia northwards in 613 (1216). This was the first step in a series of foreign expeditions, which was pursued by step for 53 years. It was continued the next year by the crushing of the Bañû Rîyâh Arabs, who lived in the plains of the west, and by a first fiscal exploitation of the country. The Almohads, paralysed by dynastic feuds, made no serious thrust in return until 27 years later, when the Bañû Marin were defeated by the troops of the caliph al-Sâdî (642 = 1244). After a forced check, the conquest was resumed with more method by the amir ‘Abî Yahyâ b ‘Abî al-Hâfî. He endeavoured to increase his military forces by granting lands to groups of his kinsmen and taking into his service foreign mercenaries, and so made every effort to capture towns. To achieve this end and to gain a moral support which he lacked, the amir claimed to be the mandator of the Hâfîsids [q. v.], the Almohads of Ifrîkiya. He further declared himself the protector of the holy men, who were venerated by the people. It was thus that he took possession of Meknès, Fas, Tárîz, Rabat and Sûla. Finally the help he gave the Almohad pretender ‘Abî Dâbîbî enabled the amir ‘Abî Yûsuf Yağhûb, Abu Yahyà’s successor, to annex Marrakesh, which marked the completion of the Marinid conquest (669 = 1269).

Inheriting this area of the western Muslim world, which had been the very heart of the great Almohad empire, the Merinids also inherited the traditions of those they had dispossessed and their dreams of hegemony in Spain and Barbary.

As in the time of the Almoravids and Almohads, Spain was for the Merinids the land of martyrs for the faith. Not only did the dynasty send there its troublesome sons, princes whose presence in the Magrib might be inconvenient and who formed the corps of volunteers of the faith, but several sultans fought there in person: ‘Abî Yûsuf, whose secession of the holy war was his one great scheme, his successor Abu Yağhûb, and Abu ‘l-Hîsân, who saw the failure of these overseas expeditions.

In crossing the Strait, Abu Yûsuf fulfilled his deepest vow but he was also answering the reiterated appeals of the Bañû ‘Al-Âmar of Granada, who were tired of enduring the exactions and insults of the King of Castille. He was received there as a saviour and at once undertook a plundering expedition. Don Nuño de Lara, endeavouring to capture the loot taken from the Christians, sustained a heavy defeat near Ceija and was himself slain (674 = 1275). Very few other pitched battles are mentioned in these wars of the Merinids in Spain, but almost daily razzias into Christian territory. The Muslims destroyed or carried off the crops and stocks and they took prisoners who were sold as slaves in the Magrib. The relations between the Sultans of Fâs and of Granada, by no means warm at the time of the landing in Spain, became decidedly hostile when Abu Yûsuf claimed the ownership of the town of Almeria as a base for his future operations in the Peninsula. Ibn al-Âmar appealed to the King of Castille for help against the encroachments of his rescuer. An alliance was formed between Christians and Muslims of Spain which Yaghmorsân, sultan of Tlemên, soon joined. The latter undertook to prevent or impede any further crossings of the Moroccan ruler into Andalusia.

The entente with the Christians did not however prevent the latter from continuing the task of the Reconquista in 709 (1309) they took Gibraltar and which was repeated again to the Magribi Sultan, Abu ‘l-Hîsân sent his son ‘Abî al-Malik who recaptured Gibraltar (733 = 1333). ‘Abî al-Malik having been killed, Abu ‘l-Hîsân sent a large army on ships supplied by the ports of Ifrîkiya and himself landed near Tarifa. This town was in the hands of the Christians. He tried to take it but was routed by the combined forces of Alfonso XI of Castille and Alfonso IV of Portugal. This disaster of 1340 and the taking of Algeciras by the King of Castille finally discouraged the Merinid sultan. Neither he nor his successors again made attempts in Spain.

If conducting their wars from reviving against Christianity the glories of the wars of the Almohads, they were able to devote themselves to regaining the great African empire of their predecessors and they succeeded in doing so for a comparatively short time. That empire, as is well known, covered in addition to the kingdom of the Merinids, that of the ‘Abî al-Wâdîds of Tlemên and that of the Hâfisids of Tunis [q. v.]. The kingdom of Tlemên was that most directly threatened by the ambitions of the sultans of Fâs. Causes of quarrel were numerous between these neighbouring and related dynasties. To old rivals, dating from the days when the two clans were nomads, had been added the competition of two adjoining states each seeking to extend their frontiers.
The Ḥab al-Wādīds very soon lost hope of annexing territory in the west. If, as we have seen, they were a thorn in the side of the Merīnīds who desired to cross into Spain, this policy was of brief duration. Very soon they had to confine themselves strictly to the defensive. On many occasions, the kingdom of Tlemcen was invaded and the Tlemcenians shut up within their walls. For example for eight years and three months, from 698 (1299), they were blockaded, during which period the Merīnīds established a permanent camp which became the town of al-Manṣūra [q.v.]. In addition to numerous other works of circumvallation, Tlemcen however did not fall till later. In 737 (1337) Abu l-Ḥasan took it; he and his son Abū Ḥanīfa were to hold it for 22 years. For these two princes, whose reigns mark the apogee of the dynasty, Tlemcen was only a first stage towards Ifrīkīya. The dream of recreating the empire of the Almoravids was to be realised by annexing the Ḥaṣid kingdom.

Constant relations, in which each hoped to gain some advantage, united the two states of east and west, Banū Ḥaḍa al-Mansūr and Banū Marīn. To a contemporary observer like the Egyptian al-Umārī, the Banū Marīn alone counted as a military power, but the Banū Ḥaḍa, descendants of the Almoravids, had a prestige which the Banū Marīn could not claim in spite of the title of Amīr al-Mamlūkīn which Abū Ḥanīfa arrogantly assumed. This explains why, from the very first, the Banū Marīn in annexing the towns of the Maghrib declared themselves mandatories of the sovereigns of Tunis and why they married Ḥaṣid princesses. On their side, the Banū Ḥaḍa did not think it wise to refuse their daughters; they dealt tactfully with the Moroccan šūgūn, who might be useful in protecting them against the šūgūn of Tlemcen.

In a word, they hoped to see the Merīnīds attack central Maghrib but not to become complete masters of it, which would directly expose Ifrīkīya to the attacks of the conquerors.

This is what actually happened in 1347. Taking advantage of the usurpation of the throne of Tunis and of the troubles which followed it, Abu l-Ḥasan invaded Ifrīkīya and sought to impose his authority there as in his own kingdom. The situation here however was very different from what he was familiar with in the Maghrib. In Ifrīkīya, the Arabs were still very strong. Abu l-Ḥasan came to grief against the Arab tribes united against a foreign master and near Kairawan they inflicted a disastrous defeat on him in Muḥarram 749 (April 1348). This disaster even endangered the position of the Merīnīds in the Maghrib itself. An attempt by Abū Ḥanīfa, son of Abu l-Ḥasan, to reconquer Ifrīkīya proved fruitless.

In spite of the collapse of Marīnīd aims, the period of these two last šūgūn was nevertheless one of the greatest in the history of Muslim Barbary, one of those which has left us most memorials of its magnificence.

The Merīnīds were vigorous builders. In 1276, Abū Yūsuf had founded New Fās, west of the old town, to make it his official capital; but it was during the first half of the 14th century that the greatest building activity was displayed. The majority of those that have come down to us date from this period. Works of considerable artistic value, they are at the same time evidence of the military activity and religious ardour of the Banū Marīn, like the ramparts and the mosque of al-Manṣūra, the walls and necropolis of Chella, the madrasas of Fās and Sale, the different buildings erected near Tlemcen around the tomb of the great ascetic Sidi Bū Madyan. Piety in the form of mysticism was the dominating note in the intellectual life of the Maghrib. We must however not forget that the court of Fās was frequented by men like Abū al-Rāhīm b. Khaldūn, Ibn al-Khābib and Ibn Bāṭtūta, who have left a name in the field of literature and profane learning.

The failure of the attempts upon Ifrīkīya and the disaster at Kairawān may be taken as the beginning of the decline of the Merīnīds. As a result of these military failures, the troops stationed in some parts of the Maghrib had to be withdrawn. The passes of the Atlas being no longer guarded, the Arabs of Sūs and Ṭafilāt, excited by the rumours from Ifrīkīya, began to display their turbulent spirit. The tribes who paid taxes now paid only at longer and longer intervals under the threat of expeditionary forces sent against them. There was still a graver cause of decline: the power of the viziers vastly increased. An aristocracy of high officials related to the royal family handed down offices from father to son, backed by powerful clans, and ended by acquiring the power to nominate the new sovereigns. To keep them in tutelage, there was to choose for the throne a minor or a weakling.

When the Sultan displayed some desire to rule in person, they did not hesitate to dethrone or assassinate him. Thus in 1362 (1561) Abū Sālim was decapitated by a soldier of the Christian militia; his successor Tāshfīn, an idiot, was deposed and replaced by Abū Zayyān, who was found strangled and drowned in a reservoir.

In the midst of these palace revolutions the unity of the kingdom was destroyed. We find the prince who governs Sījlīmāsīs fighting with the sultan reigning at Fās. The vizier who has control of the legitimate sovereign has pretenders against him, who end by dividing up the country among them. Marrakesh fights against Fās. At one time, the traditional enemies of the dynasty, the 'Abd al-Wādīds of Tlemcen, endeavour to profit by the occasion to resume the aggressive policy of Yaghmurān. But Tlemcen was itself too weakened to attain success. Besides, it was attacked in the rear by the Arabs of the Central Maghrib, instigated from Fās. One of the shockgs of the Sūward Arabs is called the ‘friend and patron of the Merīnīd dynasty’. The Banū Marīn had another means of neutralizing Tlemcen; this was to support pretenders of the ‘Abd al-Wādī family. To sum it up, in spite of the weakness of the Banū Marīn, the Banū ‘Abd al-Wād, whose lands had for the most part passed into the hands of the Arabs, cut a still sadder figure and could not resist when attacks from the west were resumed. From 1389 all the šūgūn of Tlemcen ruled under the suzerainty of Fās.

But grave events were to turn the attention of the Merīnīds from the affairs of the Central Maghrib. In 1401, King Henry III of Castile landed in Barbary to take vengeance for outrages of the Muslim corsairs and destroyed Tetuan. This attack, which produced considerable commotion in the Maghrib, and the taking of Ceuta by the Portuguese in 818 (1415), provoked a vigorous response by the religious element. The threat from abroad, combined with its weakness in meeting this critical
situation, brought about a series of troubles under which the dynasty succumbed. In 823 (1420) after the assassination of the Sultan Abū Sa'id, the Merinids gave place to the Bani Wāqṣūṣ.


MERKEZ, MUSLIH AL-DIN MEST, an Ottoman Shaikh of an Order and Saint. Merkez Muslih al-Din-Muslih b. Múslih b. Kildj b. Hajdjar belonged to the village of Šar Shī Ṣamālū in the Anatolian district of Adãhībâyâ. He was at first a pupil of the Mollā Ahmad Pasha, son of Khusraw Meg [q.v.], and later of the famous Khâlid Shaikh Sâlim Efeñî, founder of the Sunbūyâa, a branch of the Khabūyâa, head of the village of Kudju Muslih Pasha in Stambul (cf. on him: Brûsi, Mehemmed Takır, ‘Ocmâlî Mûlîddîrî, i. 78 sqq.). When the latter died in 936 (1529), Merkez Efeñî succeeded him in the dignity of Pir. He held the office of head of a monastery for 23 years and died in the odour of sanctity in 950 (1552), aged nearly 90. He was buried in Stambul in the mosque which bears his name (cf. Hadišet al-Diwan, i. 230 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, O. O. K., iv. 95, N°. 495) before the Ayn Kusya. At the tomb of Merkez Efeñî there is much visited holy well, an aynâ, to which one descends by steps. Its reddish water is said to have the miraculous power of healing those sick of a fever (cf. Ewliya Čelebi, i. 372; J. v. Hammer, Constantinopolis, i. 503; do., G. O. K., ix. 95, N°. 495, following the Ḥadišet al-Diwan, loc. cit.). Beside it is the cell (çâwîya) of Merkez Efendi, of which wonderful stories still circulate among the people. He had many pupils, including his son Ahmad, famous as the translator of the Kâmil, his son-in-law Muslih al-Din (cf. Ewliya, i. 372), the poet Ramdân Efendi, called Bihışkî and many others.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text: Taškograzade, Shâhâb al-Nuṣârîya, transl. Mejdî, p. 522 sq.; Brûsi, Mehemmed Tâhir, ‘Ocmâlî Mûlîddîrî, i. 160; Mehemmed Thurya, Sigillût ø.; Guepin, iv. 363; F. Bâbiner, G. O. W., p. 44, note 1. (FR. BâBINER)

MERÇINA, an Anatolian sea-port on the south coast of Asia Minor. Merçina, the port and capital of the former sandjak of the same name (with an area of 1,780 sq. m.) in the vilayet of Adana [q.v.] on the south coast of Anatolia, is 40 miles from Adana, to which a railway runs. The name Merçina comes from the Greek mýrsini (μύρσιν), myrtle, because this tree grows in large numbers in this region. The regularly built town, founded only in 1852, with about 21,171 inhabitants (1927) is only of importance as a port for the export of silk, corn and cotton. The climate is very unhealthy in summer. The old name of Merçina was Zephrinum; in the vicinity (8 miles S.W.) lie the ruins of Soloi or Pompeipolis. The town which is quite modern is of no Muslim historical interest.

**Bibliography:** V. Guignet, La Turquie d’Asie, ii. 50 sq. (FR, BâBINER)

MERTOLA, ATR. Marrûla and Mirtûla, a little town in the south of Portugal on the Guadiana, 35 miles above and north of the mouth of this river, at its junction with the Guadiana. This place, the Murillôs of the Romans, was of some importance in the Muslim period. It was in the district of Beja and according to 'Ali was the best defended stronghold in the whole of the west of the Peninsula. At the end of the ninth century it was the headquarters of an independent chief, 'Abd al-Malik b. Abi l-Djawâd, who was in alliance with the lords of Badajoz and Osonoba and held his own against the Cordovan emir ‘Abd Allah.


MÉRWARA, a British district in Râdiputâna, lying between 25° 24' and 26° 11' N. and 73° 45' and 74° 29' E., has an area of 641 sq. miles and a population (1901) of 100,459. Beyond the fact that between 1138 and 1232 (1725 and 1816), several unsuccessful attempts were made by Râdipûts and Mârâhâs to subdue the country, the history of Mërwâra is a blank up to 1234 (1818), when the British appeared on the scene. The District was at one time an impenetrable jungle, inhabited by outlaws and fugitives from surrounding states. The population known under the name of Meis originally comprised a mixture of castes, Candîla Gujarâs, Bîlî, Râdiûts, Brahmans and Minâs. It is said that Nisâlde, the
MÉRWĀRA — MESHHED

Čauḫān King of Adjmir, subdued the inhabitants and made them draw water in the streets of Adjmir. The country has made much progress under the British rule.


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MÉRZĪFĪN, also called MĀRŠIWAH, a town in the Anatolian wilāyāt of Siwās [q.v.], and in the lands of Amasia [q.v.] at the beginning of the fertile plain of Süla Owa, with 11,334 inhabitants (in 1922), of whom the Armenians have had to migrate, which produces a good deal of wine and makes some cotton. Mārṣīfīn before the World War was the centre of activity of the Protestant missions in this region and contained the Anatolia College. The town most probably occupies the site of the ancient Phazemon (Φαζεμών) in the district of Phazenomitis; the name is probably a development of Φαζεμών. Ibn Bīfī (cf. Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoukides, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, iv., Leyden 1902, p. 292–293) also gives the form چاوستن. Little is known of the early history of the town in the Muslim period. It belonged to the kingdom of the Danishmands [q.v.] and when in 1393 Bayzāz I drove the ruler of Siwās, Mir Ahmad, out of the country, the land of “Marṣawīn”, as the Traveller Hans Schiltberger (cf. Hans Schiltbergers Reiserück, ed. V. Langmantei, Tübingen 1885, p. 12) called it, passed to the Ottoman empire. Mārṣīfīn plays a notable part in the history of Ottoman culture at the birth-place and scene of the activities of learned men and authors (cf. A. D. Mordtmann, Anatolien, ed. F. Babinger, Hanover 1925, p. 88). In Mārṣīfīn there used to be a number of dervish monasteries (cf. Ewliya Čelebi, Sīyāhētnāne, ii. 306 infra, where several are mentioned). Of special interest are the mosques, mainly converted from Byzantine churches, including the so-called Eski Džamī, on the walls of which Christian paintings could until recently be seen (cf. V. Cüceit, La Turquie d’Aile, i. 486) and the mosque of Hamd II, both on the market-place. The saint locally revered was Piri Dede Şulţān, said to be a pupil of Hāddīj Bektāşī (Ewliya, op. cit., p. 306). In A. D. Mordtmann’s time (1852) the “whole Turkish population” consisted of shaits, i.e. descendants of the Prophet.

Bibliography: Ewliya Čelebi, Sīyāhētnāne, ii. 306 sqq.; Engl. transl. by J. v. Hammer, ii. 212 sqq.; Le Voyage du Mendiant d’Asie, . . . . . , ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1887, p. 68; J. Mörer, Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor, London 1812, p. 350; Petermann’s Mitteilungen, 1859, Heft 12; C. Bitter, Erdkunde von Kleinasiien, i. 179 sqq.; Wm. Ainsworth, Travels in Asia Minor, London 1842, i. 33; Wm. Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor, London 1842, i. 329; A. D. Mordtmann, Anatolien, ed. by F. Babinger, Hanover 1925, p. 87 sqq.; Henry J. van Lennep, Travels in little-known parts of Asia Minor, London 1870, i. 82; F. Camont, Sinope Pontica, ii. 140; ii. 162; V. Cüceit, La Turquie d’Aile, i. 758 sqq. — As regards the derivation of the name Mārṣīfīn from Phazemon, it must be pointed out that the ancient name no longer came easily to the mouths of the later Greeks: Stephen of Byzantium (fifth century A. D.) already writes Φαζεμων (var. lect. Φαζεμών, Φαζεμών)). (Fr. Babinger)

MESHHED (al-Maṣḥāb), capital of the Persian province of Khurāsān (q.v., ii., p. 966), the greatest place of pilgrimage for the Shi‘īs in Persia. It lies 3,000 feet above sea level in 59° 35’ E. Long. (Greenw.) and 16° 17’ N. Lat. in the valley from 10 to 25 miles broad of the Keshf-e Rūd, which runs from N. W. to S. E. This river, also called Ab-i Meshhēd (the River of Meshhēd), rises about 14 miles N. W. of the ruins of Tus [q.v.] in the little lake of Cheshme-i Gūās (cf. Fraser, op. cit., p. 350; Khānīkoff, op. cit., p. 110; Yate, op. cit., p. 315) and joins the Heri (Hari)-Rūd (q.v., and cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 407 sqq.) about 100 miles S. E. of Meshhēd on the Russo-Persian frontier. Meshhēd lies about 4 miles south of the bank of the Keshf-e Rūd. The hills which run along the valley rise to 8,000 or 9,000 feet at Meshhēd.

In consequence of its high situation and proximity to the mountains, the climate of Meshhēd is in the winter rather severe, in the summer, however, often tropically hot; it is regarded as healthy.

Meshhēd may in a way be regarded as the successor of the older pre-Muhammadan Ṭūs [q.v.], and it has not infrequently been erroneously conflated with it.

The fact that Ṭūs is the name of both a town and a district, together with the fact that two places are always mentioned as the principal towns of this district, has given rise among the later Arab geographers to the erroneous opinion that the capital Ṭūs is a double town consisting of Ṣābānīn and Nīkān; e.g., Yākūt, iii. 560, 1 (correct at iv. 825, 3) and in the Lubāb of Ibn al-ʿAjīb [q.v.], quoted by Abu l-Fida (op. cit., p. 453). Kāzvinī (Aṣḥāb al-Bīlāb, ed. Westenfeld, p. 275, 21) next made the two towns thought to be joined together into two quarters (mashālī). This quite erroneous idea of a double town Ṭūs found its way into European literature generally. Sykes (J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1115—1116) and following him, Elgood (A History of Persia, London 1918, i. 53 sq.) have rightly challenged this untenable idea. The older Arab geographers quite correctly distinguish between Ṣābānīn and Nīkān as two quite separate towns. Nīkān, according to the express testimony of the Arabic sources, was only 4½ parasang (farsāṅk) or one Arabic mile from the tomb of Ibrāhīm al-Rasīd and ʿAlī al-Rīdā (see below) and must therefore have been very close to the modern Meshhēd. The ruins of Ṣābānīn-Ṭūs and Meshhēd are about 15 miles apart.

As to Nīkān (often wrongly vocalised Nawḵān) it is sometimes called more precisely (e.g., Yākūt, iii. 153, 21) Nīkān Ṭūs, and occasionally (e.g., Ḩāqi, = B. G. A., i. 257, 3; Ḩādī Māḥmūd Mustawfi, op. cit., p. 151, 2—3) included with Sanābād. The distance between these two towns is put at an Arabic mile (Yākūt, iii. 153, 21) or what is practically the same, 1½ parasang (e.g., Ḩāqi, op. cit.; ibn ʿArabī in Abu l-Fida’, op. cit., p. 451). Nīkān must have lain to the east and northeast of the modern Meshhēd and a small part of it is the northeastern quarter of the latter town.

In Nīkān or in the village of Sanābādīh belonging to it two distinguished figures in Muslim history
were buried within one decade: the caliph Ḥaṟūn al-Raḍḥid and the ʿAlī al-Riḍā b. Mūsā.

When Ḥaṟūn al-Raḍḥid was preparing to take the field in Khurṭān, he was stricken mortally ill in a country house at Sanābād on where he had stopped, and died in a few days (193 = 809). The caliph, we are told (Tabari, cf. cit., iii. 737; 15-17), realising he was about to die, had grave dug in the garden of this country mansion and consecrated by Kūfī-ān-readers.

The three available accounts differ at first sight as to the house in which Ḥaṟūn spent his last hours. Two of them are given by Tabari: according to the first (iii. 736, 17-29; 734, 4) it was on the estate of Ḥunaid b. Abd al-Raḥmān that the caliph stopped; the second story (iii. 735; 15-16; 738, 14-15) says that Ḥaṟūn lived in the mansion of Ḥunaid b. Abī Ghannām. A third story in Vāḵūt (iv. 560) says that the tombs of Ḥaṟūn and of ʿAlī al-Riḍā were in one of the gardens of the house of Ḥunaid b. Kājṭābā. Now there is not the slightest doubt that the references to the house (Jūr) of Ḥunaid b. Kājṭābā and to that of Ḥunaid b. Abī Ghannām are to the same place. Ḥunaid b. Kājṭābā must be the same person as Ḥunaid b. Abī Ghannām; they are both described as the man of Taṭī.

As to Tabari’s second story, which substitu- tes a dūr b. Abd al-Raḥmān for a dūr Ḥunaid, it may be observed that Ḥunaid b. Abd al-Raḥmān held the office of governor of Ḥārānās under the Omayyads (caliphate of Iḥām) from 111 to 116 (729-734) (on him cf. above i. 1109 sp.; ii. 375b; Weil, cf. cit., i. 629-631; E. von Zambaur, cf. cit., p. 47). Ḥunaid probably resided as a rule not in Nīḫāpūr or Tūs but in the palace at Sanābād which he had probably built. One of his successors, Ḥunaid, also chose to live here and seems to have enlarged the place. This would explain how our sources call the same house the house of Ḥunaid and of Ḥunaid. Perhaps the estate became the property of the ʿAbbāsid on the death of Ḥunaid.

About a century after the death of Ḥaṟūn, the caliph al-Maʿṣūm died on his way from Māzandarān and spent a few days in this palace. Along with him was his son-in-law ʿAlī al-Riḍā b. Muḥaṣṣel, the caliph designate, the eighth imām of the Twelvers. The latter died suddenly here in 205 (818); the actual day is uncertain (cf. Strothmann, Die Zeitschr. für Geschichte, Leipzig 1926, p. 171). On ʿAlī al-Riḍā and his death cf. above i. 296, 298j; iii. 222v; Weil, cf. cit., p. ii. 225b; Fraser, Narrative of a Journey into Khurasan (London 1825), p. 449-451 (gives the story current in Meshhed of the main’s death); Yate, cf. cit., p. 349-342; Sykes, The Glory of the Shah World, London 1916, p. 235-238; W. Jackson, cf. cit., p. 312.

It was not the tomb of the caliph but that of a highly venerated imām which made Sanābād (Nūḵān) celebrated throughout the Shi’a world, and the great town which grew up in course of time out of the little village actually became called al-Maḥsād (Meshhed) which means “sepulchral chapel” (primarily of a martyr belonging to the family of the Prophet). Cf. on the conception of Mashhad, iii. 523 and v. Berchem in Dizī, Churrasäische Bandemwalter, i. (Berlin 1915), p. 89-90. Ibn Hawkāl (p. 313) calls our sanctuary simply Meşhād, Vāḵūt (iv. 153) more accurately al-Maḥsād al-Riḍāwī = the tomb-chapel of al-Riḍā; we also find the Persian name Mešḥād-i moḵداد = “the sanctified chapel” (e.g. in Ḥaṃd ʿAllāh Muṣṭafwī, p. 157). As a place-name Meshhed first appears in al-Muḵkaddasī (p. 352), i.e. in the last third of the tenth century. About the middle of the sixteenth century the traveller Ibn Baṭṭaṭa (iii. 77) uses the expression “town of Maḥsād al-Riḍā”. Towards the end of the middle ages the name Nūḵān, which is still found on coins in the first half of the sixteenth century under the Ilkhanīs (cf. Codrington, A Manual of Musliman Numismatics, London 1904), p. 189), seems to have been gradually ousted by al-Maḥsād or Meshhed. At the present day Meshhed is often more precisely known as Meshhed-i Riḍā, Meshhed-i moḵkadas, Meshhed-i Tūs (so already in Ibn Baṭṭaṭa, iii. 66). Not infrequently in literature, especially in poetry, we find only Tūs mentioned, i.e. New Tūs in contrast to Old Tūs or the proper town of this name; cf. e.g. Muḥammad Mahdī al-ʿAlawi, Tūrīkh Tūs aw al-Maḥsād al-Riḍāwī, Bagdad 1927, p. 3.


The importance of Sanābād-Meshhed continually increased with the growing fame of its sanctuary and the decline of Tūs. Tūs received its death blow in 791 (1389) from Miṃrāṅghāt, a son of Timūr. When the Mongol noble who governed the place rebelled and attempted to make himself independent, Mirāṅghāt was sent against him by his father. Tūs was stormed after a siege of several months, sacked and left a heap of ruins; 10,000 inhabitants of Yate, p. 316; Sykes, in J.R.A.S., 1910, p. 1118 and Browne, cf. cit., iii., p. 190). Those who escaped the holocaust settled in the shelter of the ’Alid sanctuary. Tūs was henceforth abandoned and Meshhed took its place as the capital of the district.

As to the political history of Meshhed it coincides in its main lines with that of the province of Khurasān [q.v.]. Here we shall only briefly mention a few of the more important events in the past of the town. Like all the larger towns of Persia, Meshhed frequently saw risings and the approach of war within its walls. To protect the mausoleum of ʿAlī al-Riḍā in the reign of the Ghaznavid Maḥdī [q.v.], the then governor of Khurasān erected defences in 1037. In 1121 a wall was built round the whole town which afforded protection from attack for some time. In 1161 however, the Ghuʾz [q.v.] succeeded in taking the place, but they spared the sacred area in their pillaging. We hear of a further visitation by Mongol hordes in 1296 in the time of Sulṭān Ghāzān [q.v.]. Probably the greatest benefactors of the town and especially of its sanctuary were the first Timūrid Shah Rukh (809-850 = 1406-1446; see vol. iv. 265 sp.) and his pious wife Dīwāhr-Shāhī.
With the rise of the national Safavid dynasty [q. v.], a new era of prosperity began for Meshed. The very first Shâh of this family, Ismâ'îl I (907–930 = 1501–1524; q. v.), established Shi'ism as the state religion and, in keeping with this, care for the sacred cities within the Persian frontier, especially Meshed and Kumm, became an important feature in his programme as in those of his successors. Pilgrimage to the holy tombs at these places experienced a considerable revival. In Meshed the royal court displayed a great deal of building activity. In this respect Tâhmasp I, Ismâ'îl I's successor (930–984 = 1524–1576; q. v.), and the great Shâh 'Abbâs I (995–1037 = 1587–1627; q. v.) were especially distinguished.

In the xvith century the town suffered considerably from the repeated raids of the Ozbegs (Uzbek). In 1507 it was taken by the troops of the Shâhâbî Shâh Khan [cf. Shâhâbîzâde]; it was not till 1528 that Shâh Tâhmasp I succeeded in repelling the enemy from the town again. Stronger walls and bastions were then built and another attack by the same Ozbegs was thwarted. But in 1544 the Ozbegs again succeeded in entering the town and plundering and murdering there. The year 1559 was a disastrous one for Meshed. The Shâhâbî Shâh 'Abîl-Mu'min after a four months' siege forced the town to surrender. The streets of the town ran with blood and the thoroughness of the pillaging did not stop at the gates of the sacred area. Shâh 'Abbâs I who lived in Meshed from 1555 till his official ascent of the throne in Kâzvin in 1557 was not able to retake Meshed from the Ozbegs till 1598.

At the beginning of the reign of Tâhmasp II [q. v.] in 1722 the Afghan tribe of Ablâhî [q. v.] invaded Khorasan. Meshed fell before them, but in 1726 the Persians succeeded in retaking it after a two months' siege. Nâdir Shâh [q. v.] (1736–1747) had a mausoleum built for himself in Meshed.

After the death of Nâdir Shâh civil war broke out among the claimants to the throne, in the course of which the unity of the Persian empire was broken. The whole eastern part of the kingdom of Nâdir Shâh, particularly Khorasan (except the district of Râshâb), passed in this period of Persian impotence under the rule of the vigorous Afghan Shâh Ahmad Durrânî. An attempt by Kârim Khan Zand to unite Khorasan to the rest of Persia failed. Ahmad defeated the Persians and took Meshed after an eight months' siege in 1167 (1753); cf. above i. p. 160, 202, 203. Ahmad Shâh and his successor Timûr Shâh left Shâh Rukh in possession of Khorasan as their vassal, making Khorasan a kind of buffer state between them and Persia. As the real rulers however, both these Afghan rulers struck coins in Meshed (cf. above i. p. 202). Otherwise the reign of the blind Shâh Rukh, which with repeated short interruptions lasted for nearly half a century, passed without any events of special note. It was only after the death of Timûr-Shâh (1207 = 1792) that Agha Muhammad Khan, the founder of the Kâjjâr dynasty, succeeded in taking Shâh Rukh's life, putting him to death in 1210 (1795) and thus ending the separation of Khorasan from the rest of Persia (cf. above, i, p. 204). The death soon afterwards of Agha Muhammad (1211 = 1796) enabled Nâdir, who had escaped to Hârât, to return to Meshed and take up the reigns of government again. A siege of his capital by a Kâjjâr army remained without success; but in 1803 Fath 'Ali Shâh was able to take it after a siege of several months when Nâdir's funds were exhausted.

From 1825 Khurâsân suffered greatly from the raids of Turkoman hordes and the continual feuds of the tribal leaders (cf. Conolly, op. cit., i. 288 and Yate, op. cit., p. 53). To restore order the crown prince 'Abbâs Mirza entered Khurâsân with an army and made Meshed his headquarters. He died there in 1849 (1833).

The most important political event of the xixe century for Meshed was the rebellion of Hasan Khan Sâlîr, the prince-governor of Khurâsân, a cousin of the reigning Shâh Muhammad-î 'Abbâs. For two years (1847–1849) he held out against the government troops sent against him. At the time of the accession of Nâsir-al-Dîn (1848) Khurâsân was actually independent. It was only when the people of Meshed, under pressure of famine, rebelled against Sâlîr that Hasan al-Saltana's army succeeded in taking the town.

In 1911 a certain Mr. F. MacGregor, a native of Herât declared himself independent in Meshed under the name of Muhammad-î 'Ali Shâh and for a period disturbed Khurâsân considerably with the help of a body of reactionaries who gathered round him. This gave the Russians a pretext for armed intervention, and on March 29, 1912, they bombardeed Meshed in gross violation of Persia's suzerain rights and many innocent people, citizens and pilgrims, were slain. This bombardment of the national sanctuary of Persia made a most painful impression in the whole Muslim world. Yusuf Khan was later captured by the Persians and put to death (cf. E. G. Browne, The Press and Posts of Modern Persia, Cambridge, 1914, p. 124, 127, 156; Sykes, History of Persia, London 1927, ii. 426–427).

Meshed is now the centre of eastern Persia, the capital of the province of Khurâsân which, since its eastern part was taken by the Afghans in the xvith century, is barely half its former size (cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 383 sq.; Yate, xi, 108 sq. and above, ii. 966). In the middle ages it was not Tâs, Meshed's predecessor, but Nâsîshbîr (modern Persean Nishapûr) that was the capital of this extensive and important province. A royal prince has usually been governor since the fall of the Nâdirids. Since 1845 the lucrative and influential post of Mutawalli-Itâslu, the controller or treasurer of the sanctuary of the Imâm, has usually been combined with the governorship (cf. Yate, op. cit., p. 322).

The only plan — not very accurate — of Meshed known to me is that of Colonel Dolmāje (cf. Curzon, op. cit., i. 151, note 2; 160) and was made about 1870. It is published in MacGregor, op. cit., i. 284. The plan of the town is an irregular oblong with its longer axis running from N.W. to S.E. Its circumference is according to the most reliable calculations about 6 miles, the greatest breadth about a mile, and the length not quite two miles measured along the main street Khâbâhân which runs right through the town.

Like most Persian towns Meshed is encircled by a great girdle of walls, which gives it a very picturesque appearance. The lines built to stiffen the defences, namely a small moat with escarpment before the main wall and a broad ditch around outside, are now in ruins and in places have completely disappeared.
MESHHED

The citadel (ark) in the southwest part of the town is directly connected with the system of defence. It is in the form of a rectangle with four great towers at the corners and smaller bastions. The palace begun by 'Abbâs Mîrâb but finished only in his lifetime or by his son, is connected with the fortress proper, now fallen into disrepair (cf. Vate, op. cit., p. 327). It is used as the governor's residence. The whole quarter of government buildings which, according to MacGregor, occupies an area of 1,200 yards, is separated from the town by an open space, the Maidûn-i-Tôp (Cannon Place) which is used for military parades.

There are six gates in the city walls.

The town is divided into six great and ten smaller quarters (naddâla, see Vate, op. cit., p. 328). The six larger bear the names of their gates; see al-Mahdi al-'Alawi, op. cit.

The principal street which divides the whole town into two roughly equal halves, the Khîyâbân, is a creation of Shâh 'Abbâs I who did a great deal for Meshhed (1587-1627; see Vate, op. cit., p. 319; cf. the picture in Skyes, The Glory of the Shîa World, p. 149). The street, 34 feet wide and well-paved, was let out for the benefit of the Imâm al-Rîdâ. In the sixteenth century Fraser (1852, 1853), Conolly (1853), Burns (1853), Ferrier (1845), Eastwick (1862), Vâmbéry (1863), Colonel Dolmane (the sixties) and Massey (1853) visited the sacred area. Only Fraser, Conolly, Dolmane and Massey actually entered the sepulchral chapel itself. Vâmbéry and Massey were dressed as Muslims while the others retained their European dress. Except Dolmane, all these travellers have given more or less full descriptions of the sacred area. The full and accurate description given by Skyes in the J. R. I. S., 1910, p. 1130-1148 and in The Glory of the Shîa World is based on information supplied by the attaché to the British Consulate, Khân Bahâdur Ahmad al-Khân (cf. J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1113 and The Shîa World, p. 1128 and in Glory of the Shîa World, p. 100. The latter differs in details not incomparably from 'Amîn al-Dawâ's plan; which is right we have not the means of telling.

The history of the sanctuary of 'Ali al-Rîdâ is pretty well known from inscriptions and literary sources (cf. especially the references in Vate, op. cit., p. 317 sqq.; Sykes, J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1130 sqq.; and Mahdî al-'Alawi, op. 14 sqq.). According to local legend, Alexander the Great built a wall around the site as he foresaw in a dream that it was destined to be the tomb of a saint (cf. Fraser, Narrative, p. 449; Sykes, op. cit., p. 1130). As early as the second half of the tenth century, as Ibn Hawkal tells us (B. G. A., ii. 313), the Alîid sanctuary had a strong wall built around it, within which devout men who wished to lead an ascetic life (tihâf, q.v.) took up their abode. The almost contemporary account of al-Mahdî in Abu 'Abîd, p. 542 is similar. A few decades later, Sultan Mahâmil of Ghâzan (1998-1930) as a result of a dream enlarged the bazaars, dwellings, etc., it forms a town by itself; a wall around it cuts it off completely from the rest of Meshhed. The main entrances from the Khîyâbân are two great doors on north and south, but they are barred by chains so that no vehicle or peddler can enter for the ground of the Bast is holy and may only be trodden on foot. Animals which get in by accident become the property of the administration of the Imâm. The Bast also has the right of asylum (whence the name Bast). Debtors who take refuge in it are safe from their creditors; criminals can only be handed over by order of the Mutawalli-Bashi, which is now usually done after three days. In the whole of the sacred area strict discipline is maintained by its own police; there is a special prison for thieves (see the plan in Yate, p. 332, No. 75; cf. also Conolly, i. 263; Khânlûkî, p. 98; Bassett, op. cit., p. 224; Curzon, i. 153-154; Massey, op. cit., p. 1006; Yate, p. 334).

Entrance to the Bast is strictly forbidden to all non-Muslims. In earlier times the rule does not seem to have been so strict, for Clavijo (see Bibl. 1404 was able to go into the source of the Imâm al-Rîdâ. In the sixteenth century Fraser (1822, 1823), Conolly (1830), Burns (1832), Ferrier (1845), Eastwick (1862), Vâmbéry (1863), Colonel Dolmane (in the sixties) and Massey (1853) visited the sacred area. Only Fraser, Conolly, Dolmane and Massey actually entered the sepulchral chapel itself. Vâmbéry and Massey were dressed as Muslims while the others retained their European dress. Except Dolmane, all these travellers have given more or less full descriptions of the sacred area. The full and accurate description given by Skyes in the J. R. I. S., 1910, p. 1130-1148 and in The Glory of the Shîa World is based on information supplied by the attaché to the British Consulate, Khân Bahâdur Ahmad al-Khân (cf. J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1113 and The Shîa World, p. 1128 and in Glory of the Shîa World, p. 100. The latter differs in details not incomparably from 'Amîn al-Dawâ's plan; which is right we have not the means of telling.

The history of the sanctuary of 'Ali al-Rîdâ is pretty well known from inscriptions and literary sources (cf. especially the references in Vate, op. cit., p. 317 sqq.; Sykes, J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1130 sqq.; and Mahdî al-'Alawi, op. 14 sqq.). According to local legend, Alexander the Great built a wall around the site as he foresaw in a dream that it was destined to be the tomb of a saint (cf. Fraser, Narrative, p. 449; Sykes, op. cit., p. 1130). As early as the second half of the tenth century, as Ibn Hawkal tells us (B. G. A., ii. 313), the Alîid sanctuary had a strong wall built around it, within which devout men who wished to lead an ascetic life (tihâf, q.v.) took up their abode. The almost contemporary account of al-Mahdî in Abu 'Abîd, p. 542 is similar. A few decades later, Sultan Mahâmil of Ghâzan (1998-1930) as a result of a dream enlarged the
buildings of the tomb and provided a new wall around them (see Sykes, p. 1130). The sanctuary at a later date seems to have fallen somewhat into decay, for about a century later it was restored by the Saldjik Sultan Sandzir, (cf. Sykes, p. 1132) and the tomb was divided by small local tradition says, for the miraculous cure effected on his sick son there (see Fraser, op. cit., p. 451; Napier, F. R. G. S., xiv. [1876], p. 80 sq.; Sykes, op. cit., p. 1141—1142 and in Glory of the Sia World, p. 238 of it). It is to this event that an inscription of 512 (1118) inside the chamber of the tomb refers (see Sykes, p. 1140—1141 and cf. Mahdi al-Sawabi, p. 18). There is also a second inscription (in Sykes, p. 1142—1143) which records a restoration undertaken in 612 (1215).

The existence of these two inscriptions, the oldest in Meshhed, shows that the Mongols of Tughril Kuhna when they swept over Khorasan in 1220, if they may have plundered the sanctuary, spared the buildings. We hear of another restoration of the buildings in the reign of Sultan Ulujji Khudibanda (1304—1316; cf. Sykes, F. R. G. S., 1910, p. 1132; Mahdi al-Sawabi, p. 18). From the middle of the sixteenth century we have the somewhat fuller description of the sanctuary of 'Ali al-Rida by Ibn Battuta (ii. 77—79). Timur's son Shah Kuhk (1406—1449) and his wife Jwahar Shahid did a great deal for the Haram. The latter built the splendid mosque to the south of the tomb which still bears her name. The Dari al-Siyeda, the fine hall west of the tomb, and the adjoining chamber, the Dari al-Huffa, are also due to this period. Under Timur's grandson Sultan Husain Bahkta (1469—1506) [q. v.], the visier Shir 'Abd erected the southern part of the Sahi-Kuhna, the "old court", with the imposing portico; see the inscription reproduced in Sykes, p. 1132.

With the coming to power of the Safavids a new and brilliant era dawned on Meshhed. The rulers of this dynasty vied with one another in the development and adornment of the sanctuary of 'Ali al-Rida, which they raised to the religious centre of their kingdom. In this re-peat Tahmasb I (1524—1576) erected a minaret covered with gold in the northern part of the Sahi-Kuhna, adorned the dome of the tomb with sheets of gold and put a golden pillar on the top of it. The Ozbegs carried off this rich adornment on their raid in 1589. 'Abbas I the Great did most of all the Safawids (1587—1627) for Meshhed. 'Abbas I (1611—1666) devoted his attention mainly to the further decoration of the Sahi-Kuhna. The inscription published in part by Sykes, p. 1132 (cf. also Khanikoff, p. 103) was written by the master hand of Muhammad Reja 'Abbasii (on him cf. Sarre and Wittich, Ziehungen der Ria Abbasib, Munich 1914, p. 15—16). Sultan I (1666—1694) devoted special attention to the decoration of the dome of the Imam's tomb; see Mahdi al-Sawabi, p. 19 (cf. also Yate, p. 348; Sykes, p. 1137).

Foreign potentates also gave great gifts to the 'Aliid sanctuary in the Safawid period, such as the Emperor Akbar of India who made the pilgrimage to Meshhed in 1615 (cf. Yate, p. 319) and in 1512 the Kuch (Kutch) ruler of the Deccan, was Nadjif Shah (1576—1747) who did most for the town of Meshhed in the eighteenth century. Although very strict Sunni, he devoted a considerable part of the enormous wealth which he had brought back from his Indian campaign to the embellishment of the great Shah's place of pilgrimage. He restored thoroughly the southern half of the Sahi-Kuhna built in the reign of Sultan Husain Bahkta. He decorated the peculiarly richly and covered it with sheets of gold so that it is still called "Nadir's Golden Gate" after him. In 1730, before his accession to the throne, Nadjir erected a minaret covered with gold in the upper part of the Sahi, as a counterpart to that erected by Tahmasb I on the north side of the "old court". Cf. on Nadjir Shah's activities at the sanctuary of al-Rida, Muhammad 'AbdHamid Turabkh Akshib Shakib (Memoirs, ed. Balfour, London 1851, p. 272).

The rulers of the Kajjar dynasty of the sixteenth century, Fath 'Ali (1797—1834), Muhammad Shah (1834—1848) and Nadjir al-Din (1848—1896), faithfully followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, as regards attention to the Imam's sanctuary.

In spit e of the number of times which the 'Aliid sanctuary has been plundered in course of time, it still has countless treasures within its buildings and puts in the shade, as regards this wealth and the extent of its buildings and courts, all the other great Muslim sanctuaries, except perhaps Mecca, but including the much admired Najaf and Kerbela'.

A detailed and accurate description of the Haram and an account of its architectural history based on its present state cannot be given because the strict prohibition of admission to members of other faiths has prevented non-Muslim scholars from examining thoroughly and reproducing the buildings. Relying on descriptions of the sacred area prepared by Europeans and Orientals and on the valuable data contained in inscriptions (the latter were first noted by Khanikoff, p. 103—104; the more important were published by Sykes assisted by Khan Bahador Ahmad Din, in J. R. A. I., 1910, p. 1151 sq.); we can assume with considerable probability that, except the tomb proper, which in its present form (excluding the later dome) according to the inscription (512 = 1118), dates from the beginning of the sixteenth century, only insignificant remains of the earlier mediaval period have survived. The Haram in its present form is in the main a creation of the last 500 years, as is briefly outlined in the above short historical sketch of the sanctuary.

The dome of the tomb with its various annexes rises in the centre of the sacred area and is surrounded on the north and east by two great rectangular courts, the Sahi-Kuhna and the Sahi-Now, while in the south it is flanked by the extensive buildings of the Jwahar Shahid mosque.

The most popular entrance to the Kuch and the one preferred by pilgrims is the gateway in the Bilt Khaydan bazaar by a chain. The road runs for 259 yards through this street flanked with shops and ends at a great gateway through which the Sahi-Kuhna, the "old court" is entered. Its northern part dates from the time of Shah 'Abbas I, while the southern is as old as the second half of the sixteenth century (reign of Sultan Husain Bahkta) but was completely restored by Nadir Shah.

But the great towers with niches-like halls, hence called Minarets admit to the court. The simplest are the west and east towers built by 'Abbas I; the former has the clock-tower, while the platform of the latter is used as a nikah-khan. i.e., "music-
house”, where, according to an old Persian custom, found in other royal cities, sunrise and sunset are greeted with music. From the east gate one reaches the eastern part of the Boust through the Haram of the Pain-Khiyaban. Much more impressive from the architectural point of view are the northern gateway built by 'Abbâs II and especially the southern gateway of the court, “Nâdir's Golden Gate”, Nâdir Shâh’s most splendid achievement and the most imposing building of the whole Haram. At each of the two great gates stands a minaret 100 feet high, the upper part of which is covered with gold; the builder of the northern gate was Tâhmasp I and of the southern Nâdir Shâh. Nâdir built in the centre the famous octagon of “Nâdir’s Well” covered by a gilt baldachin (Sahâ-l-Khâmî Nâdirî = Nâdir’s water-carrier-house”); it was hewn out of a huge block of white marble which the Shâh had brought at great expense from Herât. The walls of the court are pierced by two rows of alcoves, the lower of which is occupied by artists, schools and dwellings of the servants of the mosque, while the higher officials of the Imam occupy the upper storey. The whole courtyard has a length of about 100 yards and a breadth of 70, is paved with dark Meshhed stones (cf. below) which are also to some extent tombstones. For pictures of the Sahñl Kuhna with clock tower and Nâdir’s Well see above, ill. 354, pl. 15; Yate, p. 340, 346; Sykes, Glory of the Shâh World, p. 241; picture of Nâdir’s Golden Gate in Yate, p. 326 and Sykes, p. 245. Nâdir’s golden gateway leads southwards into the area of the holy tomb, the sepulchral chamber with the halls and rooms surrounding it. Strictly speaking, it is only this nucleus of the whole sacred area that should be called Haram or Haram-i Maškâdâr or Haram-ul Mubârâk, terms often extended to the whole Bast. The names al-Rawâya al-Mašâkhâra and Āsînâm = the (holy) threshold, are also used. After passing through the Golden Gate one enters the Dâr al-Siyâda, built by Dzâwâr Shâh, the finest hall in the sacred quarter. Hung on a wall here is a round dome (ahwâl) to be that on which the poisoned grapes were offered to ‘Ali. The pilgrim can see into the sepulchral chamber through a silver grille from the Dâr-al-Sîyâda. Turning to the southeast one enters a smaller, more simply decorated chamber, the Dâr al-Huffâz. Adjoining the Dâr al-Huffâz in the north is the dome of the Mausoleum of the Imam. The interior of the sepulchral chamber (see the picture in Sykes, op. cit., p. 241), an almost square area 30 x 27 feet, is, as there are no proper windows, lit by the dim light from golden lamps and chandeliers and furnished with the greatest splendour. The tomb itself is in the N.E. corner and surrounded by three beautiful grilles, one of which, dated 1747, is said to contain the mausoleum of Nadîr Shâh now destroyed. ‘Abbâs I gave the top of the tomb with its gold covering. In a projection at the foot of the tomb, Fath ‘Alî Shâh placed a false door of gold inlaid with jewels (picture in Sykes, op. cit., p. 255). In niches in the wall behind glass are kept very valuable votive offerings (jewelled arms, etc., mainly gifts of the ruling house). On the wall are the two inscriptions already mentioned of 512 (1118) and 612 (1215) of which the first is the earliest known example of the so-called round hand (thulûth) in Arabic epigraphy (cf. v. Berchem in Dics, Churassan, Banldenmârter, i. 97, note 8). These enable us to place the building of the present chamber in the beginning of the 12th century, while the dome 65 feet high covered with sheets of gilt copper was built only in 1607 by ‘Abbâs I and renovated in 1675 by Sulaimân I, according to inscriptions on its outside. As the thread of tradition regarding the site of the Imam’s grave can hardly have been broken, it may be assumed practically with certainty that the present dome is built on the true site. There is no longer any trace of Harun’s grave; it probably was in the centre of the mausoleum, whence the tomb of the ‘Aliid who died later was put in a corner of the same place. Of the other chambers and isolated buildings belonging to the system of the Haram proper, we shall only mention here the Gumbad (domed tomb) of Allâh Wadî Khân, which lies to the N.E. and takes its name from its builder, a famous general of ‘Abbâs I (cf. Conolly, i. 271; Sykes, The Glory of the Shâh World, p. 266; see also the picture in Dics, Persien: Islam. Baukünst in Churassan, p. 54). Leaving the sacred chamber by the eastern door one reaches, after traversing two adjoining rooms, the “Golden Gate” of Nâşir al-Din, which leads into the New Court (Sahn-i Naw) its northside is bounded by the Pain Khiyaban. Fath ‘Ali Shâh began this court in 1819. His two successors continued the building, which was completed in 1855. If one turns southwards from the Dâr al-Siyâda already mentioned, one soon enters the area of the charming mosque endowed by Sultan Dzawâr Shâh and bearing her name. Like the Sahñl Kuhna this older court, an oblong running N. to S. about 100 yards long and 90 broad, is broken in the middle of each of its four sides by an arched hall (aiwân), while the unbroken parts of the walls have rows of alcoves fitted up as dwellings. The largest and finest of these four aiwâns of the mosque, the Aiwan-i Maškâra in the south (for Maškâra = stall, cf. iii., p. 330), is used for prayers; in it is a wooden pulpit in which the Mahdi will one day show himself to the faithful. The entrance hall is covered by a blue dome which surpasses that on the tomb of the Imam in height and width, and is flanked by two high minarets covered with blue glass tiles. The centre of the court is occupied by the Masjîdi Pir Zun = “Mosque of the Old Woman”, a square unroofed area surrounded by a wooden balustrade around which runs water in a deep stone channel. The Dzawâr Shâh mosque is the noblest and finest building in the sacred area; cf. the opinions of Fraser, Narrative, p. 447; Vâmbéry, Meine Wanderungen etc., p. 322 and Sykes, F.R.A.S., 1910, p. 1145.—Pictures of the mosque in Sykes, The Glory of the Shâh World, p. 265; J.R.A.S., 1916, p. 344 (Aiwâni Maškâra and Pir Zun); Dics, Persien: Islam. Baukünst, p. 45-48. Of the various small sanctuaries which the pilgim visit in the Haram, only two need be mentioned here, the Ziyârât Kadam-i Mubârâk or Sharîf = “place of the pilgrimage of the blessed or excellent foot” also called Dzâh-i Sir-i Cihâr-pâ = “place of the foot-stone” (see the plan in Yate, p. 332, No. 16). A circular space covered by a dome (east of the north aiwan of the Dzaw-
har Şâdh mosque), in which reverence is paid to a dark grey oval-shaped stone said to contain an impression of ʿAli al-Ridā’s foot (cf. Massy, op. cit., p. 1003—1004). The second noteworthy feature of the Bâst is a tall stone pillar, out of which a water basin has been roughly hewn. It is said to have fallen into the Bâst as a shapeless block from heaven (see Massy, op. cit., p. 1002).

Inside of the sacred area are the richest and busiest bazaars of the town, the most richly endowed madrasas, the most profitable caravanserais and the most popular baths. These are all, like the dwelling houses there, the absolute property of the Imám, the ʿAlîd burlæd here, i.e. of the ecclesiastical authorities who administer the sanctuary on his behalf. The whole Bâst belongs exclusively to them. This dead hand however has still more possessions in land, buildings, canals (bawāt, q.v.), in all the provinces of Persia, especially in the immediate and more distant vicinity of Meshhéd.

To the vast sums which these properties yield in produce and rents, are to be added the considerable payments for funerals and tombs, the gifts of pilgrims etc. There is also considerable expenditure, the payment of a considerable number of higher officials and of a large number of lower officials and servants, the maintenance of many pilgrims, the cost of repairs, lighting, decoration of the sanctuaries etc. The income of the Hâram in course of time has naturally varied. Towards the end of the ʿṢâfâwî period it is said to have been about £15,000 while at the time of Frasér’s first visit (1822), as a result of the troubled times, it had sunk to £2,000—2,500 (Frasér, Narrative, p. 456). Later travellers, like Basset (1878) and Curzon (1889), estimated the annual revenues of the Imâm at £16,000 to £17,000 (without revenue in kind); for the last decade of the sixteenth century Massy (p. 1106) and Yate (p. 344) give £20,000. Forhâm Beg’s estimate (op. cit., p. 43) of £40,000 is certainly much too high.

At the head of the administration of the Hâram there has been from early times a Muṭawâllî-Bâšî, who must be a layman. In view of the very influential position which this official occupies in his capacity as head of the greatest Persian sanctuary and treasurer of a very considerable estate, it is only natural that an appointment to such a position of trust is regarded as a very special honour. As it was not uncommon for disputes about the limits of their respective spheres of authority or other matters to arise between the holder of this office, the representative of ecclesiastical power, and the governor of Khurāsān, the clerical element has since the middle of the sixteenth century been subordinated to the civil power by giving the office of Muṭawâllî-Bâšî to the governor of the time (see Yate, p. 322, 344). This very lucrative double office — the Muṭawâllî-Bâšî gets 10% of the revenues of the Hâram — is as a rule only held for a few years by the same individual.

The Muṭawâllî-Bâšî is assisted by a staff of higher officials (muṭawâllîs). His directions in his capacity the varied hierarchy of the sacred area, among whom the muṭāsâfīs [q. v.], who have a thorough knowledge of religious law and are men of great prestige and influence, occupy the first place. Next comes a regular army of lower clerics (mullâs) who conduct the services, teach in the schools and guide the rites of the pilgrims, not a few of them make a living by supplying official documents sealed with the seal of the Imâm (see the picture in Sykes, Glory of the Shîa World, p. 275) which deal among other matters with the answering of petitions made by the pilgrims at the sacred tomb (cf. Khanîkoff, p. 99). On the administration of the sanctuary of Meshhéd cf. Frasér, op. cit., p. 455—456; Curzon, i, 162—164; Massy, p. 1006 and especially Yate, p. 344—346.

As we know from mediaeval Arabic sources, pilgrimage to the tomb of ʿAlî al-Ridā began at an early date. We occasionally hear also of royal visits from the sixth century onwards.

As to the number of pilgrims who visit Meshhéd annually we have different estimates for the sixteenth century but as exact figures can hardly be kept and the numbers vary greatly, they can only claim reliability to a very limited extent. While Yate (p. 334) gives the annual number for the last decade of the sixteenth century at 30,000, earlier travellers, except Marsh (1872: 20—30,000), give much higher figures, e.g. Bellew (1872): 40—50,000; Ferrier (1845): 50,000; Khanîkoff (1858) and Eastwick (1862): over 50,000; Curzon (1889) even gives 100,000, but this is certainly too high. The numbers go up considerably when special religious ceremonies are going on, e.g. at the anniversary of ʿAlî al-Ridā’s death (cf. the pictures in Diez, Persien, p. 46) and during the first third of the month of Muḥarram at the Tâdiya (q.v.) in memory of the tragedy of Kerbela. We have a full description of the Meshhéd festival of the year 1830 from Conolly (see his Journey, i, 267—284, 335—336) and a shorter one of 1894 by Yate (op. cit., p. 144—148); cf. also the illustrations in Yate, p. 146 and the drawing by the painter ʿAlî Rida ʿAbdî of a Meshhéd pilgrim at the time of the Muḥarram festival in Sarre and Mittwoch, Zeichnungen des Rize Abbasî (Munich 1914), Plate i (thereon p. 23, 49 and Id., ii, 216 sq.).

Every pilgrim who arrives has a right to free maintenance for three (according to Vâmbéry: six) days. In the sacred quarter, south of the Bâsh Khiyân (see the plan in Yate, p. 332), there is a special kitchen used exclusively for pilgrims, which gives out 5—600 free meals every day (cf. Vâmbéry, op. cit., p. 325; Goldsmith, Eastern Persia, i, 364 and Curzon, i, 162).

On the ceremonies which the pilgrims have to perform at their visit to the tomb of ʿAlî al-Ridā, we have accounts by Massy, op. cit., and the notes supplied by Khân Bahâdûr Ahîmd al-Dîn Khân in Sykes, J.R.A.S., 1910, p. 144—145 and in the Glory of the Shîa World, p. 240 sq. Special mention may be made of the three circumambulations (bawâf [q. v.] of the tomb and the cursing of all enemies of the imâm three times especially the Caliphs Harûn and Maʿîmân.

Every pilgrim who has performed the pilgrimage to ʿAlî al-Ridâ’s grave in the prescribed fashion is entitled to call himself Meshhedi. Meshhéd occupies first place among all the places of pilgrimage in Persia. Among the great sanctuaries of the Muslim world, Meshhéd stands seventh in the view of Shîa theologians, coming after, not only Mecca and Maʿîmân, but also the four specifically Shîa sanctuaries of the Ḥâkîm, Nâdir, Kerbela, Sâmarra and Kâtîmân, in the order (cf. Sykes, The Glory of the Shiâ World, p. xiv). According to a version current in Shîa
circles which Curzon (i. 150) gives. Meshhed is entitled to the sixth place, coming between Kārim-
main as fifth and Sāmārāšt, which is put seventh.

The longing of every Shi'ī to find a last resting place in the shadow of one of the beloved Imāms
caused extensive cemeteries to be laid out at an early date at the great centres of pilgrimage.
Thousands of corpses are brought every year to Meshhed, mainly from Persia, but also from all the Shi'a lands, particularly India, also Afghanistān and Turkestān. Nowhere in the whole of Persia are there so many tombs as at Meshhed. As the ground of the cemeteries must be used over and over again, the graves change their occupants every few years. Fine solid tombstones are not used, but simply rough blocks of granite or soapstone from the quarries of the neighbourhood (cf. also Conolly, p. 343—4 and Khanikoff, p. 105). Graves within the sacred quarter itself are naturally most desired. Every available space there is used for the purpose; the pavingstones in the courtyards are often tombstones for the dead below. The fees for graves within the Bast, which vary with the distance from the Mausoleum of 'Ali al-Ridā, bring a not inconsiderable revenue to the authorities.

Of the large cemeteries (maqbaras) outside the Bast the most important is the Maqbara Kāt-i Gāh ("place of the killing") lying north of the sacred area. East of it is that of Saliyād Aḥmad in which three children of the seventh Imām, Muṣā al-Kaẓīm, are buried (cf. Mahdī al-Alawī, p. 8). In the Ħāfīz Khīyānī quarter is the Maqbarat Pīr-i Fāṭīmā. S.E. of the citadel is the mausoleum of Gumbād-i Sāhī ("green dome") which takes its name from a half ruined mausoleum there, now inhabited by dervishes (cf. Yate, p. 328; Mahdī al-Alawī, p. 9).

In the Nūkān quarter is the Maqbara Shāh-za de Mahjīmad (see Mahdī al-Alawī, p. 8). We may also mention that outside the Nūkān gate on the site of the old town of Nūkān (see above), are visible the remains of a gigantic cemetery on which, according to Sykes (J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1116), there may be found stone sarcophagi with inscriptions carved upon them dating from 760 to 1099 (1359—1688).

Outside of Meshhed a good half hour's journey to the south, on rocky ground is the mausoleum of Mirzā Ibrāhīm al-Riḍā (see Mahdī, op. cit., p. 8) and still farther from the town, 3 miles north of it, is the Maqbara Kāt-i Māfīdā (cf. Sykes, op. cit., p. 1124 and Ibn Sādī, vi. 127 sq.). According to the popular view, he was a Sūfī in spite of his relations with 'Ali and is therefore in a way regarded as the patron of the Sūfīs in Khurāsān, of whom those who live in Meshhed are usually buried near his tomb. Kāt-i Māfīdā's mausoleum is one of the most interesting in the whole of Khurāsān: it is a large octagonal building crowned by a dome but now it is in a half ruined condition.

Meshhed is the centre of Muslim theological and legal studies in Persia. A number of colleges (madrasas) there are devoted to teaching these subjects. Lists of them with dates are given by Fraser (p. 456—460) who mentions 14 of the present 16 madrasas, also by Khanikoff (p. 107) who gives 3, and by Mahdī al-Alawī (p. 9—12). The latter observes that there were 20 older colleges, of which he gives 13, and a number of more modern ones. Fraser also gives brief notes on the possessions of the various madrasas and the clerics (mulās) attached to them. Yate (p. 329—330) simply mentions six of the best known. From these lists, which supplement one another in welcome fashion, we get the names of 20 colleges.

From the dates of foundation we find that the oldest of the madrasas still standing in Meshhed is the Madrasa Dūdar, which was built in 823 (1420) by the Timūrid Sultan Shāh Rukh and restored by Salāmān I. Under the same ruler was built the Pārīzād Madrasa which was completely remodelled by Salāmān I. From the time of 'Abbās II date the two almost contemporary colleges Khirārī Khān (1058 = 1649) and Mīrzā Dījā'far (1059 = 1650). The majority of the older colleges, no fewer than nine in number, date from the time of Salāmān I, who also restored some buildings (1666—1694). As to the Kādārs, one was founded in the reign of Fāṭīmā Shāh and two in that of Nāṣīr al-Dīn, who also restored two that had fallen into ruins.

From an artistic point of view, the finest is the Madrasa of Mīrzā Dījā'far which was built and richly endowed in 1659 (1650) by a Persian of this name who had made a fortune in India. It is generally regarded as the third finest building in Meshhed, next to the Mausoleum of 'Ali al-Ridā and the Diwāhar Shāhī Mosque. In its plan, with vaulted halls and courtyard with niches, and its rich decoration, it follows the style of the courts and mosques of the sacred area above described, typical of the ecclesiastical architecture of Persia (cf. above, li. 439, 447 sq. and also Fraser, p. 466—467). Not only the Madrasa of Mīrzā Dījā'far but also other richly endowed colleges, like that of Pā'īn-Pā'ī (both of the time of Salāmān I) owe their origin to Persians who had made fortunes in India (cf. on the foundation of the two last named colleges: Fraser, p. 457—459; Sykes, The Glory etc., pp. 267—269). The most esteemed colleges are in the Bast, namely the three already mentioned as the oldest, Dūdar, Pārīzād and Khirārī Khān, also Iltīsār and 'Ali Naḳī Mīrzā. Others, like the above mentioned Mīrzā Dījā'far Madrasa and the Mustaṣṭar Madrasa have doors communicating with the Šah-n-i Khāna of the Haram quarter.

Students also live in the madrasas, their maintenance being provided for by pious endowments. While in Khanikoff's time (1858) there were no outstanding teachers there and the number of students was small, the reputation of the Meshhed colleges went up again in the second half of the 19th century so that Sykes (The Glory etc., p. 267 sq.) in 1910 puts the attendance at 1,000 students, who came from Persia, India and other Shi'a regions. The student who wishes to take a higher theological training after the nine years' course at Meshhed must go to Meshhed 'Ali (Nedjeff, q. v.) and attend the lectures of the teachers there, who are the first authorities on Shi'a theology.

We have no details of the libraries of the Meshhed colleges. Of the rich Fāṭimā Khān Madrasa, Fraser only says (p. 457) that it has a valuable library. The administration of the Haram also has a large and valuable collection of books (cf. its location see the plan in Yate, p. 332, No. 65 and cf. No. 29), founded in the first half of the xvth century by Sultan Shāh Rukh. The treasures accumulated under him and his successors were for the most part lost when Meshhed was sacked by
the Ozbegs under 'Abd al-Mu'min Khan (1589; cf. Yate, p. 318; Sykes, The Glory etc., p. 239; cf. also Herfeld, in Ephemerides Orientales, 1926, No. 28, p. 7—8). A thorough examination of the manuscripts here might give valuable results.

In this connection we may mention the activity of the Meshhed printing press. The town began with the last decade of the sixteenth century; see thereon Brown, The Press and Poetry of Modern Persia (Cambridge 1914), p. 348 (Index, s. v. Meshed); Brown, Literary History of Persia, iv., Cambridge 1928, p. 233, 489; Mahdi 'Alawi, p. 12.

Meshed is remarkably rich in mosques which are built in the sacred area, at cemeteries and at separate ways, and are connected with madrasas and other buildings of a religious character.

Here we may also mention the Musalla which stands outside the town, 1/2 mile from the Fárin Khiyá'íén gate on the Haráát road. It is a hall (arváán) about 30 feet high which opens into a great arch about 60 feet high.

However picturesque Meshed may look from outside, the impression one gets on entering it is far from pleasing, excepting the Bst which forms a separate enclave. Except for the already described broad main street (Khiyá'íán), there are only narrow dark alleys the level of which is almost always considerably above that of the inner courts of the houses of brick, so that they can only be entered by long gloomy passages (cf. Khanikoff, p. 304; Yate, p. 328).

As to the population of Meshed, — the permanent residents, excluding the many pilgrims — it is at its highest in the reign of Nádir Sháh, who frequently held his court here and in every way contributed to the prosperity of the town. At that date Meshed had not less than 60,000 inhabitants. But the half century of turmoil which followed the reign of Nádir Sháh brought about a great decline in the town so that only 5,000 houses were reckoned there in 1796 (cf. Yate, p. 330). In the sixteenth century a slow but steady rise. Trulliher in 1807 estimated the number of houses at 4,000; Fraser in 1822 at 7,700 with 25,300 inhabitants. Conolly (1830) and Burnes (1832) estimate 40,000 inhabitants; Ferrier (1845) and Khanikoff (1858) at 60,000. In 1875 Khabirzadeh suffered a terrible famine and 24,000 in Meshed alone died of starvation (see Goldsáimid, i. 361).

Baker is too high in putting the figure at 80,000 in 1873 and Curzon too low at 45,000 for 1889. Meshed at the present day is said to have 100,000 inhabitants (see Mahdi 'Alawi, p. 4); it is in any case the third largest town in Persia.

The permanent population of Meshed is a rather mixed one; in consequence of the great influx of pilgrims and the commerce which was very great at least in an earlier period, many foreigners (Turkomans, Afghanis, Indians etc.) settled in Meshed. Except for a very small section, all the Muslims of the town are Shi'ís. The small number of Sunnis are mainly Afghans and Turkomans. We have already mentioned that the Masjidi Sháh and the Makbara Khvá'í Kabi are used by the Sunnis. The number of Christians is infinitesimal and is confined to a few Armenian traders and the personnel of English and Russian consulates established in 1889.

Nádir Sháh settled 100 Jewish families in Meshed whom he had transplanted from Kazwin. After his death their position became a miserable one, especially after the catastrophe which overwhelmed them in 1839. When in this year, during the celebration of the Muslim Kurbaan festival, a Jewess on medical advice placed her hand, which was suffering from an eruption, in the bowl of the holy sweet water dog, the Muhammadans took this for an insult to their religious observances. The excited mob, seizing the excuse, fell upon the Jewish quarter, plundering and murdering as they pleased and destroyed the synagogue. The surviving Jews had to adopt Islam. These Jewish converts are described by Dájjad, more fully Dájjad al-'Ism = "new comers to Islam", because their forced conversion is of recent date. The change of faith was only an external one; it is true that these Dájjad to avoid suspicion regularly attend the mosque, but not a few of them are said to observe their old rites in secret. The number of Judeo-Muslims in Meshed at the present day who are small traders, physicians, etc., was put by Basset (1878) at 300 families, by Yate at 200 in the Jews of Meshed and their persecution in 1839 (cf. Trulliher, p. 273; Conolly, i. p. 304—308; J. Wolff, Narrative, p. 177, 394—396; Ferrier, p. 122—125; J. J. Benjamin (see Rabi), p. 189—190; Vámbéry, Wanderungen, p. 324—325; Basset, p. 230—233; Yate, p. 322.

The clerical element is strong in the Muslim population; everywhere one sees mullás, 'ulamas (students) and derívishes. The town swarms with saiyádís (alleged descendants of 'Ali among whom the 'Ish'á'í, who claim descent from 'Ali al-Khá'í, enjoy special privileges. Meshed is not only one of the most famous cities in the whole Muslim world but also one of the most immoral in Asia. Prostitution, the so-called pilgrim marriage (Pers. Dárát: cf. Muri' and iv., p. 353, 355), sanctioned by the 'Imámi group of the Shá'í, abounds here. Most pilgrims take advantage of this in the institutes of temporary marriage (cf. Khanikoff, p. 98; Curzon, i. 164—165; Ibrahim Beg, p. 45; Yate, p. 419: Allemane, iii. 86—87).

The people of Meshed are described as very superstitious; see especially Basset, p. 228 cf. and the Meshed Stories in Conolly, i. 316—318. Many stories are told of miracles wrought in the holy sanctuaries: see Fraser, p. 451—452; Basset, p. 426—427; Massy, p. 992—993, 1002; Yate, p. 325—337.

The population of the town lives partly by catering for pilgrims and partly on local industries and commerce.

The industries, once very flourishing, have now declined. The famous manufacture of sword blades, introduced by a colony of swordsmen transplanted by Timur from Persia, has now almost entirely disappeared (cf. Trulliher, p. 275; Fraser, p. 124; Ferrier, p. 468; Curzon, i. 160).

A speciality of Meshed is the manufacture of decorated vessels (household utensils, like jugs, pots, dishes etc.) out of serpenite and dark grey soapstone (Meshed stone), from the quarries 11/2 hours south of Meshed. This stone industry is old and the Arabic sources of the middle ages mention it as native to the district of Tásh and especially to the town of Nükán (the predecessor of Meshed), cf. B. Götz, ii. 313; iii. 324—326; al-Muhallabi in Al-Bukhári, p. 452; Ali Hámíd 'Alí Sháhání, in J. A., 1925, p. 203; Yü'úsuf, iv. 824 and cf. G. Le Strange, op. cit.
For the sixth century cf. Trullihier, p. 274–275; Fraser, p. 469; Ferrier, p. 124; Bellew, p. 356–367; Baker, p. 184; MacGregor, i. 291–292; Bennett, p. 234; Curzon, i. 167.

Persia, the trade in the turquoise mines east of Meshhed (about 16 days’ journey distant; cf. FiehEits and Le Strange, op. cit., p. 368; Fraser, p. 409–420; Ferrier, p. 106–107; Khankoil, p. 90–92; Bassett, p. 216–217; Yale, p. 399–408) at one time were of special significance in Meshhed’s trade and industry. Meshhed was the centre of the turquoise trade; for the whole output of these mines came to it and they were controlled by Meshed merchants. The turquoise were sorted in Meshed and put into commerce there. Now however, the finest specimens are usually sent directly abroad from the mines and only pieces of inferior quality come to Meshed, to be worked there by the still very stilled stone cutters into ornaments and souvenirs for pilgrims. On the turquoise industry of Meshed cf. Trullihier, p. 274; Bellew, p. 357; Goldsmith, i. 365; Baker, p. 234.

Weaving is another important industry in Meshed. The carpets produced here were at one time of immensely greater value than those of the present day, which are produced in factory fashion. The modern shawls of Kashmir style are especially prized and known as Meshed, as are the velvets, which in Fraser’s time were regarded as the best in Persia. On weaving in Meshed cf. Fraser, p. 468; Ferrier, p. 124; Goldsmith, i. 365; Baker, p. 184–185; Curzon, i. 167; Ibrahim Beg, p. 47; Schweinitz, p. 27–28; Allemagne, iii. 110.

Until the second half of the sixth century, Meshed was one of the first emporia of Eastern Iran. At the intersection of important caravan routes, it was the entrepôt for the trade of Central Asia and especially of Afghanistan. Since however Russia has become established in Turkistan and built the Transcaspian railway, Meshed’s trade has much declined. Nevertheless the town must still be described as an important centre of traffic and trade, not least on account of the numerous pilgrim routes that lead to it. Meshed is 150 miles from the Russian railway station of Ashkabad [q. v.], the capital of the Transcaspian area; there is a good road between the two towns.

For the housing of the numerous pilgrims and other strangers who come to Meshed, a considerable number of caravanserais are available. In Fraser’s time (1822), there were at least 25–30 such places in use, apart from some that had been abandoned and allowed to fall into ruins (see Fraser, Narrative, p. 460). Khankoil (p. 107–108) gives 16, four of which, intended for pilgrims only, were inside the last; of these latter the oldest is the Sultân Caravanseri, built by Tahmâsp I; others date from Sulamân I.


**MESSHD HUSAIN (KEBELA)**, a place of pilgrimage west of the Euphrates about 60 miles S.W. of Baghdad on the edge of the desert (Yākh, Mādīm, ed. Wüstenfeld. iv. 249). It lay opposite Kāsir ibn Hubaira (al-Iṣākhī, B.G.A., 1, 85; cf. al-Baladhūrī, *Futūh*, ed. de Goeje, p. 287; al-Makdisī, B.G.A., i. 121. The name Kēbela is probably connected with Aram. Krbēla (Daniel, 3. xx) and Assyr. Karbalā (a kind of headress) (G. Jacob, *Türkische Bibliothek*, xi. 35. note 2). It is not mentioned in the pre-Arab period.

After the taking of al-Iṣāf, Khalīd b. al-Wahd is said to have encamped in Kēbela (Yākhū, ir. 250). On the 13th of the 1st month (the 9th Muḥarram) 61 (Oct. 10, 680) the Imām Husain b. 'Alī (cf. ii., p. 339) on the march from Mecca to the Ḥira, where he intended to enforce his claims to the Caliphate, fell in the plain of Kēbela in the district of al-Tabarī, iii. 2190; Yākhū, ir. 870; now according to Māssignon Khānā Kāʿā; according to Musil: Ishān Nainwa) in a battle with the troops of the governor of al-Kūfa and was buried in al-Ḥār (Yākhū, ii. 188 sq.; al-Tabarī, iii. 752; E. Herzfeld, cf. above, ii., p. 221).

The place where the decapitated body of the Prophet's grandson was interred (on the fate of the head which was cut off and sent to Damascus to Varsī, cf. van Berchem, *Festwrit*, ed. So- thawez, Berlin 1915, p. 298–310), called Kāb al-Husain, soon became a celebrated place of pilgrimage for the Shi'is (cf. art. sīfa'). As early as 65 (684–685) we find Sulaimān b. Šarāf going with his followers to Husain's grave where he spent a day and a night (al-Tabarī, ed. de Goeje, ii. 545 sq.). Ibn al-Athīr (*Ṭūrīk*, ed. Tornberg, v. 184; ix. 338) mentions further pilgrimages in the years 122 (739–740) and 346 (1054–1055). The parts of Meshed Husain at quite an early date were endowed by the pious benefactions of Ann Mūsā, mother of the Caliph al-Mahdā (al-Tabarī, iii. 752).

The Caliph al-Mutawakkil in 236 (850–851) destroyed the tomb and its annexes and had the ground levelled and sown; he prohibited under threat of heavy penalties visiting the holy places (al-Tabarī, iii. 1407; Ḥamd Allah al-Mustawfī, *Nizāt al-Khūlāb*, ed. Le Strange, p. 32). Ibn Hawkal (ed. de Goeje, p. 160), however, mentions about 977 A.D. a large meghed with a domed chamber, entered by a door on each side, over the tomb of Husain, which in his time was already much visited by pilgrims. Dābī b. Mūhammad al-Asā'ī of 'Ain al-Tamr, supreme chief of a number of tribes, devastated Meshed al-Ḥār (Kēbela) along with other sanctuaries in which a punitive expedition was sent against 'Ain al-Tamr in 369 (979–980) before which he fled into the desert (Ibn Miskawaih, *Ṭūrīk*, ed. Le Strange, p. 32). Ibn Sāfin (ed. de Goeje, p. 160), however, mentions another large meghed with a domed chamber, entered by a door on each side, over the tomb of Husain, which in his time was already much visited by pilgrims. Dābī b. Mūhammad al-Asā'ī of 'Ain al-Tamr, supreme chief of a number of tribes, devastated Meshed al-Ḥār (Kēbela) along with other sanctuaries in which a punitive expedition was sent against 'Ain al-Tamr in 369 (979–980) before which he fled into the desert (Ibn Miskawaih, *Ṭūrīk*, ed. Le Strange, p. 32).


In Rābiʾ al-awwal 407 (Aug./Sept. 1016), a great conflagration broke out caused by the upsetting of two wax candles, which reduced the main building (al-Kabba) and the open halls (al-Arwākha) to ashes (Ibn al-Athīr, ix. 209).

When the Saḵitū Shāhīn Shah Shāh came to Baghādād in 479 (1086–1087) he did not neglect to visit the two Mesheds of Ḵal and al-Husain (Ibn al-Athīr, x. 103). The two sanctuaries at this time were known as al-Maghābān (al-Bundāši al-Iṣākhī. *Ṭawīrīk*, ed. Houtsma, in *Revue des textes*, ii. 77) on the analogy of the duals al-Iṣākhān, al-Bundān, al-Iṣākhān, al-Mīrankān.

The Ikhān Ghażān in 1303 visited Kerbelā and gave lavish gifts to the sanctuary. He or his father Argān is credited with bringing water to the district by leading a canal from the Frāt (the modern Nahr al-Husaynīya) (A. Noldeke, *Das Heiligum al-Husayn zu Kerbalā*, Berlin 1909, p. 40). Ibn Bāṭnātā (ed. Defremery and Sanguinetti, ii. 99) visited Kerbelā in 727 (1325–1327) from al-Ḥilla and describes it as a small town which lies among palm groves and gets its water from the Frāt. In the centre is the sacred tomb; beside it is a large madrasa and the famous hostel
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the alluvial plain it is an important "desert port" for trade with the interior of Arabia.

The old town with its tortuous streets is surrounded by modern suburbs. About half to three quarters of the citizens are Persians, the remainder Shi'i Arabs. The most important tribes among them are the Bani Sa'd, Salâme, al-Wuzûm, al-Tâhâmaz and al-Nâşiriyê. The Dede family is the richest: for constructing the Nahr al-Husainiya it was rewarded with extensive estates by Sultan Selim.

The name Kerbelâ strictly speaking only applies to the eastern part of the palm gardens which surround the town in a semi-circle on its east side (Muñil, The Middle Empires, p. 41). The town itself is called al-Meshhed or Meshhed al-Husain.

The sanctuary of the third Imâm lies in a court yard (šahra) 354 x 270 feet in area, which is surrounded by 726 ans and cells. Its walls are decorated with a continuous ornamental band which is said to contain the whole Kur'ân written in white on a blue ground. The building itself is 156 x 138 feet in area. The rectangular main building entered by the "golden outer hall" (picture in Grothe, Geogr. Charakterbilder, pl. Ixxviii., fig. 136) is surrounded by a vaulted corridor (now called Mâna; A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 20, 3) in which the pilgrims go round the sanctuary (pawâf) (Wehlar, Reise arâb. Heidennamen, p. 100—112). In the middle of the central domed chamber is the shrine (sârâb) of Husain about 6 feet high and 12 long surrounded by silver mazhribiya work, at the foot of which stands a second smaller shrine, that of his son and companion-in-arms ʿAlî Akbar (Māsun, Kitâb al-Tanbûh, ed. de Goeje, B. G. A., vii. 503).

"The general impression made by the interior must be called fairy-like, when in the dusk — even in the daytime it is dim inside — the light of innumerable lamps and candles around the silver shrine, reflected a thousand and again a thousand times from the innumerable small crystal facets, produces a effect like the dreams of imagination. In the roof of the dome the light loses its strength; only here and there a few crystal surfaces gleam like the stars in the sky" (A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 25 sq.).

The sanctuary is adorned on the Kibla face with magnificent and costly ornamentation. Two manâtras flank the entrance. A third, the Manâfr al-ʿAbd, rises before the buildings on the east side of the Šahra; south of it the face of the buildings surrounding the court recedes about 50 feet; on this spot is a Sunna mosque. Adjoining the Šahra on the north side is a large medrese the courtyard of which measures about 85 feet square with a mosque of its own and several mihrâbs (on the present condition of the sanctuary: cf. A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 5—26, on its history p. 35—50 and on its architectural history, p. 51—66).

About 600 yards N.E. of the sanctuary of Husain is the mausoleum of his half-brother ʿAbbâs. On the road which runs westward out of the town is the site of the tent of Husain (Khaunagâh). The building erected there (plan in Noldeke, pl. viii.; photograph in Grothe, pl. Ixxxviii., fig. 145) has the plan of a tent and on both sides of the entrance there are stone copies of camel saddles.

On the desert plains (seh) west of the town stretch the graves of the devout Shi'is. North of the gardens of Kerbelâ lie the suburbs, gardens.
and fields of al-Bikâr, N.W. those of Kurra, S. those of al-Qâhêriyya (Yâkût, iii. 768). Among places in the vicinity, Yâkût mentions al-Akr (iii. 695) and al-Nawâyi (iv. 816).

A branch line diverging north of al-Hilla connects Kerbelâ with the Baghdad–al-Basra railway. Caravan roads lead to al-Hilla and Najaf. The sanctuary of Hûsain still has the reputation of securing entrance to Paradise for those buried there, because many aged pilgrims and those in failing health go there to die on the holy spot.


(E. Hönigmann)

**MESHED-I MISHRIYAN**, a ruined site in Transsaspians (Turkmenian). N. W. of the confluence of the Atrak and its right bank tributary the Sunbar, or more exactly, on the road which runs from Cât at right angles to the road connecting Cikighir with the railway station of Aydân.

The ruins are surrounded by a wall of brick and a ditch and have an area of 320 acres. The old town, situated in the steppes which are now peopled by Turkomans, received its water from a canal led from the Atrak about 40 miles above Cât. Near the latter place the canal diverged northwards from the river, crossed the Sunbar by a bridge and finally followed an embankment 6 feet high on which the bed of the canal was 12 feet broad.

The ruins of a fine mosque can still be seen, the gateway of which, decorated with faience, has an inscription according to which this ribât was built by 'Abî al-Dânya; wa 'Abî-Allah al-Islâm wa 'Abî-Mus'lîm ZZîl Allâh fî. 'Abî-Mus'lîm Sultan Mu-Samam b. Sultan Tâkî, Bûtân Amîr al-Mu'minîn. The Khârîshâshâh Maülâmmed in question reigned 1200–1220. On one of the two towers (minarets) is written: bismilâh ... barakanâ min Allâm majma' amara bihi Abî Dîführ Afméd b. Abî 'Abd-Allâh sâhîl al-ribât, d'azwâzi 'llâmâ. *Anâl Ali R. (.) (.)*. The identity of this Afméd is unknown but the title "lord of the ribât" which he gives himself, confirms the fact that M.-Mishriyân was a frontier fortress (ribât). Near the east gate stood another white mosque.

Tradition (Conolly) ascribes the destruction of Mishriyân to the "Kâlmuq Tatars". The appearance of the Kâlmuqs in these regions may be dated about 1600.

The name Meshed-i Mishriyân (variants: Mes-\-torian, Mest-\-Dobian, Mest-\-Dovran, Mustan) is obscure, unless Mestorian is to be explained as "Nestoriyan "Nestorian Christians"; it may be that during his campaign in the Col (*弥勒," to the east of the Caspian, Yazlagird II persecuted the Christians (Hoffmann, p. 50; Labouret, Le christianisme dans l'Empire d'Occident, 1824, p. 126).

The site of the ruin (to the north of Djûrđân) is given the name Dihîsân in Muslim sources, which recalls the name of the old Scythian people Daha who led a nomadic life on the Atrak (Grek Άθα and ἁθά; cf. Tomachev in Paulycl-Wissowa, Real-Encycl. ü., iv., col 1945). From the Dahan clan of the Pomôi was descended the Arghakhâdi dynasty which imposed its authority on the Parthians (cf. Mi\-norsky, Transcaspia, J.A., 1930, July–Sept., p. 6).

The basin of the Atrak (the ancient Škêra) is at the extreme limit of the lands described in the classical and Muslim annal geographers. The sources mention several settlements in Dihîsân but in a somewhat confusing fashion. As the analysis by Hoffmann and by Barthold has shown, a distinction must be made between: 1. the settlement on the sea-shore, 2. the town of Dihîsân and 3. the ribât Dihîsân.

1. The first of these was built on a promontory (dokht) behind which ships could shelter. Martz, Erzähler, p. 130, reads the name concealed in the variants in ɪstâkhrî, p. 219, note b, as "Dihîsân Bayâsîn" which he connects with the district of Bayâsan mentioned (in Dihêrjan) by Tabari, ii. 1330; Bairazi, p. 337 and Ibn Khûr-\-dâdhîbû, p. 35. The Hûdod al-\-Àâm mentions a peninsula of Dihîsân-Sur on the coast of Dihîsân. This خرب may be an echo of the name of the Turkish (†) princes (Hoffmann, p. 281) who attacked Djûrđân from the north (Ibn al-\-Athîr, ii. 22). Lastly Tabari, ii. 1325, locates an island of Buhaira 5 farsakh from Dihîsân. Barthold identifies all these names with the cape of Hasan-Kul which shelters the bay into which the Atrak flows. (If also the article تیکان, on the Dizî-\-Aram mentioned in the شیخ-\-نامه).
A difficulty is raised by Iṣṭakhrī (p. 219) who puts at 50 farsākh and p. 226 at 6 marbala (each of 87/a farsākh) the distance between Abasḵân (at the mouth of the river Djurdjân, now Giummāsh-tapā?) and the cape of Dihistān in question. If we follow this double indication literally, we ought (with Hoffmann, p. 279, who reads the name "Dihistān—Tābahīr") to move the cape of Dihistān considerably to the north, in the bay of Krasawodsk, which is certainly a very important place. In this case the cape would be a different one from Bahāʾī = Ḥasan Kūli (Hoffmann, p. 278).

2. The town of Dihistān, according to the middle Persian list of the towns of Erān, was founded by a certain Narsaḵhār the Arḵakid (Marquart, Erānī, p. 73) and according to the Nāṣr al-Kūhī, p. 166, by the Sāsnād Khūshā b. Pūrtāz. According to Muḥaddāsī, the town of Dihistān was called Akhūr. Tabārī locates (the town of) Dihistān 23 farsākh from (the river of) Djurdjān and, as we have seen, 3 farsākh from Bahāʾī. This latter distance is by the way less than the actual distance between Ḥasan Kūli and Meshēd-i-Miṣrīyān.

3. The ruins of Meshēd-i-Miṣrīyān (as the inscription on the mosque suggests) must correspond to the town of Dihistān, which Muḥaddāsī, p. 358 (cf. also p. 312, 367, 372) mentions distinct from Akhūr. This ribāṭ situated on the borders of the steppes had fine mosques and rich markets. Relying on Yāḵtā, i. 39, Barthold thinks that in the ninth century the ribāṭ (and not Akhūr) to the east of the Djurdjān-ribāṭ road) was the capital of the district of Dihistān.


(M. Minorsky)

MESFI, an important Ottoman poet of the time of Bayzid II. Born in Frighina (northern Albania), he came as a youth to Constantinople and there he became a sofat (theological student) and distinguished himself as a calligrapher. In the end he won the favour of the grand vizier Kâdim Alī Pasha [q. v.] and became his divan-kâtip. But his irregular life and carelessness in the performance of his duties frequently irritated his patron (Alī Pasha called him Skhī r ʾeghūtān). He held his post, however, till the death of Alī Pasha in 917 (1511) in battle against the Shīʿis rebels under Shāh Kūli. Mesfi wrote an elegy on his death, full of the deepest emotion.

His attempts to find a new patron failed. He had to be content with a miserable fief in Bosnia where he soon died in 918 (1512), poor and forgotten and still quite young.

According to Ahmad Pasha [q. v.] and Nedjāt (d. 914 = 1509), Mesfi was regarded as the third great Ottoman poet and the greatest lyric poet before Bâki. He is a most artistic and original figure. His output was not extensive, but of lasting influence. His Divān has not yet been printed, and a fate could be to nearly all important Turkish poets. In his lyric poems he is above the average of contemporary poets. In addition to the grace and delicacy of his diction, there is a certain novelty in his style. New images and pictures are introduced with great boldness, perhaps a result of his Albanian blood. The best known of his poems, in Europe is his Ode to Spring (marochba) which Sir William Jones published with a Latin translation: Poëtas Asiaticae commentariorum libri sex, Leipzig 1774 and has been repeatedly reprinted (by Toderini, by Wieland in the Deutsche Merkur, by J. v. Hammer etc.). His Divān is also of importance linguistically, for it bears the stamp of the language of Constantinople.

Mesfi's most original work is his Miṣnad, Skhī r-ʾengīz (the "Thriller of the Town"), which is also the most original work in Turkish literature down to Mesfi's time. It is original in subject also, as it did not have a Persian model.

It introduced quite a new style of poem, which was frequently imitated. Skhī r-ʾengīz represents the first attempt at humorous verse in Turkey, and its language is very close to the spoken speech. Here Mesfi could write Turkish to his heart's content, while in other forms he had to use the learned jargon. He laments in one passage that without Persian and Arabic there would be no room for him as a poet, even if he had come down from heaven.

Skhī r-ʾengīz is a burlesque catalogue of the beautiful "boys" of Adrianople — it is interesting to note that they are all Mūhammadan — and became popular on account of its unsuitable language.

As a product of his activity as a secretary, we also have a collection of inšī'ā, elegant specimens of epistolary style, not without historical interest, entitled Gūlī ʾSal Berg (the hundred-leaved rose). I have a manuscript of this work, which seems to be rather rare, of 991 (1583) entitled 'Inšī' ī Mesfi.'

Bibliography: Sehi, Heşık Bikhit, Constantinop. 1325, p. 109; Lauti, Topschi, Constantinop. 1314, p. 309–314; Thurey, ʾSāfīlā-ʾi ʾṭebāna, Constantinop. 1311, iv. 369; ʾSāmī, ʾKūmās, Constantinop. 1316, vi. 4286; Ahmad Rīfāt, Lughāt-i Ṭarīḵāhī, Constantinop. 1350, v. 50; H. ʿUsāmān al-Din, Amuṣiā-ʾṬarīḵāh, Constantinop. 1327, ii. 260; ʾNajīb ʾAṣīr, ʾMīshīl Divvānī, T.O. E.M., i. 300–308 (Notes historico-sociologiques tirées du divan de Meski). Mehmēd Tāhir, ʾOtbāźānī Miʿlīlīfīrī, Constantinop. 1333, i. 410 (the Divān in the Hamidiya-Library is numbered 1372 = 973). We should not find the copy of the inšī'ā in the Cat. of the Nūr-ʾi ʾṭebāna'; Hammer, G.O.D., i. 297–320; G.O. R. 2, i. 679; ʾSmīrūn, Otev ʾīstoriī, St. Petersburg 1891, iv. 477 (Kors); Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, London 1902, ii. 226–226; the Catalogues by Persich (Berlin, Gothä), Rieu a.o.

(Th. Menzel)
MEZWOMORTO, an Ottoman Grand Admiral whose real name was IZDIJH HUSAIN PASHA.

Hadjdjy Husein Pasha, known as Mezzomorto, i.e. "half-dead" because he was severely wounded in a naval battle, came from the Balearic Islands, if A. de la Motraye's statement (Voyages, The Hague 1727, i. 206) that he was born in Mallorca is right. He probably spent his youth sailing with corsairs on the seas off the North African coast. He first appears as a desperate pirate in the summer of 1682 in the Barbary States. When France was preparing to deal a decisive blow at the powers of Algiers, whose arrogance had passed all bounds, he was handed over as a hostage to the French after the bombardment of Algiers, but managed to return there, to strike down with his own hand, in a mimicry of the mercenaries whom he had stirred up, the Dey of Algiers Baba Hasan, who was ready to make peace and to fight his way to the head of the state (summer of 1683; cf. Zinkeisen, G.O.R., v. 51 sq.). Husein Reis in the following year concluded with Louis XIV of France a truce for a hundred years, which however was only of brief duration. His own rule over Algiers was not long either (till 1688; cf. A. Bernard, L'Algérie, Paris 1902, p. 159). Ten years later, in Muhammad I. 1107 (Aug. 1693), Husein Reis, who had already distinguished himself as commander of a galleon (kştän) (kştän-i dorya) in succession to Amüldj率达到Husein Pasha, who was appointed governor of Adana after the taking of Chios. He owed his promotion to his skilful seamanship at the capture of Chios where he distinguished himself in the battle with the Venetian fleet (spring of 1695). In 1697 Husein Pasha inflicted a disastrous defeat on the Venetian Captain General Alessandro Molino off the island of Lemnos, and in the following year in a naval fight on July 6 with Molino's successor, Giacomo Cornaro, near Mytilene it was very doubtful whether the Crescent on the Lion of St. Mark gained the victory (cf. Zinkeisen, G.O.R., v. 183, from the account by the imposante Garzoni in his Istoria della Repubblica di Venezia, Venice 1705, p. 644 sqq. 691 sqq. 748 sqg. and 775 sqg.) Ottoman authorities and the historian Rashid (fol. 231; cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., vi. 635) credit the victory to the Ottomans. In 1113 Mezzomorto was dismissed from his rank and re

placed by 'Abd al-Fattah Pasha. He retired to Chios, where his adventurous life came to an end in the same year on the 13th Safar 1113 (July 20, 1701, according to Safvet, op. cit.), on the 14th Safar 1114 (i.e. July 9, 1702) according to others. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., vi. 766 and vii. 624, gives the date as 15th Rabii-i 1113 (Aug. 20, 1701). One of these dates is probably that of his dismissal.


MIDHANA, [See MANARA.]

MIDJAT PASHA, Ottoman statesman, twice grand vizier.

Midhat Pasha was born in Stambul in Safar 1238 (beg. Oct. 18, 1822), the son of Hddjdjy 'Ali Efendi-Zade Hddjdjy Hdsig Mjemmed Efendi Efendi, a native of Kuschuk. The family seem to have been a profession Bektashi and Midhat Pasha also had a leaning towards them. His earliest youth was spent in his parents' home at Wildin, Lošca (Bulgaria) and later in Stambul, where his father held judicial offices. In 1836 he was working in the secretariat of the grand vizier and later he filled confidential posts in various governovernors' (including two years in Damascus). In 1841 he came to Konya and in 1849 became second, in 1851 first secretary to the Council (savciler-ve'lası). In 1854 the grand vizier Kebir-Mehmed Pasha gave him the difficult task of pacifying the provinces of Adrianople and the Balkans and clearing them of robber bands. Here he displayed for the first time his special talent for administration, which were not unnoticed by the Porte and soon afterwards brought him the appointment of governor of the Danube districts (Wildin, Siltin). In 1858 he spent six months travelling for study in western Europe, including Vienna, Paris, Brussels and London. In 1851 he was appointed governor (sâhiil-i*) of Denizli and Priyren with which he was already familiar from his time in the Porte, where he earned distinction by his pacification of the country, so that, when the new organization of wilayets was carried out in 1864, he was given the model province, Danube-Bulgaria (Fati Wilayet). During his four years' governorship, he raised the province to a level rate in Turkey, although it was only under his successor that the people learned to thank him for it. He built schools and educational institutes everywhere, created funds to make advances to and support useful undertakings, built hospitals, granaries, roads (2,000 miles) and bridges (1,400) and improved communications in every way. As he required money for all these progressive undertakings, which the government could not give him and he would not receive by abuse of taxation, he raised the necessary funds by "voluntary contribution" from the people. The Bulgars, with whom for national reasons he had no sympathy, suffered not a little from the enterprising spirit and unrestrained love of work of the young governor who, of unbending will and inexorable severity, was of a nature not attractive, but rather arrogant and conceited. At the same time he was quite modern in his views and had no scruples about
1876 Midhat Pasha became grand vizier for the second time, and five days later, the constitution was solemnly proclaimed. The reactionary party and a powerful camarilla never ceased its endeavours to bring about the fall of Midhat Pasha and to bring his progressive schemes to nought. Under the pretext of high treason he was dismissed on Feb. 5, 1877 and banished to Europe. He was put upon a steamer and went via Rome and Paris to England. He was only permitted to return in 1878 and then only to Crete. In November 1878 under pressure from England, he was appointed governor-general of Syria. In 1880 he was transferred to Smyrna as governor. Here Abd al-Hamid's wrath overwhelmed him. In May 1881 he was arrested and brought to Stambul. The latter charge of having caused the assassination of Sultan 'Abd al-Aziz was brought against him. Midhat Pasha was condemned to death but the sentence was not carried out. He was banished for life to Tā'īf in Arabia. After repeated attempts to poison him, he was strangled on April 10, 1883 (Radjah 29, 1301) in prison. In this tragic fashion ended the life of one of the most notable and best statesmen of Turkey, perhaps the most important administrator that the Ottoman empire has produced in modern times. Midhat Pasha had a son, 'Ali Haidar Midhat Bey, who after his death conducted a campaign to clear his memory and wrote a very full life of his father.

Rbiography: The main source for the life of Midhat Pasha is the work of his son 'Ali Haidar Midhat Bey, which appeared in 2 vols. entitled Midhat Pasha, Hayati-i iyiyileyi, hikmati, mensü hayati at Stambul in 1325 (1909) (vol. 1: Taşkıri-i ibret; vol. 2: Miftahi-i Hafet, Hidaf press). — He had previously published The Life of Midhat Pasha. By his son 'Ali Haydar Midhat, London 1903, xii, and Midhat-Pasha, ta väi — son awwer. Par son fifs Ali Haydar Midhat Bey, Paris 1908, xxii. A kind of translation of these works is: Vasef Kamal Bey Hatatta, Muğżhəhur Midhat Pasha, 1st ed., 2 vols. (Paris, 1910), 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Paris, 1916). — Another work was given him which had not been accepted with reluctance and held for barely three months. On Feb. 17, 1874 he was again dismissed and retired once more to private life. He used the leisure thus forced upon him to work out the schemes which he later unfolded and which meant a decisive change in the orientation of the Ottoman empire. In August 1875 his old enemy Mahmud Nedim Pasha, who had again received the imperial seals, appointed him minister of justice but by November he had handed in his resignation which was accepted. The empire was then in a state of complete confusion rising, famine, an empty treasury and a hostile people. Midhat Pasha then composed his famous memorandum of March 9, 1876, which was to have such momentous results. On May 20, 1876 he entered the cabinet of the grand vizier Muterrif Ahmed Rushdi Pasha as minister without portfolio. In the night of May 30, Sultan 'Abd al-Aziz was deposed and Murad V raised to the throne of his fathers. On July 15, a proclamation issued in the name of the new sovereign used for the first time the word "constitution". Midhat Pasha was the soul of the new movement and he worked ardenty with a few kindred spirits to give Turkey a constitution. Sultan Murad V became insane and was replaced by his brother 'Abd al-Hamid; on December 18,
Leipzig 1878, p. 82 sqq.; [G. Dempoßoff], Snrail and Shoe Ptolemy, Vienna 1879, p. 237 sqq.; Carl Desse, Geschichte der Buchdruckerei in den Turkei, Vienna 1906, p. 37 sqq. But the western sources have mainly to be used with caution, as the very varying statements about its origin, date and place of birth show.

(From R. Baringer)

MIDILLÜ, Turkish form for Mytilene, name of the island of Lesbos, which in the middle ages had already taken the name of its capital. The island is about 650 sq. m. in area and has two large gulf, the Gulf of Kalloni (Kaláma) and that of Jeros (Kelemia). When Mytilene first became acquainted with the island, it belonged to the Byzantine empire. Its conquest in the reign of the emperor Alexios Comnenos in 1084 (1054) by the Emir of Smyrna, Techas, father-in-law of the Seldjük Khalil Arslan I b. Sulaiman, was only temporary. After the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins (1204), the island passed for a time to the Venetians. In 1355, the emperor John Palaeologus, on the marriage of his sister with the Genoese Francesco Gattilusio, granted the island to the latter as a fief. It belonged to this family until Mehmed II the Conqueror took Constantinople in 1454. The last Sultan to pay tribute to the Turks, to which the Gattilusio had in the hope of retaining their position readily agreed; and when the grand vizier Hamza Pasha in 1456 anchored off Lesbos on the voyage to Rhodes, the prince Döno Gattilusio sent rich gifts to the Turkish commander through the lieutenant Ducas. After the death of Dornno, his son and successor Domenico sent an embassy under the same Ducas to try to gain the good graces of the Sultan, but the Turks imposed rather harsh conditions. In 1458 Domenico was slain by his brother Nicolaus who had escaped from Lemnos and the latter seized the island. On the pretext that he had given shelter to the pirates that harassed the A. Minor coast and had committed other acts hostile to the Sultan, Mehmed II in 1462 set out against Lesbos. The grand vizier Miqmat Pasha conducted the siege of the capital. It was taken on 27 days' bombardment and the Sultan received the surrender of the island in person (Xedji Pasha Zade, ed. Giese, Leipzig 1899, p. 158 sqq.; Hadji: Khalifa, Tuhf el-Abyad il-Efsar al-Ra'is, Constantinople 1844 [1728-1729], fol. 6²; Hammer, ii. 15, 67; Zinkeisen, ii. 226, 239 sqq.). A mosque in the citadel of Midillü was built by Fath; cf. Newton, i. 117; Koldewey, p. 11.

Attempts of the Venetians under Orsato Guisti-nian (1464) to take the island from the Turks failed (v. Hammer, ii. 81 sqq.). An expedition against the island in 1500 of the allied French and Venetian fleets was thwarted by the Turkish forces (v. Ham-mer, ii. 337; Hadji: Khalifa, ed. supra, fol. 108). Since that date the island has been in undisputed possession of the Turks during the Balkan War it was handed over to the Greeks on Nov. 24, 1912 and finally conceded to them by the Peace of London of May 30, 1913, although with certain reservations by Turkey.

The island, the largest in the Archipelago, belonged to the "wilayet of the Archipelago" (Djezzar-i Bahr-i sefid) and formed in it the sandjak of Midillü with 5 kazas: Midillü (with the capital, in the east of the island); Pilemar (= Plomary, in the south); Molova (= Molivo, the anti- cient Methynna, in the north); Sighri in the west of the island; and lastly the Junda Islands (Maskonisi) of Midillü; cf. Sani, Kamal d'Al-Ma'moun, i. 1894, 4243; Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii. 449—472; cf. also: Suleiman Fa'is, Rikhal Derya, i. (Stambul 1929), p. 55 sqq. — According to Bae-deker 1014, the island had 140,500 inhabitants of whom 6/7th were Greeks and 1/7th Muhammadans.

Bibliography: On the island in ancient times and most of the questions connected with it, see the very full article by Burchner on Lesbos in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, xii. (1925), col. 2107—2133.

A full description for the earlier Turkish period is given in his Turk Piri Re's in his Behiye written in 1521; this section has been translated by Maximilian Bittner in Paul Kretsch- mer, Der heutige Littische Dialekt (= Schriften der Balkankommission, 11,4), Vienna 1905, col. 579—584 and in my ed. of the Behiye of Piri Re's (Berlin and Leipzig 1925), chap. ix.: Midillü, text p. 21—26, transl. p. 32—42.

The most important later descriptions are those of Pococke, Description of the East, v.1/1, London 1745; Newton, Travels and Discoveries in the Levant, London 1805, i. 37 sqq.: A. Conze, Reise auf der Insel Assyros and R. Koldewey, Die antiken Bauwerke der Insel Lesbos. In Auftrage des Kaiserlich-Deutschen Archologischen Institutes untersucht und aufgenommen, Berlin 1890. This book gives details of early explorations of the island and accurate maps on a larger scale of sections of it.

MIDIMARA, the censer, from jamara, "glowing coal". The Arabic name for the con- stellation of the A. where the Scorpion (scorpio) in Arabus, arc in Uccco, Manulis etc.) or censer (jaqar in Prome, tarbun in Geminius.


MIDRĀR BANE. [See SULAMITI.]

MIHNA (A.), noun derived from the root m-h-n, appearing in the Arabic verb mahan, "to smooth", and in some Ashtopian derivations, tsg. (e.g. the trials to which the prophets and especially the family of Muhammad. the 'Alids, are exposed in this world. cf. Goldzweig, Vorlesungen, p. 212 sqq. 261.), inquisition. In the latter sense it is usually applied to the Mu'tazilite inquisition and persecution extending from 215—234 (833—849). On the word form of the verb, mahan, "to torture", especially the so-called Inquisition des sultans mustabik, vide, p. 81, note 101.

The first Mu'tazilite inquisition was instituted towards the end of his reign by the A. al-Ma'mun (q.v. 195—218 = 835—853), who was a Mu'tazilite by conviction, especially with regard to the creation of the Qur'an [cf. the articles AL-QUR'AN and MU'TAZILITES]. He sent a letter to the governor of Bagdad, l-ḥāk b. Ibrāhīm, ordering him to cite before him the kāfis under his jurisdiction in order to test them in accordance with their opinion on the Qur'an (Tabari, ii. 1112 sqq., transl. by Paton, ed. cit., p. 57—61; Kahr Bu-Akhd, p. 338 sqq., cf. Abu l-Mahāsin, b. 556).
of the caliph (Abu l-Maḥāṣīn, i. 683; Patton, p. 115 sqq.), although it is said that he had restrained his father from prosecuting the miḥna any further. He ordered the governors of the provinces to know the consequences of this order. Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal in the meanwhile had become a favourite teacher; when, however, he heard of the renewed activity of Āḥmad b. Abī Dūād he refrained of his own will from teaching, and was henceforth left alone.

Al-Walīḥī personally intervened in the trial of one of these persons. The theologian Āḥmad b. Naṣr b. Mālik al-Kūzātī who had moreover taken part in a conspiracy (Weil, ii. 341; Patton, p. 116 sq.; cf. Tabari, iii. 1343 sqq.; de Goeje, Fragm. hist. arab., p. 529 sqq.). Questioned about the Kurʾān, al-Kūzātī replied that he believed it to be the word of God. The trial had not proceeded much farther, when the caliph put an end to it and personally made an attempt to behave his victim, in which he did not succeed without the assistance of some one more skilled than himself (Shaḥbān 231 = 846).

Other persons of note who remained steadfast under al-Walīḥī were Naʿūmān b. Ḥammād and the well known Abī Yaḥyā Yūsuf b. Abī Bawāji, the pupils of al-Salih, the editor and one of some of his works (Patton, p. 119). Both died in prison. As an instance of the fanaticism of Āḥmad b. Abī Dūād it is related that, when in 231 (846) it was proposed to ransom 4,600 Muslim prisoners from the Byzantines, he proposed to abandon those who would not admit the creation of the Kurʾān; this was actually done (Tabari, iii. 1351 sqq.; Fra.m. hist. arab., ii. 532; Abu l-Maḥāṣīn, i. 654; Patton, p. 120). It is said that al-Walīḥī gave up his Muʿzatīite views before his death. The miḥna continued to exist during the first years of the reign of his successor al-Mutawakkil (232—247 = 847—861), but in 234 this caliph stopped its application and forbade the profession of the creation of the Kurʾān on pain of death.

MIHRAB, the seventh month of the Persian solar year which runs from Sept. 17 to Oct. 16 and therefore begins the autumn. Mihr is also the name of the 16th day of each month. To distinguish between the month Mihr and the day, the former is called Mihr Māh and the latter Mihr Kūs. On the 16th Mihr, the day when Mihr Māh and Mihr Kūs coincide, called Mihr-gān, one of the great feasts begins, which is also called Mihr-gān and lasts till the 21st of the month. The first day of the feast is called Mihr-i ʿImāma, the general Mihr, the last Mihr-i khitān, the special, proper Mihr. The associations of this feast partly relate to the beginning of autumn, partly to the sun, whose name the month indeed bears, and partly to herioc legend: Mihr-gān is the feast of Firdūsū’s accession after his victory over Ḍaḥḥāk. The rites observed at the feast see the sources mentioned below.


**MIHRĪ MĀH SULTĀN. daughter of Sulaimān the Magnificent. Mihrī Māh (sometimes also written Mihr-ū-māh: cf. Karačelēbī-āde, Kaušat al-Ebrār, p. 458) was the only daughter of Sulaimān the Magnificent [q.v., as well as F. Babinger, *in Mißer der Politik*, III, Berlin 1933, p. 39—65]. While still quite young she was married to the grand vizier Rūstem Pāsha (cf. F. Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 81 sqq.) in the beginning of December 1539 (cf. J. H. Mordtmann, *in M. S. O. S., Year xxxi., Part 2, p. 17), but the marriage does not seem to have been a happy one. She used her enormous wealth — St. Gerlach in 1576 estimated her daily income at not less than 2,000 ducats (cf. *Tagbuck*, Frankfurt 1674, p. 266) — for many pious endowments. Among these the most important were the two mosques built by her, one in Şam at the Adriamopite gate (*Edirne Kōtus* Diyarbakır, and Eivlyı Şam at Sivas, 1567; Hājī Ḥusain, *Hadībat al-Dīnārîn*, i. 24 and J. v. H. Hammer, *G. O. K.,* ix. 50, No. 91) and the other (Mihr-i Māh Sultān Dāmānī; cf. Eivlyı, op. cit., i. 466 472 473; Hājī Ḥusain, op. cit., ii. 186 and J. v. H. Hammer, *G. O. K.,* ix. 128, No. 741) near the landing-stage in Şamatur. The second was the work of the great architect Sinān [q. v.] who built it in 954 (1547) and also erected a palace for Mihr-i Māh in Şamatur near this mosque. After her husband’s death (July 8, 1561) Mihr-i Māh Sultān intervened in political matters on several occasions; for example, she continually urged upon her father that the conquest of Malta should be one of the main undertakings of the Holy War and offered to equip 400 galleys for this campaign at her own expense. She was still alive at the reconciliation with her brother Selim and his accession. The correct date of her death, Jan. 25 1578 is given only by Gerlach, *Tagbuck*, p. 449: the date in Karačelēbī-āde, op. cit., p. 458, namely Dhu l-Ka’dā 954 (Jan. 20—Feb. 18, 1577), is a whole year out. She was buried beside her father in his turbe (tomb-mosque) in Şamatur. From her marriage with Rūstem Pāsha two sons and a daughter Vāhid Khānum were born: the latter married the grand vizier Ahmad Pāsha.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text, cf. Mehemed Tḥuraytā, *Ṣīḏīl-i ṣelḥmīn*, i. 83; J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, iii. 393, 425 and pass.: a description of the circumcision festivals of her sons Dāhāngīr and Bayāzīd is given in the Turkish MS., No. 34, fol. 453 sqq. in the Pruss. State Library (cf. W. Pertsch, *Verselhinas*, 66). (FR. BABINGER)

**MIHRĀB (see also MASHHĪD, D. C.) Derivation of the niche.** The mihrāb niche has been given a twofold origin by Orientalists and historians of art: from the Christian apsis and the Buddhist niche. “Tout ce qui reste de la bastique dans le sanctuaire de la mosquée c’est la qibla, sorte d’abside atrophée” says M. v. Berchem in his *Notes d’archéologie arabe* (cf. *A.*, vol. xvii., 1891, p. 427).

The introduction of the niche mihrāb into the mosque is no doubt rightly ascribed to the Omeyyads, who were the first to build mosques of any size, under the influence of the Christian architecture of their lands. The simple Arabian and Persian village mosques have no niches— even at the present day. According to tradition, Walī ʿAbd, when he visited the mosque built for him with the help of Byzantine masons in Medina, was reproached with having built the mosque in the style of Christian churches (Wustenfeld, *Geschichte der Stadt Medina*, Abh. G. W. Götta, i., 1861). When ʿUmar b. ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz in his Syrian buildings had the kīlā built in the form of a niche, he provoked the opposition and anger of the zealots on account of the similarity which was thus produced between the mosques and churches. H. Lawrens has collected a number of references, in which the mihrāb is roundly asserted to be copied from the Christians and to have become naturalised only with difficulty and not till the second century (Zayyāt, p. 94, note 1 quoted by C. H. Becker, *Zur Geschichte des islamischen Cultus, Islamstudia*, p. 493). Perhaps the custom of placing several niches in the kīlā wall of large mosques was also a gesture against the appearance of imitating the Christian custom. On the other hand it should not be forgotten that the semicircular niche was one of the most widely disseminated ornamental in Mediterranean architecture, and its adoption was much more natural than an imitation of the much larger apses. The derivation of the mihrāb from the Buddhist or Hindu niche for idols has as much or as little in its favour as the other. For it was only exceptionally that the Indian idol stood in a niche, but regularly it was in a separate quadrangular cell. The separate phenomenon of the eastern polygonal mihrāb developed by the Turkish peoples, which was brought by the Seljuks and other Turkic Mutasarrifs to Mesopotamia from the end of the 9th century can only be explained satisfactorily as a deliberate creation of its makers. As the heart of the house of worship, the mihrāb forms the culminating point in the equipment of the mosque, and as the carrier of the varied forms of decoration and continually changing systems of Muslim decorative art through the centuries is of considerable importance in the history of art. As a barometer of culture and art the mihrāb, if properly read, shows the prevailing tendency of art and its changes as a result of social changes. The writing of its history is a task for the future and it can only be outlined here. *History.* The kīlā was originally indicated not by a niche but by some mark such as a strip of paint or a flat stone marked in some way. Ac-
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cording to Abū Hurairah, it was introduced into the first mosque of the Prophet in Medina: *In-
stead of a mihrāb or prayer niche a block of stone directed the congregation; at first it was
placed tangent to the boundary, and it was removed to the southern when Mecca
became the Kiblah* (R. F. Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, 1874,
ii. 72). The oldest mosque of ʿAmar in Fustāt of
21 (642) had no niche, but the kibla, accurately
calculated, was marked (Corbett. J. R. A. S., 1890,
p. 757–800). The Arabian use of slabs to indicate
the kibla instead of a niche survived, alongside of
the mihrāb and in spite of it, for several centuries
within and without Arabia. The mosques in Arabia
proper are still unknown and only a few buildings
on the borders enable us to draw some con-
clusions. The runs of the xith–xith century on
hal在当地 (Diez. Eine syrische Moscheeum auf der Insel Bûhrain, Fahrb. d. assiat. Kunst, 1925,
II. Halbband) and the mosque of Kisimkazi on
Zanzibar (J. R. A. S., 1922, pl. iii.) show examples
of a type later well known. Such slabs of
or stucco were frequently built into the front
pillars of the ābādān down to the xiliith century
to indicate the kibla. They are to be found in
Mogul (Herzfeld, Arch. Reis., ii. 277, 280) and
they would certainly have been found in Baghdad
for example had the old mosques survived there.
They gave the caliph and his representatives the
opportunity, so limited in Islam, of perpetuating
their names and bestowing themselves helpers of
Islam by erecting such flat mihrābs. Examples are
the richly ornamented stucco slab presented
by the vizier al-ʿAfdal in the name of the Caliph
al-Mustaʿṣir (485 = 1092) to the mosque of Ibn
Ṭūlūn and its counterpart ordered by Sulṭān Lāḏūn
(696–698 = 1290–938) (Illustr. in F. Flury,
Die Ornamente der Hürim und Ashar-Moschee, 1912, pl. xvi.). When Muslim architecture is
deliberately developed on a grand scale however we
find the mihrāb in the xith century as a semi-
circular shell-shaped niche flanked by pillars, and
this is the form that has survived essentially with
local variations to the present day.
Mesopotamia. The oldest example here is the
mihrāb of the Džām al-Ḵbāṣ-ski in Baghdad.
It consists of a single marble block 5′ 4″ inches
high and 3′ 8″ broad with a semi-circular niche in
it 1′ 2″ deep. The columns have spiral grooves
in them and Corinthian-like capitals upon which
the horse-shoe-shaped shell is directly placed
without an abacus. The niche, otherwise smooth, has
in the central axis a perpendicular strip of ornament
as its sole decoration, which is quite devoid of
any structural function and is quite in the textile-
like style of late ʿIbāḍite decoration. Herzfeld
supposes that this mihrāb was brought by water
about 145 A.H. for the newly founded Baghdad
from North Syria or Djīyār Bakr and suggests for
this similar mihrābs of Northern Mesopotamia,
the similar niches in Christian churches as models
(H. J. 35 sq.). The Ḵbāṣ-ski type of mihrāb
is found again in the walls of Amur, which were
built in 297 (910) by al-Nuṣrād (M. v. Berchem.
Imitation aus Syrien etc., coll. by Frh. von
Oppenheim: The Bayudh. Prize in Samarra. Fig.
in Berchem-Strz.), in Amurā, fig. 12 (1922,
pl. III sq.) the change to the pointed arch
however took place here probably by the tenth
century, certainly in the xith A.D. Instead of the
semicircular we find also flat niches cut out in
the form of a rectangle e.g. in the tomb of a
holy man in Abū Hurairah (Sarre-Herzfeld, Arch.
Reis., i. 133 sq.). The use of stucco, which is so
easily worked, hastened the development of the
form of the niche in the xith century. In the
mausoleum of the Forty Faithful (al-ʿArbaʿin) in
Takrit there is a stucco mihrāb of 690 (1261–62)
with a stepped arch in profile. The tomb of Zāin al-
Sindjār of about 657 (1258) contains a richly
decorated stucco mihrāb completely covered with
ornaments and scrolls (Arch. Reis., p. 308 sq.,
pl. iv.). This wealth of decoration may in turn
have reacted on the niches of stone, as the rich
mihrāb of the great mosque of 543 (1148) and
other niches in Mōsul show (Arch. K., pl. v.
xxi. xciii.). In contrast to Persia, stone remained
the usual material here. We now find twisted
little pillars with vase bases and vase capitals,
zigzag arches and richly fluted bands with plumed
furnacions (mihrāb of Bād-i-Dīn in Mōsul). The
Hellenistic massel-shell, so far as it still survives,
was easily worked, and structural ornament
into ornament. The rectangular frame of the arch
of the niche completed the adaptation of an originally
Hellenistic type to the oriental spirit of architecture.
In the vacant field below the couch we here frequently
have a musel shell carved in relief. We find vari-
ations like the flat rectangular niches with the base of
the couch protruding as in the Džāmil al-ʿOmariya
(Arch. K., pl. cxxxv.). When however we find in
Pandjāb ʿAli in Mōsul in 686 (1287) i.e. under
the Ilkhan Argūn, a polygonal mihrāb with sa-
lacte canopy, we have apparently eastern, Sel-
dūk influence, which produced the abstract stereo-
metric crystallisation of the details and general form.
Their seeming structural function is taken from
the flanking pillars by direct continuation around
the arch. Finally we may mention the occurrence of
corner mihrābs in Mesopotamia when the kibla
demanded it and it was not possible to orient the
whole building properly. Such exceptions were
confined to sepulchral domes (Māshhād Ṣīmān ᾃn-
Syria. The Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus
has twelve mihrābs in all (cf. the plan by A. Dické,
supplemented by C. Watzinger and K. Wutzinger,
Damasus, Die islamische Stadt). If systematically studied, they would probably give a conspectus of
the development of the mihrāb in Syria. Only the
principal mihrāb appears, at least in its architectonic
development, if not in its embellishment to go back
to the time of the foundation of the mosque. The
other niches were put up mainly in the sixth century
and later (cf. 1890, ser. vii., p. 158). The two
favourite styles of decorating the walls in use among
Byzantine workmen under Walid were essetībāte
and glass mosaic. They must have been used almost
exclusively for the early mosques along with carved
mouldings. The description by Ibn Djbair, who
visited the mosque in 580 (1184) i.e. not till
after the first great fire of 461 (1069), gives us an
idea of the mihrāb as it then was, probably still
predominantly Omayyad. The mihrāb wall was
covered with marble slabs: the arch of the niche
had inscriptions in gilt letters on a blue ground,
probably in mosaic, and had a quadrangular frame.
The wedges between arch and frame were decorated
with the famous “vineyard of Walīh”, as we may
safely assume, in mosaic. The vaulting of the niche
was probably adorned in the same way. The frame
of the miḥrāb was crowned by a miniature arced, a motive which with others was taken to Spain (see below) and above this the wall was adorned with views of celebrated towns and trees in mosaic, the Ka'ba in the centre. Remains of these mosaics still survive and the mosaics discovered a few years ago in the mosque by the French give us an idea of the splendour of their colouring. The miḥrāb destroyed in the fire of 1803 had a miniature arced (illustr. in Saladin, Manuel, fig. 35); it had also an arch encircling it above, which also suggests an Omayyad origin. (According to Marqās, La mosquée d’el-Walid à Damas et son influence sur l’architecture musulmane d’Occident, R. A., L., where the dependence of the mosque of Cordova on that of Damascus is discussed, in Damascus all arches were originally horseshoe-shaped — and as in the rebuilding — arranged in two stories as we see from old descriptions). Of the miḥrāb of the Ḥārām al-ʿAṣāf we know that it was covered with marble in 583 (1187) by order of Saladin. It has a wide niche formed of segments, with a pointed arch. The two sets of pillars with acanthus capitals are earlier than Saladin (Saladin, op. cit., fig. 28). Le Bon mentions two peculiar miḥrāb niches in the transept of the mosque (La civilisation arabe, p. 148 and fig. 68). Under the Aljūḥids the use of interlacing patterns in stone was popular in Northern Syrian architecture. They are sometimes teeliner, sometimes rounded interlaces of textile origin which were used on the fronts of doors and prayer niches either in profile or as bands of stone in alternating colours. The decoration of the miḥrāb thus received a remarkable stimulus, as the prayer niches of the Madrasa al-Sultāniyya and the Ḥārām of Madrasa al-Firdaws of 633 (1235), both in Aleppo, and the miḥrāb restored by Ṣubīl of the Kubbat al-Silsileh in Jerusalem, etc. (picture in Creswell, The Works of Sultan Baibars, B. F. F. A. O., pl. xxvi., pl. 28, 29). Another peculiarity of the Syrian miḥrāb is the occasionally found adornment of the vaulting of the niche with — it is true very rounded — views of women and men in opus sectile, as an example of which we may take the miḥrāb of the great mosque of Tripoli founded in 603 (1294) (cut. in M.I.F.A.O., vol. xxv. 1909, pl. 5). The later Syrian miḥrābs continued the traditional elaboration with different colourful mosaics to which Turkish influence added the stalactite conch.

Egypt. The principal miḥrāb of the oldest mosque that has survived in Cairo, the mosque of Ḥāmid b. Ṣulṭān, is thought to be the original one in its general structure. The miḥrāb frieze with inscription at the level of the capitals and the marble covering below belong either to the restoration by Kālān or may probably to that of Ladjīn. Thus a type was created in Cairo in the middle of the third century which is characterised by the double stepping of the niche with two pillars on each side. In this case taken from old Christian buildings and by the studded pointed arch and rectangular frame; this form became the Egyptian model in place of the Māqṣūrī potamian conch, the top of the niche was smooth and probably, as in Kānawān, painted. The narrow top continued through the Fatimid period while the double recess of the niche with pillars gives all later Cairene miḥrābs their character. A stucco miḥrāb of the fourth (tenth) century, only the upper third of which has survived in its original form, of which there is a copy in the Arab Museum, had the same structure with two pairs of pillars. The conch was imposed later (Flury, Ein Stückmiḥrāb des IV. (X.) Jahrhunderts, Sarre-Festschrift, 1925, Fig. 4.-3). The stucco miḥrāb of the sepulchral mosque of Dījiyūṣī on the Muḥāymin in Cairo, a century later (478 = 1085) and particularly richly decorated, has a simialt niche with a high pointed top (cut. in Flury, Ornamente lxxiv. cit., pl. xii.; Springer, Heilb. d. K., vi., fig. 400). It is to be assumed that the original miḥrābs of the Fāṭimid mosques of Ḥākim and al-Ẓāhir also belonged to this group. The al-Akmar mosque, completed in 519 (1125) introduced a new motif in its façade, which was much imitated in Cairo, the placing of a row of ribs like the corrugation of a shell along the top of the niche. The stucco miḥrāb already mentioned, a copy of which is in the Arab Museum, must have been embellished about this time by a mussel shell. The miḥrāb in the sepulchral chapel of Shadjarat al-Durr [q. v.] the widow of Sultan Ṣulṭān Naṣrān al-Din Ayūb of c. 648 = 1250 (fig. in R. L. Devonshire, Some Cairo Mosques, London 1921, p. 32) shows this fashion in a much more decided and more advanced muqarnas stage. Such variations were however the exception. On the other hand the stucco miḥrāb survived down to the Mamlūk period Creswell, etc. ascribes the stucco miḥrāb on the outside of the north wall of the mosque of ʿAmr, rebuilt by Sulṭān Baibars, to the time of Baibars on grounds of style (658—676 = 1260—1277) (The Works of Sultan Baibars, F. F. F. A. O., fig. 400, 1926). The splendour of the exceedingly thick stucco ornamentation in relief is here increased by the muqarnas in the miniature arceding of the upper part of the niche. Stucco decoration thus reached its last effective possibilities. With the Mongol invasion of Syria, Syrian influence on Egyptian art was renewed (Cairo also benefited by the taking of Mōṣul by the Mongols in 653 = 1255 and the resultant migration of the celebrated coppersmiths of Mōṣul to Cairo, work which this time on the art of the metal-workers flourished, cf. Creswell, op. cit., p. 182). Syrian influence also brought the Syrian miḥrāb overlaid with marble slabs and stone mosaic to Egypt, where it drove out the other types and became predominant. The oldest prayer niches of this new kind appear in the buildings of Kālān at the end of the viiiith (xiiith) century. The plastering double pillars give them their Gothic grace and elevation. The arches are usually composed of alternating coloured wedge shaped stones serrated in various ways. The walls of the niches are decorated with mosaic in geometric patterns between miniature arceding and the conch vaulting overlaid with light and dark strips of colour alternating (often zigzag). Exceptionally we also find glass mosaic, as in the masjid of the Mārisīn of Kālān. Under the late rulers of the Circassian Mamluks the decoration of the niche reached its height. The inlaying was done with all kinds of costly materials such as mother-of-pearl, turquoise, lapis lazuli. (Madrasa of Aḥṣāf b. Murkāb and al-ʿĀmīn: cf. Briggs, Media. arch., fig. 119 and 127).

A small group by itself is formed by the three portable miḥrābs of the viith (xivith) century from al-Ẓāhir, Sayyida Rukayya and Sayyida Nafīsā which are now preserved in the Arab Museum.

Mağrib. The history of the miḥrāb in the
western lands of Islam begins with the prayer niche in the great mosque of Kairwan. It was not the direct model for the later miḥrābs — this was reserved for the portal of the library of this mosque — but with its wide semi-circular niche and the slightly rounded but still pointed arch it forms the transition to the western form of miḥrāb. The pillars of mottled red and yellow stone rest on late antique bases and support pseudo-lycanthus porphyry capitals the abacuses of which are decorated with Kufic inscriptions. The wall of the niche is covered with marble slabs, some perforated, some carved in relief, the frames of which also bear inscriptions Beland is a recess. The vaulting of the niche still shows traces of having been painted with vine tendrils arranged in circular patterns, which remind one of Mshatta (pictures in G. Marçais, Confepe et palpons de la Grande Mosquée de Kairwan, 1925, pl. viii.). The frise separating the recess and the vaulting of the niche, and the surrounding walls are covered with the famous lustre tiles made, in some Baghdad and some by a Baghdad artist in Tunis, and presented in 281 (844) by Iḥšāb b. Ağḥāb. This remarkable miḥrāb of the early period, when Islam was still in search of a style, thus combines all that the empire could produce in decoration, sculpture, painting, both richly brightened by gold and shining tiles. The fully developed western style is found a century later in the miḥrāb of the Mosque in Cordoba. This miḥrāb, built by Hākim II about 970, consists of an isolated hexagonal space 12 feet broad and 23 to 26 feet high. One side is formed by the wall containing the door. The floor and walls are covered with regular pieces of white marble, above are a frise of inscriptions and the cornice, on which a richly carved niche wall with clover-leaf arch on marble pillars with gilt capitals forms the upper part, which again terminates in an enriched frise and is covered by a single piece of marble in the shape of a musel shell. In the inscription on the outer wall the artist is mentioned "the work of Badr b. al-Khājiya." The historically important part here is the entrance wall to this chamber, which consists of a horseshoe-arch gateway with rectangular frames and miniature arceding at the top. This form of wall, which now become typical for miḥrāb- and portal walls in most lands of the Maghrib and shows its own course of development, has been traced to the portal wall of the library of the great mosque in Kairwan as the earliest model, or both go back to a common Persian original (cf. Marçais, Manuel, i. 264 sq.) In Cordoba we meet with a special shape of the miḥrāb recess, the origin of which is doubtless different from that of the niche and goes back to an original with special functions connected with the cult of relics and of the dead. According to tradition, a relic of the Prophet was actually preserved in this space and the believers used to pay reverence to it in a sevenfold circumambulation. A quite singular, similar, isolated miḥrāb is found in the madrasa in Khargird, Khurāsān (cf. Ma‘gird and below Persia). (Whether here we have the influence of the pradakshina of the Indian cult of relics cannot be settled. The circumambulation of altars, tombs of saints, and other sacred objects was of course a widespread custom in northern lands also) Horseshoe-arches, multiple rectangular border and miniature arcade are the typical elements of the henceforth canonical miḥrāb wall. The wedge-shaped stones of the horse-shoe arch are not serrated in complicated fashion, as in Egypt and Syria, but usually alternate in colour and are all smooth, as in Cordoba, or alternately smooth and carved in relief. In Cordoba the spandrils are still filled with palm-branches and acanthus-like tendrils in relief and the two borders decorated with Kufic inscriptions (cf. R. Amador de los Ríos, Inscripciones arabes de Cordoba, Madrid 1892). The niches of the miniature arceding with clover-leaf arches are covered with mosaic (piet. in E. Kühnel, Maurische Kunst, K. d. O., pl. 13, 14). The wall of the pentagonal miḥrāb niche in the great mosque of Tlemsen of about 1155 A.D. is similarly formed (piet. in Kühnel, op. cit., pl. 24). But we already find here in the spandrils the isolated rosettes which first appear on the miḥrāb of the Aljafería in Saragossa of the second half of the eleventh century (piet. in Marçais, Manuel, fig. 215). The miḥrāb wall of the Almohad mosque in Timițăl in the Atlas (1153 A.D. shows, instead of the tendrils, a woven pattern such as is often found on carpets (piet. in Marçais, op. cit., fig. 216); and in place of the miniature arceding we have round windows alternating with flat niches. A divergence from the canonical type is found in the miḥrāb of the mosque in Tozeur built in 590 (1194) in the oasis of Djerid (piet. in Marçais, op. cit., fig. 218). It has a double arch and profuse ornamentation, on the wall of the niche also. Marçais explains the divergence by saying that the mosque was built by a conqueror of Almoravid descent in the Almohad period by workmen from Andalus. The niche bears the stamp of hurried improvisation. The miḥrāb here reproduced, in the Sidi Ogha mosque in the Sībi oasis at Biskra which is considered the oldest mosque in Algeria, may be regarded as an example more in the popular tradition, therefore particularly interesting. The date is unknown. The decoration belongs to the field of Khirbuni. Under the dynasties which succeeded the Almohads from the xii.—xiv. century the Cordoba type remains the model in principle. Only the proportions are more slender, the horseshoe arches more elegant and, instead of the miniature arceding, windows with coloured glass in a stucco framework have become naturalised. The isolated miḥrāb chambers have given place to semicircular or polygonal niches. Examples are the miḥrāb of the mosques in Taza, Sidi bel Hassan and al-Uṣbā in and near Tlemsen, in Fès and the Hamlet of Granada. The latter covered with mosaic (piet. in Marçais, op. cit., fig. 336—338 and P. Ricard, pl. x. xi.). In Tunis of the xv.—xvith century also the miḥrāb with flat round niche and horse-shoe arch of alternately coloured and ornamented stones and rectangular frame continued to predominate. The plinths are regularly covered with marble or tiles, while the niche vaulings are fluted like a musel shell.

Persia, Turkestān, Afghānīstān. The two earliest prayer niches in Persia, so far as is known, are in the mosque at Nayin, east of Isfahān, of the x.—ix. century A.D. (Viollet-le-Duc and Flury in Syria, 1921, pl. xxx and S. Flury, in Syria, 1930) and in the Towān at Khargird, Khurāsān, of the x.—xvi. century (Diez, Chrishānische Baudenk-märke, pl. 30). In spite of their different ornamentation, these
Fig. 1: Mihrāb of a Mosque in Bahānān.

Fig. 2: Mihrāb of the Sidi-Ukba Mosque in Kairawān.

Fig. 3: Mihrāb of the Mosque in Sidi 'Ukba (Ziban oasis, Algeria).
Fig. 4. Miḥrāb of the Ahmed b. Ṣalān Mosque in Cairo.

Fig. 5. Miḥrāb of the Muḥāyad Mosque in Cairo.

Fig. 6. Wooden miḥrāb from the Saḥīla Naḥīsa Mosque in Cairo (Arab Museum).

Fig. 7. Miḥrāb from Bīdhāpur (1636 A. D.).
Fig. 8. Mihrāb of the Qawwāl Shāh Mosque in Meşhēd.

Fig. 9. Mihrāb of the Uljaitu Khudābanda Mosque in Iṣfāhān (1310 A. D.).

Fig. 11. Mihrāb of a Mosque in Iṣfāhān (XVIIIth century A. D.).
Fig. 10. Persian frieze with lustre decoration.
two stucco mihrābs are very similar. Both are rectangular niches flanked by inset 3/4 pillars with leaf capitals, with pointed arches diagonally set and thickly decorated with tendrils in a rectangular frame. The back wall under the arch presents a repetition of the architecture of the niche so that we have a niche in a niche. In Persia therefore, if Flurry is right in his early dating, perhaps as early as the third (ninth) century, a rich double framed style of mihrāb had been developed, which lasted down to the xivth century, as is shown by the next surviving monument of this group, the stucco mihrāb in the Masjīd-i Dūm'a in Isfāhān of 710(1310)(Diez, K. d. ist. Volker, p. 109, 2nd ed., p. 85). In the interval however the decoration, at first purely floral, had become mainly epigraphic, a transition that can be followed step by step from the xivth century. The stucco mihrāb of the mosque of Dījīyārī on the Mūkātām in Cairo of 478(1085) is also of importance for this sequence of development (pict. in Flurry, Ornamenten etc., pl. xvii).

But in Persia a second type developed alongside of the stucco mihrāb, the mihrāb decorated with lustre faience, with which this part of the decoration of the mosque and with it Persian faience reached its zenith. The lustre mihrāb of Khāgān of 624(1226) in Bīlīn (pict in Springer's Kunstgeschichte, vl. 458) and a similar niche from Warāmīn in the possession of the firm of Kelekan (Cat. of the Exhib. of Persian Art, London 1931) may be quoted as examples. These mihrābs show the same double niches as their stucco counterparts but are flatter, more framework than niche. In place of the curved arch, the canopy is a rectilinear gable, a change in shape probably mainly due to the material. The colours are predominantly a light blue ground with letters in dark blue relief and decorations in brown lustre. By the combined effect of the colours and the profuse ornamentation, these mihrābs have a truly fairlike suggestion and reach the highest ideal of Islamic decorative art. The mihrāb assumed a new form in the Timūrid period. Instead of the semi-circular or flat rectangular niche we now find under Turkish influence the polygonal — pentagon constructed out of an octagon — of larger dimensions than previously, broader and deeper. The ornamentation proceeds parallel with the usual Timūrid wall decoration. In the same way the plinth is covered breast-high with polygonal tiles and the walls above usually with flat miniature arcing, which pass into vaulted muğharašt painted or covered with tiles. Finally the frames and the scrolls of inscription filling them are frequently inlaid with that finely executed tile-mosaic which forms the glory of Timūrid architectural ornament. As examples may be mentioned the mihrābs in the praying chambers of the madrasa in Khağırd (Diez, Chur. Baukunstler, pl. 33. 1), the mihrāb of Isyārʿ Abī Walīn near Herāt (Niedermayer-Dietz, Afghan., fig. 174), the splendid prayer niche in the mosque of Džawar-Zade in Masjīd (Diez, K. d. ist. Volker, v. fig. 456 and 108) all of the xivth century. The mihrāb in the splendid madrasa in Herāt, now destroyed, may have been similar to that in Mīshhīd, here reproduced, having being founded by the same prince and probably built by the same architect (cf. above iii. p. 387). In the Safavid period, we find alongside of mihrābs with mosaic and muğharašt also painted niches, which show intertwining tendrils standing out in white from a brick red ground. Mihrābs like this are to be seen in the ruins of the Mūsālā outside Isfāhān and in Reshān, Khūrāsān (fig. Diez, Chur. Baukunstler, pl. 22, 3). They seem to have been very widely disseminated. It may be mentioned in conclusion that in place of a prayer niche in the Kūhā-īwān of the Timūrid madrasa in Khūrāsān, there is a rectangular windowless chamber, accessible by a doorway through the inner wall. The similarity with the mihrāb chambers frequently found in the Maghīb is remarkable and is discussed under Spain.

In India. No mosques earlier than the xivth century have survived in India. In the mosques of the xivth—xvth centuries the prayer niche in India is usually flanked by decorated Indian pillars adorned with Indian ornamentation. The gable-shaped panels over the niches are particularly ornamental. The wall of the niche is usually adorned in relief with a lotus rossette and a pendant vase out of which grow tendrils. Numerous niches of this kind are to be found in mosques of Gūḍjadēr and Aḥmadābād of the xivth—xvth centuries. An Indian peculiarity is the placing of three to five, sometimes even seven mihrābs in the kišār wall in keeping with the architectonic units of the main building, each marked by a dome (Djāmāf Masjīd in Bīrūn, and Champañīr, Gūḍjadēr etc.). There are also mosques with mihrāb chambers, which we can assume with Havel to be adaptations of the former cells for idols (Dhołka, Gūḍjadēr, Khāns Masjīd and Aḥmadābād). It is therefore not impossible that isolated mihrāb chambers outside of India, as in Khūrāsān, Persia, or even in the Maghīb, should be traced to Indian influence, although this feature is not found in the earliest mosques in Aṣmīn and Déhī. In Gūḍjadēr however these chambers might have been used as mihrābs in the oldest mosques and provinces with a sea coast and international trade may have had influence abroad (cf. Arch. Survey of India, Western India, vol. vii, Gūḍjadēr, Aḥmadābād). When Persian influence began to be felt under the Moghīl emperors, the Indian elements gradually disappeared from the mihrābs and their place was taken by the polygonal niche in the wall incrustted with coloured marble. Under Aḳbar Indian detail still survived. The arches of the mihrāb of the great mosque in Fāḥšār Sīkht, for example, are edged with a lacework of carved palmate frizzes; the material is stone but the inlay work imitates the Persian tiled mihrābs (pict. in V. A. Smith, A History of Fine. Art in India and Diez, K. d. ist. Volker, p. 229 and p. 141). In the court mosques of Agra and Déhī we find dazzling white marble mihrābs with coloured intarsia of flowers. The most splendid mihrāb in India and indeed in all the lands of Islam is the niche of the Friday mosque in Būlāpār, the former capital of the ʿĀdil Shāhī in the Dekhān. The only rival that it can ever have had is Wald's mihrāb in Damascus. Framed by a gigantic arch resting on double pillars, the pentagonal niche recess constructed out of an octagon goes deep into the wall on whose surfaces the motif of the niche is three times repeated. The central of the three niche areas is mystically marked by a girt eight-pointed star as the real kišār. In gigantic letters of gold the two sacred names Allah and Muhammad in the spandrels of the arch impress themselves on the hearts of the worshipper, and chime in
afresh in the drumshaped flanking pillars, which, in Bīdījāpūr decoration are frequently used as conventional ornament but are here of structural importance. Manāras and sepulchral domes crown the structure and their principal motive is again a niche in the centre. This imposing decoration is carried out in shallow relief and is painted with red, blue and black colours heightened with gold. In the rectangular fields on both sides and in the arches are inscriptions on bands and in medallions of which we give Cousens translation of one because it sums up Muslim philosophy in a nutshell:

"Place no trust in life: it is but brief".
"There is no rest in this transitory world".
"The world is very pleasing to the senses".
"Life is the best of all gifts but it is not lasting".
"Malik Ya'qūb, a servant of the mosque and the slave of Sūltān Muḥammad, completed the mosque".

This gilding and ornamental work was done by orders of the Sūltān Muḥammad Aḍīl Shāh, 1045" (1636 A.D.).

Asia Minor, Armenia and Turkey. The mihrāb took a development quite of its own among the Seldjūqs of Rūm. Instead of the descent of the niche of the high, Hellenistic round niche, we find here a prayer niche which rather resembles a hearth and is probably to be explained as an adaptation of the prayer carpet to this form of building. The appearance of these niches, which are thus of no structural significance, is however made up for by their stereometrically crystallised cone-shaped vaulting formed of cells. The Turkish art of the Seldjūqs brought as its dowry to the art of the Muslim world the Mugharnāt, the suggestion of which, it in turn owed to Buddhist art, for the Seldjūqs came from Central Asia where Buddhist art had long prevailed. During the short period of Seldjūq architecture in Asia Minor, the xiiith century, the form of the niches remained unaltered. They are low rectangular shallow niches with pillars built in without bases, which bear rhomboidal crystal bodies as capitals and come to a point with the conical cells of the vaulting. The spandrels and frames are inlaid with the usual Seldjūq white, blue and black tile mosaic (pict. in Löytved, Sarre, Springer-Kühnel and Dier, op. cit.).

The most important change undergone by this early Turkish mihrāb in Ottoman architecture was the raising of the supporting niche to its full height. The niche assumed polygonal form, i.e., it has three or five surfaces constructed out of the octagon, such as we find in India and Persia from the xviith century; it was however raised higher and looks more slender and regularly ended in a mugharnāt cone. The decoration consists mainly of marble and Turkish tiles. A moulded tinfoil frieze formed the usual framework for the whole. The combination of Byzantine and early Turkish elements, the forms and a certain rationalism in execution give these mihrābs that cold appearance which is peculiar to Ottoman art. The mihrāb and masjid apply also to mihrāb. The mihrāb has not yet had separate studies devoted to it. The following works have been specially used here: F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise, 4 vols.; E. Herzfeld, Die Genese der islamischen Kunst und das Miḥrābproblem (for the Khasṣāki Mihrāb), in Iṣlāh, 1.; M. v. Berchem and J. Strzygowski, Anida; H. Violett and S. Flury, Un monument des premiers siècles de l'islamie à Sfax, in Syria, 1921; S. Flury, La mosquée de Nāṣirin, in Syria, 1930; do, Die Ornamentik der Hakim und Askar Moschee, Heidelberg 1912; do, Ein Steinmihrāb des IV. (X.) Jahrh. (Jahrh. d. as. Kunst, 1925); E. Diez, Eine schittische Moscheurüme auf Bahrain (Jahrh. d. as. Kunst, 1925); do, Die Kunst der isl. Volker, Handbuch d. Kunstwissenschaft; do, Chazarsche Bau- denkmäler; K. A. C. Creswell, A Brief Chronology of the Muhammadan Monuments of Egypt to A. D. 1517, B I F A O, vii.; do, The Works of Sultan Bihars in Egypt, B I F A O, xxvi.; P. Ravasse, Sur trois mihrābs en bois sculpté, Mem. Inst. Egypt, ii. 1889; G. Marquis, Manuel d'art musulman, 2 vols., 1926; E. Kühnel, Mauvaise Kunst, K. d. Orient, vol. ix.; H. Saladin, La mosquée de Sidi Obba à Kairouan; G. Marquis, Comptes et plafonds de la Grande Mosquée de Kairouan; J. H. Loytved, Konia, Inschriften der selctiugiiischen Bauten; C. Gurlitt, Die Baukunst Konstantinopels; Arch. Survey of India, Western India, vols. vi. and vii.; H. Cousens, Bijagur, a Guide to its Ruins, Poona 1923.

MIHRĀN, the name given by Muslim writers to the Indus (Sanskrit Sindhu), called by the Greeks Ἰδέας and Ἰδέα, by the Romans Sinus and Indus, and by early Muslim writers Aḥ-Ī Sind (the Water of Sind). The name is more particularly applied to the lower reaches of the river, after it enters Sind. Pliny writes of "Indus, incisus Sindus appellatur".

The Indus rises in 32° N. and 81° E., receives the Kābul river almost opposite to Ṭāk, and the Pāndjān, the accumulated waters of the five rivers of the Pāndjāb, just above Mīhankot. Near Kakh- 

mūr, in 28° 26' N. and 69° 47' E., the river enters Sind, and below Bakkar is locally known as Dāryā, "the Sea". It falls into the Arabian Sea in 23° 58' N. and 67° 30' E. Its drainage basin is estimated at 372,700 square miles and its length at a little over 1,800 miles.

The courses of the Indus and its tributaries have undergone, even in historical times, extensive changes of which it is impossible to give details in this article, and which have misled historians who have disregarded them. They have been minutely and elaborately described in J. A. S. I., vol. lxi. (1892) by the late Major H. G. Raverty, who has illustrated his scholarly monograph by a series of admirable maps.

MIHRĀN. [See Mīhr.]

MIHRĪ KHATŪN (originally Mīhr-i Māh), an important Turkish poetess of the end of the xviith and beginning of the xvith centuries. She belonged to Amasia, which produced a number of poets, and spent her whole life there. She was one of the family of Pār Iyās. Her father was a kāšī and wrote poetry under the makhhīs of Belaš. She inherited from him her poetic gifts and also

Bibliography: The references given under
received from him the poetic and theological training ascribed to her by Ewliyâ.

Not much is known of her life. This is in part to be explained by the reticence of the East regarding women. That in the East boys rather than girls are sung of in love songs is due not so much to a preponderancy of paederasty as to a disinclination to talk of women at all. She died in 912 (1506). Her tomb in Amasia is a place of pilgrimage. She belonged to the literary circle of prince Äymâd, the second son of Sultân Bâyâzîd, who was governor of Amasia in 886–918 (1481–1512). Of a circumcision festival in the konâk of the prince in 914 (1509), it is recorded that Mihrî was the chief of the poets present.

In spite of the love affairs ascribed to her and sung by her (with Iskender, son of Sinân Pasha, with Mu'ićayd-zâde [born 860 = 1456] and others), the Turkish biographers emphasize besides her beauty her virgin life, in spite of the glowing fervour with which she described her nights of love. Her nature was evidently not quite clearly understood by the teqkeredî. Contrary to the Oriental custom, Mihrî remained unmarried in spite of many wooers. It is not improbable that the experiences described by her are not quite inventions but evidence of her passionate nature which drove her to unfeathered love. Mihrî's great merit is that she did not suppress her femininity, so that in her poems she reveals a truly womanly soul. In this respect, she is the most personal among Turkish poetesses.

As a woman she found it doubly difficult, in view of the restrictions on her sex at the time, to win a place as a poet, as the study of the Persian poets was absolutely necessary for this. The energy with which she managed to achieve her aim is remarkable. Her chief model was Nedjâmî (d. 914 = 1509), the most important poet of the period, with whom she tried to compete. Most of her pieces are written in Nedjâmî's manner. She is not very original, but very few Turkish poets are. In language and in images she is conventional. But her freshness, directness and passionate feeling, in which no other poetesses equal her, are remarkable. Her eloquence and brilliant style were proverbial.

She left a Divân (edition in preparation by Martinovitch) and several treatises in rhyme. A number of her poems have been made accessible to us by Smirnow. According to Ewliyâ's statement (in MSS., not in the printed text), she also composed risâla's on fikû and farâ'îd.


(Th. Menzel)

MIKAL, the archangel Michael [cf. MAL'îk], whose name occurs once in the Qûrân, viz. in sûra ii. 92: "Whosoever is an enemy to Allah, or his angels, or his apostles, or to Gabriel, or to Michael, verily Allah is an enemy to the unbelievers". In explanation of this verse two stories are told. According to the first, the Jews, wishing to test the valor of the mission of Muhammad, asked him several questions, on all of which he gave the true answer. Finally they asked him who transmitted the revelations to him. When he answered, Gabriel, the Jews declared that this angel was their enemy and the angel of destruction and penury, in opposition to Michael whom they said to be their protector and the angel of fertility and salvation (Tabârî, Tâfîrî, i. 324 sqq.). — According to the second story, 'Umar once entered the synagogue (miqârat) of Madina and asked the Jews questions concerning Gabriel. They gave of that angel as well as of Michael an account similar to the one mentioned above, whereupon 'Umar asked: What is the position of those two angels with Allah? They replied: Gabriel is to His right and Michael to His left hand, and there is enmity between the two. Whereupon 'Umar answered: If they have that position with Allah, there can be no enmity between them. But you are unbelievers: more than asses are, and whoever is an enemy to one of the two, is an enemy to Allah Thereupon 'Umar went to meet Muhammad, who received him with the words: Gabriel has anticipated you by the revelation of: 'Whosoever is an enemy' etc. (sûra ii. 92; Tabârî, Tâfîrî, i. 327; Zamâkhsârî, p. 92; Bâdawî ad sûra n. 91).

We do not know of any Jewish traditions which ascribe to Gabriela hostile attitude towards the Jews. For the statements regarding Michael as communicated above, there is sufficient literary evidence. In Daniel xii. 1 Michael is called the great prince, the protector of the people of Israel; cf. Tâqûm Contin., viii. 9: "Michael, the lord of Israel"; Daniel x. 13, 21 where Michael is said to have protected the Jews against the kings of Persia and Greece; further 1 Enoch xx. 5 where he is called the protector of the best part of mankind: Testamentum Levi, xvi. 6; Test. Dan., vi. 2.

In Vita Adae et Eovâ, chap. xii. 294, it is Michael who orders Satan and the other angels to worship Adam. Although the story is mentioned several times in the Korân [cf. Inds.], there is no trace in Muslim literature of the role ascribed to Michael in Vita Adae et Eovâ: the only mention of Michael in the Muslim legend is that he and Gabriel were the first to worship Adam, in opposition to Iblis who refused to do so (al-Kisâ', p. 27).

Neither does Muslim literature seem to have preserved other traditions ascribed to Michael in Jewish Apocrypha (mediator between God and mankind, 1 Enoch x. 9; Test. Dan., vi. 2; 3 Baruch, x. 2), or in the New Testament (Ep. Jude, vi. 9: Michael disputing with the devil about the body of Moses; Revelation xii. 7 sqq.) — Michael and his angels
fighting against the dragon and the final discomfiture of the latter). Perhaps a faint recollection of Michael as the protector of mankind (the Jews, the Christians) may be found in the tradition according to which Michael has never laughed since the creation of Hell (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii, 224). Further, however, Michael is rarely mentioned in hadith (al-Tahāri, ed. Mālik, the guardian of Hell, and Gabriel, appears to Muḥammad in a dream; Naṣaʿī, Ittiḥād, b. 37 where Michael incites Gabriel to urge Muḥammad to recite the Kūrān according to seven ahruf).

al-Yaʿqūbī mentions in a story of which we have no counterpart in Jewish or Christian literature either, which is not amazing, the story bearing an outspoken Shiʿite tendency. One day Al-lāh announced to Gabriel and Michael that one of them must die. Neither however was willing to sacrifice himself in behalf of his partner, whereupon Al-lāh said to them: Take 'Āli as an example, who was willing to give his life on behalf of Muḥammad (the night before the hījāra; Yaʿqūbī, ii, 39).

Michael is further mentioned by name as one of the angels who opened the breast of Muḥammad before his night journey (Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, i, 1157—59; Ibn al-Aʿārī, ed. Tornberg, ii, 96 sq.), and as one of those who came to the aid of the Muslims in the battle of Ḥadhr (Ibn Saʿd, n/f. 9, 19).

In the text of the Kūrān as well as in a verse cited by Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje, i, 329), the name of the form is Mīkāl as if it were a mīfāl form from wakāla (Horovitz). A direct reminiscence of the Greek, probably also of the Hebrew and Arabaic, forms of the name is to be found in the tradition preserved by al-Kīsaʿī (p. 12), which calls Mīkhāl the attendant of the second heaven, in contradiction to Mīkāl, who is the guardian of the sea in the seventh heaven (p. 15). Other forms of the name are Mīkāl, Mīkāl, Mīkāl, Mīkāl, and Mīkāl. It is hardly necessary to say that in the magical use of the names of the archangels that of Mīkāl is on the same level as that of his companion (e.g., Zwemer, The Influence of Animism on Islam, p. 195, 197).


MIKĀT (A., mīfāl-form from w-k-t, plural mawākīt) appointed or exact time. In this sense the term occurs several times in the Kūrān (sūra ii, 185; vii, 138, 139, 154; xxvi, 37; xliv, 40; lvi, 90; lxviii, 17).

In hadith and ḥadīth the term is applied to the times of prayer and to the places where those who enter the ḥaram are bound to put on the iḥrām. For the latter meaning of the term cf. IHRĀM, 1.

Although some general indications for the times at which some salāts are to be performed occur in the Kūrān (cf. sūra ii, 239; xi, 116; xvii, 80; xxiv, 29), it may be considered above doubt that during Muḥammad’s lifetime neither the number of the daily salāts nor their exact times had been fixed and that this happened in the first decades after his death.

A reminiscence of that period of uncertainty may be preserved in those traditions which apply a deviating nomenclature to some of the salāts. The salāt al-ṣawr e.g. is called al-ḥadījir al-ṣāwī; the salāt al-maghrib, ʿīṣa; the salāt al-Īṣāba, ʿatama; the salāt al-fadjir, al-maghrib (Bukhārī, Mawākit al-Salāt, bāb 13, 19). In other traditions the term al-ʿatama as applied to the salāt al-Īṣāba is ascribed to the Beduins and prohibited (Mīlākh, Mawājīdīd, trad. 228, 229; Abū Dāwud, Mawājit, bāb 78; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Maḥānīd, ii, 10 etc.); cf. on the other hand Bukhārī, Mawākit, bāb 20; Mīlākh, Salāt, trad. 129 etc., where the term al-ʿatama is used without censure.

From some traditions so much may be gathered, that the — or at least some of the — Mīrājīs showed a predilection for postponing the times of the salāt (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 7; Mīlākh, Mawājīdīd, trad. 166, 167; al-Nasāʾī, Imāma, b. 18, 55; Zaid b. ʿAlī, Mawājīdī al-Fālīkh, No. 113).

In opposition to this a salāt in due time is declared the best of works (Bukhārī, Dīhād, b. 1; Mawākit, b. 5; Mīlākh, Imāna, trad. 158, 159; Tirmidhī, Salāt, b. 13; Bīrū, b. 2). In other traditions this is said of a salāt at its earliest time (Tirmidhī, Salāt, b. 13).

This early state of things is reflected in several respects in a tradition according to which Ṣumār b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz once postponed one of the salāts and was rebuked for this by Ṣumār b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who related to him that al-Mughira b. ʿAwha had once been rebuked for the same reason by Abū Masʿūd al-Anṣārī, on account of the fact that Gabriel himself had descended five times in order to perform the five salāts at their exact times in the presence of Muḥammad. Thereupon Ṣumār admonished Ṣumār to be careful in his statements (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 1; Mīlākh, Mawājīdīd, trad. 166, 167; al-Nasāʾī, Mawākit, b. 10).

Some early groups of traditions affect to reproduce reminiscences of the practice in Madīna in Muḥammad’s time.

a. the salāt al-ṣawr was performed at noon, when the sun was beginning to decline (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 11).

b. the salāt al-ʿāṣr when the sun was shining into ʿAwha’s room, no shadow being yet cast there (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 13; Mīlākh, Mawājīdīd, trad. 168). After this salāt people had still time to visit the remotest parts of the town, while the sun was still “alive” or “pure” (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 1, 13, 14, 15, 21).

c. the salāt al-mīlākhīd was finished at a time when people could still perceive the places where their arrows fell down (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 21).

d. the salāt al-Īṣāba was sometimes postponed till a late hour, sometimes till the first third of the night had passed (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 11, 20, 21, 24).

e. the salāt al-fadjir was performed by Muḥammad at a time when a man could discern his neighbour (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 13); but the women on their way home could not yet be recognised (Bukhārī, Mawākit, b. 27).

In a second layer of traditions these general indications are specified by the mention of the first and the last limits allowed for the different
prayers (cf. e.g. Muslim, Musağid, trad. 176, 177). On one day Muḥammad performed: a. the salāt al-‘asr when the sun began to decline; b. the salāt al-asr when the sun was still high, and pure; c. the salāt al-magrib immediately after sunset; d. the salāt al-‘ishā when the twilight had disappeared; e. the salāt al-fajr at daybreak. On the following day Muḥammad performed: a. the suhr later than the day before; b. the ‘asr later than the day before, the sun being still high up; c. the magrib before the twilight had disappeared; d. the ‘ishā when the first third of the night had passed; e. the fajr when sunrise was near (asfara bikhā). In a tradition communicated by al-Ṣaḥīḥ (Kitāb al-Qum, i. 62) the fixing of the mawākīt just mentioned is ascribed to the example of Gabriel (cf. Zaid b. ‘Ali, Mağmu’ at-Fikāh, No. 109). These mawākīt have for the most part passed into the books of fikāh. We cannot reproduce all details here. The following scheme may suffice: a. suhr: from the time when the sun begins to decline to the time when shadows are of equal length with the objects by which they are cast, apart from their shadows at noon. The Ḥānasīnes alone deviate in one of their branches in so far as they replace the ultimate term by the time when the shadows are twice as large as their objects. In times of great heat it is recommended to postpone the suhr as late as possible; b. ‘asr: from the last time allowed for suhr till before sunset. According to Mālik the first term begins somewhat later; c. magrib: from the time after sunset till the time when the red twilight has disappeared. Small deviations only, in connection with a predilection for the first term; d. ‘ishā: from the last term mentioned for the salāt al-magrib till when a third, or half of the night has passed, or: till daybreak; e. fajr: from daybreak till before sunrise. Side by side with these mawākīt we find in the books of Tradition of and of Law the times on which it is not allowed to perform prayer, viz. sunrise, noon, and sunset (Bukhāri, Maswākīt, b. 30—32; Muslim, Salāt al-Musāfīrīn, trad. 285—294; cf. al-Nawawi’s commentary for controversies regarding this point, and further Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muh. Trad., p. 192a). According to ‘Aḥṣa it is only forbidden to await sunrise and sunset for prayer (Muslim, Musāfīrīn, trad. 296). In Makkah prayer is allowed at all times (Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣī, b. 73; Tirmidhī, Ḥadīṣī, b. 42).


MIKHĀLI SABBĀGH, an Arabic author born of Catholic parents in Akko in 1784, was educated in Damascus and then came to Egypt. Here he joined the French army of Napoleon’s expedition, had to leave the country with them and came to Paris. The State printing works employed him as a proof-reader and the Bibliothèque Nationale as a copyist of Oriental manuscripts; his irregular habits prevented him leading a comfortable or settled existence, although de Sacy and his pupils appreciated his thorough knowledge of his mother tongue. He himself only used it to compose Ḷaṣālas in the old style in praise of great men of the period and to make some money thereby. For example in 1805 he addressed a poem to the Grand Juge when he visited the printing works, in 1805 to Pope Pius VII, in 1810 to Napoleon on his marriage, in 1811 to the King of Rome, in 1814 to Louis XVIII. Three poems were printed at the government press, that to Pius VII with a Latin translation by de Sacy, that to Louis XVIII with a French one by Grandjean de Lagrange. He also published a work on carrier pigeons entitled Kitāb Muḥāṣat al-Bārī wa l-‘Aḥlām fī Ṣalāt al-Ḥamām. The colombe messagère, plus rapide que l’éclair, plus prompte que la nue, par M. S. traduit de l’Arabe en Français par Silv. de Sacy, Paris 1805; based on the preceding: Die blitzgeschw. Briefe, oder sinnreiche Kunst des Oriental, Träumen zum Bestellen der Briefe abzurichten, nach dem Arab. des M.S. Herborn 1806; Beschreibung der Kunst der Taubenpost, welche seit der Zeit der Erledigung gebräuch- licht, wird, aus dem Arab. von Dr. Th. J. K. Arnold, Frankfurt 1817; La colombe messagère, plus rapide que del lampo, trad. di S. A. Cataneo, Mailand 1822; Die Brieftauben schmächtiger als die Blitzen von dem Arab. von C. Loper, Strassburg 1879. — The last manuscript is a history of the Arab desert tribes of Syria, a history of Syria and Egypt and important for its lexigraphical information; al-Rāblī, al-dīnām al-tamām wa l-Kalām al-‘Azmah fi Ahwāl al-Kalām al-dārīj, M.S. Grammatik der arabischen Umgangssprache in Syrien und Ägypten, nach der Munchener Hs. herausg. von H. Thorbecke, Strassburg 1886.

Bibliography: Humbert, Anthologie Arabe, p. 291 sqq.; Biographie Universelle, xxxix, 427. (C. Brockelmann)

MIKHĀL-OGHLU, an old Ottoman noble family. This family traces its descent to the feudal lord Kose Mâlik Abî Allâf, originally a Greek (cf. F. A. Guéroul, in Ch. Schefer, Petit traité de l’Origine des Turcs par Th. Spankoum Cantacuzin, Paris 1896, p. 297: L’Anc. dett. Grecc est nomm. Michaîl… Dus uit Michâl sont descendus de Mâlochî). Who appears in the reign of Othmân I as lord of Chirmenki (Kirmendjik) at the foot of Olympus near Edreos, and later as an ally of the first Ottoman ruler earned great merit for his share in aiding the latter’s expansion (cf. J. v. Hammer, in G.O.R. i. 48, 57, following Idris Bitlisî and Neshî). Converted to Islam, Kose Mâlik appears again in the reign of Othmân’s son Urkhan. The rank of commander of the army’s [q.v.] became hereditary in the family of Kose Mâlik.
which is even said to have been related to the royal house of Savoy and of France (cf. Paolo Giovio: *Michalogi di sangue Turchesco e per via di donum*; si sa parente del Duca di Savoia e del Re di Francia; in this case Mikhâl [Mîkhâl] alias Köse Mîkhâl must have been descended from the Palaeologoi; cf. J. V. Hammer, *G.O.R. i. 582,* and along with the Mâloko-oghlu (properly Malković, i.e. Marković), the Ewrenos-oghlu [q. v.], Timûr-tash-oghlu [q. v.] and Tarâkhan-oghlu [q. v.] was among the most celebrated of the noble families of the early Ottoman empire. Köse Mîkhâl, called ‘Abd Allâh, died in Adrianople and was buried in the mosque founded there by him in the western Yildırım quarter.

The following genealogical table shows the order of succession of the Mîkhâl-oghlus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ghâzî Mehemmed-Beg</th>
<th>Ghâzî Yakhshî-Beg</th>
<th>Ghâzî Ball-Beg</th>
<th>Ghâzî ‘Ali-Beg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. 826 at İsmâîl</td>
<td>d. 816 at Buñar-İsâr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ghâzî ‘Ali-Beg fell at Villach 1492

Ghâzî Iskender-Beg 1) d. 903

Mîkhâl-Beg d. 895 (1490) Yakhshî-Beg

Ghâzî Mehemmed-Beg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ghâzî</th>
<th>Aḥmed Čelebi</th>
<th>Ghâzî Khîdr-Beg</th>
<th>Ghâzî Ğâzîl-Beg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suleimân-Beg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Omer-Beg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the genealogy published by İsmâîl office, *Wâhibye Defterî,* No. 247, in Siwâs, the Hâkî, *Âlîbeler* (Stambul 1345 = 1927), p. 25: genealogy of the Mîkhâl-oghlu is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ghâzî</th>
<th>Mîkhâl-Beg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghâzî ‘Ali-Beg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mehemmed-Beg</th>
<th>Yahiya-Beg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Khaîr al-Dîn | Khîdr-Pasha ‘Ali-Beg | Yurkuč-Pasha | Sinan-Beg | Baraq-Beg |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kâsim-Beg</td>
<td>Mehemmed-Pasha</td>
<td>Khîdr-Beg</td>
<td>Suleimân-Pasha ‘Omer-Beg</td>
<td>Mehemmed-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urudj-Beg</td>
<td>Mûsâtfa-Beg</td>
<td>Iskender-Beg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we compare the article *Yurkuč Pasha* in , where the descendants of this general are given, Mehemmed Suraiya, *Sidjil-i oṣmâni,* iv. 652, 1 we get a different picture of the genealogy.

1) According to Mehemmed Suraiya, *Sidjil-i oṣmâni,* iv. 101, Iskender-Beg had four sons, ‘Ali, Mehemmed, Khîdr and Suleimân. This must be wrong and the genealogy is as above.
MİKHÂL-OGHLU – MILAS


MIRNâS. [See MeKesNes.]

MîkiyaS, any simple instrument for measuring, e.g. the pointer on a sundial; in Egypt the name of the Nilometer, i.e. the gauge on which the regular rise and fall of the river can be read. To get an undisturbed surface, the water was led into a basin; in the centre of this stood the water gauge, a column on which ells and fingers were carefully measured off. The level of the water was ascertained by an official daily and proclaimed by cries.

Originally the rising of the Nile was measured by the gauge (al-rajîts). According to Ibn 'Abd al-Hašmat, al-KudâJî, and others, Josaph, the son of Jacob, built the first Nilometer at Memphis; at a later date, the "aged Dalâka" built Nilometers in Ajûnîn and Anýâbî (Antinoe). These were the Nilometers in use throughout the Greek period till the conquest of Egypt by 'Amr b. al-Ôy. The latter erected a Nilometer at Assuan and a second at Dendera. Others were built in the reigns of Mu'ašiya and 'Abd al-Ôarzî. Finally the Caliph al-Mu'âwawakkîl had a large Nilometer built and instead of the Christian officials appointed Abu l-Raddâd to look after it, and the office remained hereditary in his family down to the time of al-Mâkrî (d. 1442).

The ancient Egyptians are said to have drowned a virgin in the Nile at the beginning of its rise as a sacrifice. 'Amr compelled the Nile to rise and fall at God's command by means of a writing which he threw into the water.


MİLAD (a.). According to some Arabic lexicographers the meaning of this term is time of birth in contra-distinction to mâwîl which may denote also "place of birth". The latter is the usual term for birthday, especially in connection with the birthday of Muhammad and Muslim saints [cf. the art. Mâwîl]; milâd denotes also Christmas. For other special meanings cf. Dory, Supplement aux dictionnaires arabes, i.e.

Bibliography: the Arabic lexicons.

MİLAS, the ancient Mylasa, capital of Caria and famous in antiquity for its sanctuaries of the Carian Zeus (in medioeval and modern western sources: Milas, Milavo, Melas, Melavo), a town in S. W. Anatolia, 15 miles from its seaport, Kulluk (on the Gulf of Mendelia). It is the capital of the köza of the same name in the wilayet of Mugla (formerly the sandjak of Men-
tegh) and has 7,346 inhabitants (census of 1928) compared with 7,261 (of whom 3,200 were Greeks) who were removed by the exchange of 1922. 739 Jews, who still flourish, and 71 foreigners in 1908 (Silvanum Altia, of 1326 A. H.).

Milas lies on a low eastern spur of the Sodra Dagh (Gr. St. Elias) in the centre of a very fertile plain surrounded on all sides by hills, and watered by the Sarı Cay which flows round the Sodra Dagh on north and west. The road to the sea however does not follow this marshy watercourse but crosses the hills south of the Sodra Dagh, here commanded by the once powerful medieval fortress of Pégin (three miles S. of Milas). The bay itself was in the middle ages defended by the island citadel of Asn Kafesi (Judichel, Iassos Athen. Mittel., xx. 139) and later by a castle at the harbour built by Meḥmed II (Piri Keïn, Babrîr, ed. P. Kahle, chap. 21). At Milas met the old, and although difficult, only roads to the west to the important mediaeval port of Balât (Miletus), to the north into the fertile plain of Karpuzlu Ov‡as and Cine and into the Maender valley, and eastward to Mughla, the other important town of the district. This and its protected situation near the sea within a broad fertile plain destined the town to be once more a capital when the region again attained political independence under the Turkish dynasty of the Mentehše ([q. v.]).

The region first passed temporarily under Turkish rule when, after the victory of the Seljûks at Manzikert in 1071 the western Anatolian coast with Nicaea, Smyrna and Ephesus and even islands like Samos and Rhodes were occupied by the Turks. Although we have no definite information about Milas itself we know that the monks of the neighbouring Latmos had to leave their monasteries on account of the Turks (in 1079; cf. Th. Wiegand, Milet, iii. 185). But Byzantine rule was soon restored. It was only when the centre of the imperial government was withdrawn to Constantinople after the victory over the Latins in 1261 that this region finally passed into Turkish hands. When and after the final conquest took place we do not exactly know. Melanudion, which with Milas formed a theme from the period of the Comnenos (W. Tomaschek, Z. hist. Topographie Kleinasiens im M.A., Vienna 1891, Abh. d. Ak. d. W., p. 38), and is therefore to be located in the neighbourhood of Milas and was Byzantine till 1273 at least, was again taken for a time from the Turks of Mentehše in 1296, so that it must have been occupied by them a few years before (Wiegand, op. cit.). That Mentehše is called Σαλέκεζ = Sâhi̇lı Haqî, Emir al-Sawâhîl in Pachymeres (i. 472; ii. 211, Bonn ed.), in Sanudo (Hopf, Chron. gro−romanae, p. 145) Turquen−
domar (read: Turquemdomar = "Turkoman of the sea") suggests a conquest from the sea. There is no longer any record at this period of the bishopric of Milas, which as a church of the eparchy of Caria (see G. Parthey, Hierocles Synedemus et notitiae graecae episcopatum, p. 32, 112 etc.) was under the metropolis of Stavropolis, which still existed in the xivth century (A. Wachter, Der Verfall des Griechentums in Kleinasiens im XIV. Jahrh., p. 34 sqq.) (Stavropolis, the ancient Aphrodisiae and the village of Gere, twenty miles west of Denizli).

Milas appears as the capital of the principality of Mentehše about 1330 in al−Umari (ed. Taesch− ner, p. 21; transl. Râlaš, while Fâkeb = Phocaean which appears as a capital in the Genoese report, ibid., p. 47 is probably an error of the writer and is not to be corrected to Mughla) and in Ibn Battûta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguineti, ii. 278 sqq.) also, who here enjoyed the hospitality of the Akhî gild (on a Fatûrası̇çı̇me written in Milas at the end of the xivth century see Taschner, in Islamica, iv. 40) and admires the wealth of the town in gardens and orchards and gives the name of the lord of the country as Shüdî al−Dîn Urkhân b. Mentehše, whom he visited in his capital Pégin, not far away. The Mentehše built very little in Milas as they were engaged in embellishing their residence. It is noteworthy that the two mosques of this period lie outside the old town, still largely enclosed in its old walls; one to the south, in the Hâddîjî Hyûs quarter, the little Şahâl al−Dîn Dîmâni with outer court and stepped minaret, built under Urkhân Bey in 1330; the other just outside the walls to the east, the mosque of Ahmed Gâzî built in 1378, which with its entrance in the narrow side (without an outer court) and the stepped minaret built above it (Imâmî ھکّت, Kîtabeler, Istanbul 1929, fig. 47) looks as if it had once been a church (cf. Wul− zinger, Die Pirâs−Mencûte zu Milas, in Festh. d. Techn. Hochschule in Karlsruhe, 1925, p. 10 of the reprint). The minbar of this mosque also dated 780 (1378) is now in the Çinili Köşk in Konstantinople. From the position of these mosques, it may be deduced that the old town remained in the occupation of the Christians, who still held the most of it in quite recent times. The only mosque in the old town, just in its centre, and in the highest part of it, the Bulund Dîmâni, seems also to have been a church and was probably used by the garrison, if it is old. The medresse of Khoja Bedr al−Dîn, which dates from the period of the Mentehše, unfortunately cannot be exactly dated (Rev. Hist., v. 58).

Milas received its first important building from the first Ottoman governor Fırûz, whom Bâyazîd I appointed over Mentehše−iî (Dustûrunâme−i Enveri, ed. Mucrîm Hilâl, İstanbul 1928, p. 88) after the conquest (792 = 1390) (the date given by most Turkish sources is supported by Bâyazîd's confirmation of the Venetian privileges for Balât of May 21, 1390, Diplomatatarium Veneto−lacuntinum, Venice 1899, ii. No. 134). The Mentehše who fled to Egypt (Dustûrunâme, i. c.) was probably the prince of the house ruling in Balât, while the senior Ahmed Gâzî may have held out in Milas and Pégin till July 1391 (according to his tombstone he died in Pégin in Şahîdan 793 as sheikh). In 1394 Fırûz built to the north of the old town and outside of it a splendid mosque in the style of the Brusa private mosques (cf. Wulzinger's monograph). Ottoman rule was interrupted by Tumûr who passed through Milas on his return from Smyrna in the winter after the battle of Angora (1402) (Ducas, p. 76, Bonn ed.), for about twenty years by the restoration of the former dynasty. This last period of the Mentehše−oghlu has left no memorials in Milas or Pégin. The Ottoman commanders then made their headquarters in Pégin after which this last of the Mentehše sandjak was long called (Ahi Bekr b. Bahrâm in Hâddîjî Khlâifa, Dîkân−namâ, p. 638, i.e. the second half of the xvith century) and only moved
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to Milas at a later date, when a magnificent official residence was erected, with defensive towers, and is still partly inhabited.

From the second half of the sixteenth century we have Ewliya's description of the town (in the unprinted vol. ix. of his Saiyâhet-nâme, MS. Beghîr Agha, No. 452, fol. 51) He says the town had 4 mosques, 3 madrâsahs and two large khâns. At this time the garrison was still in Peçin. He praises the gardens of the town but rightly describes the climate as unhealthy. Among the products he mentions tobacco, with which Milas supplied the whole of Anatolia. Among the holy places mentioned by him, we may note that of Shaikh Shashteri because it probably belongs to the Baba al-Shushteri met here by Ibn Battûta. Ewliya's description of the old ruins is much exaggerated, although he saw a good deal more than now exists. Pococke (Ti. avell., ii. 2, ch. 6) at the end of the eighteenth century was still able to sketch a temple of Augustus and Roma here. All that now survives in addition to the town walls is the Balta Kapû (a Corinthian gateway with the Carian double-axe) and a mausoleum called Gümühsâh (filigree-worker) (Choseal-Gourlay, Voyage dans l'Empire Ottoman, i. 234 sqq., pl. 84 — 92). In the adjacent village of Shashteri is the tomb of Shaikh Bedr al-Din b. Shaikh Kasim, who died at Brusa in 824 (1429) and is buried here, a kâltâf of Saiyid Muhammad al-Bukhari (see Rev. Hist., v. 311 sqq.), on the site of a church of St. Xene, who died here (Bull. de Corr. Hell., xiv. 616 sqq.).

The capital of the Menteşhe, already mentioned several times, Peçin (Gr. Petsona) consists of an imposing citadel built over ancient foundations and Byzantine masonry and an extensive town lying south of it. The citadel with its walls and towers crowns a steep rock that rises out of the southern end of the plain of Milas (Ismâ'il Haâktî, fig. 40) and is accessible only at the south side by a great door flanked by a tower adorned with lions carved upon it. Inside the fortress, where there is no little village, the only architectural remains are foundations of a church. Opposite to the entrance to the citadel, on a plateau surrounded by walls, some of which still stand, lie the palace and its annexes, now mostly in ruins. All that survives is the charming medrese, built of stone, of Ahmed Gâhari of 777 = 1375 (Ismâ'il Haâktî, fig. 51 — 54). In the Fırtan, the arch of which is flanked in the spandrels by reliefs of lions holding flags, the founder is buried (see above); opposite the medrese stands a mosque built by Urkhan Bey in 752 (1352), in ruins except for the gateway of Byzantine doorbeams and fragments of ambors (the inscription is given in Ewliya), probably the one that Ibn Battûta saw being built on his visit to Peçin (Bardjin). There is also a mosque and medrese, a bath and a palatial serai, all in ruins. Exceptionally finely carved tombstones give the names of important people who lived here down to the xvith century. Ewliya, who still found about one hundred houses here, thought there must once have been a great town here. Peçin is mentioned by Kaîkahântî, Şahâl ad-Aş'âhî, viii. 18, as the possession of a certain Emîr Mîsha, lord of Balâç and Bardjin (Ş.), who is known from a coin in the collection of J. H. Mordtmann. A native of Bardjin was Maḥmûd b. Meşkid, who was the middle of the xivth century dedicated his "Book of the Falconer" (Bâzânûre) written in Turkish to a Menteşhe-oghlu (v. Hammer, Falknerkat, Vienna 1840; Thûry, Türkîk nihâyet-nâmecâhî a XIV. yüz. e., p. 29). On October 17, 1414 in Peçona the Menteşhe-oghlu Ilîbâs Bey concluded a treaty with the Venetians (Diplomaturnum Veneto-Levantinum, ii. 30, No. 166).

Biблиography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text: V. Caime, Turquie Salée, iii. 606 sqq.: Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, Paris 1872, p. 648; Heyd, Gesch. d. Levantenthands im MA, i. 584 (Fr. ed., i. 553). I was unable to consult the work mentioned by Hasluck, Christianity and Islam, ii. 596 entitled I. Koutoulis, Τά Νέα Μόναξα, in Εωσφορίς, iii. 448 sqq. For the Muslim inscriptions see A. Tewfîd, in Rev. Hist. (Constantinople), ii. 761; iii. 1146, also Haïî-Kadr (ibid., v. 57, 308) and Ismâ'il Haâktî, Kîtabeler, Istanbul 1929, p. 155 sqq.

(F. WITTEK)

MILA (a.), possession, property. The word is not found in the Kurâ'n, but is in regular use in legal terminology. The double meaning of the word shows that the usual distinction in our legal language between the conceptions of possession and property are not found in the fikr. There is, it is true, a special term for the actual power over a thing, what we call possession in the narrower sense, namely yâd, lit. "hand", but the distinction between a judicial ownership and the actual control is not found in Muslim jurisprudence and there is not a word for property which takes into account the actual ownership, either from the positive or the negative point of view. As a result we find, for example, that the ownership of a thing passes directly by an agreement if this was intended, even if the thing in question is not at once handed over. On the other hand, not only things but also rights can be owned.

The following are excluded from the possibility of being property and subject to legal regulations: 1. useless things (e.g. wild animals); 2. things the use of which is prohibited by religion (e.g. wine-grapes); 3. things which are ritually impure or have become polluted to such an extent that they cannot be purified (e.g. swine, dung etc.) so long as they are not essential parts of a pure or permitted thing. If such things, however, are acquired, one talks not of nilâlt but of ilâm (see special claim upon them; legal transactions relating to such things have a special vocabulary of their own.

Kamîl almîlk is a necessary preliminary for the property of an owner being liable to zakât [q.v.].

Biблиography: The articles "Amîn, Batî", Mâl, Şirka, Tîyarâ and the literature there given; Juyâmbol, Handleiding (1930), 360 and the references there given; al-Dîjasâli, al-Wâjiûa, i. 55 sqq.

MILLA (a.), religion, rite. However obvious it may be to connect this word with the Hebrew and Jewish and Christian-Aramaic milla, "utterance, word", it has not been satisfactorily proved how and where it received the meaning which is taken for granted in the Kurâ'n: religion or rite. Nor is it known whether it is a purely Arabic word or a loanword adopted by Muslims or others before him (Noldeke, Z. D. M. G., lvi. 413 seems to hold that it is Arabic for he refers to the 4 th form amilâ or amîlâ "to dictate"). In the Kurâ'n it always means (even in
the somewhat obscure passage, Sûra xxxviii. 6) "religion" and it is used of the heathen religions (vi. 86 sqq.; xiv. 15; xviii. 19) as well as of those of the Jews and Christians (ii. 114), and of the true religion of the fathers (xii. 38). The word acquired a special significance in the Medina sections where the Prophet in his polemic against the Jews speaks of "Abraham's milâa", by which he means the original revelation in its purity, which it was his duty to restore (ii. 124; iii. 89; xvi. 124; xxii. 77 sqq.; cf. iv. 124; vi. 162; xii. 37). Muslim literature follows this Qur'anic usage but the word is not in frequent use. With the article, al-mîlla means the true religion revealed by Muhammad and is occasionally used elliptically for alîl al-mîlla, the followers of the Muhammadan religion (Tabarî, iii. 813, 853, 8), just as its opposite al-djâmûs is an abbreviation for alîl al-djâmûs, the non-Muhammadans who are under the protection of Islâm; e.g., Ibn Sa'd, iii./1, 238, 25; cf. also the derivative milâmî opposed to dhâmîn, client (Ba'ha'i, ed. Schwally, p. 121 infra).

Bibliography: Noldke, Orientalistische Kisi-zen, p. 40; Z. D. M. G., ixxi. 415; Taba-rî, ed. de Goeje, Glosar, s. v.; Snouck Huregronje, Het Mekkaansche Feest, p. 30 sqq. (F. BÜHL)

MÌM, 24th letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of forty. On different forms of the letter cf. ARABIA, plate i. In some dialects of Southern Arabia and of tribes coming from that region, mam is and is used as the article of determination, side by side with l. A well known tradition is put into the mouth of a man from Southern Arabia in the following form: Lâta mùa am-birri am-mirî fi 'âmîla fârî. Cf. Ibn Ya'la, ed. Jahn, ii. 1531; Landesbr., Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabe méridional, ii./ii. 281—290.

(A. J. WENSINCK)

MINA, later often pronounced Muná, a place in the hills east of Mecca on the road from it to 'Arafa [q.v.]. The distance between the two is given by Mu'addas as one parasang, while Wavell calls it five miles and says the continuation to 'Arafa is nine miles. Minâ lies in a narrow valley running from west to east, 1,500 paces long according to Burckhardt, surrounded by steep barren granite cliffs. On the north side rises a hill called Thâbir. Travellers from Mecca come down into the valley by a hill path with steps in it; this is the 'Aksâba [q.v.] which became famous in connection with Muhammad's negotiations with the Madinians. The town consists of stone houses of fair size which form two long streets. Close beside the 'Aksâba is a rudely hewn short pillar leaning against a wall: this is the "great djarna" or the "Aksâba djarna", at which the pilgrims cast stones [cf. DJAMRA]. A little to the east in the middle of the street is the "middle djarna" also marked by a pillar and lastly at a similar distance the third (the so-called "first djarna"). As one approaches the east end of the valley, there is on the right of the road a square mosque surrounded by a wall, the Masjîd al-Khair, which was rebuilt by Saladin and in 874 (1467) reconstructed by the Mamlûk Sulân Kâ'tî Bey. Along the west side of the surrounding wall is a colonnade with three rows of pillars, but there is none on the other sides. It was different earlier, for Ibn Rusta (c. 300 A. H.) tells us that the mosque had 168 pillars of which only seventy-eight supported the west wing. The north side of the wall is pierced by several doors. In the centre of the court of the mosque is a little domed building with a minaret built over a fountain. There is another dome over the colonnade on the west side (see the illustrations, ii. 256).

The most striking feature of Minâ is the very great difference, noted already by Mu'addas, between the quiet and empty streets of the greater part of the year and the tremendous throng and bustle of the pilgrimage month when, as Wavell says, half a million people with heavily laden beasts of burden hope to cover nine miles in the period between sunrise and 10 a.m. Every spot in the valley is then covered with tents in which the pilgrims spend the night. Mu'addas talks of fine houses built of tusk and stone (among them was a frequently mentioned Dâr al-Imâra), and large stone buildings are still to be found in Minâ; but these are usually empty and are only let at the pilgrimage to the more wealthy pilgrims and even among these many prefer to live in tents. This depopulation of the city has been a subject for discussion among the legists, for some held that this circumstance enables Minâ and Mecca to be regarded as one city (miyâr), a view which others reject. But another circumstance must have contributed to preserve a permanent settlement of the town, which is also true of other places on the pilgrims' route, namely the incredible filth and dreadful stench which is caused by such masses of humanity at the Hajjîj. Complaints are made even of the uncleanness of the Masjîd al-Khaîf and at Minâ there are further the decomposing remains of the countless animals sacrificed. Probably the old pagan period [cf. HADJÛ], for Muhammad, as usual in taking over old customs, contented himself with cutting out the too obviously pagan elements, the result being that we can no longer reconstruct the old forms with certainty. The old poets make only passing references to them (cf. DJAMRA); that they were similar to the Muslim practices is evident, for example, from an interesting passage in the Medina poet Kâsî b. Khatîm (ed. Kowalski, No. 4, p. 1 292) where there is a reference to the "three days in Minâ" and where we further learn that the festival held there offered an occasion for entering into and carrying on love-affairs. The stone throwing is certainly very ancient; its significance is quite unimpeachable in Islám, although it is doubtful if there were already three heaps of stones in the pre-Islamic period [cf. DJAMRA]. It is also clear that the ceremonies in Minâ formed the conclusion of the Hajjîj even in ancient times. Muhammad however made some serious alterations here, for he inserted a visit to Mecca before the stay in Minâ, whereby the ceremony first received its legitimate Muhammadan character; but the old elements remained the important factors, for the Hajjîj ends not in Mecca but, as before, in Minâ, to which the pilgrims return after the digestion to Mecca. A survival of the pagan period probably exists in the slaughtering place preferred by the majority on the southern slopes of Thâbir "the place of sacrifice of the ram" (cf. Sûra xxxviii. 101 sqq.), as its association with the story of Abraham probably enabled an old pagan secret not to be adopted into Islâm. From Burton's description it is a square rocky platform reached by a few steps. Muhammad himself did not directly forbid the use
of the pagan place of slaughter, but deprived it of its importance by saying that all Minā is a place of sacrifice; a clever procedure which he also followed at 'Arafāt and Muzdalīfā.

According to the law of Išlām, the pilgrims who arrive in Mecca on the 8th Muharram 'I-Hijjādja should leave this town in time to be able to perform the mid-day ṣaḥāf in Minā and remain there till sunrise on the 8th and only then go on to 'Arafāt. The majority however do not do this but go on the 8th straight on to 'Arafāt where they arrive in the evening. After performing the ceremonies of the pilgrimage in 'Arafāt and Muzdalīfā [q. v.], they go before sunrise on the 10th to Minā to celebrate the day of the great sacrifice (Ya'qūm al-ṣaḥāf or Yawm al-nahr) (in contrast to the pre-Islamic practice, which was to start only after sunrise). Here the concluding rites are gone through, the slaughtering, the clipping of the hair and nails and the ligation. There is not complete agreement as to the order of these ceremonies, which some tradition (Waṣiṣṭī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 423) makes Muhammad declare to be quite irrelevant. The modification of the stone throwing is noteworthy, for on the day of sacrifice it is only done at the 'Aṣ'āb heap, while on the three following days each pilgrim daily throws seven little stones on all three heaps (cf. the illustrations above, ii. 256 and Burton, ii. 205). The conclusion of the whole pilgrimage is the three Minā or 'Abhād days, the 11th, 12th and 13th Muharram 'I-Hijjādja (cf. above, ii. 199 and the article TASHKHĪL). They are days of rejoicing which are celebrated with great jubilation, illumination and the firing of shots. All the pilgrims however do not wait for these three days but set off on their return journey before then.


MINARET. [See MANĀRA.]

MINBAR (A.), pulpit [cf. MASJID]. On the origin of the form of the minbar the reader may be referred to C. H. Becker's exhaustive study Die Kanzel im Kultur des alten Islam (Nordische Festschrift und Islamstudien). Becker refers to the earliest historical statement which says that the Prophet in the year 7 A. H. made his minbar on which he used to preach to the people; it had two steps and a seat (mahāf). The minbar was therefore originally a raised seat or throne. On the morning after the death of the Prophet, after stormy disputes, Abū Bakr took his seat on the Prophet's minbar in a solemn assembly and received the general homage here. The later caliphs followed this tradition, as did the governors, who ascended the pulpit on their accession to office and on their resignation. The minbar in the early period was therefore not at all specially associated with worship but was the seat of the ruler in the council. The pulpit only gradually grew out of it with the development of public worship. According to Becker, the date of the change from the ruler's or judge's seat to the simple pulpit coincides with the end of the Omayyad dynasty. In 132 A.H. all the mosques in the provinces of Egypt were provided with minbars, about the same period probably in the other lands of Išlām also. At the beginning of the 'Abbāsid period the minbar was already a pulpit exclusively. The first tendency to its use as a pulpit is seen by Becker in the introduction of the minbar into the divine service at the Mūsāllā in Medina, which is ascribed to Mu'tawwya or to his governor. The Prophet did not have a minbar at the Mūsāllā and nothing but divine service could have been held there.

The typical form of the minbar as a pulpit, which is placed to the right of the mihrāb and of the spectator, is an erection on steps with a portal or without a door at the entrance to the steps and a ciboriumlike canopy to the platform. This form is peculiar to the minbar of wood, which is the most usual. The variants in stone and brick are more simple and frequently are only a bare platform reached by three to five steps. The fine series of minbars of wood begins with that most famous of all in the history of art, the minbar in the great mosque in Kairawān. On the occasion of the extension of the mosque by 'Abdrīm ibn 'Aqlab (281–289 = 874–902) it is said to have been brought with the lustre tiles of the mihrāb wall from Bagdad and set up. It is made of plane-tree wood and is in the canonical minbar shape with a staircase—here of 17 steps—to the preacher's platform. The pulpit, however, has not yet the stylized structure of the later wooden minbar. It has not the portal nor the canopy at the top. Its composition of about 200 carved panels and narrow strips of unequal size, is simply a primitive agglomeration of profuse ornamentation, still very nomadic in feeling, such as would hardly ever have been found in Bagdad, and even in Kairawān can scarcely be regarded as original. Saladin has pointed out that the pulpit must have been restored after Kairawān had been sacked by the troops of the Fatimid Mustansir Abū Tamīm in 441 (1049). In any case it has several times suffered damage and undergone restoration so that its present general appearance cannot be dealt with critically until we have a thorough monograph based on exact investigation on the spot. The ornamentation must, as Kühnel observes, be regarded as Omayyad (Springer's Kunstgeschichte, vi. 358).

The vane brushes of the frame-strips and the panels filled with floral patterns and leaves resemble the decoration at Mashqīt [q. v.] and some of the geometrical patterns, which are of all imaginable combinations, are already found on the shafts of
pre-Islamic columns in Deyr Bakr (cf. van Berchem-Strygowski, *Amida*). The archaistic combination of designs on the minbar has no connection with the decoration which since Sāmārāḏ we call *Abbaṣīd. We have here a phenomenon comparable to *Mshattā* since here also ornamentations from different sources are combined to form a general scheme whose common denominator is formed by the formal quality of the chiaroscuro common to them all. We do not even know how long the nucleus of these carved strips and latticed panels may have previously existed in Baghdād and they may have there belonged to an Omayyad minbar before the pieces were brought to Ḫairawān and supplemented by copies and additions of local workmanship.

The few pulpits that have survived from the Fāṭimid period follow the Syro-Egyptian style of woodwork of the period with their system of frames filled with foliage. The tendrils were prevented from over-running the whole surface by being placed within small polygonal areas which were grouped together in cassettes (Kühnel, Springer's *Kunstgeschichte*, vi. 406). The wooden mīhrāb of the xith century from Cairo illustrated in the article *Mīhrāb* illustrates this style, which is also represented by the minbar made in 1091 A.D. for the mosque in *Asḵālān* and now in Hebron, and by the pulpit of 1155 A.D. in the mosque of *ʿAmr* in Ǧūs on the upper Nile.

During the Fāṭimid period the pulpit developed its canonical form as represented in the minbar of the Māṣjd al-ʿĀṣāf in Jerusalem, which was built in 1168 A.D. by Nūr al-Dīn to Aleppo and later taken by Sālādīn to Jerusalem (Salūdī, *Minbar*, p. 243). It has one of the upper ways and the domed canopy. The main decorative motives are 8-pointed stars and the polygonal and star-shaped subsidiary panels show carving in relief inlaid with ivory and mother-of-pearl. Of the minbar of Sulṭān Lāḏīn in the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn of the year 1269 A.D. little more is left than the framework, while the panels are preserved in the Arab Museum in Cairo and in the South Kensington Museum (cf. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Arab Museum*, Cairo). That wooden minbars were sometimes copied in stone is shown by the stone pulpit in the mosque-madrasa of Sulṭān Ḥassān (757—764 = 1356—1363). The mukḥaras on the door case and soon after found on the dome also, here as in the mīhrāb goes back to Turkish influence transmitted through Syria. Like the mīhrāb, the minbar also attained its finest workmanship in Cairo under the second Mamlūk dynasty in the xvth century and later. No essential alteration was later made in its canonical form and its embellishment remained standardised and varied only in details. A fine example of this fully developed Cairo type is in the South Kensington Museum. According to the inscription, it was presented by Kaʿīt Bey (1468—1495) and has finely carved ivory panels and traces of painting on the wooden parts. The usual star pattern is replaced by a smooth surface. The gilt onion-shaped dome with its finial and cresting on the stalactite cornices are, as Briggs observes, characteristic of the period (Briggs, *Minbar*, Archit. in Egypt and Palestine, p. 217).

After the Turkish conquest, the general deterioration in craftsmanship in Cairo affected the minbar also, but exceptions, like the finely-worked pulpit of the mosque of al-Burdānī, however show that the good old tradition still survived. Ḥakām II's minbar in Córdoba has not survived but from the descriptions of the Arab writers it must have been a peculiarly valuable piece of work, for according to al-Maḳḳārī it cost 35,703 dinars. It could be moved on wheels and contained the caliph ʿOmar's Kurān. In the mosque of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn in Konya is a minbar of hazelwood, according to an inscription on the posts supporting the upper part, the work of an artist of Ḳairāwān of the year 550 (1155). Two inscriptions on the door of the pulpit mention Sulṭān Masʿūd I (510—551 = 1116—1156) and ʿAlīṣūr ʿAṣlān II (551—584 = 1156—1188) (cf. J. H. Loytved, *Konia* and F. Sarre, *Seldschuksche Kleinkunst*, p. 27 sqq., pl. vi.—viii.). Inscriptions from the Kurān decorate the frames of the balustrades of the steps. The pulpit is of the traditional Syro-Egyptian form, but is, however, distinguished from them by its vigorous structure. Polygons and star-shaped panels fill the sideframes, together with the same tendril patterns symmetrically interwoven, as we find naturalised in all the eastern lands of Islām from the beginning of the eleventh century (detailed illustration in Sarre, *op. cit.*, fig. 24).

In Persia and Afghānīstān all the old minbars seem to have been destroyed by the Mongol invasion. On the other hand, the minbar illustrated here in the mosque of Dīwār Shāh Agha in the sanctuary of the Imām Rādā in Mshhed which was built about 840—850 (1436—1446) is original in ornamentation and an example of the Timūrid minbar. The structural motive is thrust into the background by the profuse covering of small pentagonal and star-shaped wooden panels with tendrils carved in relief after the style of the contemporary tiles. The effect is that of a carpet. Nothing is known of old minbars in Turkestān. In India, pulpits were built almost exclusively of stone. Many, some of them richly carved, still exist in the Muslim provinces and towns of India. The pavilion on four pillars, common and popular in India, which gives a charm to buildings for Muslim worship as a decorative finish to the roof, was also used here for the stone minbar. Indeed one might even wonder whether this originally Indian structure was carried by the Eastern Turks to Central Asian lands and adopted by them for the minbar. Minbars with such canopy are frequently found in the mosques of the province of Guḍjarāt and in Aḥmadābād (cf. these volumes in the *Arch. Survey of India, Western India*). The mosque of Ḩilāl Khān Kāḏi of 1333 A.D. in Dholka, for example, has a stone minbar with seven steps and a canopy on pillars on the roof, but no entrance gate. The triangular side walls are divided into square areas which are carved in relief (*Arch. Survey of India, Western India*, vol. vi., Guḍjarāt, pl. xxvii., xxx.). In Ḥaḏarābād, the Muslim state of the south, on the other hand, the minbars are more simple and heavier, and have no canopy (cf. illustration from Osmanībād).


(E. Diez)
Fig. 1. Minbar in the Sidi Uqba Mosque in Kairwan.

Fig. 3. Minbar in the Sultan Hasan Mosque in Cairo.
Fig. 2. Minbar in the Parenda Mosque in 'Uthmanabad.
MINṬAḴA or MINṬAKAT AL-BURŪḌI also MINṬAḴ AL-FALAK AL-BURŪḌI or (more rarely) MINṬAḴ AL-BURŪḌI means, like the technical term Falak al-Burūḍi most frequently used in scientific literature, the circle (minṭaḵa) of the twelve signs of the zodiac ("towers", Greek πύργοι), then the zone of the ecliptic formed of the twelve signs each covering 30°.

The Kūrān contains references to minṭaḵa in thirty different passages, viz:  
Sūra xxv. 16: "We have placed towers (burūḍi) in the heavens and adorned them for the spectators".  
Sūra xxv. 61: "Blessed be he that placed towers (burūḍi) in the heavens and who placed a lamp in them and a light-giving moon".  
Sūra lxxv. is entitled al-Burūḍi and verse 1: "By the heavens with its towers (burūḍī)".

Babylonia may with great probability be assumed to be the original home of the zodiacal circle. The period of its origin cannot be fixed with certainty: the first attempts at a grouping of the constellations on the path of the sun and the planets, however, date from before the period of Hammurabi and in any case into the third millennium B.C. Almost all the names familiar to us are already found in Sumerian inscriptions. The Boghaz-Köi list of about 1300 B.C. gives all the signs of the zodiac with the exception of Leo and Libra.

The only pictorial representation of the starry heavens of the early Muslim period, the fresco on the dome of Kuṣair Amra shows the ecliptic as a broad band, along which are arranged the twelve burūḍi; it also shows the pole of the ecliptic and the 12 (ecliptical) degrees of longitude, as well as the equator and a series of parallel circles. The peculiarity of the arrangement of the heavens with considerable southern latitudes shown beyond the equator on the hemispherical inner surface of the dome results in the equator and ecliptic not being shown as the largest circles. The method of representing the separate constellations on the fresco, especially the minṭaḵa, is, broadly speaking, the same as that on the Al-Farnese. (n.b. It should be noted that the fresco of Kuṣair Amra represents the heavens reflected as in a mirror).

The Twelve Burūḍi. Preliminary Note:  
The names of the burūḍi are given in Arabic literature with many variations: those quoted below are the most usual. With the fixed stars a distinction is made between those which form the outline of a constellation (Kawāṣṭān min al-tūrā, i.e. the essential stars and such as "go beyond the constellation" (khrāḍ al-tūrā) and are regarded as only being loosely connected with it, i.e. the unessential stars.

The account here given is based in its main features on the statements in the first part of al-Kazwīnī's Cosmography.

1. al-Ḥamal or al-Kaḥīb, the Ram (Aries). It consists of 13 essential stars, 5 unessential Lie in its immediate vicinity; its fore-part is turned to the west and its hind-part to the east. It has its face on its back. The two bright stars on the horn (β and γ) are called al-Sharafānī or al-Nāṭīkh (the butters); they form at the same time the first of the 28 stations (mansions) of the moon (masūli). According to another reading the name al-Nāṭīkh is given to the unessential star α Arietis situated above the figure of the Ram. The three stars ε, δ and γ Aretis form the second station of the moon and are called al-būṯafīn ("little paunch").

2. al-Thawr, the Bull (Taurus). 32 essential and 11 unessential stars; its forepart faces the east. The bright star at the point of the norther horn (presumably β Tauri) is also included in the Waggoner (Auriga) as well as in the Bull. α is called al-Dabarān, ʿAlīn al-Thawr, Tālān ʿAlīn al-Thawr, Ḥadd al-Ṭawrīnh and al-Farīb ("large camel"), while the Hyades which surround it are called al-Ḳīṭā (the "young camels"). The Pleiades are called al-Thurayiya, κ and λ togetheral-Kāblānī ("the two dogs") of al-Dabarān. The Pleiades form the third, al-Dabarān and the Hyades together the fourth station of the moon.

3. al-Dhū' al-Naʿmān or al-Dhurawa, the Twins (Gemini). 18 essential and 7 unessential stars. The Twins are in the form of two men whose heads are turned to the northeast and feet to the southwest. Castor and Pollux (α and β) are called al-Dhīrāc al-muḥabbiḥa; they form the seventh station of the moon. γ and δ are called al-Hanʿa; together with three other stars of the Twins they form the sixth station of the moon. The name of γ and μ Geminorum is al-Bākhiṭa.

4. al-Surāfān, the Crab (Cancer). 9 essential and 4 unessential stars. ε Cancri with γ and δ form the eighth station of the moon and have the peculiar Arab name of al-Nahrā ("the cartilage of the nose") or in keeping with the Almagest, al-Māṭāf (= processus). The star β on the south hind-foot is called al-Turāf ("the extremity").  
5. al-Asad, the Lion (Leo). 27 essential and 8 unessential stars; he is conceived of as looking to the west. α (Regulus), γ, ζ and η are called al-Dājūḥa ("Forehead of the Lion") and form the tenth station of the moon; ζ and δ are the eleventh station of the moon, al-Zubra ("back-hair" or "mane of the Lion") or Kūḥil al-Asad. β Leonis is called Kunīb al-Asad or as the twelfth station of the moon al-Surā. According to another reading, the name Kunīb al-Asad is given to small stars in the vicinity of al-Surā.

5. al-Adhārā (only in the catalogue of fixed stars taken from the Almagest), the Virgin (Virgo) or al-Snubūla, the ear of corn. 26 essential and 6 unessential stars; the head of the Virgin lies south of β Leonis, her feet west of α and β Librae. The five stars in the shoulders β, γ, δ and ε Virginis, form the thirteenth station of the moon al-Awādā; α Virginis forms the fourteenth station of the moon, al-Snubūla or al-Snubūla (cf. Spica) which name is applied to the whole constellation of the Virgin. (N. B. The name al-Adhārā for a Virginis is not quoted as a name of the fourteenth station of the moon). The fifteenth station of the moon consists of the stars ρ, σ, τ and λ on the left foot; it is called al-Ghafr.

7. al-Mīzān, the Scales (Libra). 8 essential and 9 unessential stars. α and β Librae on the pans of the balance form the sixteenth station of the moon which is called al-Zubānā or Za-bānā al-ʾArāb ("claws of the Scorpion") (cf. Sumerian Š.KA AN.NA., Akkadian Zibanīta as the name of the constellation Libra).

8. al-ʾArāb, the Scorpion. 22 essential and 3 unessential stars; it has its head to the west and its tail to the east. β, δ and σ Scorpis mark the seventeenth station of the moon al-
Ikth, the eighteenth station of the moon, Kalb al-'Akrab, and the nineteenth station of the moon al-Sawala ("Sting of the Scorpion"). The stars $\alpha$ and $\tau$ to the right and left of Kalb al-'Akrab, are called al-Niyat.

9. al-Rimî, the Archer (Sagittarius) or al-Kaww, the Bow or al-Samah, the Arrow. 31 essential and no unessential stars; the face with bow and arrow is turned to the west, the hind-part of the horse's body to the cast. (The fresco on the dome at Kaşan 'Amra on the other hand shows the upper part of the body of the archer turned towards the hind-part of the horse's body, and aiming with the bow over this to the west. The stars $\gamma$ (on the point of the arrow), $\delta$ (on the how-grip) $\epsilon$ (at the south end of the bow), $\omega$ (on the right foot) are called al-Nama'am al-wârid, $\sigma$ (on the left shoulder), $\phi$ (on the notch of the arrow), $\tau$ (on the shoulder blade) and $\zeta$ (under the shoulder) al-Nama'am al-sâdir. Both constellations together form the twentieth station of the moon, al-Nama'am. $\mu$ and $\lambda$ Sagittarii on the northern bend of the bow are called al-Zalîmân, $\alpha$ (on the knee), and $\beta_1$, $\beta_2$ (on the shin-bone) are together called al-Suradânî. The space almost void of stars at $\pi$ Sagittarii marks the twenty-first station of the moon, al-Balad or Burdaj al-Dirâsh.

10. al-Ljâdî, the Goat (Capricornus). 28 essential, no unessential stars: the figure is conceived of as looking to the west, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ on the eastern horn form the twenty-second station of the moon Soâd al-Dhâbih $\gamma$ and $\delta$ on the tail are called al-Muthallathânî.

11. Soâbih al-Ma'â or al-Sâhih, the water-carrier (Aquarius) or al-Dawû, the pall. 42 essential and 3 unessential stars; the head of Aquarius points to the N.W., the feet S.E. $\alpha$ and $\phi$ on the right shoulder are called Soâd al-Mallik or Soâd al-Mulk. The two (or three) stars on the left hand ($\mu$, $\nu$ or $\mu$, $\nu$, $\epsilon$, $\delta$) form the twenty-third station of the moon. Soâd al-Bula', $\beta$ and $\zeta$ on the left shoulder together with $\gamma$ and $\lambda$ form the twenty-fourth station of the moon Soâd al-Sâ'id. The four stars $\gamma$, $\zeta$, $\pi$ and $\epsilon$ on the right fore-arm and the right hand are called Soâd al-Akhiyâ and form the twenty-fifth station of the moon.

12. al-Samakâtâh, the two Fishes (Pisces) or al-Hût, the Fish. 34 essential and 4 unessential stars; the figure is conceived as two fishes, the western in the south of the back of Pegasus, the eastern in the south of Andromeda. The two fishes are connected by a hand of stars of al-Kazwini does not mention any outstanding stars.

It is evident, then, that by far the greater part of the 26 mansûl fall into the area of the 12 burâjî and form part of them. Only the following four do not belong to them: No. 5 al-Hûkâ (A. $\phi$, $\phi_2$ Orionis), No. 26 al-Fargh al-dawâl ($\beta$ Pegasi), No. 27 al-Fargh al-thââni ($\gamma$ Pegasi, $\alpha$ Andromedae), No. 28 al-Bin al-fârî or al-Yâshî (a large number of stars forming a fish in the neighborhood of $\beta$ Andromedae).

The zodiacal figures No. 1, al-Ḥamal, No. 4, al-Sarafân, No. 7, al-Miṣas and No. 10, al-Ljâdî are known together as Burâjî minâhû, Greek ζώνες τρικτής; No. 2, al-Thawr, No. 5, al-Asâd, No. 8, al-Ąkrab and No. 11, al-Dawû under Burâjî dhâlîkî, ζώνα στρικτής; No. 3, al-Djâwâd, No. 6, al-Ądârâ; No. 9, al-Rimî and No. 12, al-Samar.
altered, but not the astrological interpretations associated with them.

Buyüt. The Greek ἄρης or τόξο, Lat. domicilia or (mediaeval) domus, are called in Arabic buyüt (sg. baṭīʿ). The sun and moon are each ruler (ṣāhib, ṣābi, Greek ἀσκετής [cf. above muthallathār]) over one sign of the zodiac; each of the other five planets rules over two signs at the same time, according to the following scheme, and is also laid down in the Ṭerṭebīlas:

| Lion | Sun | Archer | Jupiter |
| Crab | Moon | Fishes |         |
| Scales | Venus | Goat | Water-carrier |
| Bull | Saturn | Scorpion |           |
| Ram | Mars | Virgin | Twins |
| Fishes | Mercury |                |           |

The burūdā from the Lion to the Goat are day-houses, the rest night-houses. If a planet is in its day-house during the hours of day or in its night-house at night, it is credited with particularly powerful astrological influence.

Sharaf and Hubūt. By sharaf (pl. asharf) we understand the Wāṣa of the Greeks, sublimitas of Pliny, altitudo of Firmicus Maternus, exaltatio in mediaeval Latin; hubūt is the Greek τεταρτώμα, τεταρτόμα, more rarely κεῖμα, class Lat. directio, med. Lat. casus.

A planet attains its maximum astrological influence in its sharaf; its influence is least in the hubūt, i.e. the point in the heavens diametrically opposite the sharaf on the circle of the ecliptic.

**Planet** | **Sharaf** | **Hubūt**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Ram</td>
<td>19°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>3°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn</td>
<td>Scales 21° (20°)</td>
<td>Ram 21°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Crab 15°</td>
<td>Goat 15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>Goat 28°</td>
<td>Crab 28°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>Fishes 27°</td>
<td>Virgin 27°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>Virgin 15°</td>
<td>Fishes 15°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only inaccuracy in the list of exaltations, already fixed in ancient times, is giving 20° instead of 21° to the Scales for Saturn, which however goes back to a very old error; it is also found in Pliny, Firmicus and in the Hindu astronomer Varāha-Mihira.

al-Baʿrāʾī assumed that at the time of the creation of the world the planets were in their aghrāf.

Various Arab writers since Abū Maʿṣūr also ascribe exaltations and dejections to the nodes of the moon (ʿaṣba or ʿuṣulānī, scil. al-kanūr); ascending node (yāʿ) as sharaf the Twins 3°, and as hubūt, the Archer 3°; vice versa to the descending node (ḥanāb) as sharaf the Archer 3°; as hubūt the Twins 3°. This allocation is not known to the Greek astrologers.

Hubūt. Each of the five planets (excluding the sun and moon) possesses in each of the 12 burūdā a sphere of influence covering several degrees (Arab. ḫadd, pl. ḫuddā, Greek ἄφοι, Lat. fines, med. Latin terminus) which has the same astrological significance as the planet itself and can represent it at any time in horoscopes. On the distribution of these spheres of influence within the zodiacal circle opinions differed widely and unanimity could never be attained. Ptolemy added one more to the Egyptian and Chaldaean divisions already in existence. (The various systems are fully expounded in the Ṭerṭebīlas, i.e. 20, fol. 43: Boll has studied this question very fully in Neues zur babylonischen Planetenordnung, Z. A., xxxviii. [1913], p. 340 sqq.).

**Miṅṭaka in Astronomy.**

The Miṅṭaka is, as in the Greek astronomy, the fundamental basis for all calculations. It is divided into 360° degrees (dīnā, pl. aṭ welded, dīnā, coll. dīnā, pl. darājār), each degree into 60 minutes (dabāka, pl. dābātā), each minute into 60 seconds (dānīya, pl. ḥawānī), each second into 60 thirds (kāliqa, pl. ḥrawlīhā) and so on.

The points of intersection of the ecliptic with the equator (dīrā or ṣalā muddad al-ṣamāh) define the two equinoxes (al-tīdāliyān), the points of the greatest northerly and southerly declination the two solstices (al-tīdāliyān). The position of a fixed star or planet with respect to the Miṅṭaka is given by its longitude (ṭil, pl. aṭwil or in al-Battānī al-dīrā al-tīqal ḥāfiz al-akwakāb) and latitude (ārd, pl. ṣurūf). The longitudes are numbered from the vernal point (al-burudā al-ṣamāh). The axis erected perpendicular to the plane of the ecliptic meets the sphere of the fixed stars in the two poles of the ecliptic (khnā ḍarār al-burūdā)

On Arab star-maps and -globes, we frequently find a mixed ecliptical and equatorial system of coordinates used (cf. the remarks above on the fresco on the dome at Kūshir ‘Arma), which consists of elliptical circles of longitude through the poles of the ecliptic and equatorial parallel circles.

**Precession** (in al-Battānī Ḥarīs al-kawākīb al-ṭāliba, in later authors more precisely Mubādarat muddad al-tīdāl). Among the Arab astronomers supporters were found for the theory of Ptolemy, who explained the precession as a continual revolution of the whole heavens around the pole of the ecliptic with a period of 36,000 years, as well as for that handed down by Thoēon of Alexandria (Ṭūwān al-Iskandārī) from older sources, according to which the process of the precessions consisted of an oscillation to and from around the “nodes of the path of the sun”. The greatest amount of the precession according to this theory is 8° west or east of the nodes; the retrogression amounts to 1° in 80 years so that the whole phenomenon repeats itself after 2,560 years. The latter theory found particular approval in India and was further developed there. Thābit b. Kura gave an explanation for it which at the same time took into account the (more suspected than observed) diminution in the obliquity of the ecliptic and calculated the length of the period at 4171/2 years. al-Battānī attacked and refuted this oscillation hypothesis of Thoēon and of the Ḥariq al-thālabāt (ṣawtul ashwāyat); on a basis of new and comparative observations he found that the precession amounted to 1° in 66 years, which corresponds to a period of 23,760 years, which is roughly 10% too small. The very accurate estimate of 1° in 70 years is also occasionally, if rarely, given in Arabic literature, according to E. Zinner, Geschicte der Sternkunde, p. 289.

**Obliquity** (Maḥl ṣalā al-burūdā, very frequently al-malik kālund hu ʿal-hul ʿi in contrast to al-malik al-dīnā, “declination of the separate points in the Miṅṭaka”, cf. al- Ağhāzī, p. 21). The pro-
blem of estimating the obliquity of the ecliptic was during the classical period a centre of interest for the Muslim astronomers. As a first attempt at an exact estimate in the Muslim period, Ibn Yunus (ch. ix., p. 222 of the Leyden Codex or of the Paris Codex, No. 2475) mentions an observation of the period between 778 and 786 which gave the value $\varepsilon = 23^\circ 31'$. We have an unusually large number of observations of later dates. (For details see Nallino's notes on al-Battānī's *Opus Astronomicum*, i. 157 sqq.).

al-Battānī in his observations used a parallactic ruler (tri-quetrum, išāda fāvitel) as well as a finely divided wall quadrant (ilhām). He ascertained with these instruments in al-Rakka the smallest zenith distance of the sun at $12^\circ 26'$, the greatest at $59^\circ 36'$; this gave $\varepsilon = \frac{2}{23}^\circ 10' = 23^\circ 35'$. This value is at the basis of all al-Battānī's calculations and tables and has been adopted by many other Arab astronomers.

The question whether the amount of obliquity remains constant at all times or is subject to a secular diminution was answered in different ways by different students. As a matter of fact the degree of accuracy of observation was not sufficient to settle this point and the old Hindu value of $\varepsilon = 24^\circ$, on which these investigations were often based, was based not on observations but only on a statement of Euclid's according to which astronomers of his time used to estimate the obliquity as a thirteenth part of the circumference of the circle.

The following table gives a survey of the Arab values for the obliquity of the ecliptic (cf. Nallino, *al-Battānī, Opus Astronomicum*, loc. cit.). The column “average obliquity” gives by Bessel's formula:

$$\varepsilon = 23^\circ 28' 28'.0 - 0'.48 368.1 - 0'.000 002 722 95.1^2 $$ (i.e., years after 1750) the true values calculated for the periods in question. The year given in brackets are only approximate, i.e. not given by the authors themselves.


**MINICOY**, a coral island in the Arabian Sea midway between the Laccadive and the Maldives Islands; it belongs like the former to the Ah Rājāh of Cannanore but ethnographically and geographically has more claim to be attached to the Maldives group. It is six miles long but very narrow, being only $\frac{1}{2}$ square miles in area. The population is about 3,000. The people, who are probably of Singhalese origin, have been Muhām-madāns since the xivth century. The language is Mahā but the Arabīl character is used. They are strictly monogamous. A girl's consent is required for her marriage and she brings no dowry, but receives presents from the bridegroom. The women go unveiled. There are three castes in the island. The inhabitants all live in one village which is divided into ten quarters in, each of which the men and women are separately organised with their own headmen and headwomen. All work on land is done by women. The men are sailors and fishermen. Most of the island's food supply has to be imported. The chief exports are cocoanuts, coir, cowries and dried fish. The important position held by women in Minicoy has suggested its identification with Marco Polo's *Female Island* (ed. Yule, ii. 404).

---

**Comparative table of the Arab values for the obliquity of the ecliptic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Obliquity observed</th>
<th>Average obliquity</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>(230 B.C.)</td>
<td>23° 51' 20&quot;</td>
<td>23° 43' 45&quot;</td>
<td>+ 7° 35&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipparchus</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>(130 B.C.)</td>
<td>23° 51' 20&quot;</td>
<td>24° 57'</td>
<td>+ 8° 23&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>(140 A.D.)</td>
<td>23° 51' 20&quot;</td>
<td>41° 10'</td>
<td>+ 10° 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabulae Probatae (al-Zādi al-munādūq)</td>
<td>Baghdad 829</td>
<td>33'</td>
<td>35° 41'</td>
<td>- 2° 41&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other observers under al-Ma'mūn</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>33° 52&quot;</td>
<td>35° 40'</td>
<td>- 1° 48&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū Musā</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>(860)</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35° 26'</td>
<td>- 0° 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Battānī</td>
<td>al-Rakka</td>
<td>(880)</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35° 17'</td>
<td>- 0° 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū Amādūr</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(918)</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35° 0'</td>
<td>- o°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Abd al-Rahmān al-Sūfī</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>(965)</td>
<td>33° 45&quot;</td>
<td>34° 35'</td>
<td>- 0° 50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu 'l-Waḥīd</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>34° 25'</td>
<td>+ 0° 35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widjān b. Rustam al-Kūhī</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>51° 11'</td>
<td>34° 25'</td>
<td>+ 16° 36'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Yunus</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>34° 52'</td>
<td>34° 19'</td>
<td>+ 0° 33'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Brūnī</td>
<td>Ghaznī</td>
<td>(1019)</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>34° 10'</td>
<td>+ 0° 50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonsian Tables</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>(1250)</td>
<td>32° 29'</td>
<td>32° 19'</td>
<td>+ 0° 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Shāṭir</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>(1263)</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>31° 25'</td>
<td>- 0° 25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Beg</td>
<td>Samarqand</td>
<td>(1437)</td>
<td>30° 17&quot;</td>
<td>30° 49'</td>
<td>- 0° 32'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUCHRI, Abu ’l-NADIM AHMAD b. YA’qûb, PERSIAN poet, nicknamed Shašt-gâla = “sixty-herds”, because of the wealth he accumulated in horses and cattle; but some say the name should be read Shašt-kul or Shašt-kula i.e. “crooked-thumb”. He was a native of Dâmgânî, calling himself Dâmgânî in his verse although Dawlatshâh says he came from Balkh. He was a younger contemporary and imitator of ’Unsûrî [g. v.], but he is considered to have excelled his model in poetic power. After completing his studies under Abu ’l-Fârâbî of Sistân (d. circa 392 = 1020) he enrolled himself in the service of the Amir Minûchîr b. Kâbûs b. Washmîrî, ruler of Dârdjân and vassal of Mâhmûd of Ghazna, and from the name of this first patron he took his taḥkâlaš. Presumably through the influence of Unsûrî he later became attached to Mâhmûd’s entourage of literary men at Ghazna, and wrote kâfûs in praise of his new patron and of his sons Mâhmûd (who reigned for less than a year) and Mâshûd who succeeded to the Ghaznawid throne. The latter was assassinated in 432 (1041), and Minûchîr did not long survive him (Kirât-kût Khân, Mâdînîn al-Faṣâdî, i. 545, says he died in the same year and quotes “Aâfî as having called him “short-lived””). In his work Minûchîr shows himself to be a skilful versifier, displaying a clever felicity of rhyme and very often a refreshing simplicity and straightforwardness of language. Also he did not hesitate to use new forms for his verse, and he is the earliest Persian writer we know of to have used the strophic form of the muwammât, which, as used by him, consists of a series of mirâs or stichai, in groups of six. All six may rhyme together, or only five; in the latter case the last line rhymes with the last lines of the other strophes. In spite of his qualities as a versifier, Minûchîr cannot be regarded as a great poet, even for his day. His themes, — women, love, divination and the virtue of patrons — are of the stock pattern, and his kâfûs are deliberately moulded on the Arabic form, with all its artificialities. In flattery of his patrons he is as servile as any in the whole range of Persian panegyrists and his conceit of himself as it appears in his work is sometimes ludicrous in its effect (cf. N. 48 in Biberstein-Kazimirsky’s edition, Paris 1886).

Bibliography: works quoted above and Ethé, in Grundrisse d. iran. Philologie. A Fârâbî ed. of the Drewan was published in 1307 A.H. (K. LEVY)

MIR, a Persian title abbreviated from the Arabic amîr and approximating in meaning both to the Arabic amîr [g. v.]. (For the dropping of the initial a’rîf, cf. Bâ Sahî for Abî Sahî etc.). Like amîr the title is applied to princes (Minûchîr, ed. Biberstein-Kazimirsky, 1886, p. 96, speaks of Mâshûd, Sultan of Ghazna, as “Mir”), but it is also borne by poets and other men of letters (e.g. Mir ’Ali Shîr, Mir Khwând, Mir Mâshûn; cf. the following art.). In India, Saiyids sometimes call themselves by the title. As a common noun, it is used as an equivalent of sâbî, e.g. Mir pand, mir ʰâhîr. In Turkish there was derived from it the colloquial adjective mirî (“belonging to the government”), which gave rise to al-mirî (“the government”) in the colloquial Arabic of Trak.

(M. HIDAYET HOSEIN)

MINOCAY — MÎRÂDÎ


MIR AMMÂN. [See AMMÂN.]


In the Kur’ân, Sûra Ixxv. 12—18 and lîl. 1—12, a vision is described in which a heavenly messenger appears to Muhammad and Sûra lîl. 12—15 deals with a second message of a similar kind. In both cases the Prophet sees a heavenly figure approaching him from the distance but there is no suggestion that he himself was carried off. It is otherwise with the experience alluded to in Sûra xvi. 1: “Praise him, who travelled in one night with his servant from the Masjid al-Ḥaṣâm to the Masjid al-ʾAqṣâ, whose surroundings we blessed, in order to show him our signs”. That Muhammad is meant by the “servant” is generally assumed and there is no reason to doubt it (Schirke, Islam, vi. 13, note 6; Bevan, Z. A. T. W., xxvii. 55 sq.); that the Masjid al-Ḥaṣâm is the Meccan sanctuary is certain from Kur’ânic usage (Horovitz, Koran, Unters., p. 140); but what is the Masjid al-ʾAqṣâ? According to the traditional explanation, but not the only one recognised in Ḥadîth (see Schirke, op. cit., p. 12, 14 and above, s. v. ISRÁ’) it would mean Jerusalem, but how could Muḥammad, who in Sûra xxx. 1 speaks of Palestine as adma ’lārdî, call a sanctuary situated in Jerusalem al-masjid al-ʾAqṣâ? The age of this explanation is not quite certain; perhaps it was already known to ’Umar b. Abî Râbi’a (ed. Schwartz, xclx) and Abî Shâkr (Lieder der Hudwiliten, ed. Wellhausen, cclxxiv. 24); but even these belong only to the Umayyad period (contrary to Lamens, Sacrifices, p. 72, this is true also of Abî Shâkr, who according to Aqîhî, xxi. 94 was a partisan of the Banû Marwân and panegyrist of ’Abd al-Malik). Muḥammad probably meant by al-Masjid al-ʾAqṣâ a place in heaven, such as the place in the highest of the seven heavens in which the angels sing praises of Allah and we would then have in Sûra xvii. 1, evidence from the Prophet himself about his nocturnal ascension into heavenly spheres (Schirke, op. cit., p. 13 sqq.; Horovitz, J. i., 161 sqq.), testimony which is however content with the mention of the experience itself and says nothing about its course. The question
of the possibility of an ascent to heaven is several times touched on in the Qur’an. In Sūra xi. 38 Fir’awn gives Hāmān orders to build a palace so that he can reach the cords of heaven and climb up to the god of Mūsā (cf. also Sūra xxviii. 3). In Sūra lii. 38, the calumniators are asked whether they had perchance a ladder (zillum) so that they could hear the heavenly voice and in Sūra vi. 35 the consequences are considered which the signs brought by the Prophet with the help of a ladder to heaven might have on his hearers. The old poets also talk of ascending to heaven by a ladder, as a means of escaping something one wants to avoid (Zuhair, Malālābā, p. 54; A’ishah, xv. 32).

Hadīth gives further details of the Prophet’s ascension. Here the ascension is usually associated with the nocturnal journey to Jerusalem, so that the ascent to heaven takes place from this sanctuary. We also have accounts preserved which make the ascent start from Mecca and make no mention of the journey to Jerusalem. In one of these the ascent takes place immediately after the “purification of the heart” (see Bukhārī, Sahih, bāb 1; Ḥadīth, bāb 76; Manātikī, bāb 42; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, iv. 207, v. 143; Tabarī, ed. de Goeje, i. 1157 sq.). In the last mentioned passage we read: “When the Prophet had received his revelation and was sleeping at the Ka’ba, as the Kūraṣḥ used to do, the angels Gabriel and Michael came to him and said: With regard to whom have we received the order? Whereupon they themselves answered: With regard to their lord. Thereupon they went away but came back the next night, three of them. When they found him sleeping they laid him on his back, opened his body, brought water from the Zāmam well and washed away all that they found within his body of doubt, idolatry, paganism and error. They then brought a golden vessel which was filled with wisdom and belief and then his body was filled with wisdom and belief. Thereupon he was taken up to the lowest heaven”. The other versions of the same story show many additions and variants; according to one, for example, Gabriel came to Muhammad through the roof of his house which opened to receive him; according to another, it was Gabriel alone who appeared to him and there are many similar variants. All these versions however put Muhammad’s ascension at an early period and make it a kind of dedication of him as a Prophet, for which the purification of the heart had paved the way. Ethnographical parallels (Schirke, op. cit., p. 2–4) show other instances of a purification being preliminary to an ascension. Similar stories are found in pagan Arabia (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 171 sqq.) and also in Christian legends (op. cit., p. 170 sqq.). Another story (Ibn Sa’d, vii. 143) says that the ascension took place from Mecca although it does not associate it with “the purification of the heart” which it puts back to the childhood of the Prophet [cf. Ḥa ilma].

In the Arabic the word is used in two different senses and this, obviously the earlier, tradition of Mecca as the starting point of the ascension was ousted by the other which made it take place from Jerusalem? The localisation of the Kur’ānic Masjid al-ʾAṣrā in Jerusalem is by some connected with the efforts of ʿAbd al-Malik to raise Jerusalem to a place of special esteem in the eyes of believers (Schirke, op. cit., p. 13; Horovitz, op. cit., p. 165 sqq.; do., in

Islamic Culture, ii. 35 sqq.) and in any case it cannot be proved that this identification is older than the time of ʿAbd al-Malik. It might all the easier obtain currency as Jerusalem to the Christians was the starting point of Christ’s ascension and from the fourth century Jesus’s footprint had been shown to pilgrims in the Basilica of the Ascension; as now, perhaps as early as the time of ʿAbd al-Malik, that of their Prophet was shown to Muslim pilgrims (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 167 sqq.). The idea of the “heavenly Jerusalem” may have had some influence on the development of the isra’ legends; when Muhammad meets ʿĪrāhīm, Mūsā and ʿĪsā in Jerusalem, the presence of these prophets in the earthly Jerusalem is not at once intelligible, but it loses any remarkable features if Bait al-Makdis (Ibn Hishām, p. 267) from the first meant the “Heavenly Jerusalem” (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 168, another explanation cf. ii. 604). Perhaps also the phrase ala ʾl-iṣrā haram al-mashhur was taken to support the reference to Jerusalem; when these words occur elsewhere in the Qur’an they refer to sites in the holy land (Lammens, op. cit., p. 72, note). While the stories quoted above only say that Gabriel took the Prophet up to the heights of heaven, but are silent as to how, others add that a ladder (miʿrāj) was used for the ascent (see Ibn Hishām, p. 268; Tabarī, Taʾṣīr, xv. 10; Ibn Sād, i/1, 143); this ladder was of splendid appearance; it is the one to which the dying turn their eyes and with the help of which the souls of men ascend to heaven. The ladder is probably identical with Jacob’s ladder in Genesis, xxviii. 12; the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees, xxvii. 21 calls this miʿrāj and Sūra lxx. 3, 4 calls Allāh Ḍhwʾ I-Malādiri “to whom the angels and the spirit ascend” (ḥaʾrāj). According to Sūra xxxii. 4, the amūr rises to Allāh; according to Sūra lii. 4 and xxxxiv. 2, Allāh knows “what descends from heaven and what ascends to it”, and in Sūra xlii. 32 there is a reference to steps (maʿrādir) in the houses of men. Muhammad therefore already knew the word, which is presumably taken from Ethiopian (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 174 sqq.). Among the Mandaeans also the ladder (sumhilā) is the means of ascending to heaven (Ginz, transl. Litbarksi, p. 49, 208, 490) and there are parallels to the ladder of the dead in the mysteries of Osiris (see Andrae, Die Osiris-Mysterien, p. 45; Wetter, Phos, p. 114, note 2); the Mandaeans amūd al-taḥbī (Fbrist, p. 335, 10) by means of which the dead man is taken to the sphere of the moon is a more distant parallel (Bevan, op. cit., p. 59).

Just as the miʿrāj is associated with the ascension, so Burāq is originally connected with the night journey to Jerusalem; it found its way however at an early date into the legend of the ascension (see Bukhārī, Manātikī, bāb 42; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, iv. 207; v. 387; Tabarī, Taʾṣīr, xv. 12). The prophets earlier than Muhammad had used Burāq as their steed (Ibn Hishām, p. 263; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh al-Khami, i. 349, p. 410); that this, obviously the earlier, tradition of Mecca as the starting point of the ascension was ousted by the other which made it take place from Jerusalem? The localisation of the Kur’ānic Masjid al-ʾAṣrā in Jerusalem is by some connected with the efforts of ʿAbd al-Malik to raise Jerusalem to a place of special esteem in the eyes of believers (Schirke, op. cit., p. 13; Horovitz, op. cit., p. 165 sqq.; do., in
the Messiah will make his entrance (cf. also Ibn Sa'd, i/i. 176). The recollection that this steed was an ass survives in Muslim tradition so that Burāk is described as “smaller than a mule and larger than an ass” (Bukhari, Manāthakh, bāb 43; similarly Ibn Highām, p. 264; Ibn Sa'd, i/i. 143). Ibn Sa'd already describes Burāk as a female beast and, as early as a story attributed by Ibn Ishaq to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri, Burāk is given wings (Ibn Highām, loc. cit.). Tha'labi seems to be the first who speaks of Burāk’s human face (in Halabī, i. 370); in the miniatures the Prophet comes to Burāk usually has a woman’s head.

At the gate of each of the seven heavens through which he wanders with the Prophet, Gabriel is asked for his own name and that of his companion (Bukhari, Sañat, bāb 1, Tabari, Tafsir, xv. 4; Annalès, ed. de Goeje, i. 1157). After he gives these he is next asked if Muhammad has already been sent as a prophet (awakad bu'ishya ilaihi, for the original awakad bi'ishīya found in Tabari, Annalès, i. 1158; see Snouck Hurgronje, Isl., vi., 5, note 4); this also indicates that the ascension originally belonged to the period immediately after his call (Schrieke, op. cit., p. 6). In each heaven they meet one of the earlier messengers of God, usually Adam in the first, Yahiya and Isā in the second, Vaisūf in the third, Idrīs in the fourth, Harūn in the fifth, Mūsā in the sixth and Ibrāhīm in the seventh heaven; there are also variations and Adam appears as judge over the spirits of the dead (Andrae, p. 44 sq.; Schrieke, p. 17; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, v. 143; cf. Apoc. Mosis, p. 37). Of the other messengers of God we are only told — as addition to what is given a description of their personal appearance — that they greeted Muḥammad; Mūsā is an exception who expressly says that Muḥammad is higher in the esteem of Allāh than himself and that the number of his followers surpasses his own (Tabari, Tafsir, xv. 11). On another occasion, Muḥammad engages in a conversation with Mūsā after Allāh had imposed upon him 50 ṣalāt a day as obligatory prayers for the faithful. On Mūsā’s advice, Muḥammad asks several times for an alleviation and each time Allāh grants it; but when Mūsā says 5 salāt still are too many, the Prophet refuses to ask for less (on Genesis, xviii. 23 sqq. as the prototype of this episode; cf. Goldziher, Studien, i. 36; Schrieke, p. 19; Andrae, p. 82). According to some versions, Mūsā dwells in the seventh heaven and the conversation seems to be more natural there. To the ascension belong the visits to paradise and to hell. Paradise according to many versions is in the seventh heaven, according to others knowledge of the first; in some it is not mentioned at all. The statements about its rivers are contradictory (Schrieke, p. 19; cf. above Kāthīr), the Sidrāt al-Muntahā is usually placed in the seventh heaven (Beyan, p. 59; Schrieke, p. 18). In one description hell is put below the first heaven (Ibn Highām, p. 269; Tabari, Tafsir, iv. 19). According to another, the place of punishment of the damned is on the way between heaven and earth and Muhammad sees it on his journey to the Bait al-Maqdis (Tabari, xv. 101, also Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, i. 257; ii. 353; iii. 120, 152, 224, 231, 239). On the punishment in hell cf. Schrieke, p. 17; Andrae, p. 44; Horovitz, p. 173; Reitzenstein, Das mandäische Buch der Grosse, p. 91 sqq.; Litzbarski, Johannismus, p. 98 sqq.; Ginsa, p. 153.

That Muḥammad appeared before Allāh’s throne in the seventh heaven and that the conversation about the obligatory prayers took place there, is already recorded in the oldest stories (see above) but only rarely do they extend the conversation between Allāh and the Prophet to other subjects (Tabari, xxvii. 26; Musnad, iv. 66 as a dream; Andrae, p. 70). But objection was raised to the assertion that Muḥammad on this occasion saw Allāh face to face (Andrae, p. 71 sqq.), and the question was also raised at an early date whether the ascension was a dream or a reality, whether only the soul of the Prophet was carried up or also his body (Caetani, Annali, Intr. § 32; Andrae, p. 72; Beyan, p. 60; Schrieke, p. 13, note 1).

The Hadith contains, besides these, other details which Asin (Escatologia, Madrid 1919, p. 7—52; do., Dante y el Islam, Madrid 1927, p. 25—71) has discussed. In developing the story of the Prophet’s ascension Muhammadan writers have used models afforded them by the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. A few features may also come from the Parables from the Arda Viraf; cf. the works already mentioned by Andrae, Beyan, Schrieke, Horovitz and W. Bouisset, in A. R. W., iv. 136—169.

Later accounts (Chauvin, Bibliographie, xi. 207 sqq.; Asin, Escatologia, p. 53 sqq.; do., Dante etc., p. 72 sqq.; Nallino, in R. S. O., viii. 802) collect and systematise the material scattered in the older sources; they only increase the matter without however increasing the depth of its thought. Among the Mi‘rādj-books which have become popular in modern times that of al-Ghaṭīṭi may be mentioned (this is the correct form, see Nallino, op. cit., p. 813) on which Dardir (d. 1201) wrote a ḥikâyā; also that of Barzanjī (d. 1179). In the non-Arab lands of Islām, Persian, Turkish, Hindustānī and Malay versions of the legend have contributed to its dispersion (see Chauvin, loc. cit.).

The ascension of the Prophet later served as a model for the description of the journey of the soul of the deceased to the throne of the divine judge (Ašin, Eschatologia, p. 59 sqq.); for the Stüffel however, it is a symbol of the rise of the soul from the bonds of sensuality to the heights of mystic knowledge. Ibn al-‘Arabī thus expounds it in his work Kāf ir al-‘Irād ilā Maqṣūm al-‘Irād (Ašin, p. 61 sqq.; Andrae, p. 81 sqq.), and in his Futūḥāt, i. 356—375 he makes a believer and a philosopher make the journey together but the philosopher only reaches the seventh heaven, while no secret remains hidden from the pious Muslim (Ašin, p. 63 sqq.). Abu l’-‘Alā ’al-Ma’arrī’s Risālat al-Qaṣf al-Fāmīn is a parody on the traditional accounts of the Mi‘rādj (Ašin, p. 71 sqq.). Ašin in his two books quoted has dealt with the knowledge of Muslim legends of the ascension possessed by the Christian middle ages and their influence on Dante. In a separate work (La escatología musulmana en la divina comedia, Madrid 1924) he has collected and discussed the literature produced by his Escatologia down to 1923.

According to Ibn Sa’d, i/i. 147 the irād took place on the 17th Rabī‘ 1, the ascension on the 17th Ramaḍān. For centuries however, the night before the 25th Rādjab — a date also significant in the history of Mecca (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 71) — has been regarded by the pious as the Lailat al-Mi‘rādīj, and the eye is like the Mawlid al-Nabī devoted to reading the legend of the feast.
Mirâdî, whose full name was Mr. Muḥammad b. Kāḍī Sāḥīn-dāt, b. Kāḍī Kalandar, commonly called Miṣrân Mir or Miṣrânî, born 938 (1531) in Siwâṣtân, Sûnd. He traced his origin to the caliph ʿUmar and spent the last 60 years of his life in great sanctity at Lâḥûr. He died in 1045 (1635). But according to the Bâdsâkâl-Nâmâ of ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd, i. 339, his death took place in 1044 (1634). Shâh Dîjâhân repeatedly visited the saint and Prince Dîrâ Shîkîh erected a splendid dome over his tomb. The Prince also wrote a work called Sâfinat al-Awliyâ in which he described fully the lives of this Indian saint and his disciples.

Bibliography: Sâfinat al-Awliyâ p. 70; Khaṣṣat al-Aṣâfî p. 154; ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd, Bâdsâkâl-Nâmâ, i. 329; Rieu, Cat. Persian MSS. British Museum, i. 358.

Mirân Muḥammad Shâh I, of Khândesh, was the eleventh prince of the Fârûkî dynasty. He belonged to the younger branch of that line, which had taken refuge in Gudjarât, and his ancestors had lived in that kingdom and had married princesses of the Mûsâfîrt family until Mâhmûd I of Gudjarât had, on the extinction of the elder branch of the Fârûkîs, placed ʿAdî Kânî III, Muḥammad's father, on the throne of Khândesh. Muḥammad, who was, through his mother, the great-grandson of Mâhmûd, and the grandson of his son, Mûsâfîr II, succeeded his father in Khândesh in 1520, and in 1527 incautiously intervened in the cause of ʿAlî al-Dîn ʿImâd Shâh of Bârûr by siding against his enemy, Bârûhân Nâṣîr Shâh I of Aḥmâd-nâgâr. He was defeated and driven back into Khândesh, but succeeded in persuading his uncle, Bâhâdûr of Gudjarât, to intervene, and with him invaded the kingdom of Aḥmâd-nâgâr. The campaign was only partially successful, but Muḥammad was indemnified by Bâhânî I for his losses. He accompanied his uncle in the campaign which ended, in 1531, in the capture of Mândû and the annexation of Mâlwa to Gudjarât, and on Bâhâdûr's death in 1537, was summoned, in his mother's right, to the throne of Gudjarât, but died on his way to Aḥmâd-nâbâd.

Bibliography: Muḥammad Kâsim Frîghta, Ghulâm-i Frîghta, Bombay 1852; An Arabic History of Gudjarât, ed. E. Denison Ross (Indian Text Series); T. W. Haig, The Fârûkî Dynasty of Khândesh (The Indian Antiquary, 1918).

Mirâth (A.), inheritance (pl. mawârîth), mawârîth legator, wâhir heir.

I. The law of inheritance (ʿilm al-fardîd, the science of dispositions), i.e. of the quotas laid down in accordance with Sûra iv. 16, which is called after its most important and most difficult part) is one of the branches of Muḥammadan law in which Muḥammad more deeply modified earlier practice by legislation. Although the Kurânic regulations are fairly detailed, the task of deducing all necessary conclusions from them, to which lawyers turned with particular enthusiasm, gave rise to a great mass of traditions and considerable divergences of opinion on questions not expressly decided in the Kurânic. In the law of inheritance we can also still trace fundamental old Arabian pre-Islamic features.

2. In the period before the rise of Islam, in keeping with the patriarchal system prevailing among the Arabs, the estate of a deceased tribesman went, if he died intestate, to the nearest male relative(s), the order of succession in which these relatives, the so-called ʿazâba (corresponding to agnats), were called upon to inherit survives systematised in its order in the Muslim law of inheritance (cf. below). Minors were, as incapable of bearing arms, excluded from the succession as were female relatives: widows also were not entitled to inherit, and originally no doubt themselves formed a part of the estate, a view which survived in the levirate marriage usual among the Arabs, to which Sûra iv. 23 (cf. below) refers in forbidding it. There is no evidence of any preferential treatment of the first-born, which we find elsewhere in Semitic law. This, the original legal position, had by Muḥammad's time most certainly altered somewhat in favour of women; in cases where the deceased left no male relatives his daughters seem frequently to have obtained the estate: but woman had by no means equal treatment with man, as is clear from Muḥammad's regulations. In addition to these principal heirs the pre-Islamic Arabs had also secondary heirs who correspond to the later so-called quota-heirs (Khawwâs al-farîdîd) and received a part of the estate, the bulk of which went to the ʿazâba. From Kurânic ii. 176 and iv. 37 which confirm this arrangement, we can see that these included the parents, the "relatives" — apparently so far as they were not ʿazâba — and the so-called confederates (ḥalîf, plur. ḥalîfâ). The settlement of the portions falling to them was done in accordance with Sûra ii. 176 — at least in part — according to the last will of the testator.

3. Muḥammad modified this system considerably in details, the main point being the improvement in the treatment of women as in his innovations with regard to the laws of family life generally (cf. Taśhîk); at the same time there is a clear endeavour to fix in legal form the practice which had varied considerably in heathen times. The main lines of the system and the general conceptions as above briefly outlined were retained by the Prophet. One provision which had been made under special circumstances he was not able later to keep in force; immediately after the Hijârâ, he had ordered that those who migrated with him (the muḥâdîřûn) and the believers in Medina (the anîrûr) should regard themselves as brethren and therefore able to inherit from one another, while all bonds of relationship between the muḥâdîřûn and their relatives left in Mecca, even if they were believers, were to be regarded as broken (Sûra viii. 73, with the limitation imposed in viii. 76); but this was expressly revoked by Sûra xxxii. 6. Tradition regards this fraternisation as a special case of confederacy (ḥalîfâ). cf. above, section 2). For the rest, Muḥammad in his first Medina period confirmed the system of secondary heirs and the whole general practice in regard to inheritance (cf. ibid; Sûra ii. 176 is probably to be dated in Kâmaṭân of the year 2 and iv. 37, of which the first view in
al-Baidawi is undoubtedly the right one, cannot be much later); that in ii. 176 he expressly makes the fair treatment of the secondary heirs a duty, already reveals the direction which later ordinances were to take. Connected with this is the probably contemporary ii. 241 sqq. which secures the wife, if she survives her husband, a legacy of maintenance for a year. Not much later, about the year 3, is Sura iv. 23: “Ye, who are believers, are not permitted to inherit women against their will”; this is a prohibition against the ‘azaba forcing the widow of the deceased into a levirate marriage and generally assuming the position of wali over her which belongs only to her male relatives; this is not meant as a regular legal ordinance but is part of Muhammad’s endeavour to improve the position of women. [cf. Pālāq.] Very soon after the battle of Uhud, when numerous Muslims had fallen, we have — as a result of it — the final Kur’ānic ordinance of Sura iv. 8–18: “To the men belongs a share of what their parents and relatives leave, and to the women a share of what their parents and relatives leave — whether it be much or little — as a definite share. 9. If the relatives (not entitled to inherit), the orphans and the poor are present at the division, give them some of it and speak kindly to them (verses 10 sqq. go on to deal with the treatment of orphans). 12. Allāh commands you, as regards your children, as follows: to the boy belongs as much as the share of two girls; if however there are (only) girls (and) more than two, two-thirds of the estate belongs to them and if there is one (girl) to her belongs the half. And the parents shall each have a sixth if (the legator) had children, and if he had no children and (only) his parents inherit from him, his mother shall have a third. If however he have brothers, his mother shall have a sixth. (All this) after deducting any bequests he may have made or a debt. Ye know not whether your parents or your children be of greater use to you. (This is) an ordinance of Allāh and Allāh is all-knowing and wise. 13. To you belongs the half of the estate of your wives, if they have no children; but if they have children you shall receive a fourth of their estate — after deducting any bequest that they may have made or any debt. 14. To them belongs a fourth of your estate, if you have no children; but if you have children an eighth of your estate belongs to them after deducting any bequest that you may have made or any debt. 15. If distant relatives inherit from a legator, male or female, and he has a brother or a sister, each shall have a sixth; but if there are more, they shall have a third among them after deducting any bequest which he may have made or debt. 16. Without prejudice (this is) an ordinance of Allāh. Allāh is all-knowing and gracious”. (Verse 17 sqq. contain promises and threats). As the settlement of the succession in indirect lines left questions undecided, Sura iv. 175 supplements the above: “They ask thee for a decision. Say: Allāh gives you the following decision for remoter kindred: if a man die childless and have a sister, half of what he has is hers and if she die childless, he is her heir; if there be two sisters, two-thirds of the estate belongs to them; but if there be both brothers and sisters, the brother shall have as much as two sisters”. The object of these regulations is simply to supplement the law regarding the rights of the ‘azaba; they are not a reorganisation of the whole law. Each of the persons named is therefore only allotted a definite portion. The remainder, and this is as a rule the major portion, of the estate falls as before to the ‘azaba. There is a distinct tendency to give female relatives half the share of male relatives of the same degree; even in the case when there are daughters but no sons (and correspondingly sisters but no brothers), they do not receive all that would belong to the sons or brothers; but as regards a few smaller portions the two sexes rank equally. The quotas here given abolished the testamentary settlement of the portions usual in the heathen period, which was still approved by Sura ii. 176; this is the historical starting point for the tradition — early interpreted in another sense — that a legacy in favour of the heirs is not valid. Sura ii. 241 sqq. (cf. above) is probably rightly regarded as abrogated by the settling of the widow’s portion in tradition. There is a slight difficulty in interpretation only in iv. 15; but there can be no doubt that this verse refers to half-sisters on the mother’s side, as indeed it has always been interpreted; the text of Ubai’ even inserts an addition to this effect (cf. Nöldeke-Bergstihsser, Geschichte des Qur’ān, ii. 85, 93, note 5). The verse iv. 175 on the other hand refers to full sisters; how the Kurān wished half-sisters on the father’s side to be dealt with, is difficult to say. In iv. 12 “more than two” (girls) is to be interpreted, as the sense requires, as “two and more”; similarly, in the case in which the mother is allotted a third of the estate, it is presumed that the father gets the other two-thirds.

4. The full details which tradition is able to give regarding the causes of the revelation of the regulation of the law of inheritance are not historical; on internal grounds all we can say is that it took place soon after the battle of Uhud (cf. above, section 3). The numerous hadiths which simply repeat the Kur’ānic regulations may be neglected here. Tradition can only record very few actual divergences from the prescriptions of the Kurān: one of these is that a woman received back as her inheritance a slave whom she had presented to her mother and who represented the latter’s whole estate (in a parallel case it is a man who has given his mother a garden; by this alteration the divergence is disposed of). According to another story, the Prophet is said to have laid it down that the wives of the mukhāfiṣīn should inherit the houses of their husbands; according to the wording, it cannot have been a temporary arrangement which was abolished by the final settlement. While nothing can be quoted in favour of the first hadith, the second, which does not seem to be intended as a foundation for any legal clause, may have a grain of historical truth in it.

5. The prescriptions of the Kurān are supplemented and developed in countless traditions among which a comparatively large number relate not decisions of the Prophet himself, but of his Companions (we may cite Ibn Ḥanbal, iv. 279 sqq. as a typical mixed form); in reality they must not for a moment be regarded as fact, but only as anonymous evidence of the first developments of the Kur’ānic law of inheritance. At this stage of development it is already firmly established that an unbeliever cannot inherit from a Muslim; the right of a Muslim to inherit from an unbeliever is finally also denied, although there is some opposition to this view; on the question
of inheritance of a murāḍ, unity was not attained. Excluded from the right of inheritance is also one who has killed the legator; according to one view, always, according to another only if the slaying was deliberate (with 'āmīt; cf. article KAT)/. That a slave has no right of inheritance is taken for granted. Legal relationship is necessary for the right of inheritance; thus illegitimate children or those whose paternity has been disputed by līdān [q. v.] have no legal claim on the estates of their father and his relations. The patron (mawāla, q.v.) is included among the 'ażaba, who are placed in the order which had been handed down from the pre-Islamic period and continued to hold good: the patron and the manumitted slave inherit from one another and according to one view, the same right is granted to the mawāla, meaning the man before whom the person concerned has adopted İslām. After the mawāla come — although some oppose this — the dhawwā 'l-arkām, i.e. persons related to the legator in the female line, whose representative is usually the kāḍī or maternal uncle. In case all these heirs should not exist, the fellow-trihesmen are named. The law in Sūra iv. 14 is also extended to the widow whose husband dies before the consummation of the marriage; on the question what should he share the two daughters, we have the answer two-thirds, doubtless in keeping with the sense of Sūra iv. 12, but also that based on the literal interpretation (the half); finally half-brothers on the father's side, about whom the Kurān lays down nothing definitely, are excluded from inheriting by full brothers. With certain modifications which occur again in the later teaching, a son's daughters are treated like daughters and grandparents like parents, but this regulation only won recognition after opposition and varying practice in details. Here arises the problem of the different shares of the grandfather along with the brothers when he appears with them as 'ażaba, which goes back to his varying position in the series (cf. below sect 60); along with other views we find quoted also the one that later prevailed but it does not seem to be the earliest. The Kurān lays it down that before dividing the estate the amount of any legacies and debts should be deducted; and in early times — and probably in literal interpretation of the Kurānic passages — the legacies often were given preference to debts; after some opposition the opposite teaching prevailed. The diya [q.v.] to be paid for a slain man was in itself subject to the usual laws as part of his estate; but in early times the wife was not allowed a share in the diya of her slain husband, which goes back to old Arab conceptions of the family; the other view ultimately prevailed. In addition there are numerous, often contradictory, views on separate points which show the eager interest taken in the matter. The interest taken in early İslām in the law of inheritance is reflected in Ḥadīth; there are traditions in which the Prophet orders the law of inheritance to be taught and learned, calling it "the heritage of knowledge" on account of its difficulty and expressing the fear that this subject, so difficult to remember, might in time disappear from the memory of his community.

6. The law of inheritance attained its full development in the system of fik. The following are its principles according to the Shāfi'i teaching (for the most important divergences in the other schools cf. below sect 7).

a. The law of intestacy in general. According to Muslim law, there is no fusion between the property of the legator and that of the heir. The creditors of the estate can therefore only assert their claims against the estate; on the other hand, the heirs have no claim on the estate until all debts are paid. The fik has therefore no special teaching on the rejection of legacies, the different ways of succeeding to an inheritance, etc. In addition to pledges entered into by the deceased, the debts of the estate include the funeral expenses and the religious duties omitted by the deceased so far as they consist of concrete things (e.g. unpaid saḥī) or can be atoned for by payment (e.g. neglected fasts [ra vim]) or can be carried through at the expense of the estate by a deputy (e.g. the fik omitted without good reason); in the opinion of a minority of Shāfi'i legists, omitted sulphates may also be included in these. After the debts any legacies have to be paid [cf. waṣīta]; the remainder passes to the heirs. A necessary condition for inheriting is that the heir has survived the testator; in doubtful cases, when persons who would inherit from one another have died without its being certain which died first, as a rule no inheritance passes between them (this decision is already found in Tradition; there was a very old difference of opinion on the point). The heir must also have existed when the testator died; only in the case where a man leaves a pregnant widow or 'umān al-wasālād, is a child's share reserved for the unborn child (Tradition is not agreed on this point). If a man is missing long enough to be considered dead, the kāḍī can declare him "presumably dead" at the request of the heirs after investigating the circumstances; the heirs thus receive the right to take possession of the estate for the time. Excluded from succession are the following: one who has caused the death of the deceased, the murāḍ, an unbeliever from the succession to a Muslim and vice versa, the ḥarī (the unbelieving member of a state with which the Muslim stands in no treaty relation) and the slave. As in old Arab law the succession of the 'ażaba is the basis of the law of inheritance in the case of an intestate; the 'ażaba are the usual heirs, inheritance by others is only an exception from the general rule; on the order of succession among the 'ażaba receive the whole estate after the deduction of the portions set aside for the quota-heirs by the Kurān (cf. under e). If there are no 'ażaba, that portion of the estate which remains after the deduction of the portions of the quota-heirs goes to the state treasury (bait al-mal); a notable change from the view found in traditions — cf. section 5 —; even 'Omar II is said to have decided otherwise, cf. al-Dārimī, farradd, bab 56), it being presumed that this is administered according to law for the benefit of the Muslims; otherwise the Kurānic quota-heirs receive the remainder of the estate in proportion to their quota by the so-called law of reversion, with the exception of the widower or widow if they are not also at the same time parents or children of the deceased (here also as in the case of the exclusion of the widow from sharing in the diya of her slain husband, the basis is the old Arab family law). Only if there are neither 'ażaba nor quota-heirs and the state treasury is not being administered in accordance with the law are the dhawwā 'l-arkām — i.e. persons related to the deceased in the female line as well as those
female relatives who cannot be quota-heirs — called upon to inherit (there are two theories regarding their order of succession). If there are none of these relatives, any Muslim may take possession of the estate, if he is capable and ready to administer it for the general good of Muslims.

b. Rights of the 'asaba. The 'asaba are called upon to inherit in the following order which in essentials already existed in the pre-Muhammadan period: 1. The male descendants of the legator in the male line, a nearer excluding the more distant relatives from the succession. 2. The nearest male relative in the ascending male line with the provision that the father, but not the grandfather (and remoter descendant), of the deceased inherits before his brothers; the grandfather shares with the brothers (cf. below). 3. The nearest male relative in the male line in the descendants of the father: first the full brother, then the half-brother on the father's side, then the descendants of the full brother, then those of the half-brother on the father's side. 4. The nearest male relative in the male line among the descendants of the grandfather (as under 3) etc.; 5. lastly the mawla, i.e., the patron (or patroness), if the deceased was a freed man, and then his 'asaba. — The brothers of the deceased inherit only with the grandfather as 'asaba in equal shares with him, but if there are more than two brothers there, the grandfather receives one-third of what is to be divided between him and the brothers. If there are also quota-heirs, the grandfather is allowed in addition at least a sixth of the estate (which he would inherit as a quota-heir; cf. below 2). He can then choose the most favourable of the three arrangements. This rule seems to be a compromise between the two earlier contradictory views that the grandfather excluded the brothers or vice versa was excluded by them (cf. above section 5). — Female 'asaba. If the deceased left sons as well as daughters they inherit jointly, the share of a son being twice as large as that of a daughter (according to Sura iv. 12) while the quota allotted to the daughters ('ibid) is dropped, as is intended by the spirit of the Kur'anic law. The daughter who inherits along with a son is therefore also entitled 'asaba and in order to distinguish her from the male 'asaba, the 'asaba binafsiki ("asaba by themselves"); she is called 'asaba bi 'l-far'i ("become 'asaba through another"). The daughter of a son of the legator is similarly treated, inheriting along with the son of a son; and the full sister who inherits along with a full brother (by Sura iv. 175); finally it applies also to the half-sister on the father's side who inherits with a half-brother on the father's side (the grandfather makes the full sister as well as the half-sister on the mother's side 'asaba bi 'l-far'i). — If the full sister and the half-sister on the father's side inherit along with a daughter of the deceased or of a son, they do not receive their Kur'anic quota (Sura iv. 175) which in this case goes to the daughter or son's daughter (according to Sura iv. 12), but the rest of the estate after deduction of all quotas that have to be paid; they are in this case therefore called 'asaba ma'a 'l-far'i ("inheriting with one another as 'asaba").

c. Rights of the quota-heirs (dha'wa 'l-far'idi; cf. the article FARA'). The regulations in this connection are in general based on literal interpretation of the Kur'anic regulations. It is true that here only the daughters, parents, husband and wife, and brothers and sisters are allotted a quota but (with some limitations) the rules holding for the daughters have been extended to the daughters of the son and those for the parents to the grandparents; in addition, a distinction has been made among the sisters between the full sister, the half-sister on the father's side and the half-sister on the mother's side. The total number of quota-heirs has thus been raised to twelve: 1. The daughter is entitled to half the estate, two or more daughters get two-thirds, but if daughters inherit along with sons, their claim to the quota drops and sons and daughters receive the whole after deduction of the quotas to be paid; in this case the daughter's share is half a son's. 2. The daughter of a son is subject to the same rules as a daughter; inheriting along with the son of a son she receives half as much as he as 'asaba bi 'l-far'i. As the son's daughter is related to the son through him, she is excluded from participation when a son of the legator inherits. A daughter on the other hand does not exclude a son's daughter from the succession; as however daughters and son's daughters together have only two-thirds of the estate as their quota, a son's daughter has only a sixth if there is one daughter, and nothing if there are two or more, unless she inherits in these cases along with a son's son as 'asaba bi 'l-far'i. 3. The father's quota is always a sixth of the estate; in addition he appears as 'asaba and receives as his quota also any residuum of the estate after deducting all quotas, unless male descendants of the legator inherit jointly with him. 4. The paternal grandfather (in default of him, the remoter ascendants) also receives one sixth of the estate as his quota but is excluded by the father; he also appears as 'asaba (like the father) if there are no male descendants nor father of the deceased. But if in addition to him there are also brothers of the legator, he appears with them as 'asaba (on the share which falls to the grandfather in this case and in the case where there are also quota-heirs cf. above b). 5. The mother by Sura iv. 12 receives one-sixth of the estate if there are children, son's children or two or more brothers or sisters of the legator; otherwise a third (on the meaning of the Kur'anic rule cf. above; in practice the father in this case as a rule receives two-thirds, i.e. according to the scheme, one sixth as quota-heir and the rest as 'asaba; on the exceptions cf. below under d). 6. The quota of the grandmother is always a sixth, from this the mother's mother is excluded by the mother, and the father's mother by the father; her mother; all other female ascendants of the legator rank equally with the grandmothers on both sides if there is no father and mother, so far as they are not related to the deceased by a male descendant not entitled to inherit (therefore for example the mother of the maternal grandfather inherits nothing). 7. A full sister receives half, two or more such sisters receive together two-thirds of the estate (Sura iv. 175). Along with a full brother or grandfather she becomes 'asaba bi 'l-far'i and receives the half of the brother's share (Sura iv. 175). Along with the daughter or son's daughter she becomes 'asaba ma'a 'l-far'i (cf. above b); sons, sons' sons and the father exclude her from succession. She has a claim to the quota only when the legator has died without leaving de-
scendants or male ascendants. The treatment of the half-sister on the father's side in general corresponds to that of the full sister; along with a half-brother on the father's side or the grand-
father, she becomes *'asaba bi *'l-ghairi*, with the daughter or son's daughter *'asaba ma'a *'l-ghairi* (cf. above); sons, sons' sons, father and full brothers exclude her from the succession. Full sisters ex-
clude her only in so far as two or more full sisters receive together two-thirds of the estate, so that nothing is left for the half-sisters; if however the half-
sister inherits along with one full sister they receive together two-thirds, the full sister getting a half and the half-sister a sixth; unless she in these cases inherits along with a half-brother on the father's side as *'asaba bi *'l-ghairi* (i.e. the same rule as with daughters and sons' daughters; cf. above). 9 and 10. The rights of the half-brother on the mother's side and of the half-sister on the mother's side are based on Sūra iv. 15: each of them receives a sixth, two or more together share a third among them; they are excluded from the succession by descendants and male ascendants. 11. By Sūra iv. 13 the widower receives half of the estate, but only a quarter if there is a son or son's child; it is indifferent whether these are his wife's or his own descendants. 12. The widow, by Sūra iv. 14, receives the half of what a widower would receive under the same circumstances; if the deceased leaves more than one widow they share equally the quota allotted to the widow. During the *idda (period of waiting; q.v.) after a revocable *talāk* a man and woman are still regarded as man and wife for purposes of in-
heritance.

**d. Exceptions from the general rules.** Although the quota-heirs can never all inherit to-
gether and in particular the collateral relatives are excluded from their quotas by those in the direct line, the number of qualified quota-heirs may sometimes be so large that the sum of their shares is larger than the whole estate; in this case their shares are proportionately reduced (cf. *'awl*). Otherwise, the occurrence of a number of heirs makes no change from the main rules necessary, except in a few particular cases which have special names; these are cases in which, if the main rules were strictly carried through, the inheritances would be in a proportion to one another which would be contrary to the law; e.g. in the case of the so-called *gharbiyat*: if some one dies leaving a husband or wife and both parents, the mother would receive in this case a third, the father's share however, which is usually two-thirds (cf. above c 1), would be here reduced by the quota either of the widow i.e. a quarter or of the widower, i.e. the half, and thus reduced to live-
twelfths or a sixth; according to tradition it was 'Omar who decided in this case that father and mother should share, in the proportion of two to one, what remains after deducting the portion of the widow or widower, an arrangement which is doubtless in the spirit of the Kur'ānic rule. Another case, the so-called *mutzharraka*, is that in which a wife leaves her husband, her mother, two

decided by 'Omar, the law lays down that the full brothers have the same rights as the half-
brothers so that all inherit in equal shares the third originally set aside for the half-brothers. On a third case of this kind cf. *akdariya*.

7. The most important points of difference among the madhāhib, including the early legists, are the following. It is unanimously agreed that an unbeliever cannot inherit from a Muslim nor a Muslim from an unbeliever; but Sa'id b. al-
Musaiyib and Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'i recognized the right to inherit in the latter case. Unbelievers who belong to different religions cannot inherit from one another according to Mālik and Ibn Ḥanbal, but they can according to Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Shāfi'i. There are three views regarding ability to inherit from the *murtadā* according to Mālik, al-Shāfi'i and Ibn Ḥanbal his whole estate goes to the state treasury; according to Abū Yūsuf and al-Shābānī it goes to his Muslim heirs; ac-
cording to Abū Ḥanīfa what he has made while a Muslim goes to his Muslim heirs, but what he made after his apostacy goes to the treasury. If a legator has been deliberately (with *'and*) and illegally slain, his slayer, it is unanimously agreed, is excluded from inheriting. Abū Ḥanīfa, al-Shāfi'i and Ibn Ḥanbal, but not Mālik, also exclude one who has killed him without design (with *khafa*; q.v.). One who is a slave to some degree can, according to Abū Ḥanīfa, Mālik and al-Shāfi'i, neither inherit nor bequeath; according to Ibn Ḥanbal, Abū Yūsuf, al-Shābānī and al-Muzani he can inherit or bequeath in the proportion he is free. According to Abū Ḥanīfa and Ibn Ḥanbal, if there are no *'asaba* and quota-heirs, the *dā`an* *'l-arham* inherits; according to Mālik and al-Shāfi'i (cf. above 6 a) as well as Zuhār, al-Awzā'ī and Dāwūd al-Zāhirī, in this case the treasury steps in. If there are only quota-heirs, according to Mālik and al-Shāfi'i the remainder goes to the treasury, according to Abū Ḥanīfa and Ibn Ḥanbal however also to the quota-heirs; according to Sa'id b. al-Musaiyib the maternal, uncle inherits along with the daughters. The relationship of *maslā*, which is produced by some one attaching himself to the tribe (usually on the adoption of Ḳāsim by a non-Arab; cf. above, sect. 5) and which results in the patron becoming surety for the *diya* (q.v.) of the client, does not, according to the usual view, give any right to inherit. Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'i and Abū Ḥanīfa take the opposite view but hold but it may be dissolved at any time by either side so long as the patron has not paid a *diya* for his client. The paternal grandmother is not excluded from the succession by the father, according to Ibn Ḥanbal only; in his view, in this case she inherits a sixth either alone or shared equally with the mother. Among female ascendants, according to Mālik, only the mothers of the two grandmothers inherit, likewise their mothers and so on, but according to Abū Ḥanīfa also the mothers of all male ascendants and their mothers again, and so on; both views are quoted by al-
Shāfi'i, but the latter is best known and has established itself in the madhāhab. According to Mālik and al-Shāfi'i, the female ascendants on the father's and mother's side share in equal portions the sixth allotted to the grandmother who is nearer of the two to the legator. According to Abū Ḥanīfa, however, the nearer female descendant on the father's side excludes the remoter on the
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mother's side from the succession. Whichever of the two sides is entitled to inherit a quota inherits, according to Malik and al-Shafi'i, only on ground of "stronger" relationship, according to Abū Hurairā and Ibn Hanbal on ground of both respects (this case, particularly frequent in the marriages of the Parsees, has been decided in various ways in Tradition; cf. al-Dārimi, Farāḍīd, bāb 42); in the case of two cousins on the father's side, of which one is also the brother on the mother's side, the latter, it is unanimously agreed, receives a sixth and the remainder falls to the two as 'asaba in equal portions, while Abū Tāwār and al-Ḥasan of Baṣrā make him inherit the whole. The estate of a child, whose paternity has been disputed by ūṣūm, as well as that of an illegitimate child, passes in default of other heirs, according to Abū Ḥanīfa, entirely to the mother (a third as Kurānic quota and the remainder as quasi-'asaba); according to Malik and al-Shafi'i the mother receives a third as Kurānic quota and the remainder goes to the treasury; according to one view transmitted from Ibn Ḥanbal the 'asaba of his mother are regarded as his 'asaba, and receive the remainder; the other view corresponds to that of Abū Ḥanīfa. In the special case of the so-called 'unānā, Malik's view agrees with that of al-Shafi'i (cf. above 62a); this is also the opinion of al-Zuhrī and of Sa'īd b. al-Mussiyib and others; according to Abū Ḥanīfa and his fellows, Ibn Ḥanbal and Dāwūd al-Zāhīrī, the full brothers actually receive nothing.

8 a. The law of the Imāms (Twelver-Shī'is) as regards inheritance is based on the same principles as that of the Sunnis but in its practice shows a number of features of its own, which already can for the most part be traced in the tradition, i.e., in the earliest post-Kurānic development. Among the divergences—apart from differences in terminology and presentation—are the classing of the 'asaba and the ḍhaww tārāmām together into one group of relatives, which is divided into three classes: 1. the ascendants in the first degree and the descendants; 2. the other ascendants and the descendants of the ascendants of the first degree; 3. the maternal and paternal uncles and aunts. Each of these classes excludes the following one from the succession and within the two categories of the second class the relative of the nearest degree excludes all others of a remoter degree of relationship, i.e., for example, the daughter excludes the son's son; within the third class a distinction is made between the uncles and aunts of the legator and their descendants, the uncles and aunts of his parents, and their descendants etc., and here also the member of a nearer degree excludes those of a remoter degree. Within the same grade all full relatives (male or female) exclude all relatives of the mother's (not of the father's) side, i.e., full sisters exclude half-brothers; the relatives on the mother's side are excluded only from a share in the residuary estate by all other relatives of the same degree. If relatives whose relationships with the legator is traced through several persons inherit jointly, the proportion of their shares is settled by the (hypothetical) shares of the persons through whom they are related to the deceased. If, for example, paternal and maternal uncles inherit together, the former divide two-thirds of the estate (i.e., the father's hypothetical share), the latter a third (i.e., the mother's hypothetical share); correspondingly, son's children and daughters children, children of brothers and children of sisters, and ascendants on the mother's and father's side. The rules applying to the brothers and sisters of a legator are also applied to his father's brothers and sisters and so on, if the latter are called upon to inherit; if, for example, father's full brothers and sisters (uncles and aunts), father's brothers and sisters on the mother's side exist together, the latter are not excluded by the former but receive a third (if there is only one, a sixth) which is divided equally among them (Sūra iv. 15), and the former receive the remaining two-thirds (or five-sixths as the case may be) of which each uncle gets twice the share of an aunt; the process is similar when their children take the place of uncles and aunts; the grandfather (and if the case arises the remoter ascendants) also inherits equally with the brothers of the legator. Within similar groups the male inherits double as much as the female, so far as there are no special regulations to the contrary (cf. above); for the rest the male relative on the father's side is not specially privileged before the others, as among the Sunnis. Besides these heirs by blood, there are heirs for special reasons, i.e., the husband and the patron (mawla) of a man who has released the legator from slavery; 2. a patron before whom the legator has become a Muslim, or who has pledged himself to pay the diva for him; 3. the imām, who here takes the place of the state treasury, and who, as the general protector of all Muslims, is entitled to inherit in the last resort. In both main groups there are simple heirs and such as have a claim to a Kurānic quota. If the estate does not suffice to satisfy all the quotas, the shares are divided to the paternal relatives only, never to the maternal. What is left over after satisfying the quotas is given to relatives by blood according to the above rule; but if there are no blood relatives entitled to inherit, the quota-heirs, with the exception of the husband or wife, receive the residuum also by the residuary law (cf. however above); if there are no heirs by blood the patrons come in, in the order given, so that the imām, i.e., the treasury, inherits only in the last resort. (These rules are not meant to assess the distribution of an estate to look very different among the Shī'is from among the Sunnis. But there are in addition differences in detail, of which the most important are the following: The Muslim can inherit from the unbeliever (and apostate); even the remotest Muslim heir of an unbeliever has a preference over all non-Muslim heirs; unbelievers of all sects inherit from one another; the succession of the heirs to the estate of an apostate who was born a Muslim begins from his apostasy. The accidental killing of a legator does not exclude the slayer from inheriting. If the sole existing heir is a slave, he is purchased at the expense of the estate (his owner cannot refuse to sell him), thus becomes free and inherits what is left; if the parents of the legator are slaves, they must in all cases be purchased at the expense of the estate, according to some the children also (this is disputed) and according to others every heir (this has not been accepted). The part-slave inherits to the degree in which he is free. One who has a claim to an inheritance from two sides inherits on both grounds. Of the estate of a child whose paternity has been disputed by Ḥasan, the mother receives a third as the Kurānic quota...
and the remainder as quasi-'asaba, according to the more usual view; according to the other the remainder goes to the imām. There are no legal relationships between an illegitimate child and his ascendants (including his mother and her relatives), only between him and his descendants; if there are none, the estate goes to the imām. In the special case of the so-called ḥanibātān (cf. above 6 d'), there is no divergence from the general principles. — On the whole then the Shi'a law of inheritance represents an independent, just as the legacy (for the distribution of the common principles found in the Kur'ān and tradition but diverging further from the old Arab pre-Islamic principles; whether and how far it the Sunni system already presupposes (as has been proved for the Zaidīs; cf. Bergstrasser, O. L.Z., vol. xxv., p. 124) has not yet been investigated.


c. The most important peculiarities of the law of inheritance among the Khāridjī Ilūdīs are the following: the paternal grandfather inherits as quasi-heir a sixth of the estate if there are no descendants of the legator; otherwise he inherits as 'asaba, thus excluding the brothers, just as he himself is excluded by the father. The grandmother is only excluded by the mother. Female descendants, like husband or wife, have no right to the residuum. Manumission confers no rights of inheritance; freedmen, negroes, Indians, Abyssinians or Nubians can inherit from another if there are no other heirs (cf. above, sect. 5). If there are no heirs at all, the estate is given away in charity. The special case of the so-called maqārahā is settled as among the ŠHābīs (cf. above 6 d'). — The dependence of this system on the Sunnī is apparent.

d. The law of inheritance, as a branch of family law and as possessing a peculiarly religious character from its very full regulation in the Kur'ān, has always been one of the chapters of Muslim law most carefully observed in practice [cf. 'ada and šarī'a]. As in the long run it must lead inevitably to the splitting up of even the largest estates, various endeavours have been made to avoid this result, which was considered undesirable. A plan, frequently adopted, was to constitute considerable portions of the estate religious endowments [cf. waqf]; the proceeds of which could be disposed of by the grantor as he pleased; but most endowments in course of time became much broken up. Another way adopted in the Dutch Indies is, in keeping with the local 'ada, to admit only a portion of the actual estate to division among the heirs; we also frequently find an estate divided already in a lifetime by gift or friendly arrangement, and not infrequently some member of the family, according to circumstances, simply takes over the estate and obligations of the deceased; lands here are taken out of the control of Muslim law. So far only a very few Indian modernists (notably Khuda Baksh) have dared to criticise the Muslim law of inheritance and demand its abolition. It is the general practice of Muslim lands and is used by the šarī'a tribunals, which also undertake the distribution of the estate, a thing too difficult for a layman to attempt. The Muslim law of inheritance is also applied to members of other creeds, when they come with problems to be settled to the ŠHārīa tribunals, which often happens in Muslim countries.


(M. E. SCHLIECHT)

MIRDAS B. UDAIYÁ, Khāridjī leader in Baṣra, killed in 61 (680—681). He belonged to the Rabīb b. Ḥanṣāla b. Mālik b. Zaidīnāt (called Rabīb al-Wuṣṭā, Naḍā', ed. Bevan, p. 185, 5 = 699, 112 Mufaddalīyāt, ed. Lyall, p. 123, 12, 772, a branch of the tribe of Tamīm which supplied so many leaders to the Khāridjī movement. His father was called Ḥaḍār b. 'Amr b. Abd b. Ka'b and Udaīya was his mother's or grandmother's name; she belonged to the tribe of Muhārib b. Ḥaṣāfa (Ibn Duraid, Kitāb al-'Ilāhī, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 134; Ibn Kūtāla, Kitāb al-Ma'ārif, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 209; Ţābarī, Mubarrad, Balāḏūrī, cf. Bīkī). He is often called by his kunya Abū Bī'llāh.

His brother Īrwa b. Udaīya had been one of the instigators of the Khāridjī movement of secession at the battle of Siīta; he himself had taken part in the movement and had fought against the Caliph 'Ali at al-Nahrawān (38 a. H.); after this defeat he gave up all political activity although, like his brother, he remained faithful to his old opinions; but he declared himself against armed insurrection, political assassination (istīrād) and the participation of women in the Khāridjī movement. These moderate views, which Mirdās retained till the extreme of the caliphate to class him among the ša'dā (quietists) of the Khāridjīs, made it all the more remarkable when he came out openly and actively against the excesses of the governor of Baṣra, ʿAbdallāh b. Ziyād, in his repression of Khāridjīsm. A woman named al-Balāḏī or al-Balāḏūrī (the latter form, given by Ibn al-Bītir from al-Balāḏūrī, seems to be wrong) had been cruelly martyred by the governor. Mirdās's indignation was so aroused that he left Baṣra with 40 of his followers and went to al-Ahwāz on the Fārs frontier, where he held out for a long time without committing any of those acts of fanaticism usual among the Khāridjīs and confined himself to imposing a levy equal in value to the pension
This episode, insignificant in itself, provoked a tremendous reaction throughout the 'Irak in view of the fame which the piety and moderation of Mirdas has brought him. His death was promptly avenged by 'Abdīa b. Hillī, who was later to become one of the leaders of the Azrā'īs rising, and it was in the name of Mirdas that the Khāridjīs rebelled again on the death of the Caliph Yazīd I (65 A.H.). The heroism and death of Mirdas were sung by several poets, notably the famous 'Imrān b. Hātān [q.v.]; his memory was cherished for long in Khāridjī circles and especially in 'Omān, the centre of the Šufyā (al-Mubarakk, p. 533, l. 14 = Aghānī, xvi. 154). The latter, whose insincerity is much less marked than that of the Azrā'īs, may rightly regard Mirdas as their predecessor (cf. Haarbrucker, asch-Scharastānīs Religionstheorien und Philosophen-Schulen, ii. 406, from the Kitāb al-Tahtīf f. 'ldin of Shāfīrū b. Tahīr al-Jasfārānī [Brock, i. 387]); on the other hand, the Mu'tazilīs held that Mirdas had only rebelled at Mandīnā (the title comes) and the Shi'īs even denied that he was a true Khāridjī (al-Mubarakk, p. 560–561). Mirdas's brother, 'Urwa b. Udaya, does not seem to have taken part in the insurrection; but this did not save him from persecution by Ibn Ziyād, who had him arrested and executed shortly after the death of Mirdas; the version which puts his execution before the rising of Mirdas in 58 A.H. (Tabarī, i. 185) is less probable. Bibliography: The fullest and most complete account is that of al-Mubarakk, al-Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 584–596, without indication of source; al-Baladūrī, Anwār al-Asfīrī, Constantiopolis MS. ʾAshīr Efendi, p. 386–387b, is very close to but not identical with al-Mubarakk's and quotes a large number of verses. He also omits the innād, al-Tabarī, Amīnae, ed. de Goeje, ii. 186–187, 390–391 relies on two sources, Wāhī b. Dājrīr and an anonymous one, of which the former does not seem very reliable and the latter follows al-Mubarakk and al-Baladūrī, but is much shorter. Wāhī, Maqdūm al-Bulūnd, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 61–62 (cf. also ii. 434, l. 1) seems to have used an independent source. Ibn al-ʿAţīr, al-Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, iii. 428–430, iv. 81–82 harmonises al-Tabarī and al-Baladūrī, and follows al-Mubarakk, p. 592 for the death of ʿUrwa; al-Dinawārī, al-Āqīdūr al-Ḥimāl, ed. Guirgias, p. 278–279 knows the episode, but wrongly attributes it to the Azrā'īs (sic!) and does not even mention Mirdas. — Cf. also Wellhausen, Die rel.-pol. Oppositionsparteien (Abh. G. W. Goetz, phil.-hist. Kl. N. J. V., 2, 1901), p. 25–27.

MIRDASIDS, an Arabic nymph of the 3rd century BC, probably from Syria. The Mirdasids took their name from the leader of the Beduin tribe of the Kilabits, Sāliḥ b. Mirdas. We know nothing of Mirdas himself. On Sāliḥ of the art. and on his successor Šbihl al-Dawla, the art.; for the other members of the dynasty cf. Ḥalāb.

In the beginning of the fifth (eleventh) century the Kilabits migrated from the ʿIrāk to the region of Aleppo. In 414 (1023) their leader Sāliḥ took the town. The dynasty, at first so strong, gradually became so feeble that its last representative Šbihl exchanged the town in 472 (1079) in spite of his brothers' protest for a few smaller towns with the then powerful Beduin chief Muslim b. Kurāīsḥ.

The importance of the Mirdasids, the second last Arab ruling family of Syria, lies in the fact that they successfully defended the northern province of Aleppo by arms and policy against the Byzantines and Turks. Lane-Poole gives the genealogy in his Muhammadan Dynasties, London 1894; Šbihl al-Dawla Nasīr (2) had also a son Mūdrak and Rashīd al-Dawla Māhmūd (4) had also sons Šbihīb and Wāḏīhāb.

Bibliography: given in the article.

MIRJAM. [See MARYAM]

MIR KHAWAND, historian, author of the Rawdat al-Safāʾ ("Garden of Purity"). He was son of Bahān al-Dīn Khwānd Shīb, native of Transoxiana, and, apparently, of Buğhūra. He lived much in Ḥerāt and died there on June 22, 1408, aged 66. His work is a universal history in seven volumes, beginning with the Creation and ending at the death of Shūṭḥ Ḥasan in Ḥerāt in 1505. The last volume, however, is really the work of his grandson, Khāwandīm [q.v.]. His work is not so interesting as his grandson's Ḥalīb al-Šīyar, for it is a compendium and wants the personal note. The style too is bombastic, and there is little historical criticism. But it is a work of great industry and has a high reputation in the East. It was lithographed in Bombay 1848, in Ẓāhrān 1852; a Turkish translation appeared at Constantinople in 1842; partial translations were made by Jenisch, Mitscharlik, Wilken, Vulders, Shea (O.T.F. series), Rehatsek (T.F. series), Jourdain and Silvestre de Sacy (Journal des Savants, 1937).

Bibliography: Quatremerre (Journal des Savants, 1843, p. 127, 170); Rieu, Cat. Port. MSS. British Museum, i. 87; Elliot-Dowson, iv. 127 (and the authorities quoted there, p. 132 sq.); Ethé (s. v. Mirkhoud), Enc. Brit., 11th ed., vol. xviii. (H. Beveridge)

AL-MIRRIKH, the planet Mars. The etymology of the name is unknown. The sphere of Mars is the fifth sphere of the planets. It is bounded on the inner side by the sphere of the sun and on the outer side by the sphere of Jupiter, and its breadth is according to Ptolemy (xx. 376) 998 miles. Its period of revolution is estimated at 1 year, 10 months and 22 days. In about 17 years, after 9 revolutions, Mars comes back to the same spot in the heavens; it spends about 40 days in each sign of the zodiac and covers about 40
minutes each day. It is said to be one and half times the size of the earth.

Astrologers call Mars al-Nakš al-aghar, the minor misfortune. It is the planet, which next to Saturn is credited with the most ominous omens and effects, war, revolts, death, configuration etc. The character of those born under Mars is in keeping with this.


**MIRZĀ or MIRZĀ, a Persian title, from Mir-zāda or Amīr-zāda, and originally meaning born of a prince** (cf. Malik-zāda and Farhang-zāda, which occur in Sādi etc.). The title, in addition to bearing its original significance, was also given to noblemen and others of good birth, thus corresponding to the Turkish Ağha. Since the time of Nādir Shāh’s conquest of India it has been further applied to educated men outside of the class of mullahs or ‘ulamā‘. In modern times the title is placed after the name of a prince, and before the name of other persons bearing it: e.g. Ḥusain Mirzā “Prince Ḥusain”, whereas Mirzā Ḥusain is practically equivalent to Ḥusain. (R. Levy)

**MIRZĀPŪR, a district (and town) in India** in the Benares division of the Central Provinces: area 5,240 square miles. The population is nearly 1,100,000 of whom barely 9% are Muhammadans. The latter show a tendency to increase in proportion to the Hindus, owing to their greater stability, comparing as they do a smaller proportion of the very poor. The district is however a stronghold of Hindaisms, and Islām makes little progress by conversion. Nothing is known of the early history of the district. It was occupied by Rājputs in the eleventh century A.D. and in the next century passed into the power of the Muslim rulers of Dwaynepur. Down to the Moghul conquest, the district played an important part in the military history of India, as it contained the great stronghold of Ćunar which guarded the gateway of the east.

At Rasulpur near Āhura is the tomb of a Muslim named Sājid al-‘Āṣaf. “All which is a place of pilgrimage. Near the gateway of the fort of Bijnaghar is shown the tomb of Sājid Zain al-‘Ābidin, the saint who miraculously took the stronghold for Shīr Shāh. The town of Ćunar contains two mosques at one of which is preserved marble said to have belonged to Ħasan and Ǧusîn. The tomb of the Āfghān saint Shāh Ǧasîm Sulaimānī (1545–1606) with those of his family forms a group of buildings of architectural interest. His festival is celebrated on the 17th–21st Dju‘amā‘dī I.

**Mirzāpūr city** is the capital of the district of the same name. It has a population of 50,000 of whom a sixth are Muslims. It is a Moghul foundation dating from late in the xvith century: in the xvith and early xviith centuries it attained great prosperity as a trading centre, being at the junction of important roads and at the highest point on the Ganges reached by the larger ships. In 1864 the opening of the East India Railway left the town isolated; since then it has declined, as the railway now carries the trade with which it used to deal.

Among the mosques is one founded in the middle of the xivth century by a Muslim lady named Gām, who also left funds to build a sarai. The town contains the celebrated Hindu shrine of Vindhyesvāri, much visited by pilgrims and formerly held in special veneration by Thugs.


**MIRZĀ TAḴĪ KHĀN, Amir-i Niẓām or Amir-i Kābir,** was born at Farāhān of humble parents, his father having been first the cook and then the steward of the Kā’im Mākām, Mirzā Abu-l-Kāsim, who ended his life as the first minister of Muḥammad Shāh Kāfant (1534–1548). In 1850, as a young menial, Taḵī Khān accompanied the Persian Commander-in-Chief on the Mission which was sent to St. Petersburg after the murder at Tīhrān of the Russian ambassador Gribacoff. On his return to Persia after this visit to Europe, he was promoted to be a mirzā or writer, and subsequently was advanced to the rank of khān. By the time his master and patron died the young official had achieved distinction enough to be made wazīr responsible for the army in Āḏbarsīmān. Still further honours came, when, during the negotiations at Erzerūm for the settling of outstanding disputes between Persia and Turkey, he was sent to represent his own country in place of the Mughāl Nawâb, who had fallen ill after his appointment as plenipotentiary. On the conclusion of the Treaty of Erzerūm, Mirzā Taḵī returned to Tīhrān and was then commissioned to accompany the young Shāh, Nāṣir al-Dīn Mirzā to Tabrīz, to which the Shāh was sent as governor of Āḏbarsīmān. In 1848, Taḵī Khān’s master became Shāh, and on the way back to Tīhrān he appointed his lieutenant to the post of Prime Minister. It is said that either modesty or prudence caused him to refuse the title of Sāḏr-i A‘pām which is bestowed on the holders of the office, but, in any event, he contented himself with the less imposing one of Amir-i Niẓām, which he held in Āḏbarsīmān as Commander-in-Chief. As a mark of the royal favour he was given the sister of the Shāh in marriage, and found in her a wife who displayed the utmost devotion to him for the short remainder of his life.

In office he had the rare distinction in Persia of being inamnable to bribery, and he had a regard for his country which led him to resist interference from foreign powers in its affairs. Moreover, recognizing the reactionary influence of the ‘ulamā‘, he attempted in such ways as were open to him to counteract their activities.

He reorganised the army in spite of attempts by his enemies to rouse certain sections of the troops into revolt against him, he made efforts to improve the fiscal system of the country and had some success in making the provincial treasuries self-supporting. Trade, both internal and external, was encouraged by him, and it was he that equipped Tīhrān with the fine bazaars which it now has. As has been indicated, his period of office was not a peaceful one. In 1850 occurred the execution of the “Bābi” [q. v.] at Tabrīz, the revolts of the Bābis at Yazd and Zind致します and the execution of the “Seven (Bābi) Martyrs” at Tīhrān. The risings were put down with great cruelty, and in consequence an attempt was made by the Bābis on the life of the Amir-i Niẓām, whom they regarded as responsible. Almost from the begin-
ning of his period of office he had aroused by his influence over the Shāh the jealousy of the latter's mother and of possible rivals, and their secret attacks were helped by his overbearing character. In November 1851 his enemies succeeded in securing his dismissal, after which the ill-judged attempt of the Russian ambassador to give the fallen minister his protection roused the anger of the Shāh who ordered him to retire in disgrace to Kāshān. There, on January 9, 1852, he met his death at the hands of the sovereign's farāsh-bāshī.


MISĀHA (science of measurement, plane and solid geometry) is the name given by the Arabs to the science of comparing magnitudes and its methods. In the wider sense it covers the measurement of all things which can or need be measured, mainly lengths, areas, volumes, weights and numbers; in particular however, the ḥul al-misāha deals with geometry, with definitions of solids and geometrical figures as well as the laying down of rules for the calculation of lengths, areas and volumes of the different figures in elementary plane and solid geometry. The conception misāha therefore includes only a portion of what we call measurement in the wider sense, or practical or technical geometry (i.e. the measurement of things having length, breadth and volume); in particular it excludes mensuration in the narrow sense, geodesy. The Arabs possessed special treatises dealing with the problems of geodesy. They therefore make the same distinction between theoretical and applied measurement, which had developed among the Greeks from the time of Aristotle and is most clearly expressed by Hero in his Metrica and Dioptra.

The definitions given by the Arabs themselves of the conception misāha are very varied. Some authors give a very wide one (e.g. al-ʿUmayt: "Measurement consists in ascertaining an unknown quantity by means of a known one. The result gives the amount of the unknown quantity in units of the quantity used for measuring"); most of them mean by it the measurement of length, area and volume. Al-Shinshawī makes a clear distinction between direct measurement, "the test of coincidence" (tāḥīk), and indirect measurement by calculating from certain formulae.

We find treatises on geometry throughout the whole period in which the Arabs acted as the transmitters of the ancient culture with which they had become acquainted, from the earliest beginnings of their literary activity at the beginning of the ninth century A.D. to the decline of Arab mathematics about 1600. The purpose of such works was to give the future surveyor, architect or soldier the necessary equipment, the theoretical foundation for his profession. Three groups of these treatises can be distinguished according to their method of treatment:

a. those which contain examples, completely worked out, illustrating the process of calculation (e.g. that of al-Baghḍādī);

b. those which only contain a series of fully worked out problems, and are a kind of exercise book (e.g. that of Abū Bakr).

On the method of exposition in these works it should be noted that we cannot of course speak of mathematical formulae in our sense of the word among the Arabs. They, especially the eastern Arabs, had no language of mathematical formulae; it was only late among the western Arabs and probably only in the field of algebra that a technical language was developed. The rules for measuring were always written out fully in words, sometimes even the figures occurring in the text.

The matter of the works on misāha, especially the larger ones, as a rule comprises introductory remarks, rules for calculating areas and volumes and the most important lengths found on them, and occasionally also practical exercises.

A. Introductory remarks. These are as a rule

1. Definition of the term misāha.

2. Explanation, description and systematic classification of the geometrical figures to be discussed.

3. Definition and list of the most common units of measurement.

B. Rules for calculation.

I. Plane surfaces (and the lengths occurring on them).

1. Quadrilaterals (square, rectangle, rhomboid trapezium, trapezoid, quadrilateral with salient angle).

2. Triangles (equilateral, isosceles, scalene, right angled, acute-angled and obtuse-angled).

3. Polygons (regular, irregular, "drumshaped figure" (mudhabbat), "hollow figure" (mudjawwaf), "stepshaped figure" (mudjawāj).

"Drumshaped" and "hollow" figures are formed by the combination of two congruent trapeziums in such a way that in the former the shorter, in the latter the longer parallel sides coincide; a number of varieties are distinguished. The stepped figure is formed by placing together a number of rectangles of the same length but different breadth, in which the proportions of the breadths form an arithmetical progression.

4. Circle. Segments of a circle (semi-circle, segment, sector, circumference) and related areas (horseshoe or crescent [kīṭāl], egg-shape, bean-or lentil-shaped, or oval figures).

The crescent is formed by the subtraction of two segments of circles of different radius with a common chord. Egg-shape and bean-shape by the addition of two congruous segments which in the egg-shape are less, in the bean-shape greater than the semi-circle. The area of the oval (ellipse) is given by Savasorda as \( \frac{1}{4} (a + b)^2 \pi \).

II. Solids (and the areas, especially superficies, and lengths that occur on them).

1. Prism (ordinary straight and oblique prism, square column, rectangular column, dice, triangular prism, obliquely cut prism, corpus simile domui in Abū Bakr as translated by Gerard of Cremona).

2. Cylinder.
Pyramids (straight and oblique pyramids, sections of pyramids).
4. Cones (straight and oblique cone, section of cone).
5. Sphere and section of a sphere, hemisphere, segment, sector and zone.
6. Regular and semi-regular bodies (the five Platonic and two Archimedean are treated at any length only in al-Kāshi).
7. Other bodies [cylindrical vault (azdžāj and ṭibān; the only difference between them is the length) hollow dome (ḫubbā), roof-shape (corpus simile cabur) in Abū Bakr), wreaths and discus (hollow cylinder), terrace-shaped figures].

C. Practical exercises.

These are generally speaking rare in works on misāḥa. We frequently find exercises in dividing fields modelled on Hero and Euclid. Savasorda has a number of exercises on fields on slopes, in hollows and on summits and on the calculation of the heights of hills; al-Ḥanbalī has some on the measurement of inaccessible pieces of ground, the depth of wells and breadth of rivers. Of other problems may be mentioned, for example, the calculation of the number of pieces of stone or bricks required to build a house or a roof, the ascertainment of the height of a wall.

It must not however be supposed that the subject matter as above described is fully contained in any work on misāḥa. The individual works differ in subject matter according to the inclinations and abilities of their authors, just as our text-books of geometry do at the present day. We find works planned on a very comprehensive scale (by al-Ḥanbalī and al-Kāshi), alongside of very brief ones, often dealing only with portions of the subject (e.g. the anonymous Berlin MS. N°. 5954 which contains only formulae for calculating plane surfaces), or even only a single problem (like the treatise by al-Shinehwarti). We therefore often find expositions which are only put into works on geometry in order to show the author's special knowledge or results of his research in a particular field.

Among remarkable examples of this kind are those which were by Ḥamūghī al-Kāshī in a work on mīṣāḥa of a treatment of regular and some semi-regular bodies (the calculation worked out by him in sexagesimal fractions to the fifths is so accurate that it only begins to differ from the correct figure in the tenth decimal place); the formulae for the area of a surface given by al-Ḥumāwī \( F = V \), for trapezoids with a right angle and his improvement of Hero's formulae for the segments of a circle; the formula for an arc given by al-Karkhī; the formula \( d^2 = \frac{1}{2} [n(n-1) + 6] a^2 \) where \( d \) is the diameter of the circle around a regular polygon of \( n \) sides of length \( a \) given by the same author and al-Bağhdādī (the same formula is found in Nemerurus and Regiomontanus and attributed by the latter to the Hindus; it is however, so far as we know, not found in any Hindu mathematician's work yet published) also the application of algebra to geometry by Abū Bakr and Ibn al-Banna. The former uses the algebraical solution for problems of areas in order to show the application of equations of the first and second degree to the six cases distinguished by al-Khwārizmī; the latter uses combinatorial analysis to investigate the different possibilities of stating the problem.

The methods of calculating the volume are the same as we find among the Greeks and Egyptians. When it is not a question of matter that has been taken over from them, in which case the formulae are directly adopted, the obtaining of results is purely inductive and empirical. Al-Karkhī for example for the volume of a sphere gives, in addition to the formulae \( d^2 (\frac{11}{4} a^2) \), on the method of obtaining which he says nothing, also \( d^3 \left( \frac{28}{45} \right) \) which he gets by comparing the weight of a cube of wax with the weight of a sphere, which is made out of the cube of wax and whose diameter is equal to the edge of the cube. al-Bağhdādī deals with a method of ascertaining the volume from the weight and specific gravity. al-Kāshī knows the method of immersion of Archimedes mentioned by Hero. The direct method of measuring the length of areas by laying a thread along them is still recommended as the most reliable by al-Karkhī and Bahā al-Dīn. It is evident that such methods must lead to approximative results and formulae of approximation, the typical feature of practical geometry, continue to be used by the Arabs in measuring long after they obviously knew of their inaccuracy. Ibn Mammātī criticises the usual formula for the area of a triangle \( \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c) \), and \( \frac{1}{2} (a + b) \), al-Bağhdādī the formula for a quadrilateral \( \frac{1}{4}(a + c) \frac{1}{4}(c + d) \), which comes from the Egyptians.

The reasons for the long survival of such rules are partly that the formulae gave in practice quite useful results and partly that the practical men who were concerned with measurement in the exercise of their trade wanted values easy to calculate rather than great mathematical accuracy and took no note of slight errors, especially if they thereby avoided calculations with roots. For similar reasons and in keeping with the traditional practice, almost all works of mīṣāḥa give no scientific geometrical proofs of the accuracy of the formulae they quote. Only the book of the Jew Abraham Savasorda, who may be reckoned among the western Arabs, gives logically worked out proofs in any number; we occasionally find references to early mathematicians (especially Euclid) in Ibn al-Banna and Ibn al-Ḥanbalī. Probably inspection was quite sufficient (Abū al-Azīz for example draws plane figures in a network of squares each of one unit and counts the squares and their parts within this area) or a simple demonstration in some form or a calculation to prove the correctness of the procedure, which was frequently illustrated also by examples completely worked out.

A further peculiarity of Arabic authors was to give formulae which agree completely in substance in different algebraical forms. The Berlin MS. N°. 5954 gives for example for the calculation of the section of the hypotenuse \( q \) in the right angled triangle the following formulae: \( q = \frac{1}{2} [a + (c^2 - b^2); a] = \frac{1}{2} (a + c + b) (c - b); a] = \frac{1}{2} [a + (c + b); \frac{c}{a}] = \frac{1}{2} [a + (c + b) - \frac{c}{a}]; \frac{c}{a}] = \frac{1}{2} [a^2 + (c^2 - b^2); a]. \) This differentiation was probably only intended to give as many forms as possible of the relations between the known and unknown magnitudes so as to afford the practical man a choice of different correct formulae of which one might suit the special case better than another.

The sources of Arab geometry are to be sought among the Greeks and Hindus. The form and
substance of the rules are almost entirely Greek, especially in the older authors. Hero's "elaborations" in particular, which in turn go back to Egypt, seem to have been the model for Arab works on geometry. To Egypt may be traced the prefaceing of a metrological section (found in many books on miskha), the problems on dividing fields, the formula for the trapezoid, the special name for the upper side of a quadrilateral (re c al-'urf), Hindu are the values for π in al-Khwārizmī, the formula \( V = abd \), for the quadrilateral inscribed in a circle, the terms are, perpendicular from the summit of an arc and chord, the marking of lengths in Hindu figures, the use of algebra to solve geometrical problems (equations, method of double error, combinatorial analysis). The chief teachers were however the Greeks, whose achievements the Arabs generally speaking never surpassed; the requirements of practical mensuration gave them no new problems and practical geometry remained down to quite modern times elementary, the majority of the works of which had been finally settled long ago by the Greeks.

The services of the Arabs to geometry lie less in the extension of the field by ascertaining new, hitherto unknown facts, although in the miskha works we do find a series of new and novel rules, than in their enrolment of this science by new methods of calculation and teaching and especially in their preserving the inheritance of the ancients and handing it down to the western world. Although Hero's geometry first became known in northwestern Europe through Roman surveyors, it was mainly the Arab sources which gave new life to this subject which had become stagnant in its old form. Arabic original works were made accessible to the west in Latin translations. Leonardo of Pisa in his Practica geometriae, which remained a standard work for three centuries, depended closely on Savasorda, who most probably owes a great deal to Abū Bakr as there are striking similarities between the Liber embadorum and the Liber mensurationis; down to late in the xvith century we continually come across writings on practical geometry, which in form and content show to what originality they go back.

**Bibliography:** a. Manuscripts: Arab. authors translated into Latin:
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1. Ibn al-Dīyāb (c. 1150) "Records of the measurement of surfaces", Escurial, old N°. 924, fol. 1a. 70b: 2. 'Imād al-Dīn al-Baghdādī (+1335; Suter, N°. 494), "Work on the science of measurement and the sharing of difficulties", Berlin 5976, fol. 17a. 26v: 3. Ibn al-Banna' (+1359: 1340; Suter, N°. 399), "Treatise on the doctrine of measurement", Berlin 5945, fol. 70v. 73v:

4. anonymous, "Treatise on the principles of the doctrine of measurement" (written in 1355), Berlin 5953, fol. 56b. 59v:


(H. SCHIRMER)
sura (Yāqūt, iii. 449; al-Khāzīn, i.e. as Marquart, S. B. B. A., 1912, p. 492) has recognized, the agglutinative Turkic name for Kâshghar, Ordunkand. Of this kingdom of the Boghākhāns however, this author (p. 447 sqq.) tells us that it belonged to the tribe of Boghārā, whose ruler was a descendant of Āli, as the East Turkholic legend of Satok Boghārā Khān says of his grandson. The story is therefore compiled from various sources. Marquart (Sachau, "Festschrift", p. 271—272) has also recognized that the alleged ruler of Sadjištān whom the author claims (op. cit., p. 458, 4) to have met, Abū Ǧāfār Muḥam- 

mūjās, a p. 1, of the third world of Kazwin's Cosmography in the Gotha Mss. 1506 (Möller, No. 2316) and has been edited from it by Schlozer.

**Bibliography:** al-Thālibī, Yūmat al- 

Dākir, iii. 174—194; F. Wustenfeld, Die Abu 

Dolaf Mīsar Berichte über die turkischen Herden, 

Zeitschr. für vergl. Erdkunde, i. Jahrg., vol. 2, 

Heft 9, Magdeburg 1842; Abu Dolaf Misarīsh 

ben Mōhārak de ibnue suo asiatico commenta- 

rius, ed. C. Schlozer, Berlin 1845; W. Grigo- 

rieff, "Arabisches petraesches Myth X" (Abu 

Dolaf in strassburgensi egeo nom srednei Arxi, 

in Zurnal ministerstvo narodowego prazjzniki, 

vol. clxii/2 (1872), p. 1—45. (G. Brockelmann)

**MISBAH.** [see Surbā.]

**MISKĪN,** poor, a loanword which has shown remarkable vitality. It goes back to the Assyrian miskīnu, "poor" (in the Laws of Hammurabi it is a name for a class between those enjoying full citizenship and slaves; according to L. W. King: freemen who do not belong to the ruling race). In the meaning "poor" it has passed into Aramaic (miskīn), Hebrew (miskīn), North Arabic (miskīn or, against analogy, miskīnī), into Southern Arabic and Ethiopic (miskīn). It has passed from Arabic into Italian and as meschino into French as mis- 

guin. In Arabic, on the analogy of the form miskīlī, it is usually of common gender but the feminine form miskīnā is also found with plural miskīnūt. Muḥamād often uses the word in the Kurān in the list of persons whom it was a duty for believers to support. As in Sūra ix. 60 it is found alongside of fukārā', commentators and jurists have felt that some distinction must be made between the two. They usually explain miskīn as needy, but not absolutely without possessions like the fukārā', and refer to Sūra xviii. 78, where there is a reference to poor people who possess a ship among them. How uncertain this is, is however evident from the fact that the Mālikīs in opposition to the Šafī'īs take the other view and regard the miskīnānūs as the most needy; cf. also the various definitions collected by Lane. Dāh Matrāba in Sūra xc. 16 does not help us. From the meaning "poor" gradually developed that of "base, miserable", also in the moral sense, cf. e.g. Ibn Sa'd, iii/6. ult. where Abu Sufyān's wife Hind is called al-Miskīnā. On the other hand, the word can mean "humble" as in the words attributed to Muḥamād: "Let me live as a miskīn

and die as a miskīn and include me among the miskīnānūn."


**MIṢR,** a. a proper name denoting the eponym of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the Copts. In accordance with the Biblical genealogy (Genesis x. 1 sqq.) Miṣr is called the son of Ḥām, the son of Nēb. The Biblical origin of the pedigree appears clearly in the form Miṣrīm or Miṣrīn (cf. Hebrew Miṣrāyim) which is found side by side with Miṣr.

In some genealogies between Ḥām and Miṣr there is inserted Bāṣār, a name of which the origin is unknown to me.

There exists, however, also quite a different genealogy, according to which Miṣrān is a son of Tablīl, one of the early heroes (ḏāqābīra), who ruled Egypt after the Deluge.

**Bibliography:** al-Ṭabarī, *Ṭibrīz*, ed. de Goëe, i. 217; al-Ya'[ābī, *Ṭibrīz*, ed. Hout- 


b. a proper name denoting Egypt as a country. It may be supposed that Miṣr was already the name of Egypt among the Arabs in pre-Islamic times as it is used in the Kurān (e.g. sūra x. 87; xii. 21, 100; xiii. 59), where the Biblical form Miṣrām does not occur. It has remained the Arabic name of Egypt [q. v.] up to the present day.

**b. a proper name denoting the capital of Egypt, i.e. at present and since its foundation Cairo, which with its full name is called Miṣr al- 

Kāhirā (cf. Cairo). Miṣr occurs, however, already as the name of the city or the cities situated south- 

west of later Cairo; when the name had been transferred to this city, the name Miṣr al-kādira (Old Miṣr) clung to the old settlement, situated between the mosque of Āmīr and the right bank of the Nile (cf. Butler, *Babylon of Egypt*, p. 16).

In the period between the Arab conquest and the foundation of Cairo the name Miṣr is regularly applied to the settlement just mentioned (Ibn Khūrdadhbih, *B.G.A.*, vi. 287, 271; Ibn Rosteh, *B.G.A.*, vii. 116 sqq.; al-Bukhārī, *Farād al-Kāmiš*, bāb 13; Abū Dāwūd, *Taḥāra*, bāb 74). We are, however, not able to decide which of its parts (Babylon, Fustāṭ or the Tūlūnīd capital) is especially denoted by it. It may be supposed that the combination of Fustāṭ Miṣr "Fustāṭ in Egypt" (cf. e.g. Masûdī, *Tanbih*, *B.G.A.*, xii. 388; Maqītī, *Ḳitāb*, i. 168 opposes Fustāṭ Miṣr to ord Miṣr) forms the link between the application of the name Miṣr to the country and to the capital. After the conquest of Egypt by the Muslims there were two settlements only on the right bank of the Nile where it divides, viz. Babylon and Fustāṭ. The papyri never mention Miṣr as the name of either of these settlements. Yet in the latter part of the seventh century A. D. the application of the name Miṣr to one or to the other or to both
must have begun, as is attested by John of Nikiu who at least once uses Mésr as the name of a city, where he speaks of "the gates of Mésr" (p. 25). In other passages Mésr appears as the name of the country (p. 201, 209). The statement that the use of Mésr as the name of a town arose after the Muslim conquest only, is in opposition to Butler, who maintains that at least since the age of Diocletian there existed on the right bank of the Nile, to the South of the later Babylon, a city called Mésr (cf. Butler, Babylon of Egypt, p. 15; do., The Arab Conquest, p. 221 note). Caetani (Annali, A. H. 19, § 47) has already pointed to the fact, that the traditions concerning the Arab conquest of Egypt do not give the slightest credit to the existence of a city bearing the name of Mésr. Butler's reference to the Synaxary proves nothing, as this work was composed many centuries after the conquest. — The Coptic name of Babylon was Keme.


d. a common noun, denoting a town; it is used especially in connection with the capitals of the provinces in the times of the conquests, e.g. in the tradition: "The amār will be conquered at your hands" (Abū Dawūd, Dībālāh, bāb 28). Basra and Kāfa are often called "the two misr" (Bukhārī, Haqīqī, bāb 13; Yaqūt, Maqāmī, iv. 454). Further any town may be called misr (e.g. Bukhārī, Dībālāh, bāb 2; Aḥfāl, bāb 15; Idrīs, bāb 25; Tirmidhī, Nīkāh, bāb 32 etc.). This misr is a genuine Semitic word, cf. Liṣān al-ʿArab, s. v. and the Jewish-Aramaic mīṣr, māṣrād, which have the same meaning, viz. that of a house or a field as an exactly delineated and demarcated territory (cf. J. Levy, Chaldäisches Worterbuch; do., Neuhébraisches-talmudisches Worterbuch).

It may be supposed that the geographical name Mīṣr (cf. above, a.—c.) comes from the same root and has originally a meaning akin to that of the common noun. (A. J. Wensinck).

Mîṣrā', a term in Arabic prosody applied to a hemistich or half line (huit): the first hemistich is called ʿadār and the second ʿadār. Each has two, three or four feet, tafṣīda or ḥāfī.(1) The last foot of the first hemistich is called ʿarūd and the last of the second ʿarūd. As a general rule, and in the first verse of a poem, the ʿarūd foot should have the same measure (tāfṣīr) and rhyme (tafṣīd) as the ʿadār foot.

(MOI. BEN CHENER)

Mîṣṣīs, arab. al-Maṣṣīṣa, a town in Cilicia on the Dājhīn.

In antiquity it was called Māṣāu ʾistīna a name, which (like that of Māṣāu ḫūdīn in the Cilician passes) is derived from the cult of the legendary seer Mopos (cf. Meyer, Gesch. d. Altert., viii, 2, § 483). In ancient times, the town was chiefly famous for its bishop Theodorus (d. 426), the teacher of Nestorius and friend of the suffragan bishop and inventor of the Armenian alphabet, Maγhṭāoē (Peeters, Revue des Études Armén., ix., Paris 1929, p. 210; on him cf. e.g. al-Maṣṣūdī, Tanbih, ed. de Goeje, p. 152; Mich. Syr., transl. Chatbot, ii. 3; Barhebraeus, Chron. eccles., ed. Alboum-Lamy, i. 133; Theophanes, Chron., ed. de Boor, i. 77, 96 sqq.). In 1761 a synod was held in Moposheisia in June 550 to see that his name was removed from the diplomas of the bishops (Masis, Acta Concil., ix., col. 275—289; Hefele, Konzilien geschichte, ii, 832—834). At a later date the name of the town was usually written Moposuēstia (pronounced: Mobsuhestia); cf. Append. ad Petri Sivili hist. Manich., ed. Gieseler, p. 63, i.; Wilh. Schultze, Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforsch., xxxvii., new series, xii., 1895, p. 372; references in Gerber to Georg Kypr. 819; Syr. Moposheisia: Noldke, W. Z. K. M., iii, 1889, p. 356; Severus Antioch., Epíst., v. 6, ed. Ioukois, p. 338; Arab. Mobsbustiā in Ibn Khurābdībūtī, ed. de Goeje, p. 90). As early as the end of classical times we already find the popular form Mōmpštis (Tab Peut), Byzant. Māṣṣīs (Michael Glykys, Annali, Bonn. Corp., p. 507; A. Kanumucka, ed. Reурсмыхед, i. 140; in al-Īdrīsī, ed. Gilemiller in Z. D. P. T., viii, 24; Mēnsrī; the Byzantine work on "Towns with later altered names", ed. Burckhardt, Iberikos, Šeńskim, Leipzig 1893, p. 62, Appendix I., No. 29, wrongly says: Kαταχάλα κω είναι τή Māṣṣīs: the former is rather the modern Būdūm Kāfī, Māsīs (Theodosius, De sit u terrae sanctae, c. 52, ed. Geyer in Corp. Script. Eccles. Lat., xxxix., 159, ed. J. Syriaca Maṣṣūdī, ed. Heister, Antichena, ed. Re✞münk. I. fasti della chiesa patriarcale Antichena, Rome 1920, p. v.; Byzant. Inschr. xxv., 74, 81), from which the Arabic al-Maṣṣīṣa, Armen. Misiēs, and Turk. Mīṣrīs or Misīs have arisen.

The emperor Heraclius is said to have removed the inhabitants and laid waste the district between Antioch and Mopsueisia on the advance of the Arabs, in order to create a desert zone between them (al-Tabari, i. 2396; al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 163; between al-Ikandarūn and Tarsūs), and under the Omayyads all the towns taken by the Arabs from al-Maṣṣīṣa to the fourth Armenian (Malaya) and still (one left behind for fortified and uninhabited as a result of the inroads of the Mardaites. (Theoph., ed. de Boor, i. 363, 17). According to Abu l-Khaṭṭāb al-Āzdī (in al-Baladhuri, p. 164), the Arabs conquered al-Maṣṣīṣa and Tarsūs under Abu ʿUliba, according to others under Musa b. Maṣūrī, who was sent by him and who thereafter advanced as far as Zanda (in 16 = 637; Caetani, Annali dell' Iscr., ii, 805, § 311). Mūʿawiyā on his campaign against Ṭammūriyya in 25 A. H. found all the fortresses abandoned between Anṭākīya and Ṭarsūs (see above), According to the Māṣṣīs Mūʿawiyā had himself destroyed all the Byzantine fortresses up to ʾAntākīya in 31 (651—652) on his return from Darawīla (Darwīla in Phrygia) (al-Baladhuri, p. 164)). After the Syrian rebellion against ʿAbd al-Malīk, the emperor Constantine IV Pogonatos in 65 (684—685 a. d.) advanced against the town and regained it (al-Yaḥūbī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 321). Yahyā b. al-Khaqam in 77 marched against Mard al-Shām between Malaya and al-Maṣṣīṣa (al-Yaḥūbī, ii. 337). It was only in 64 (703) that ʿAbd al-Malīk's son ʿAbd al-ʿĀṣ returned the town, and had the eschatol rebuilt on its old foundations (Baladhuri, p. 165; Yāḥūbī, ii. 466; Wākīdī in Tabari, ii. 321).
MISSÍS

1127; Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, iv. 398; Theoph., Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 372, 41; Mich. Syr., transl. Chabot, ii. 477; Elias Nisibeni, Opus chronolog., ed. Brooklyn, p. 155; ibid., p. 75; Scot. Syr., chronica monasterii, ed. Guidi, p. 232, transl. p. 176, under 1015 Sel. year: Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, i. 472. In the following year, he installed a garrison in the fortress, including 300 specially picked soldiers, and built a mosque on the citadel hill (Tall al-Hisæ); a Christian church was turned into a granary (kurna, kurnâ = korram, korra: al-Baladhuri, p. 165; Ibn al-Sijîna, ed. Bâinî, p. 179). To the same event no doubt refers the wrongly dated reference in the Chronicon of the Armenian Samuel of Ani of the year 692 A.D. to the fortification with strong walls of the town of "Ma- mesta, i. e. Misr" by the Muslims under 'Abd al-Malik (Ratic temporumque ad saum actent pretiâri Samuelli Anticius, in Euseb. Pamphil., Chron., ed. A. Mai and I. Zohrab, Mediolani 1818, App. p. 57; Alişan, Sisoevan, p. 280). Every year from 1500 to 2000 men of the corps (paxwâd) of Antakya used to winter in the town. According to Michael Syrus (transl. Chabot, iii. 478), 'Abd al-Malik died in 1017 Sel. (705 A.D.) in al-Masqîs. 'Umar II is said to have intended to destroy the town and all the fortifications between it and Antioch and to have been either prevented by his own death (Baladhuri, p. 167) or dissuaded by his advisers; according to this version, he then had a large mosque built in the suburb of Karfâbâyina in which there was a cistern with his inscription. It was called the "Citadel Mosque" and kept up till the time of al-Mu'tasim (al-Baladhuri, p. 165); but Karfâbâyina was probably not really built till the time of al-Mahdi or Hurrîn al-Raghib; [see below]. Yazîd b. Djughar ('Azâd, a tooth) in 704 A.D. attacked Sis (ze Sîsu kâstro: in al-Tabarî and Ibn al-Athir; Sisâna in the Nâhiya of al-Masqîs) but was driven off by Heraclius, the emperor's brother (Theophan., ed. de Boor, p. 372, 23; A. M. 6196: according to al-Tabarî, ii. 1185; and Ibn al-Athir, iv. 419, wrongly not till 87 A.H.). Hijsân built the suburb (al-Rabaq), Marwân II the quarter of al-Khûsîs east of the Dîjâhân, which he surrounded with a wall with a wooden door and a ditch. The bridge of Dûsir al-Walid between al-Masqîs and Ahdâna, 9 mil from the former, was built in 125 (742-743 A.D.) and restored in 225 (840) by Mu'tasim (al-Baladhuri, p. 168; Yaqût, Mu'jam, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 82; Safi al-Din, Mrâzîd, ed. Juynboll, i. 255). In the first half of the viith century the caliphs al-Walid II and Yazîd III brought the gipsy tribe of the Zu't, who had been deported to Başra by Mu'awiya in 670 A.D., and settled them with great hordes of buffalo in the region of al-Masqîs in order to fight the plague of lions in the district of the Dîjâbal al-Lukkâm (al-Baladhuri, p. 168; De Goede, Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Eigeners, 1875, p. 17-22). The first Abbassíd, Abu 'l-Abbâs al-Saffâh, on his accession strengthened the garrison by 400 men, to whom he gave lands; the same estates were later allotted to them by al-Masûr. The latter in 139 (756-757) restored the wall, which had been damaged by an earthquake in the preceding year, and increased with 8000 settlers the much diminished population of the town, which he called: al-Mâmu'ra (al-Baladhuri, p. 166; Ibn al-Athir, v. 382; Yaqût in 579, s.v. al-Mâmu'ira: Ibn al-Sijîna, p. 179). On the site of a heathen temple be built a large mosque which far surpassed the mosque of 'Umar in size. When 'Abd Allah b. 'Abî was governor of Maârib (i.e. 211-226), it was enlarged by al-Ma'mûn. Al-Masûr increased the garrison to 1000 men and settled in the town the inhabitants of al-Khûsîs, Persians, Slavs and Christian Arabs (Nabâtaeans), whom Marwân had transplanted thither (see above), and gave them allotments of land. It is probably that to the same event the story refers that Sâlih b. 'Ali, when in the 'Abbâsid period the inhabitants of al-Masqîs, harassed by the Byzantines, resolved to migrate, sent Djughar b. Yahyâ al-Raghibi al-Khurâsâni in 140 (757-758) to rebuild the town and settle it with Muslim inhabitants (al-Baladhuri, p. 166; according to al-Tabarî, ii. 135 in the year 141). Under al-Mahdi the garrison was increased to 2000; in addition there were the Amîkîya corps of almost the same size which wintered here regularly until Sâlih of Turrius. Beched increased the garrison by 500 men instead. There is a brief reference in the Syriac inscription of 'Eneshâ to a raid by al-Mahdi to the Dîjâhân (Syr. Gîhân) in 780 A.D. (1091 Sel.: Chabot, in J. D., ser. ix., xvi., 1900, p. 287; Pognon, Inscription, de la Syrie et de la Mesopotamie, p. 148-150, No. 84). Hurrîn al-Raghib built Kafarbaîya or according to another story, altered the plans for this suburb prepared by al-Mahdi and fortified it with a ditch; he also built walls which were only completed after his death by al-Mu'tasim. In 187 (803) an earthquake laid waste the town (al-Tabarî, iii. 688). In the following year, the Byzantines invaded and pillaged the region of al-Masqîs and 'Ain Zarba and carried off the inhabitants of Tarshûs into captivity, whereupon Hurrîn al-Raghib attacked and defeated them (Mich. Syr., iii. 16). According to al-Tabarî (iii. 709) and Ibn al-Athir (vi. 135), the Byzantines in 190 (806) invaded 'Ain Zarba and Kansat al-Sawdî and took prisoners there; but the people of al-Masqîs regained all their loot from them. If, as it seems, the curious story in the Byzantine chronicles (Theoph., Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 446, 15; Georg. Kodren, Bonn. Corpus, ii. 17) that in 771-772 (A. M. 6264) 'Alâ'edar Balad, i.e. el-Fâdûl b. Dîhât, who had 500 Byzantine prisoners with him, lost 1000 men and all his booty through a sortie of the Mäghribîs, refers to the same events, the latter would appear to be wrongly reported and wrongly dated.

On the 13th Hizârân 1112 Sel. (811 A.D.) the walls and many houses in the town and three adjoining villages fell in a great earthquake; near al-Masqîs the course of the Dijâhân was dammed up so that the boats lay on the dry bed (Mich. Syr., iii. 17). In 198 (813-814) Thâbit b. Naqîr al-Khûsîs was fighting in the Syrian marches of al-Masqîs and Ahdâna (Yâkîbî, i. 541). On his campaign into Bilâd al-Rûm, al-Ma'mûn passed through al-Masqîs and Tarshûs in Muharram 215 (March 830: al-Tabarî, iii. 1103; Ibn al-Athir, vi. 204; Abu 'l-Fidâ', Anales Musulm., ed. Reiske, ii. 152: Weil, Gesch. d. Chal., ii. 239). In revenge the emperor Theophilos in 216 (831) raided the lands around these two towns and slew or took prisoner 2000 men (al-Tabarî, iii. 1104; Ibn al-Athir, vi. 295).

After the emperor's campaign against Zibatra (837 A.D.) in which he also defeated the Mäghribîs (Const. Porphyrog., De castris, ed.,
Bonr, p. 503; Vasilev, *Visintiya i Arabi*, in *Zapiski ist.-filol. fak. imp. S.-Pthg. Univ.*, čast Ivi., 1900, p. 85 sq., note 4), al-Muʾṣaṣim bi Liḥṭa in the following year attacked ʿAttārūya; his general Baṣhir commanded a part of the army which included the Maṣṣaṣa contingents (Mich. Syr., iii. 96). In 245 (859) the town was again visited by an earthquake which destroyed many places in Syria, Mesopotamia and Cilicia (al-ʿAkkāṣi, 1440). The Caliph al-Muʿāṣirid after restoring order in the Thughfūr al-Šāmiyya (289 = 900) returned from al-Maṣṣaṣa via Fundūq al-Ḥussain, al-Iṣkandariyya and Baghrūs to Anṭākiyya, Ḥalab and al-Kaḳka (al-Taibānī, iii. 2198–2200; al-Fundūq, a place in the latter near al-Maṣṣaṣa: Yāḥūt, iii. 918; Saʿīd al-Din, Marāṣīl, ii. 365).


In 352 the emperor Nicephorus took Adana, the inhabitants of which fled to al-Maṣṣaṣa, and sent the Domesticus John Taimissēs (Yāḥūya b. al-Shimīṣīkī b. al-Dumīstikī) against this town. The latter besieged it for several days but had to withdraw as his supplies were running short, and after laying waste the country round burned the adjoining al-Mallūn (Maṣṣaṣī) at the mouth of the Djahān (Yāḥūya b. Saʿīdī, *op. cit.*, p. 74 sq.). The commander himself came again against him l-Kaḍa, 352 (Nov. 964) to the marches (al-Thughfūr) and besieged al-Maṣṣaṣa for over 50 days but had again to abandon the siege owing to shortage of supplies and retired to winter in Kaṣāriyya. Finally the town was stormed by John Taimissēs (Arm. Kuṭīr Zan) on Thursday the 11th Radja 354 (July 13, 965). The inhabitants set it on fire and fled to Kafarbaḥiya. After a desperate struggle on the bridge between the two towns the Greeks took this suburb also and carried off all the inhabitants into captivity (Yāḥūya b. Saʿīdī, *op. cit.*, p. 795; Ibn al-ʿĀthir, vii. 408–411; Abu l-ʿIffālī, *Ann. Musl.*, ed. Reiske, ii. 452 sq.; Mich. Syr., iii. 128; Elias Nisibīnī, ed. Brooks, p. 218; transl. p. 106; Georg. Cedren, ed. Bonn, ii. 362; Leona Diakon, ed. Bonn, p. 52 sq.; Mattīeas Uthayecī, ed. Dularier in *Rev. hist. croix*, Docum. Arm., i. 5; Stepʿan Ašokī of Taron, Arm. Gesch., transl. H. Gelzer and A. Burkhardt, Leipzig 1907, p. 134, 24). They were, to the number of 200,000, it is said, led past the gates of Taṣrūs, which at that time was being besieged by the emperor's brother Leo, to terrify the people of the town (Ibn Shīhāna, *Rawaẓid al-Maṣṣasī*, in Freytag, *Z. D. M. G.*, Elias Nisibīnī, *op. cit.*). The gates of Taṣrūs and of al-Maṣṣaṣa were gilded and taken as trophies to Constantinople, where one set was put in the citadel and the others on the walls of the Golden Gate (Georg. Cedren., ii. 365).

The town remained for over a century in the hands of the Byzantines; the Emperor Bassil II Bolgaroktonos stayed for six months in the region of al-Maṣṣaṣa and Taṣrūs before going to Armenia after the death (March 31, 1000 A.D.) of the Kουpalēs (Yahya b. Saʿīdi, *Tarīkh*, ed. Rosen, p. 39. in *Zap. Imp. Akad. Nauk.*, xliiv., St. Petersburg 1883). In 1042 the Armenian prince ʿAlpargīrī, son of Ḥasan and grandson of Khašākū of the house of the Arcrunians, was sent by the emperor Constantine Monomonachos as governor to Cilicia (St. Martin, *Mon. sur l'Arm.*, i. 199). In 1055 A.D., Philaretos Hrachomios, who was appointed in Constantinople perhaps Sebastos (Mich. Syr., iii. 173) or at least Kουpalēs (Mich. Attal., Bonn ed., p. 301) and whose ephemeral kingdom comprised the land from Taṣrūs to Matlāya, Urfa and Anṭākiyya, held al-Maṣṣaṣa (Mich. Syr., loc. cit.: Laurent, *Byzant. et Antioche sous le courapate Philaretos*, Rev. des Et. Arm., ix., 1929, p. 61–72). Shortly before the arrival of the Crusaders, the Seldjuk Turks took Taṣrūs, al-Maṣṣaṣa, ʿĀīn Zarba and the other towns of Cilicia (Mich. Syr., iii. 179). About the end of Sept. 1097 the Franks under Tancred, who had been invited thither by Lambert of Uskin III., took the town which was stormed after a day's siege: the inhabitants were slain and rich booty fell into the hands of the victor (Albert. Aquens., i. 15 sq., in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* clxvi., col. 446 sq.; Radulf. Cadom., *Gesta Tancrodi*, c. 39 sq.). William of Tyre describes al-Maṣṣaṣa on this occasion (i. 21, in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, col. 295): "Erat autem Manimistra una de nobilissimis ciuitatem provinciae civilitates, quod et multorum incolarum insignis, sedet optimo agro et glba where et amabiliter præcipua commendatibis". Count Baldwin, who had quarrelled with Tancred, followed him along with the admiral Winimer of Boulogne and encamped in a meadow near the Djahān bridge: Winimer left him there and went with his fleet to al-Kaḍa, while the two rivals had a desperate battle, after which Baldwin withdrew to the east (Albert. Aquens., iii., i. 15, 59, in Migne, *op. cit.*, col. 446, 472). Tancred followed him, after he had improved on the city "plus paternas quam principis leges" (Radulf. Cadom., c. 44). The Byzantine general Tatikios, who had joined the Crusaders to take over their conquests in name of the emperor, left them in the lurch in the beginning of Feb. 1098 at the siege of Anṭākiyya and ceded to Bohemund the town of Tursol (Taṣrūs), Manimistra and Ademna (Adana) (Raymond of Aguiles, in Bonn, *Gesta Del per Francos*, Hanover 1861, p. 126). Bohemund only took possession of the towns of Taṣrūs, ʿĀīn Zarba and al-Maṣṣaṣa in August (Will. of Tyre, vii. 2). After the town had again fallen to the Greeks for a period. Tancred again took it in 1011 (Rad. Cad., c. 143). But to hand it over with Taṣrūs, Adana and ʿĀīn Zarba to Bohemund on his return from captivity in 1103 (Will. of Tyre, vii. 2. in Migne, *op. cit.*, col. 379). In the following year however, Longinas, Taṣrūs, Adana and Maṣṣaṣa were regained by Byzantium by the campaign of the general Monasras (Anna Connona, *Alēsikē*, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 140, 5, who apparently did not recognise the identity of Maṣṣaṣa with Méfou

In 1122/3 the Rupénid Levon I (Rupenov), son of Constantine, took the town (Arm. Mēsas, Misas, Mamestra or Manuesta from the Greeks (Cinnamos, i. 7; iii. 14; Smbat Sranper, Chronicle, in Docum. Arm., i. 615). The brother of the emperor John I Komnenos went to him and Levon gave his sons his daughters with the towns of all Adana as dowries. But when they quarrelled he took back from the Greeks all that he had given them, and Isaac had to flee with his sons to Sulṭān Masūd (Michael Syr., ii. 230). Levon, falling through treachery into the hands of Raymond of Poitiers, had to cede (1136–1137) al-Massja, Adana and Sarvanti'kar (now Sawaran Ka'fe?), but regained his liberty in a couple of months; he very soon retook these towns (Docum. Arm., i. 152 sq. = Chron. de Mathieu d'Edesse, transl. Dulaurier, p. 457; Smbat, op. cit., p. 616). The emperor John in 1137 (1448 Sel.) had his revenge on Levon. He invaded Cilicia, took Taras, Adana and al-Massja, sent his Levon himself with his wife and children and took them to Constantinople, where Levon subsequently died (Ibn al-Aswār, xi. 357; Michael Syrus, iii. 245; Gregor. presb., Forts. d. Chronik des Mattiæ, transl. Dulaurier, p. 323; cf. Docum. Arm., i. p. xxxii, i and 153, 4; Will. of Tyre, xiv. 24; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kg. Jerus., p. 211). John installed Comlan (Calamanus), son of Boris and grandson of King Comlan of Hungary, as governor of Cilicia (Will. Tyre, xiv. 24, xix. 9, in Migne, Patr. Lat., cc., col. 603, 756; a "Dux Ciliciei" mentioned in Regum et principum epistolar., no. 24, in Bongars, Gesta Dei per Franc., p. 1512, l. 46 and passim). When the emperor John died at Marsj al-Dībādī on April 8, 1143 (Will. of Tyre, xvi. 22 sq.; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kg. Jerus., p. 238, 4), his successor Manuel I Komnenos had his body brought by boat from Mopsuestia down the Pyramos to the sea and taken by sea to the capital (Niketas Choniats, Man. Komn., i., Bonn ed., p. 67).

Thoros II, the son of Levon who had escaped home from his confinement in Constantinople, was again able to cast off the Byzantine yoke. When in 1151 he took Mēsas and Tīl (Tall Ḥamādīn) from the Byzantines (Smbat, in Docum. Arm., i. 619) and made their general Thomas prisoner, the emperor Manuel in the following year sent against him with 12,000 cavalry Andronicos Komnenos, whom he had appointed governor of Tarṣūs and al-Massja (Gregor. presb., in Docum. Arm., i. 167 = Matth. Edessa, transl. Dulaurier, p. 334; Smbat, Chron., in Doc. Arm., i. 619). Andronicos, who did not recognise Thoros as ruler of Asia Minor, advanced against al-Massja but was surprised by the Armenians and put an ignominious flight with his 12,000 men. Thus not only the town, which was very well supplied with the boundaries and military material of all kinds, fell into his hands, but also a great part of Cilicia (Gregor. presb., transl. Dulaurier, p. 334–336 = Doc. Arm., i. 167 sqq.; Smbat, op. cit.). The emperor, himself too weak to avenge the insult, induced by gifts the Sulṭān Kīlājb Arslān II (Gregor. wrongly: Mas'ūd) of Kūnīya to attack Thoros. The Sulṭān, who on the first occasion (1153 A.D.) was content with the defeat of the Armenian and the return of the lands taken from the Greeks, again attacked al-Massja, 'Ain Zarha and Tall Ḥamādīn (Arm. Tilin Hamunun) in 1156 but could do nothing against them and had finally to retire after heavy losses (Gregor., op. cit., p. 338 = Doc. Arm., i. 171).

The emperor Manuel himself passed through Cilicia in 1159 with a large army to the assistance of the Crusaders. Thoros had already retired to Yakhka in the desolate mountains (Armen. Rhyma Chron., in Doc. Arm., i. 505) when the emperor entered al-Massja at the beginning of November, but he did no injury to any one there (Gregor., transl. Dulaurier, p. 353 sq. = Doc. Arm., i. 187). The Frankish kings led by Baldwin came to pay homage to the king in the town or on the adjoining pratum pallarium (as Will of Tyre, xii. 27 translates Marsj al-Dībādī) where his court was held in camp for 7 months (Gregor., transl. Dulaurier, p. 358; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kg. Jerus., p. 298). Thoros was also able with great tact to become reconciled with him, and on acknowledging Byzantine suzerainty and ceding several towns in Cilicia, was recognised as "Sebastos" of Mēsas, Anazarbos and Yakhka (Doc. Arm., i. 186; Smbat, ibid., p. 622). His brother Mēh, who attempted his life while out hunting at al-Massja and
Adana, was banished by Thoros and given by Nūr al-Dīn the town of Kūrus (Kyrrhos; Smbat, loc. cit.). After the death of Thoros of Mésis (1168–1169; Smbat, p. 623), Meh (Arab. Malūb b. Li-vun al-Armāni) succeeded him and at first ruled only over the district of the passes (Bilâd al-Durâbī). In 1171 he surprised Count Stephen of Blois at Mamistra and plundered him (Will of Tyre, xx. 25–28). In 1171 (1117–1113), supported by troops of his ally Nūr al-Dīn, he took from the Greeks Adana, al-Maṣṣaṣa and Tarsus (Ibn al-Adhrī, xi. 255; Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. in Röhrich, in Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Kreuzzüge, i, Berlin 1874, p. 336).

When Meh's successor Rūpēn III fell through treachery into the hands of Bohemund of Antioch, his brother Levon (I) obtained his release in 1184 by ceding al-Maṣṣaṣa, Adana and Tall Hamdūn (Ṭīna) and paying 3,000 dinars; immediately afterwards, Rūpēn retook these strongholds from the Franks (Mich. Syr., iii. 397; Doc. arm., i. 394).

Het'um, the nephew of the Catholicos Grigor IV and son of Çortanēl of Taron, who came to Cilicia in 1189 with his brother Shahinshah, received from Levon II (1185–1219) his niece Alice, daughter of Rūpēn III, in marriage and the town of Masis, but died in the same year (Smbat, in Doc. arm., i. 629; Marquart, Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 481 sq.). The Emperor Frederick II (1190) was about to go to Syria via Tarsus and al-Maṣṣaṣa when he met his tragic end in the Kalakados (alleged[?] letter of the Armenian Catholics in Ibn Shaddīd, in Rec. Hist. Orient. des Crois., iii. 162): a portion of his army thereupon went to Antioch via Tarsus, Mamištria and Thegō (Iššīn al-Muṭahk-kab; not Portella, the Syrian passes, with which Röhrich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusalem, p. 530, i, identifies it).

Wilbrand of Oldenburg, who visited the East in the train of Duke Leopold VII of Austria and Steiermark and the Teutonic Grandmaster Hermann von Salza, came to Cilicia in 1212 to Mamistre, which he describes as follows: (Wilbr., c. 18, ed. Laurent, Peregrinationes, Leipzig 1864, p. 175): "Hiera est civilitas bona, super flumen sita, satis aequa, nummus habens circa se turritum, sed antiquitate corrossum, paucos in quod damus, hanc habet, habebatur, quibus omnibus rex illius terrae imperat et dominatūr". In the vicinity lay "quoddam castrum quod etiam de patri-mone beati Pauli... sed nunc temporis positi detur a Graecis". "In hac civitate [Mamistre] habitats sepulchrorum beati Pantalonii. Ipsa vero dicta Camamella (cf. Tomaschek, S. R. Ak. Wien, 1891, ap. vol. p. 71) magnum dictum". Levon II granted the privileges of Genoa and Venice the privilege of having their own trading centres in al-Maṣṣaṣa, which could be reached by ship from the sea before the mouth of the Djîlah became silted up (Alisjahb, Sisuan ou l'Arménie-Cilicie, p. 287). The attempt of Raymond Rūpēn of Antioch to seize the throne of Armenia after Levon's death in 1219 failed; he was, it is true, able to take Tarsus and attack al-Maṣṣaṣa but he was taken prisoner by Constance of Barzberd and died in prison in 1222 (Doc. arm., i. 514; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusalem, p. 74 sq.).

For a century the Rūpēnids ruled almost undisturbed in the town. Their glory reached its height under the splendid-loving Het'um I (1219–1270). Here were held the annual festivals of the Church at which numerous princes and nobles used to gather down to the last and difficult years of the king. Here was held the brilliant ceremony at which his 20-year old son Levon was dubbed knight. Hither the king brought the seat of government after the destruction of Sis (Alis-şah, Sisuan, p. 287 sq.).


In 1322, the Egyptians crossed the Djîlah by a bridge of boats, got behind the Armenians who had retired to Masis and inflicted a severe defeat upon them; among those who fell are mentioned the barons Het'um of Djîlkanoç, his brother Constantine, Wahram Lotik, Oshin, the son of the marshal, along with 21 knights and many men (Smbat's Continuator, in Doc. arm., i. 668). This authority also mentions a raid by an Egyptian force against al-Maṣṣaṣa (Manouestia), Adana, al-Ma'llūn (Mlûn) and Tarsus in 1334–1335 (Doc. arm., i. 671; Tomaschek, S. R. Ak. Wien, 1861, part viii, p. 68). The last Egyptian invasion took place in 823 (1373–1374). Among the towns destroyed were Sis, Adana, al-Maṣṣaṣa and ʿAin Zarba, and Levon IV had to surrender in 1375 after a siege of nine months in Ghaban (Doc. arm., i. 686, note 3). The town thus passed nominally into the Fatihār al-Djâhāntya of the Mamlūk empire; it had, it is true, by now sunk into insignificance and it is not mentioned, for example, among the towns taken by Shahsawār in 1467 (Alisjahb, Sisuan, p. 290).

Armenian sources mention 8 archbishops of the town from 1175 to 1370 (1175–1206 David, 1215 Johannes, 1266 Sion, 1306 Constantine 1316 John, 1332 Stephen, 1342 Basil, 1362–1370 unnamed; cf. Alisjahb, op. cit., p. 290). Michael Syrus knows only Job of about 800 A. D. (Chron., transl,
Chabot, iii. 23 sq., 451, No. 27) and the Frankish writers from 1100 onwards Bartholomaeus, before 1234 Radulphus and in the years from 1162–1238 three or four more unnamed bishops (Albert, Aquens., ix. 16; Will of Tyre, xiv. 10; Le Quén, Oriens Christianus, i. 119–1200; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kyr. Jerus., p. 42, 202). On account of the many Egyptian invasions the Latin archbishopric was removed to Ayas by Pope John XXII in 1320 (Alişhan, Sisovan, p. 290).

After the fall of the kingdom of Little Armenia, the power of the Karamdín-Oghlu and Dhu T-Kadr-Oghlu gradually spread in Cilicia. Selim I on his campaign against Egypt in 922 (1516) and on his return also preferred to keep to the east of their land (Taechehn, Anatol. Wergnete, ii. 32). Missis has been Ottoman since that year, in which the decisive battle was fought on Mardi al-Dibbj on.

In Kafarbayia a khan was built for caravans passing through in 1542 and restored in 1830 by Hasan Paşa. The Djallán bridge became useless in 1736 when the central arch collapsed; in 1766 this was repaired but it was blown up in 1832 on the retreat of the Turkish troops from the fighting at Balân in order to hold up the advance of Ibrahim Paşa’s pursuing army. As late as the middle of the 18th century it could only be crossed by an improvised wooden footbridge.

In modern times Missis is mentioned only by eastern pilgrims and travellers who as a rule only spent a short time there. Thus it was visited in 1432 by the Burgundian Bertrand de la Broquière (“Mistre-s-Fehán”), in the xvi century by P. Belon, 1682 the Mecca pilgrim Meryed Edib, 1695 the Armenian Patriarch of Antiochia Makarios, 1704 Paul Lucas, 1736 Chevalier Oter, 1766 the Dane Carsten Widen, 1813 Mac. Kinnell, 1834 Aucter Eloy, 1836 Colonel Cheaney, 1840 Ainsworth, 1853 Victor Langlois, whose reports were exhaustively used by Carl Ritter (Erkundige, xix. 66–115). The “Merges Galles” visited by Ludwig von Rauter on July 8, 1568, is not (as in Rohricht-Meisner, Deutsche Pilgerreisen nach dem K. L. 1880, p. 434, note 43) al-Massisa, but Merkez Kafes on the Bâb Iskandarân (Cilic.-Syr. passes). Somewhat fuller descriptions of the modern Missis and its vicinity and mediaeval ruins were given in the xvi century by Langlois, Alişhan and its beginning of the xxi century by Cousin (see Bibliography).

The stretch of the Baghdad railway from Doura south of the Taurus via Adana and Missis to Mâmûra at the foot of the Amanos was opened on April 27, 1912. As a station on the railway (the station is actually 1½ miles N.W. of the place) the town gained a certain strategic importance in the Cilician campaign of the French in 1919–1920 (1919: settlement of about 1,250 Armenians; May 27–28, 1920: futile Turkish blockade of the town, viz. 1,000 strong; end of July: withdrawal of the troops by Adana; cf. E. Brémond, La Civilité en 1919–1920, in Rev. Etud. Arm., Paris 1920, i, p. 311, 360, 363, 365). After the Turkish occupation the newly settled Armenians were probably exterminated in the usual way. The importance of the town has now passed to the neighbouring Djilân. According to the Arab geographers, al-Massisa lay on the Djilân (Htgas), sometimes confused by the Byzantine authors with the Edgab, Arab. Sahlân, with which it seems to have had at one time a common mouth: George Cedrenus, ii. 362; Anna Comn., ii. 147, 1–2 days’ journey from Baiyâ and one from ‘Ain Zarba and Aghana, 12 miles from the Djilân. The town should be seen from the Friday mosque in the town; in front of the town lay a beautiful fertile plain (the ancient ‘Aţâr al-nilâ). Al-Massisa lying on the right bank was connected with Kafarbayia by an ancient stone bridge built by Constantinus and restored by Justinian. The country round was rich in gardens and cornfields, watered by the Djilân. According to Yaḳût, the town originally had a wall with 5 gates and Kafarbayia, one with 4 gates. A pecularity of the town were the valuable fur-cloaks exported all over the world. Ten miles from al-Massisa, which is somewhat inaccurately placed by Ibn Khuradhdhib, Yaḳût and others on the Djilân al-Lükkâm (Amanos), was the plain of Mardi al-Dibâjî, which is often mentioned in the records of the fighting between the Mamlûks and Little Armenia (probably the “ager Mississa” on which Ciceri encamped: ad fam., iii. 8). In its N.E. on the town on the road to Sis, was the fort of al-Amûdân (al-Mâkrît, ed. Quatremère, ii. 111, 61); cf. Kal’at al-Amudân in Abu l-Fida, Ann. Muri., ed. Reiske, v. 18; located by Alişhan, Sişovan, p. 225 sq. too far east in “Hemité-kalessi”). A field on Mardi al-Arâfîn is also mentioned near al-Massisa (Yaḳût, iv. 487; Saft al-Din, Marazi, ii. 74). Tall Hâmîd, a strong fortress of the Thughûr al-Massisa, corresponds to the modern Hâmidieh, now called Lîqîân (Z.D.M.G., xi. 101, 200; Yaḳût, i, 866; Saft al-Din, Marazi, i. 211; Ibn al-Shihâna; Bairât ed., p. 339). There also was Tall Hîm (Yaḳût, i. 867; Marazi, i. 211; Ibn al-Shihâna, ibid.; exact site unknown). Al-Ain at the foot of the Djilân al-Lükân, over which went the Darb al-Ain pass, was also one of the forts of al-Massisa (Yaḳût, iii. 756; Marazi, ii. 293); on the frontier against Ḥalab lay Bâqa (q.v.; cf. van Berchem, Voyage en Syrie, i. p. 257, 8). Hisn Si İn (al-Balâdhûr, p. 165; Yaḳût, iii. 153) is probably also to be sought near al-Massisa. A pass called Thînyat al-Uçbîk, to be distinguished from that of the same name near Damascus, was in the region of al-Massisa (Yaḳût, i. 936; Marazi, i. 230). Even the remote fortress of Samâli (on its site cf. Tomashka, Petitschrift f. H. Ktirt, p. 144) was sometimes reckoned in the Syrian Thughûr and located near al-Massisa and al-Tarsîs, Balâdhûr, p. 170 (Dhamalî, Yaḳût, iii. 416; Marazi, ii. 167; Byzantine le kârîm synulâq); al-Sâfâf on the present Sugulît (Z.D.M.G., xi. 180; Reiske on Abu l-Fida, Annal., ii. 649, note 76 according to Ḥâdîjî Khahîsh: “Hisn Safûf, that is Sugul”) is also reckoned by Yaḳût (iii. 410) to the marches of al-Massisa. Not far from the town was a Syrian monastery, Gawkîth (mentioned about 1200 a.d.: Barhebr., Chron. eccle., ed. Abbeles-lamy, i. 624; in Alişhan, Sişovan, p. 265: Dukkât, probably identical with Touchbeh). The neighboring fortress of a damodoq (now Tumlu-Kale) and Cumbetefort ("in territorio Meloni", i.e. of Miln, Arabic: al-Mallûn) were according to Wilbrand of Oldenburg (op. cit.) about 1212 in the possession of the Teutonic Order (Allemann). The Venetians had a church in al-Massisa (Gestes des Chiffres, in Doc. arm., ii. 831). Armenian authors mention there the churches of St. Sarkis, Thors and Stephan (Alişhan, p. 288 sq.). The present Missis (frequently also written Missaş).
Juynboll, a Kudama, Rev. Taeschner. sq wood 2 not III; not incised the "c. scinem 237; 386 napiov 209, smooth al-Hamdani, 238, viii. index, 68 Peterm. which 76; Ibn p. 217; the 214; Ma- Reinaud, be understand 26th in the al-Faklh, . 116, . al-MakdisI, 11217., 97, Nallino, (transl. Kafarbina use of "Huranije"). (Voyage 1,179, which mentions (in Travels, 1909, to 2500 of Turkish town al-Shihna, which was studied by the Austrian "Theodor Kotschy on 24th- 268 April 1859. On account of its medicinal herbs, Ibn al-Rumiya in his commentary on the book of Dioscorides says that many writers took al-Maṣṣaṣa to be the city of the wise Hippocrates (Ibuḵrāt) who, however, according to others, belonged to Ḫimṣ (Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍlīl, in Patrol, Orient., xiv. 393; Ibn al-Shiḥna, Bairūt, p. 180).

Near the mouth of the Djiḥānī, which at one time was navigable for small ships up to al-Maṣṣaṣa, lay al-Mallūn, the site of which is not known (Mallāz; now rather Beblef than Karatāsh; cf. R. Kiepert, Form. orb. antiqu., viii., text p. 19). The Frankish writers also speak of a "portus de Mo- mistra" (Raimundus de Aiguliers, Historia Francorum qui ceverum iterum carente, c. xi. ibid. arm., i. p. xlii, note 1), probably on the "fauces fluminii Malmistoae" in which al-Idrīsī mentions the place al-Busā (Z. D. P. V., viii. 141; Tomschesch, S. B. Ak. Wien, cxxiv, 1891, fig. viii., p. 69 writes al-Buṣā).

as appears e.g. from the tradition in which it is related that Muhammad one day received a visitor and kept the tooth-pick "at the end of his tongue" (Mir, Tahāra, trad. 45). Concerning Zaid b. Khālid it is related that he used to sit in the mosque keeping the tooth-pick behind his ear, "just as a writer will keep his pen" (Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 25; al-Tirmidhī, Tahāra, bāb 18). When Muhammad was in his last hours, there entered a man with a piece of wood fit for a síwāk; 'Abdīya took and chewed it, so as to make it smooth (Bukhārī, Maqāzīh, bāb 83).

In general Ḥadīth emphasises the value attached by Muhammad to the síwāk. When he entered his house, his first movement was towards it (Muslim, Tahāra, trad. 43; Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 27). His servant 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd has received the epithet of šāhīh al-sīwāk "the one who used to take care of Muhammad's síwāk" (Bukhārī, Fadail al-Sijāh, bāb 20). When Muhammad awoke at night, he cleansed his mouth by means of the síwāk before he washed himself and performed night-prayer (Bukhārī, Adāhān, bāb 8; Wudū', bāb 73; Tahāra, bāb 47). When fasting, Muhammad also made use of the síwāk (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 445, 446).

The miswāk is chiefly used before wuḍū' as a preparation before the salāt. It is said that this was the practice of Muḥammad (Muslim, Tahāra, trad. 48) who attached so great a value to it, that he would have declared it obligatory before every salāt, were it not that he feared thereby to over-burden his community (Bukhārī, Adāhān, bāb 8; Muslim, Tahāra, trad. 42; Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 23; Tirmidhī, Tahāra, bāb 18). In one tradition it is said, as a matter of fact, that the obligatory use of the síwāk before every salāt was introduced by Muhammad as a compensation for the abolition of the obligatory wuḍū' before every salāt (Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 25). In another tradition (Nāṣiḥi, Dijamā', bāb 66) the use of the síwāk is called obligatory before the Friday-service.

The appreciation of the miswāk which appears from all these traditions culminates in the fact that it belongs to the customs of the "natural religion" (āfāra: Abū Dāwūd, Tahāra, bāb 29) or to the ordinances of the Apostles (Tirmidhī, Nikāh, bāb 1).

Nevertheless Fīkḥ does not declare the use of the miswāk obligatory in any case. There is general agreement on this point. According to some traditions, however, the Zāhirites did declare the use of the miswāk obligatory before the salāt, but these traditions are not generally accepted. According to Fīkḥ the use of the miswāk is recommended at all times, especially in 5 cases: in connection with the salāt, under all circumstances; in connection with the wuḍū'; with the recitation of the Kurān; after sleep; and as often as the mouth has lost its freshness, e.g. after long silence.

According to the学校 of Shāfī the use of the miswāk is bīlāmāble (makrūḥ) between noon and sunset at the time of fasting; for the nasty smell (khalaft) of the faster's breath is beloved by Allāh (cf. Nāṣīḥi, Tahāra, bāb 6).

It is recommended to use a miswāk of arāk-wood of medium hardness, neither too dry nor too moist; to cleanse the palate as well as all sides of the teeth, beginning from the right side of the mouth, moving the miswāk upwards and downwards in order not to hurt the alveoles.

---

**Bibliography:**

**Mīzāf.** [See Mūrīz.]

**Mīthkāl.** (A.), the weight of a thing; this is the meaning of the word in the Kurān; a particular weight for weighing precious metals, jewels, drugs, etc., probably the oldest unit in the Arab Troy system. The mīthkāl corresponds to the Roman solids of the Constantinian system which the Arabs adopted in Syria. 'Abd al-Malik took it over for his unit of gold when he reformed the currency in 77 (696). His dinār weighed a mīthkāl of 65.5 grains (4.25 grammes), hence mīthkāl is used as a synonym for dinār. The silver dirham weighed 1/10 of a mīthkāl and the mīthkāl contains 24 kīrāts. Slight variations in weight are found in the different parts of the Muḥammadan world.

**Bibliography:** See the bibliographies to the articles DINĀR and ḤANĪB. (J. Allan)

**Mīwadnā.** [See Ḥamāk.]

**Mīzāf, Mīzāfī.** (A., plur. Māsāfī). Among the various classes of musical instruments dealt with by Arabic, Persian and Turkish writers on music is one which embraces those with "open strings" (awār mušākā) such as the lyre or cithara, harp, psalter and dulcimer. Among them are instruments grouped as māsāfī. Nowadays, this term refers to all stringed and wind instruments (M. F. O. E., vi. 28) but in the Middle Ages it had a more restricted meaning and stood for "instruments of open strings", Al-Djawhari (d. ca. 1003) and al-Ṣaghānī (d. 1261) define them as "musical instruments which you beat upon as in the ṣād (lute), ṣinbār (pandore) and the likē", meaning by this that māsāfī are played with the fingers or plectrum in the same way as the ṣād and ṣinbār were. The Ṣādī's Al-Arīṣ includes the tambourine among the māsāfī, but it is an erroneous deduction from the saying of 'Cmar, marra bi-ṣāfīi 'udīn ("he passed by the sounding of the udin") which has misled many writers (cf. Sachs, Reallexikon der Musikinstrumente, s. v.). The author of Māsāfī al-ʿalām (12th cent.) states that the mīsāfā is "a stringed instrument belonging to the people of al-ʾIrāk" (p. 237), whilst al-Muʿarrīzī (12th cent.) says that the mīsāfā was "made by the people of al-Vāmān", a provenance which Ibn Khurābdīb (d. 912) also gives the instrument (al-Maṣādī, viii. 93). A more precise classification is allowed by al-Ṣabhānī who includes the mīsāf among barbītons (barābī) and lyres (laʿīrān), which agrees with our oldest authority, al-Ladī b. al-Muẓaffār (viith cent.), who says that both mīsāfā and mīsāfā were given to an "instrument of many strings", whilst al-Farābī (d. 950) specifically denotes mīsāfī as instruments of "open strings" (Kosegarten, Lib. cent., p. 77, 110). In the Klīb al-ʾAghānī the mīsāfā is rarely placed in the hands of the minstrels, probably because it was of inartistic merit. One performer on the instrument, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥārīmī b. Baskīrī (11th cent.), was asked sarcastically if it were a rat-trap (Aghānī, x. 153).

Tradition averes that māsāfī were "invented" by ʾAbīlā the daughter of Lamak, who was of the
seventh generation from Adam (al-Mas'udi, viii. 89). Since there was hadith condemning 
ma'ṣaf as signs of the end of the world (al-Tirmidhi, ii. 33) it is quite likely that the fukaha thought it consistent with policy to make Dilal or Dañal ("error, destruction") the originator of these ma-
lahi or "forbidden pleasures". On the other hand, we read that "David the Prophet had a mīṣaf on which he used to play when he recited the psalms" (Ibid. al-Farâd, iii. 189), which was an echo of the Jewish tradition that he was an adept on the kinnar (I Samuel, xxvi. 16, 23). The name may be a survival from the days of belief in sympathetic magic. The voice of the djinn was termed the 'aṣaf, and the spiritual world could be conjured by the sounds of the mīṣaf. In Islamic times musicians claimed that their music was inspired by the djinn. The Greek μῆδαθες was an instrument of the same class as the mīṣaf. It was of Lydian origin and the name is suspiciously like the Semitic one. 

Lyre and cithara. Although we see these instruments in the hands of the ancient Semites on the monuments they do not appear to have had acceptance among the musicians of Islamic times except with the fallāthun, unless the seven-stringed wanaḍī (="sanafī") of Khūrāsān was such an instrument (al-Mas'udi, viii. 90). Both words are of Greek origin and they appear in Arabic as ṛur and ḥāfara generally. In Palestine and Egypt to-day, a primitive type of lyre is known under the name of ṛubāra barbariya or ḥāfara (kissara) barbariya. Villoteau (Descr. de l'Egypte, état mod. i. 918) and Saint-Saëns (Lavignac, Encyc. de la musique, 1852) have shown that much of the ancient Greek method of lyre-playing still obtains in the modern Egyptian ḥāfara-playing. It is worthy of notice that the Arabic word for striking the ḥāfara strings is ḥarraba, and this is practically identical with the Greek κύπων. 

Harp. Whilst we possess an actual example of a Sumerian harp with the sound-chest below the strings, this type does not seem to have had any vogue with the Arabs or Persians in artistic music, and is only found among the peasantry. In Palestine and Upper Egypt to-day it is called the ṛubāra sumdānī and nanga. The harp with the sound-chest above the strings has been a far more important instrument and the Semites and is to be found in the Assyrian sculptures (cf. the Assy. word sanak and the Ethiopic ṭanbo). That extremely chatty Turkish writer Ewliya' Celebi says that this instrument, which the Persians called the ṭang, was "invented" by Pythagoras to solace Solomon (Travel. i.ii. 227), and while al-Shalalī says that it was of Byzantine (Ḳūm) origin (fol. 15). Yet Ibn Khuradhībīh and al-Dj awhari show that it was peculiar to the Persians and, indeed, the name may be found on the Ša-
sian sculptures (Ker Porter, Travels, ii. 175). The Arabs called it the ḏinak and/or ṣanafī (cf. al-Dj awālikī, ed. Sachau, p. 97). It may be that the ḏinak and ṣanafī were different types of harp, the Persian and Arabān. There were certainly two types, the straight sound-chest and the crooked. In the Maṣfīth al-Kūm the Byzantine salbāk (ṣenbūn) and ṭur (ṣūba) are likened to the ḏinak and ṣanafī respectively. Among the Arabs the ḏinak is mentioned as early as al-Ashā Māmūn (d. ca 829). Al-Fārābī devotes a section in his Kitāb al-Maṣāfīt to ma'ṣaf, djinnik and/or ṣanafī, and other instruments "in which there is made to every note, according to its state, a solitary string", and he shows them strung with both fifteen (diatonic) and twenty-five (chromatic) strings (Kosegarten, i. c.). Both Ibn Sinā (d. 1037) and Ibn Zaila (d. 1048) deal with the ṣanafī, whilst in the Kanān al-Talāfī (xivth century) and the works of Ibn Ghālī (d. 1435) the ṭang is fully described. The oblique sound-chest was 109 cm. long, and the handle (dastū) 81 cm. long. From the sound-chest to the horizontal bar below twenty-four or twenty-five strings of goat's hair were stretched, being fastened to metal pegs (ma'llāfī). Some players even used thirty-five strings so as to embrace the scale of the Systematists. The face of the sound-
chest was of skin, but the remainder of the framework was of vine or plum tree wood. The handle was placed under the left arm (cf. the pictures in MSS.) and the fingers of both hands were used in performance, plectra (ṣażūnīt) being fastened to the finger tips. Nowadays the harp has fallen into complete desuetude among the Arabs and Turks. Even among the Persians it has become rare, and in its modern form it was little different from the occidental instrument (Advieille, La mu-
tique chez les Persans, p. 13), whilst the instrument shown by Kämper (xvith century), under this name was a zither. In 1658 Ewliya' Celebi found only twelve players of the ṭang in Constantinople because, he said, it was a difficult instrument to play (Travel. ili. 234). At this time the Turkish ṭang had forty strings, and a very large instrument of the xvith (not xivth) century is given by Engel (Mus. instr. in the South Kensington Museum, p. 59). 

Although the "humped back" of the ṭang or ḏinak became a favourite theme for poets, and it was certainly the best known type, yet an instrument with a "straight back" was also to be found. A more pronounced "hump" existed in a type mentioned by Ibn Ghali and called, probably on account of this feature, the ṣagrī. It was strong similarly to the ṭang but had a wooden instead of a skin face on the sound-chest, and its tuning-
pegs were also of wood. 

A Byzantine harp called the salbāk (erroneously written salyak, ṣalāyak [cf. the art. ṣalayk, which clashes with the opinion of the present writer, Red.], or salbān in most dictionaries and MSS.) was also known to the Arabs. It was actually a survival of the old Greek σαλβάν (salvān, salvān) and is described in the Maṣfīth al-Kūm as "an instrument of the Greeks (Yūmānūyūn) and Byzantines (Ḳūmūn) resembling the ḏinak" (p. 236). According to Ibn Khuradhībīh it had twenty-four strings (al-Mas'udi, viii. 91: cf. Farmer, Byzantine musical instruments in the ninth century, p. 4 sq.). Ibn Sinā classes it with the ṣanafī among the instruments with "open strings" stretched across a space. 

Psalter. In describing those instruments with "open strings" stretched across a surface, both Ibn Sinā and Ibn Zaila mention a particular type named the ṣanafī. Whilst the name suggests a "long necked" instrument, the details given of "strings of different lengths but identically situated bridges (hamḥīlīt), compel one to recognize it in a trapezoidal psaltery. one species of which was known later as the ṭīnānī. The word ṣanafī also stood for "phoenix", and we know that the Greeks of old had an instrument called the psalē. This

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
may account for both the instrument and the name among the Arabs. It is not mentioned however, after the 8th century.

The Ḧanūn [q.v.], the present-day psaltery of the Arabs and Turks, is said by Ibn Ghālibī to have been invented by Plato, although the instrument as known in the 8th century is attributed to al-Fārābī (Ibn Khallikān, Biog. Dict., iii. 309). The word itself is derived from the Greek κιθάρα. Although the instrument is delineated in the various MSS. of the Syriac lexicon of Bar Ḥabīl (10th century) sub “Ṣibārā”, yet the name Ḧanūn is not given. It is mentioned in the Thousana and One Nights (ed. Macnaghten, 49th and 149th nights), and in one place is designated the Ḧanūn miṣrī (“Egyptian psaltery”). In Spain it was particularly favoured and al-Ṣaḥḥānī (d. 1231) includes it among the Andalusian instruments manufactured at Seville (al-Makkari, Analectes, ii. 143–144). In the Persian Kanz al-Tawḥīf and in Ibn Ghālibī it is described in detail. The shallow, flat, trapezoidal sound-cast, 9 cm. deep, was made of vine or plum tree wood. The lengths of the back and treble sides were 81 and 40.5 cm. respectively, whilst the oblique side was 74.25 cm. It was mounted with sixty-four strings (seventy-two in Ibn Ghālibī), arranged trichordally. Although the Ḧanūn has fallen into disuse in Persia, it is still a great favourite in the Maghrib, Egypt, Syria, and Turkey, and where it is to be found strung trichordally with from fifty-one to seventy-five strings.

A rectangular type of psaltery of greater compass was the nūkha. It was invented by ʿAbd al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn (d. 1294) and a design is sometimes to be found in his Kitāb al-Aṣwār (see Farmer, Arabic musical mss. in the Bodleian Library, frontispiece). Its features are also fully discussed in the Kanz al-Tawḥīf and by Ibn Ghālibī. Its dimensions were 74.25 × 54 cm., whilst the depth of the sound-cast was 27 cm. 108 strings were mounted on the instrument.

Dulcimer. Ibn Sinā and Ibn Zaila describe an instrument with “open strings” played on with beating rods (mashāriq) which is called the ṣanīr ṣīnīr (or ṣanīr ṣīnīr). This is clearly the dulcimer, later to be generally known as the ṣanīr ṣīnīr (also written ṣanīr ṣīnīr and ṣanīr ṣīnīr), a word derived immediately from the Aramaic, but probably finally traceable to the Greek ἱανυρός. Indeed, it is invariably found in the hands of Jews and Greeks. It is of similar structure to the Ḧanūn, but with two of its sides oblique instead of one. The strings, which are mounted dichordally in Egypt, are of metal and are beaten with sticks (mashāriq) instead of plectra as in the Ḧanūn. We find it mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1406) and al-Haythami (d. 1563), but its popularity was but slight among the Arabs. In the 18th century it is doubtfully acknowledged by Russell (i. 152) and Niebuhr (Sympson) in Egypt, both Villotane and Lane show that it was only to be found in the hands of Jews, Greeks and other foreign residents, whilst native writers like Musharla and Darwish Muhammad make no mention of it. To-day it is practically unknown in Syria and Egypt. In the Maghrib it is unnoticed by Host, Christianowitsch and Salvador-Daniel, and although it is dealt with by Delphin and Guin, it is scarcely known to-day. In Persia however, it obtained greater recognition. In the 18th century it is mentioned by Chardin, but not by Kaempfer, whilst Advielle in the 18th century gives both a design and a description. In Turkey, whilst the word is registered in the 19th century by Meninski, it is not mentioned by Ḥājjī Kāhilī nor described by Ewliyya Celebi, in their lists of Turkish musical instruments. In the next century however, it is recognised by Toderini, and to-day the ṣanīr is one of the most esteemed instruments in the country, where it may be seen in two forms: the ṣanīr turkı and the ṣanīr transii. The former, exclusively used by the Jews, has 160 strings, grouped in fours, giving thirty-two notes, a two octave chromatic scale. The latter, which is confined to the Turks, was introduced from the West about the middle of the last century by a certain Hilmī Bey. It is mounted with 105 strings, also grouped in fours, which are placed on the sound-cast in the Occidental way.


H. G. Farmer

Al-MIZĀN, the balance, is the nomen instrumenti from wazāna to weigh, which means to weigh in the ordinary sense and also to test the level of, like the Latin libra. Here we shall discuss:

I. The various instruments used for weighing in the ordinary sense; brief notes are added on the ascertainment of specific gravities. 2. Levelling instruments.

I. Balances.

The steelyard (al-ḥarāṣṭa, q.v.) has already been dealt with; the general principles of the balance are also discussed in this article. — The usual balance with two arms of equal length had the same shape among the Muslims as in ancient times and at all periods in the west; this we know from extant specimens and illustrations in various works, notably in al-Khāzinī, in a manuscript of al-Kazzwīnī with reference to the constellation Libra (fig. 1), in a manuscript of Hariri, in the ʿAynī’s Akhbar of Abu l-Fadl (fig. 2). In the beautiful manuscript from which Ch. Schefer published the Siyar Nameh of Naṣīr Khusrūw,
and is contrasted by the ḥawwān al-ṣafīyya to the ḥābhān (steelyard), also tarīs from the Persian torāzī, then mīḥmales for scales for gold and ḥubbā for beam and tongue. Ṣindī means the longs and also the beam. According to J. Ruska, ḥābhān seems to be used for scales (for gold). On the expressions connected with karāfīn, see that article. Al-Ma'mūsī mentions Harrān as a place where balances were made, in his work Aḥsan al-Taḥāṣim fi Murūfat al-Āfālim, p. 141; in this town many very skilful mechanisms were engaged in making astronomical instruments. The accuracy of the balances made in Harrān was proverbial.

The Arabs devoted special attention to the construction of balances used to identify metals and jewels from their specific gravity, to distinguish false from genuine and pure and to ascertain the composition of alloys of two metals by the use of the principle of Archimedes. They called these balances mīṣān al-mawṣī, "water" (hydrostatic) balances. Of makers of these, al-Khāzīnī (c. 1100, q. v.) mentions: Sanad (Ṣind) b. Ṭūfālī (c. 250 = 864), Muḥammad b. Zakayyā al-Kāzī († 320 = 932—933), Ibn al-ʿĀmid († 359 = 969—970), Yūḥannā b. Yūsuf (perhaps al-Kāsī, d. c. 370 = 980—981), Ibn ʿArabī († 1037), Ṣamāʿī al-Ṭūsī (the "measurer", also mentioned by al-Bīrūnī without the "Massāḥ"), Abū Ḥaṣīm Omar al-Khāyaṭī (as the celebrated mathematician is never called Abū Ḥaṣīm, it is doubtful whether he is the individual mentioned by al-Khāzīnī). The balances made by these men are still fairly simple as only two, or at most three, scales were used in them. A contemporary of al-Khāzīnī, namely Abū Ḥakim al-Muẓaffār Ibn Ismāʿīl al-Aṣḥābī (d. before 513 = 1121) added two more scales; these and other improvements made the scales much more convenient to use. Of him al-Bīrūnī says (E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xx., Einige Biographien nach al-Bīrūnī, in S. B. P. M. S. Erł. l., xliii, 1910, p. 17): "He constructed the balance of Archimedes with which one ascertains forgeries. The treasurer of the great sultan feared that his frauds would thus be discovered. He therefore broke the balance and destroyed its parts. Al-Muẓaffār died of grief as a result". Al-Khāzīnī then took up al-Muẓaffār's work and made the balance a
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Schefer, Publications de l'école des langues orientales vivantes, ii. ser., i., Paris 1881). The common balance is called mīṣān but in the Kurān we also find ḥūṣīrī, which, according to al-Thaʾlabī, is a loanword. Other names are ṣāḥīkīn, which does not only mean the beam and tongue of the balance
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and is contrasted by the ḥuwān al-ṣafīyya to the ḥābhān (steelyard), also tarīs from the Persian torāzī, then mīḥmales for scales for gold and ḥubbā for beam and tongue. Ṣindī means the longs and also the beam. According to J. Ruska, ḥābhān seems to be used for scales (for gold). On the expressions connected with karāfīn, see that article. Al-Ma'mūsī mentions Harrān as a place where balances were made, in his work Aḥsan al-Taḥāṣim fi Murūfat al-Āfālim, p. 141; in this town many very skilful mechanisms were engaged in making astronomical instruments. The accuracy of the balances made in Harrān was proverbial.

The Arabs devoted special attention to the construction of balances used to identify metals and jewels from their specific gravity, to distinguish false from genuine and pure and to ascertain the composition of alloys of two metals by the use of the principle of Archimedes. They called these balances mīṣān al-mawṣī, "water" (hydrostatic) balances. Of makers of these, al-Khāzīnī (c. 1100, q. v.) mentions: Sanad (Ṣind) b. Ṭūfālī (c. 250 = 864), Muḥammad b. Zakayyā al-Kāzī († 320 = 932—933), Ibn al-ʿĀmid († 359 = 969—970), Yūḥannā b. Yūsuf (perhaps al-Kāsī, d. c. 370 = 980—981), Ibn ʿArabī († 1037), Ṣamāʿī al-Ṭūsī (the "measurer", also mentioned by al-Bīrūnī without the "Massāḥ"), Abū Ḥaṣīm Omar al-Khāyaṭī (as the celebrated mathematician is never called Abū Ḥaṣīm, it is doubtful whether he is the individual mentioned by al-Khāzīnī). The balances made by these men are still fairly simple as only two, or at most three, scales were used in them. A contemporary of al-Khāzīnī, namely Abū Ḥakim al-Muẓaffār Ibn Ismāʿīl al-Aṣḥābī (d. before 513 = 1121) added two more scales; these and other improvements made the scales much more convenient to use. Of him al-Bīrūnī says (E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xx., Einige Biographien nach al-Bīrūnī, in S. B. P. M. S. Erł. l., xliii, 1910, p. 17): "He constructed the balance of Archimedes with which one ascertains forgeries. The treasurer of the great sultan feared that his frauds would thus be discovered. He therefore broke the balance and destroyed its parts. Al-Muẓaffār died of grief as a result". Al-Khāzīnī then took up al-Muẓaffār's work and made the balance a
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most accurate means of measuring; he called it the universal balance, *al-mizān al-djarnīf*. But, no doubt in memory of his predecessor, he called his book *Kitāb Mīzān al-Ḥikma*.
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Fig. 4.

For special purposes such as the examination of gold and silver and their alloys, many contrivances were made with balances and the movable scales and running weights on the beams, for example in the physical (*taḥāf*) balance of Muḥammad b. Zakariyā al-Rāzi (fig. 3); it goes back to Greek models, e.g. of Archimedes (fig. 4; cf. al-Ḥāzīnī, *op. cit.*).
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Fig. 5.

Here we shall describe somewhat more fully the "balance of wisdom" of al-Ḥāzīnī.

Al-Ḥāzīnī gives the beam *A* of the balance (fig. 5) a thickness of six cm. and a length of

---

1) H. Bauerreiss (*Zur Geschichte des spez. Gewichtes im Altertum und Mittelalter*, Dissertation, Erlangen 1913) has reconstructed the "balance of wisdom", as nearly as possible following the data of the original. Reproductions are in Erlangen and the German Museum in Munich. The illustration is taken from a photograph. In the original right and left are reversed.
two m. In the centre it is strengthened by an additional piece $C$, obviously intended to avoid any bending at this point. A cross-piece $H$ (‘arida) is let in here. Corresponding to it is a similar cross-piece $F$ on the lower part of the toogs, in which moves the tongue $D$, itself about 50 cm long. The upper cross-piece $E$ is hung by rings to a rod which is fastened somewhere. Pegs or small holes are placed at exactly opposite places of the cross-pieces $B$ and $F$ to which threads are tied or drawn through. The friction at an axis is thus avoided, which, in view of the great weight of the beam, is quite considerable. The knob visible below the beam under its centre is used to secure the tongue to the beam or to take it out in order to adjust it evenly. The tongue has for this purpose a peg at the foot which goes through a hole in the beam. Al-Khāzīnī also observes that one could also take shorter beams but then all the other dimensions must be proportionately smaller.

The beam is divided not on one side only, as in the illustration, but on both. The scales are hung on very delicate rings of steel (ghurāb "ravens") the points of which fit into little niches on the upper surface of the beam. Five scales are used in ascertaining specific gravities, i.e. in investigating alloys and examining precious stones. Of these the scale $H$ (fig. 5a) is called the cone-shaped or al-hākim, the judge, as it is used to distinguish false from true. It goes into the water and in order to meet with less resistance in sinking is cone-shaped and pointed below. The scale $f$ is called the winged (muqaffāt, fig. 5b and 5c, side and top view). It has indented sides so that it can be brought very close to the adjoining scales. It is also called the movable (muqaffāt). There is also a movable running weight $K$ (al-rumānā al-sayyāra) which serves, if necessary, to adjust the weight of the lighter beam; it is therefore also called the rumānā of the adjustment (al-ta’dil). The other scales are used to hold weights. Al-Khāzīnī attained an extraordinary degree of accuracy with his balance. This was the result of the length of the beam, the peculiar method of suspension, the fact that the centre of gravity and axis of oscillation were very close to each other, and of the obviously very accurate construction of the whole.

Al-Khāzīnī himself says: when the instrument was weighing 1,000 mithkāls, it could show a difference of 1 ḥabba — 1/98 mithkāl, i.e. about 75 centigrammes in 4.5 kilogrammes. We thus have accuracy to $1/98,000$.

Al-Khāzīnī used his scales for the most varied purposes. Firstly for ordinary weighing, then for all purposes connected with the taking of specific gravities, distinguishing of genuine (zamīn) and false metals, examining the composition of alloys, changing of dirhams to dinārs and countless other business transactions. In all these processes the scales are moved about until equilibrium is obtained and the desired magnitudes in many cases at once be read on the divisions on the beam.

False balances. That as early as the time of Muhammad balances showing false weights were used for fraudulent purposes is shown by various passages in the Kūrān (Sūra xxvi. 182; vii. 13; xvii. 37). We read for example: "Weigh with the just (or upright, mustaḵfīm) balance". Al-Djawbātī (middle of the xiiith century; cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, iv., Über Wagen bei den Arabern, in S. B. P. M. S. Erk., vol xxxvii., 1905, p. 388) describes two such arrangements. In the one the beam of the balance consisted of a hollow reed closed at the ends in which there was some quicksilver; by a slight inclination of the beam this could be made to flow as desired to the side of the weights or of the scale pan and thus make the one or other appear heavier. A balance like this was used in Cairo in the time of E. W. Lane by a dishonest police inspector (muḥtasīb). In the second pair of scales the tongue was of iron and the merchant had a ring with a magnetic stone. By bringing the ring close to it the balance went down to right or left.

The balance or the principles applying to it were used for many purposes besides weighing. Contrivances turning on an axis in which sometimes one and sometimes the other side becomes lighter or heavier, especially by the admission or release of water, were used to produce automatic movements; they are often called mizān (cf. e.g. the writings of the Banū Mūsa and of al-Djazarī; e.g. in F. Hauser, Über das Kitāb al-Ḥiyāl. Das Werk über die sinnsinnreichen Anordnungen der Banū Mūsa, Abb. 2, Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften und Med., Heft 11, 1922; E. Wiedemann and F. Hauser, Uber die Übren im Bereich der islamischen Kultur, in Nova Acta der Kais. Leop.-Carol. Akademie, vol. c., 1915, No. 5 and other passages). In the hour balance used to measure time, a container filled with sand or water is hung at one end of a lever poised with arms equal and has a hole in the bottom. The equilibrium disturbed by the gradual loss of sand or water is compensated for by weights which move along the other arm. From their weight and position one can calculate the time that has passed (E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xxxvii.: Über die Stundenwage, in S. B. P. M. S. Erk., xlvi., 1914, p. 27; a full description is given by Prof. F. Hauser in E. von Bassermann-Jordan, Die Geschichte der Zeitmessung und der Übren, 1919).

Most artisans also describe as "scales" al-misfāra, i.e. rulers, al-baraku, the compasses, al-khiniyya, set square and level, as they serve to show lapses from the straight etc. — Miḥāl, ell, chāhīn, kubbān are "scales" with which one measures whether things are correct or over measure in business transactions (Ras'īl Ḳibrūm al-Safā, Bombay 1305, 1/ii. 128).

For a few further meanings of al-mizān see Dozy, Supplément, s. v. wasana. — In mathematics the balance is used to elucidate certain mathematical processes. The steelyard is used to illustrate the inverse relation: the weights are in inverse proportion to the length of the arms (cf. e.g. Th. Ibel, Die Wage im Altertum und Mittelalter, in Programm Forchheim, 1905—1906, p. 93; Ras'īl
with the water displaced weighed \( P_3 \), so that from 
\[ P_3 - P_2 \] 
we get the volume of water corresponding to the mass \( P_1 \), which is then calculated by al-Biruni for a weight of 100 mukhlafs. As almost always,

in ascertaining the specific gravity the Arabs rely on the ancient, particularly on the work of Menelaus "on the artifice by which one ascertains the quantity of each of a number of mixed bodies". Finding all the weights of the materials, the aim is often called Ibn al-mizân, the science of the balance, or of accurate measurement, as in the preparation of the elixir etc. the choice of the right proportion of the ingredients is an important matter.

Among other uses of the word mizân may be mentioned that a tree on a boundary near Bamiyan at the source of the Jordan was called "tree of the balance" (mizân). We may also note that on the day of judgment a balance with a very long beam will be erected (on its cf. e.g. M. Wolff, Muhammediache Exkateleutia, Leipzig 1872, text, p. 81, transl., p. 148 and al-Ghazâlî, al-Durr al-fikhr fî Kitâb "Ulûm al-âkhâra, ed. L. Gautier, Leipzig 1878, text, p. 67, transl., p. 79).

Specific Gravity. We have already mentioned that the "balance of wisdom" and other scales were used to test the purity of metals etc. and to ascertain the composition of alloys: we shall now briefly discuss the work of the Arabs on this subject. Two magnitudes have to be considered. The weights of equal volumes are compared, which corresponds to an investigation of the specific gravities. Al-Biruni, for example, takes hemispheres of the different metals or rods of equal size and compares their weights, or the volumes of equal weights are compared by finding those of any weights and then comparing the specific volumes (i.e. the volumes of the unit of weight). For these measurements one used either methods based on the principle of Archimedes, according to which a body loses in a liquid as much weight as the volume of the fluid displaced by it, or one measures the fluid displaced by the body itself. For this purpose al-Biruni constructed a cone-shaped vessel (al-alât al-mukhâfûsa) [fig. 6]. This vessel is filled with water until it begins to run out by a pipe at the side: then a definite mass, as large as possible, of the substance (weight \( P_1 \)) is weighed, as is the scale \( P_2 \) placed under the outlet pipe. The substance is then put in the vessel and the pan

1) it is to be noted that expressions like specific gravity and specific volume, which refer to the unit of weight and the unit of volume are not found among the Arabs. Al-Biruni, for example, gives the amount of water displaced by 100 mukhlafs of various substances corresponding to their volume and the weights of the metals which have the same volume as 100 mukhlafs of gold and in the case of other substances the same volume as 100 mukhlafs of blue yâkût.
other substances, in order to ascertain the unknown amounts of the separate constituents: *Mībar fi Mitākh al-Dījam al-muḥtafīla* li 'ṭikhrājīd Mīd-dār madjǎlītha by Samīl b. Yaḥṣī b. 'Abālās al-Maghrībī al-Andulī (d. 1174-1175 C, Maghārm; s. Ibn al-Kīfīṣ, p. 200; Suter, N° 302).

The statements on specific gravities refer to: A. *Metals*: gold, mercury, bronze (*jisr*), copper, brass (*šīkh*), iron, tin (*rāzj*), lead (*usruf* and *usrub*). B. *Precious stones*: blue *yāḥūt*, red *yāḥūt*, ruby, emerald, lapis lazuli, pearl, coral, cornelian, onyx and rock crystal. C. *Other substances*: Pharaonic glass, clay from Siminān, pure salt, salt earth (*ṣāḥab*), sandarach, enamel (*mīna*), amber, pitch, wax, ivory, bakkan wood, willow wood.

The weights of equal volumes of liquids and the volumes of equal weights of liquid are sometimes found directly, sometimes ascertained with the areaometer of Pappus. The former magnitude plays an important part in the liquids used in every day life like oil and wine. The second was of more scientific interest. It is especially interesting that the Arabs found that hot water and hot urine had a larger volume than equal weights cold. They also knew that ice had a larger volume than the same weight of water.

The facts ascertained with the areaometer of Pappus for fluids refer to cold fresh water, hot water, ice (does not properly belong to this connection), sea water, wine, grape wine, saffron, olive oil, cow’s milk, hen’s egg, blood of a healthy man, warm and cold urine.

Fig. 7 shows the areaometer reconstructed by H. Bauerreiss from al-Khāzīnī. X is a massive cone used to make the instrument heavy. There are inscriptions corresponding to the Roman numerals. For details the reader may be referred to H. Bauerreiss’s article. — The principle that floating bodies of the same weight sink in water to the same depth finds application in a juristic trick cited in the *Kitāb al-Hījal fi ‘l-Fīkh* of Abū Hātim al-Kāzīnī. The weight of a camel is ascertained by putting it in a boat and noting how deep the boat sank. The camel is then replaced by iron weights until the boat sinks to the same level (cf. J. Schacht in G. Bergstrasser, *Beitr. zur semiti schen Philologie und Linguistik*).

In medical works and treatises on weights and measures, figures are given for the weights of equal volumes of wine, oil and honey (cf. Bauerreiss, op. cit.). So far as it is a question of particular bodies, the values as ascertained by the Arabs agree very well with those obtained by modern science and even surpass in accuracy those obtained by it up till the beginning of the last century.

**Bibliography:** This is given in the article AL-KĀRĄTȘUN.

2. **LEVELLING (waṣṣa, to weigh, corresponding to the Latin librae).**

The Arabs certainly adopted a large number of methods of levelling and testing levels from other peoples, either the Byzantines or the Persians. The statements in Ibn Waḥṣiyya (see below) about the making of canals etc. agree with those of Vitruvius, who in turn drew on Greek sources. The Arabs learned partly from Greek works; for example, we are told that according to Philoön (according to M. Steinschneider: Philon), the incline in canals must be at least 5:1,000; but they also utilized data gained from the practical experience of land owners, canal builders etc. Whether the Arabs were acquainted with the standard works of Hero on this subject, the *Metrica* and the “On the Dioptra” (Hero, *Opera omnia*, ed. H. Schöne, iii., Leipzig 1903), is not known, for no corresponding title is found in the biographical or bibliographical works. But the writing mentioned in the *Fīhrīs* “On the use of the astrolabe” may have dealt with geometric problems. Many problems in the Arabic sources are very similar to those dealt with in the work “On the Dioptra”; only the Arabs use the astrolabe or quadrant instead of the dioptra. Whether one or other of the methods described below was discovered independently by the Arabs and by whom, cannot be established from the authors on the subject, who were mainly practical men. They are described in the most different places.

In levelling, one is faced with two problems: firstly to make a surface exactly level and horizontal or to place a rod or a surface exactly perpendicular, and secondly to ascertain the point on the same level as a given one, or to ascertain the difference in height between two points.

1. A surface is made level and horizontal in the following way:

   A ruler with a straight edge is moved over the surface and one sees whether it touches it everywhere so perfectly that light penetrates nowhere between ruler and surface; in this case the surface is perfectly smooth (al-Shirāzī, see below).

   That the ruler itself is straight is ascertained by seeing if a thread stretched along it and fastened to it at one end can be lifted the same height from the ruler along its whole length. Whether three rulers are straight is tested by putting them side by side and exchanging their sides (Ibn Yūnūs, in K. Schöy, see below).

   To examine if a surface was perfectly horizontal, the following tests were adopted:

   1. Water is poured over the surface and it is observed whether this flows equally in all directions; this is one of the most usual methods. The same plan is given by Proclus in his *Hyapotaxis* (ed. K. Manitius, Leipzig 1909, p. 50, 51). According to him, one pushes supports in under a level surface on all sides till it shows no slope anywhere; this is the case when water poured on it remains standing without running to one side.

   2. An object which can roll is placed on one side; if it does not roll off but only oscillates, the surface is horizontal (al-Shirāzī, see below).

   3. Water is poured into a plate or dish (*djīfma*, fig 8) with an edge which is parallel to the surface and of the same height all the way round, and it is observed whether the water comes exactly up to the edges on all sides (Ibn Luyūn, see
Al-Urdi also used the same method in order to see that the outlets for water in a distribution system at Damascus were all of the same level. In the centre of the reservoir he put a gutter like this and deepened or raised the bottoms of the channels running out of it until the water from the gutter spread equally over the channels which revealed any inequalities (fig. 11). Cf. H. J. Seemann, in S. B. P. M. S. Erlg., lx., 1928, p. 49, 81 and J. Frank, in Zeitschr. f. Instrumentenkunde, xlviii., 1929.

4. A plumb-line (ṣ̄̄kaš̄̄l, buṣ̄̄l, balad [from ṣ̄̄kaš̄̄], ṣ̄̄kaš̄̄la) is dropped from the apex (fig. 12) of a isosceles triangle, made for example of wood, with its perpendicular marked; a piece is sometimes left open in the centre of the under side for the weight of the plumb-line. If the plumb-line coincides with the perpendicular, the surface is horizontal (the figures go back to al-Shirazī and al-Khalkhālī). Such drawings have led to the erroneous idea that Muslim students were already acquainted with the pendulum (cf. E. Wiedemann, in Verhdl. d. d. phys. Ges., 1919, p. 663; the apparatus is called al-fāḍīn [e. g. in al-Shirazī, al-Urdī, see below], Dozy, op. cit., also al-kāsin).
In the architect's balance (fig. 13), according to Ibn Luyūn or al-Tīghnārī (see below), a quadrangular piece of wood is placed on the beam \( ab \) to be examined; in the middle of it, a perpendicular line \( ba \) is drawn before which a plumb-line is hung; according to the original figure, it seems to be two parallel lines between which the plumb-line hangs.

Al-Marrākushi (see below) has described a more perfect form (fig. 14). In the figure \( ab, ac \) and \( de \) are rods, and \( ab = ac \) and \( de \) is an equilateral triangle; \( de \) is pierced in the centre. A plumb-line is hung from \( a \) through the hole. If the surface on which \( b \) and \( c \) are put is horizontal, the thread of the plumb-line goes through the centre of the hole.

Whether the levels and other similar instruments are themselves correct, whether for example the plumb-line from the apex to the base is perpendicular, is tested in this way: After the plumb-line comes to rest in one position of the level, the latter is put in various positions on some horizontal surface, particularly in one perpendicular to the first, and in one in which left and right have places exchanged. If the plumb-line always comes to rest the level is correct but if it only does so in the former case the error can be corrected by adjusting the position of the surface and that of the level.

The level here described is usually called kiniya (γυνία); the word, however, is also used for the wooden set square, as used by carpenters (s. Miftakh al-ʿīlam, ed. v. Vloten, p. 255) and land surveyors like Abu 'l-Wafā (s. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und Medicin, Heft iv., 1922, p. 98). A synonym is according to al-Shirāzī (Nihāyat al-ḥaṭāṭ fi Darāyat al-ʿĀfāk, Mak. 2, chap. 13): ʿafadān. From the same root we have in Ibn Wahshiyah (Cod. Leidensis, No. 1729, p. 527) ʿafadān, in Doxy (Supplement, ii., p. 246) ʿafān and ʿafīn. Connected with this is ʿafadān, dual of ʿafād.
4. The gnomon is moved backwards and forwards (turned about on its foot: *mukbîl wa-mudhir*); its shadow must only move so far on the level surface, on which it stands, as is in keeping with the movement of the sun during the turning (Ibn Yûnus, see below).

5. A circle is described at the foot of the rod and a pair of compasses used to test whether the distance of the top of the gnomon is the same from all points of the circle.

6. Ibn Sinâ drills a small hole through the gnomon parallel to its base, puts it in a vessel with a horizontal bottom which is filled with muddy water and examines whether the surface exactly coincides with the level of the hole.

7. In order to examine whether a level surface is standing exactly perpendicular, two exactly equal parallelepipedal blocks of wood (fig. 16) are placed on it, \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \), one above the other. From the upper edge of \( L_1 \) a plumb-line is hung; one watches whether its thread exactly touches \( L_2 \); the best plan is to place a very thin ruler between \( L_1 \) and the plummet and test the position of the thread with respect to \( L_2 \) (al-Marrâkûshî, see below).

II. In order to ascertain the difference in height between two points \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) which are at a distance \( a \) from one another, as is necessary in making a canal for example, one looks horizontally from \( x_1 \) with an apparatus which is at a height \( h \) from the ground to a vertical rod at \( x_2 \) and ascertains the height \( h_1 \) at which the point observed is above the ground. A mark can be made on it (in modern mensuration, the rod at \( x_2 \) has divisions marked on it). The difference in height is \( h_1 - h \). According to fig. 19, the Arabs, like Hero, seem to have used something similar. Ibn al-`Awâmî (see below) uses a square board on which are marked a number of circles touching one another, which are distinguished by different colours or have different centres. In order to place the rods absolutely perpendicular, plumb-lines are hung beside them (fig. 17).

The horizontal line of vision is obtained in various ways:

1. A rod (e.g. an ell long) with square sides is put up in such a way that the upper surface appears horizontal to the eye and one looks along this surface.

2. The rod (*khuṭṭâl*) is put on the above mentioned dish or plate (fig. 8) and one looks along it.

3. At the end of the rod nails are fastened at the same height and their heads are pierced and one looks through the holes.

4. For a rough examination, one can put, at the two places, two tube-shaped bricks which, for convenience may be made each out of two half-pipes (Ibn al-`Awâmî, see below).

5. An astrolabe is put in a horizontal place such as the edge of a well or on its cover and one looks through the eyepiece.

Other methods of ascertaining differences of level are as follows:

1. An assistant is sent from the higher position to the lower holding a rod of a known length / vertically until one sees just the end of it; if \( h \) then is the level of the eye, \( t - h \) is the difference in height. If the distance is too great for the top of the rod to be distinguished, a light is put on it, for example a lighted candle and the observation is made by night.

2. If it is a question of ascertaining whether a place outside a well is lower than the level of water in the well, the distance of the latter from the surface of the ground or from the edge is ascertained by letting a rod and thread down with a shining heavy object at the end and used in calculation. Two apparatuses, closely connected with each other, are the following:

a. To a rod (fig. 17) the triangle with the plumb-line is attached. To its two ends two threads with weights at the ends are attached, \( a \) and \( b \).

b. Two posts \( 1 \) and \( 2 \) are erected at the points, the difference in level of which is to be ascertained. The one thread is fastened to the end of the lower post \( 1 \) and the other hung along and over the post \( 2 \) until its weight comes to rest. The amount of shifting of the thread measures the difference in height (al-Khâzînî, see below).

4. The *murdjîkal* (the bat, fig. 18) consists of an equilateral triangle with a plumb-line which hangs from the middle of one side. The triangle is suspended by this side. Two rods, an ell in length, are erected to ells apart; a rope is passed from the top of one to the top of the other and by two threads \( a \) a the *murdjîkal* is suspended in its centre. If the plumb-line goes through the apex of the triangle, both places are on the same level, if not, one is raised by putting stones below it for example; but the end of the rope can, as in 3, be moved along (Ibn Lûyûn, see below).

5. In the Paris manuscript No. 2468, an unknown author describes 3 apparatuses for levelling (fig. 19a–c). In the first (*al-mudhrîr*), the known rod of wood an ell in length is bored through its entire length and tongue with a tongue suspended from its centre (fig. 19a). Through the hole a rope some 15 ells long is drawn which is fastened to the two vertical rods already mentioned. The second apparatus (fig. 19b: *al-shabthâ*) the similar) corresponds to the *murdjîkal*: only the two threads \( a \) \( a \)
and Bahāʻ al-Din but not described; it probably corresponds to our canal-level, a communicating pipe filled with water, such as is very fully described by Hero (Dioptra, p. 197 and loc. cit.) but he gives it no particular name, probably because it is associated with a dioptra. On the plumb-line of the figure is written ṭahkāla (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xxxv., see below).

Tiğhārī mentions another instrument called ḥisān al-kalāf, Ibn Wahshīya (see below) one of brass called kafār or kākar. Neither are described however. Arab authors who give full descriptions of Arab instruments are the following:

1. Ibn Wahshīya (or Abū Tālib al-Zayyāt, † 870) in Kitāb al-Falāḥa al-Nabatīya, in "the Book of Nabatean Agriculture" (cf. H. Schmeller, in Abhandlungen zur Gesch. der Naturwissensch. und Medizin, Erlangen 1913, Heft VI, p. 36). His data are supplemented by those of numerous commentators.


3. Ibn al-Awāmī (c. 1350) in Kitāb al-Falāḥa (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, x., see below).

4. Abū ʻOthmān b. Lūyūn (c. 1348) in Kitāb al-Lūyūn, deals with levelling ground etc., and gives notes on al-Tihānī and others (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, x. 317 and Dozy, Supplement, ii. 302 and 579).

5. Bahāʻ al-Din al-ʻAmīlī, Essenz der Rechenkunst, ed. F. Nesselmann (1547–1622, s. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, x. 319).

Full details of levelling are given in the astronomical books in discussing the ascertainment of the meridian, e.g. in Kubṭ al-Dīn al-Shirrānī (d. 1311; cf. E. Wiedemann, in Zeitschr. f. Physik, vol. xii., 1922, p. 267, al-Khalīkhī etc. Many books on the astrolabe give information on the subject in discussing surveying problems, e.g. al-Bīrūnī (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xvii. 59 sqq.).

I give once again the names of the levelling instruments:

mīzān, mīzān al-hāmidīn, mīzān al-kāf, mīzān al-iwzār, kūfāz, ṭāwī, ʿaḍān, ʿaḍāūn, ṭafṣān, mārjābāl, kākar.

I know of no comprehensive treatise on levelling in connection with canal building etc. in the early Muslim period. For the literature see my Beiträge, iii. 229; xviii. 26 and H. Schmeller, loc. cit., p. 41. — For knowledge of these matters in ancient times see C. Mikel, Die Ingenieur- technik im Altertum und H. Diels, Antike Technik, Leipzig 1920.


MIZMĀR means literally "an instrument of piping". In the generic sense it refers to any instrument of the "wood-wind" family, i.e. a reed-pipe or a flute. In the specific sense it refers to a reed-pipe (i.e. a pipe played with a reed) as distinct from a flute, as we know from Ibn Sinā (d. a. v. 1037) who describes the mīzām — a reed-pipe — as an instrument "which you blow into from its end which you swallow", as distinct from an instrument like the yārū — a flute — "which you blow into from a hole". Ibn Zaila (d. 1048) writes similarly but substitutes the Persian word ńay for the Arabic word mīzām. In Ibn Sinā's Arabic treatise al-Naḏāʿūt we read of the mīzām, but in the identical passage in his Persian Dānīshnāma the word is ńay. Further, the Mafṣūth al-ʻUmūm says, the mīzām is the ńay" (p. 236). For the present purpose, "woodwind" instruments (māṣūmāt) may be divided into:

1. Reed-blown types; and 2. Pipe-blown types. Among the former we have single reed-pipes of the clarionet, oboe, and saxophone types, as well as double reed-pipes, the bagpipe, and the eλγ̌. Among the latter we have the flute and recorder, as well as the panpipes.

a. Reed-blown types. — Single reed-pipes occur in ancient Semitic art and literary remains (Lavignac, i. 35 sqq.). Hoary gossip attributes the "invention" to the Persians (al-Maṣūmī, Murūdī, viii. 90), whilst Ḥaḍīšī himself is claimed to have been the actual "inventor" (Ewliyā Ṣefī, i. 641). With Islamic peoples, reed-pipes are found with a conical or cylindrical tube (undūs) pierced with finger-holes (ṭūḥūb), and played with a single or double beating reed (kaša, kāshā). Among the Arabs of the 9th century, the mīzār finds a place at convivial
parties (Mufaddat'yat, xvii), and in the viith century it is one of the martial instruments of the Jewish tribes of Al-Hidādz (Aghānī, ii. 172). When Islam came, an anathema was placed on reed-pipe music, it would seem, on account of the female reed-pipe player (sammār) who, as was common in the East, was looked upon as a courtesan, and, indeed, the terms sammāra and zānīya became almost synonymous. It is improbable that the Prophet Muhammad could have referred to a reed-pipe (mizmār) in the well-known hadith in praise of the chanting (ī'ra'a) of Abū Mūsā al-ʾAjbarī. The reference was rather to a mizmār (Hebr. mizmār “psalm”) from the māzāmīr of the House of David” (cf. my Hist. of Arabian music, p. 33). In early days, what the Arabs called the mizmār, the Persians called the nāy, and the latter distinguished the flute by the name nāy narm (soft nāy). Later they called the reed-pipe the nāy sāyḥ (black nāy) and the flute the nāy safīd (white nāy) because of the colour of the instrument. About the beginning of the ixth century, a musician at the Abbasid court, named Zubān invented a reed-pipe which was named after him the nāy zānāmi or zānmī (Tūḏā al-ʾArūṣ). What the invention was we can only conjecture. It may have been the cylinder used for altering the pitch of the instrument, or perhaps it was the introduction of a conical tube (see my Studies, p. 79, 82). At this period we have no information whether the various reed-pipes had cylindrical or conical tubes or whether they were played with single or double beating reeds. The word zānmī was accorded little favour in the East, whatever favour the invention itself found. In the West, where the name eventually became vulgarized into sulūmī, it became the most important reed-pipe not only in Spain as we know from al-Shakundī (d. 1221; al-Makḵari, Moh. Dyn., i. 59), but also in the Maghīb. (Ibn Khaldūn, ii. 353). It became the xelāmi of the Spaniards (see also Schiaparelli, s. v.).

The mizmār (= mizmār wahhād) is described and delineated by al-Fārābī (d. 950). It had eight holes for fingering, giving a complete octave. He also describes a smaller reed-pipe called the sur-yānai (Kosegarten, p. 95; Land, p. 122; D'Erlanger, p. 262). One special feature of this instrument was called the shahrā. In the Masāfīt al-ʾĀlām (p. 237) we read: “The shahrā of the mizmār is its head, and it is that by which it is made narrow and wide [in compass]”. It was actually the cylinder inserted into the head of the instrument which lowered the pitch when required (see my Studies, p. 82), a device called later the tanī (Amer al-Tuḥaf) or faṣī (Villoteau). It was called the shahrā perhaps on account of the button at the top of the cylinder which was turned round. The word sūrānai came to be modified into sūrnāt and then surnā. Popular etymology opined that the word was derived from sīr “fête” and nāy “reed”, but this form only appears in the lexicons (Wurzeln- und Formenwerke). Some modern even write sūrūnā. The sūrnāt found its way into martial music as early as the beginning of the ixth century (Aghānī, xvi. 139: the text has sūrnā). In the ixth century, Ibn Zaila shows how, by devices in the fingering and embouchure, other notes were obtained on the reed-pipe (Pers. nāy). In the Persian Kans al-Tuḥaf (ixth cent.) the mizmār, also called the nāy sīyāt, is both described and delineated. More valuable is the explanation of the actual making of the beating reed with which the instrument was played, from which we learn that it was a double reed. In the next century a Turkish author Ahmad Ughī Shukrullah copied extensively from this work (Lavignac, i. 3012). Ibn Qalībī (d. 1435) says that all the notes could be obtained on the zāmī sīyāt nāy by accomodating the fingering and the embouchure. The smaller instrument, the surnāt, was defective in the upper octave he says. A similar type of reed-pipe to the latter called the batalān is also mentioned by him. Ewliyā Čelebi says that it came from Shirāz. In the Muhammad b. Murād Treatise (xvth cent.) we learn that the nāy awzd (= nāy sīyāt = mizmār) was 27 cm. long.

With the Turks, the Persian word surnāt had been altered to sūrnā and the term had become common to both the zāmī (= mizmār) and sūrnā in the East. Ewliyā Čelebi (xvth century) mentions among the Turkish reed-pipes of his day the kūbā sūrnā or sūrnāt, the kūbāt šamī, the ūdī sūrnāt, and the gāzūrfī sūrnāt (a Mocclean reed-pipe). He also speaks of the būrnātta which, he says, was an English invention (i. 642). If this is the same as the surnātta, it was the clarionet, an instrument which Denner is said to have “invented” about 1600, which is after its mention by Ewliyā Čelebi. The Persians still continued to call their reed-pipe the sūrnāt, and a xvth century design of the instrument is given by Kaempfer. Both Russell in Syria (i. 155) and Villoteau in Egypt (i. 356 sq.) refer to several kinds of reed-pipes in use in the xvth century.

The latter delineates these and describes them fully. They are three, the kūbā sūrnā or zam al-kūbā, the zam or sūrnā, and the gūrūr or zam al-sūrghāyir, the first being 58.3 cm. and the last 31.2 cm. in length. The modern instrument is also delineated by Lavignac, p. 2793; Sachs, p. 428. For specimens see Brussel, Nos. 122, 355, 357; New York, N° 133.

In the West also we find a new name, or instrument, the ghaita or ghāyta (q. v.). It is said to have been introduced by the Turks (Delphin and Guin, p. 48) but the name is mentioned by Ibn Batūta (d. 1377) who likens the Mesopotamian surnāt to the Maghībīan ghaita (ii. 126). There are, however, two kinds of ghaita, one — a cylindrical tube blown with a single reed, and another — a conical tube blown with a double reed. This may explain why ghaita does not always equate with sūrnāt and mizmār in the West (Tadikirat al-Nisāyr, p. 93; Muhammad al-Saḥīr, p. 34). The cylindrical tube instrument is known in Egypt as the ghāta. For details see Bī Ḍai, p. 103; Delphin and Guin, p. 47. For specimens and designs see Host, p. 641, tab. xxx.; Brussels, No. 351; New York, Nrs. 402, 2824; Lavignac, p. 2921.

A reed-pipe that became quite famous in Western Europe was the bāk played with a reed. The original bāk [q. v.] was a horn or clarion, and was made of horn or metal. Pierced with holes for fingering, and played with a reed, a new type of instrument, somewhat similar to the modern saxophone, was evolved. In the xth century, this bāk was “improved” by the Andalusian Caliph al-Hakam II (Bibli. de autores Expt., ii. 410). Ibn Khaldūn, who describes it, says that it was the best instrument of the zamr family (ii. 353). Ibn Qalībī,
in his holograph MS. in the Bodleian Library, writes ḍāk, but adds, “also called ḍāk”, but the latter remark has been deleted. It appears to be delineated in the Cantigas de Santa Maria (Kianho, fig. 41, b.).

Another interesting instrument is the 'Irāṣḵiya or 'Īrāḵiya, which may have been the forerunner of the European rACKET. It has a cylindrical pipe and is played with a double reed. It is probably the descendant of the Nay al-'Irāḵi that al-Chażzāl (d. 1111 A.D.) speaks of. It is delineated and fully described by Villoteau (i. 643 sq.). Examples are given at Brussels, N°. 124; New York, N°. 2861.

With Islamic peoples, reed-pipes belong to outdoor music. Just as we see them in the Aṣf Lāla sou-Lāla as being essential to folk, ceremonial, processional, and martial music, so they are today, and probably have always been.

Double reed-pipes. Ibn Khuradadbih says that the Persians “invented” the double reed-pipe called the diyānāi (al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, viii. 90), the earliest instrument of this type that we know by name in Arabic literature, although it appears in the eighth century frescoes at ʿUṣur ʿAmrā (Musil, pl. xxiv.). It has been suggested that the word should be diimī, but diyānāi is also given by al-Fārābī (see my Studies, p. 57), who describes and delineates the instrument which, he says, was also called the miṣmūr al-Muγhānnī or muṣrūwāfī. The two pipes were of equal length and each was pierced by five finger-holes, which gave an octave between them. Probably the instrument known in the Middle Ages as the summārā (vulg. summārā) was actually the old diyānāi, although it merely equates with ʾishūla in the Glossary Latin-Arabicum (xth century) and the Vocabulista (xth century). As early as the xith century we read of the maγwūfī in Egypt (al-Maḵrīzī, If. 136). The name itself means “joined” (see my Studies, p. 78), and it was doubtless a double reed-pipe. Since the xith century at least, summārā has been the name for this instrument in the East (cf. Niebuhr, I. 145), and Lane (p. 367) describes and delineates it. It has cylindrical tubes and is played with single beating reeds. It is to be found with a varying number of finger-holes and is named accordingly (Sachs, p. 433). In the Maghrib it is called the maγrūn and maγrānā (Lavignac, p. 2793: R.A., 1866), whilst in Syria it is given a vulgarized or metathetical form of the old muγwādī (cf. Sachs, p. 257; Dalman, Pal. Divan). For specimens and descriptions see Brussels, N°s. 115-118; New York, N°s. 2167, 2633; and Z.D.P.V., 1927, p. 19. Specimens in my collection range from 18 to 43 cm. in length.

Another type of double reed-pipe has only one pipe pierced with finger-holes, whilst the other serves as a drone. This also carries the name of summārā when the two pipes are of equal length (cf. Niebuhr, I. 145). When the drone pipe is longer than the chanter pipe it is known as the argūḥī (argūḥūn, Maṣḥārka, p. 29; argūḥūn, Lavignac, p. 2812) in modern times (cf. Freytag-Cheest. Arab., 1831, p. 34) in Egypt and Syria. Villoteau (i. 962) gives a detailed description with scales and designs of three sizes, 107, 82.6 and 38.6 cm. in length. (In South Kensington Museum there is one 144 cm. long.) Like the preceding instrument it is played with single beating reeds. The drone pipe is furnished with additional tubes (ṣīyāḏī) which are affixed to lower the pitch.

In Syria the smaller type of argūḥī is named the maṣḥār, a most significant name, in spite of it being ignored in the lexicons. Lane (p. 367) figures a six finger-holed instrument which, he says, was used at ʿdhrās, and by Nile boatmen. For specimens see Brussels, N°s. 342-346; Z.D. P.V., 1927, pl. 2.

Bagpipe. An ancient instrument in the Orient. Just prior to Islam we have it figured on Sasanian sculptures (Ker Porter, Travels, ii., pl. 64). We do not know its ancient Semitic name, but Ibn Sinā and Ibn Zaila mention it as the miṣmūr al-arīrub, describing it as being played by “an artificial contrivance”. Although Niebuhr (i. 146) calls it the summārāt al-kerba, and Lane, p. 356 names it the summārā bīrān, the more general term used in Arabic speaking countries is sukrā, although we find miṣmaw used in Tunisia (Von Hornbostel, p. 4). The word sukrā is given variations by some European writers as in the sukkara of Villoteau (i. 970) and the sukhara of Rouanet (Lavignac, p. 2812). In Persia, the bagpipe has long been known as the nāy anḏūn and nāy maγh or maγhāk (Burhān-i ʿalī) from whence the Hindūstānī name maγh or maγhūk (Tagore, p. 24; Day, p. 151). In Turkey, the older word was ṭilīm, ṭilīm or ṭilīm (Meninski, Sachs; cf. Ewliyā Čelebi, i. 642; ṭilīm dādāk), but ʿalqād would appear to be equally popular, and this name is to be found throughout the Balkan countries (cf. Arab. ḏula; Span. gaita; Engl. bagpipe).

The bagpipe used by Islamic peoples is generally equipped with a chanter pipe (with five or six finger-holes) and mouthpiece, but rarely with a drone pipe. The chanter, terminating in a horn bell (Schallstuck), is often double, a feature which was probably the original reason for the term summārā being used with the bagpipe. The woodwork is sometimes inlaid with metal, whilst another feature is the adornment of the instrument with tassels, beads, shells, and other frippery.

Designs may be found in Niebuhr (tab. xxvi.) and Sachs (p. 434), and actual specimens in Brussels, N°. 372.

Instrument of free reeds. The Chinese ʾē skilled is such an instrument. Probably it was not used by Islamic peoples although known to them. The ching is described in the Maṣfāh al-Ulīm as follows: “The ʾustūq is a musical instrument of the Chinese. It is made of compound tubes (anādıb), and its name in Persian is biša nuγhūta” (p. 237). We get a little more information from Ibn Ghābī who informs us that the ʿulībre or miṣfār-i khatav was made of tubes of reed joined together. It was blown through a tube and the notes were obtained by finger-holes. For description and designs see Van Aalst, Chinese Music, p. 80.

b. Pipe-blown types. — The flutes of the Arabs, Persians and Turks, unlike those of Western Europe, are played vertically, a current of air being blown across the orifice (maγhāk) at its head. Ewliyā Čelebi (i. 623, 636, 642 read ʿa)nābī ) is not sure whether it was Pythagoras or Moses who “invented” the first instrument of this type, the shepherd’s flute, called the ʿa)bāl (cf. knawī). Ibn Khuradadbih says that it originated with the Kurs (al-Masʿūdī, viii. 90). and Ibn Ghābī (Ṣahr ʿal-luʿwār) says that this instrument was the nāy abyād (white nāy). We know from Ibn al-ʿAṣrābī (d. 846) that the Arabs called
this flute or reed-pipe the ṣhiyya. A characteristic of the Arab flute was its length, hence the ancient Greek proverb which likened a talkative person to an Arabian flute (Menandri Pregm.).

In the early days of Islam, the Arabs called their flute the ḵuṣḏaba (later modified into ḵuṣaba) and this is the name used by the poets al-ʾAṣḥāb (d. 629) and Rukha b. ʾAl-ʾAdudjān (viii th century). These terms fell into desuetude in the East when Persian musical influences were at their height. The Persians called their flute the nay norm (soft nay) so as to distinguish it from the nay proper and the surnay, which were reed-pipes, and so the Arabs of the East called their flute the nay, although in the West the old word ḵuṣaba or ḵuṣaba was retained. Another term for the flute in early days, perhaps a different kind, was yarā (Masfīth al-ʿUlamī, p. 236), and in the xth century Glossarium Latino-Arabicum it equates with calamaula. In the xi th century it was still a common name with ʾSaʾf al-Din Ābd al-Muʾmin (p. 9) in the East, and with al-ʾShākundī in the West (al-Makki, i. 59; read yara not barda). In the contemporary Vocabulary in Arabic it (yarā) agrees with ḵitu. The words kaʾira and kaʾira (al-Juwahārī, al-Firūzābādī) would appear to be vulgar forms of yara.

Whilst the diminutive ḵāṭiba (ḫuṣāṭiba) sometimes occurs in reference to a small flute, ḵuṣāba and ṣhibā (V ḵuṣaba “to grow up”) were the more general terms used in ʿIrāk (khwān al-Ṣafā, i. 97), ʿIrāq (al-Makātib, i. 136), Spain (al-Shāhī, Voc. in Arab.), and the Maghrib (Ibn Khalūdīn, ii. 352). It became the saxophone of Western Europe. Another name for a small flute was ḫiwaṭlā, and this word also found a place with the Latins as the joč (Du Cange). In Persia, the small flute was called the ḩuška (Kanz al-Tulāf), hence the Balkan pisaka and pīnaka.

We read of the nay in the Azhānī (ix. 71) but we cannot be sure whether it was a flute or a reed-pipe. Arābī (Kossegharten, p. 45) ignores the flute (nay) and says that it was inferior (nūṣūr) to the mızmār (reed-pipe), but it soon gained wide recognition in chamber music probably by reason of ʾuṣfi apreisement and the ḥikār of the darwešt. ʾSaʾf al-Din Ābd al-Muʾmin (d. 1294) describes the nay with eight holes for fingering, the thumb-hole at the back being called the diwašt (“vehement”), its name revealing its function. In the Persian Kanz al-Tukāf (xvith cent.) we find two very small flutes mentioned, but in the ʾAlwār (xvith cent.) we find that the nay ayyād was normally 63 cm. long. Five larger sizes are given, the longest being 99 cm., with two smaller sizes, the limit being 31.5 cm. Ibn Qāhibī also registers several varieties including the nay hamm of 67.5 cm. approximating in pitch to the bāmm of the flute, and the nay ʿir of 33.75 cm., approximating to the ʿir string. Ewliyā Celebī (xvith cent.) gives the names of a number of Turkish flutes (i. 623) including the ṣhab manaṭ, the diwašt, and the halak. Vallois (i. 954) describes and delineates the Egyptian instruments of the late xvith century. The largest, 77 cm. long, was the nay ʾshāḥ (= ṣhab nār), and the smallest, 48.8 cm. long, was the nay ʾdīrāf, the kiwft of modern Syria (Musḥarka, p. 29). Other flutes named by him are the nay kuṭb, the nay ʿuṣṣur ṣuḥūd (the ʿuṣṣur), the nay ẓuṭb, and the nay ʿuṣṭān. In Turkey the ʿuṣṣur ṣuḥūd is the smallest flute used in chamber music (Lavignac, p. 3019). Turkish and Egyptian flutes are usually well made, with a head to support the lips. In Palestine and the Maghrib they still retain, more or less, a primitive appearance, and although the seven holed flute is common (Christianowitsch, pl. 2), the five and six holed instrument has acceptance (Delphin et Guin, p. 45; E. D. P. V., 1927, pl. 1). In the Maghrib the flutes in the orchestras still retain the name of ḵuṣaba (vulg. ḵuṣaba), and they are generally about 40 cm. long, whilst the ʾuṣḳīr or ḵuṣbāba (ḥuṣbāba) is smaller. In the interior, longer flutes like the gūlūb and sūṭūd may be found. Delphin and Guin give an account of these.

The recorders, or flute à bec, also found favour in the East. This is the Arabic nay labāk (mouth nay), the Persian sūt, the Turkish ʾuṣḳīr, and the Hindustāni alqā바. As early as the ikhwān al-Ṣafā and the Masfīth al-ʿUlim (xth cent.) we read of the ʾuṣḳīr, which was doubtless a flute à bec (see my Studios, p. 8). Villoteau (i. 951) says that it was an instrument of this type in his day in Egypt. The Ṿīduk or Ṿīdāk is mentioned by Ewliyā Celebī in nine different species (i. 642), and is also mentioned by Ḥaḍīḍī Khālīfī (i. 400). The ʾuṣḳīr would appear to have been a small three-holed recorder such as was common with pipe and tabor players in Mediaeval Western Europe. It was played with the fingers of one hand, the other hand being used for beating the ṣafī or drum, hence the phrase in al-Ghazālī: “the ʾuṣḳīr of the drummer (ṭabḥūr)”.

Pan pipes are also common to the folk. Both Pythagoras and Moses are credited by Ewliyā Celebī (i. 624, 635) with the invention of the mızmār or panpipes. Although the wood stands for a composer of melodies in the Masfīth al-ʿUlim (see also Meninski), it referred to a musical instrument in the xvith century (N. E., xiv. 312). A contemporary writer, Ibn Qāhibī, says that the mızmār is one of the [wind instruments] with free pipes. Its notes are determined by size [of pipes]. The longest have the lowest notes, and the shortest the high notes. We find the instrument called mızmār (Farhang-i ʾShārī) whilst Ḥaḍīḍī Khālīfī (i. 400) has mızṭāl, and Toderni (i. 327) mezzal, which probably gave birth to the Roumanian mustal. The term mızṭāl survived up to modern times (Villoteau, i. 963), but the more general word used today (Musḥarka, p. 29) is jānāk. (Pedro de Alcala [1503] mentions a harp by this name, but perhaps he confused the name with ḵaṭl). Russell (The Natural History of Aleppo, i. 156) writing in Syria in the xvith century says that panpipes were to be found with from three to twenty-three pipes. Kamers, p. 743, delineates a xvith century Persian instrument.

The names of instruments in the maʿzmār group in Arabic are legion. Many of those not mentioned in this article are regional and are of folk origin, their source being often discernable, such as in the sawmār and sawmārā, to name only two. More interesting however, are the older words like kunbāuka, naṭib and zaṅākā. The first two occur in al-Firūzābādī (d. 1414), and naṭib, which equates with mızmār, reminds us of the much debated passage in Ezekiel, xxviii. 13. Zaṅākā occurs in al-ʾAhārī (d. 981) and even earlier (cf. Lane). The Greek σαῦμακων and the Latin sambucus were stringed instruments, and Isidore of Seville’s sambucus as a “wood-wind” instrument has long been
at this time to be often confused with those of ḥāṣṣ and musāhis [q.v.]. In the time of the Muḥammad b. Ṭāfṣil b. Mutḥaddis [q.v.], al-Mansūr, each of the twenty-one Almohad tribes had two mizzārs "one for the first rank of the hierarchy, i.e. the earliest recruits of the Almohads, and another for those who had joined them later (zhārī)".


At the present day, mizzār is in constant use in Fās for the nāṣib [q.v.] of the principal Sharīfī groups who live in this capital.

(E. Lévy-Provençal)

MĪZĀR, a Persian word which passed into Arabic in the form میزارد or میزانید; we also find in Arabic the Persian plural, mizzārān, but usually combined with mizzār in the expression mizzārān mūbedh, which means "chief of the mizzārs", "grand mizzār". It is also found alone (mīzārān) standing for mizzārān mūbedh. The Arabic plural is mūzā'ib. The word is derived from the Persian magzapat, which means "chief of the magzā" and therefore indicates a priestly office; according to al-Ḥarīdī, Kitāb al-Tanbih wa l-Ighrāf, R. G. A., v. 127, the word would mean ḥāṣṣ al-dīn and be derived from mu = "religion" and ṣad = "protector", and according to al-Ya'qūbi (Ṭārīkh, i. 207) ʿalīm al-ʿulāmāʾ. In Armenian texts the word is rendered by mzaqet in the Greek acts of martyrs by Muqāṭa Muqāṭa muqāṭa muqāṭa; in Syriac and especially in the acts of the Persian martyrs not only by ممکن, but also by ممکن, in one passage (Hoffmann, Auzüge, p. 88, cf. below), the word ممکن is used immediately before ممکن.

The Syriac has also ṭaṣṣ muqāṭa or ṭaṣṣ ḍunqāṭa corresponding to the Greek ἄξως άργων των ἵππων. We have no satisfactory information regarding the functions of the mūbedhān, or mūbedhān mūbedh. The information given below relates to the Sāsānian period, a period in which the clergy were reorganised and which is reflected in the Arabic and Persian Muslim sources.

In the later Avesta we find references to the sacerdotal organisation but the names do not agree with those of the Sāsānian period; for example the principal office, that given in the Sāsānian period to the mūbedhān mūbedh, is called zaraštstraotena, and had judicial functions like the chief of the mūbedhān. The term magzapat is only found in the Pehlevi commentaries on the Avesta. The sources from which we can extract information about the mūbedhān, and the mūbedhān mūbedh or chief of the mūbedhān, are of course Pehlevi or go back to Pehlevi texts. Among the former which have come down to us is the Bundakhtān which among other things contains a list of mūbedhān mūbedh; the Ardā Wirāf Nāmag; the Kārmān-kār Arshābkhīr-i Pāpakān (transl. by Noldke in the Benzey-Festschrift = Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, iv. 1878, and by Pagliaro in L'Epica e il Romano nel Medio Eto persiano, Florentiae 1927; a part of the text 1–3 is reprinted in the Hilfsbuch für das Pehlevi by Nyberg); the Māsān-kā-hār Dāte-
and the education of the people. These mōbeda and their chief (cf. below) were like all priests the repositories of learning, profane as well as sacred (cf. Tantib, p. 97, where there is an allusion to the unbounded knowledge of the mōbeda and herbeda) and the Arab writers must also have obtained information from mōbeda (cf. Inostreznov, Études sassanides, p. 10). The mōbeda had also judicial functions (cf. below); in the Acts of the martyrs they appear vested with executive power; but since courts of inquiry were composed of lay officers and priests, it is probable that this power was exercised by the whole college or by delegation. It is also certain that the title of mōbeda is not applied exclusively to these heads of administrative divisions or dioceses (of whom it is nevertheless characteristic) because at the court of the king, according to the sources, especially the Šāhānšāh, there were many high priests called mōbeda or herbeda who formed a kind of council around the grand mōbeda (cf. below) or who had other special offices. Gradually the same mōbeda must have come to mean, as at the present day, a priest fully qualified to do everything in connection with worship. The other terms for Persian priests seem to refer rather, either to their dignity (e.g. dāstār) or to functions occasionally performed by them (cf. zoroastrianism). Rat and maguyat are sometimes put on the same level. The relation of the mōbeda to the other degrees of the hierarchy like the herbeda, another office (perhaps teacher) having supervision over a body of priests, is not clear. Al-Mas‘ūdī says in the Ta‘ībih, p. 103, that herbeda were lower in rank than mōbeda.

At the head of the hierarchy of priests were the hūrbeda or chief of the herbeda and the mōbedān mōbeda or chief of the mōbeda. Tansar, the writer of the famous letter, is called by the Denkār: hūrbeda hūrbeda, according to Darmesteter “chief of the religion”; while al-Mas‘ūdī (Tantib, p. 99) calls him better the mōbeda of Ardashir. Indeed it is quite certain from our sources that the supreme head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy was the chief of the mōbeda (mōbeda mōbeda) or his representative, the chief of the court; all the power of the Zoroastrian clergy which constituted a state within the state was concentrated in this pontiff. Al-Mas‘ūdī in the Ta‘ībih, p. 103, says of his rank that it was almost equal to that of a prophet.

In accounts of the ceremonial of the Sāsānids, he is always given first place and he frequently appears surrounded by a council of high priests, herbeda or mōbeda. Besides all the functions which he exercised as head of the clergy, i.e. the supervision of the whole religious life of the country, the settlement of theological questions, of problems of ecclesiastical policy, the appointment and dismissal of ecclesiastical officials, he had others which we must outline. Christensen thinks he can deduce from several sources (letter of Tansar, al-Mas‘ūdī, Tantib, p. 103–104; Yavā‘īkī, Historia, p. 1–202), that four or five high officials formed with the king a kind of ministry, the composition and number of members of which perhaps changed from time to time but which always included the mōbedān mōbeda (cf. e.g. the Šāhānšāh, ed. Mohl, vi. 223 where the mōbeda is called the king’s vizier). But he was also supreme judge as head of the mōbeda of the administrative divisions, as the latter were the
judges of higher degree in their respective areas. It is evident from the studies of Bartholomae on Iranian legal texts (and especially on the آئینی انسانی), that in the different districts there were judges of first instance and of two degrees (just lower, mas higher), above whom was the مبعد (religious judge). The supreme judge was ultimately the مبعد in the Persian Empire. The judge of the district. The supreme judge was ultimately the مبعد whose final sentence could not be disputed. For the judicial functions of the مبعد it is interesting to consult the acts of the Persian martyrs in Syriac and Greek (cf. Hoffmann, "Auszage aus syrischen und persischen Martyrern, Leipzig 1886; the texts of Bedjan, etc., in "Patriologia Orient., etc."). The Arab writers also give us a pretty clear idea, especially as regards the مبعد; for example in Tabari, i. 952; Noldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 230. The مبعد in advising the king in the matter of the son of دحی Yazan, lays particular stress on the young man's right to have his prayer granted; al-Mas'udi, ماردان (ii. 156) and Tabari, p. 103, calls him مسیح السیجی; in the ماردان also (i. 211) we are told in connection with the abuses of Hormuz son of Khusraw that, having abolished the jurisdiction of the مبعد, he has given authority to the king in the matter of the son of دحی Yazan, lays particular stress on the young man's right to have his prayer granted; al-Mas'udi, ماردان (ii. 156) and Tabari, p. 103, calls him مسیح السیجی; in the ماردان also (i. 211) we are told in connection with the abuses of Hormuz son of Khusraw that, having abolished the jurisdiction of the مبعد, the good old tradition and the ancient laws were thus disused. In al-Tha'alibi, Hist. Pers., p. 506-7, we find two answers which are interesting in this connection; they were given by the مبعد to the king, who had consulted him with regard to the sentence of death to be pronounced against his chief wife and her cook; in the Kitāb al-Taṣdeeq, p. 28, it is related that king خورُمیل full of admiration for a subtle answer given by the مبعد exclaimed: "It is with justice that kings have given you the first place and that they have entrusted you with the control of jurisdiction!"

Some Arabic sources also allude to the court of justice which was held on the occasion of the great festivals of the Aryan and the مهران (e.g. Kitāb al-Taṣdeeq, p. 159-63; al-Mahdī wa l-Adīd, p. 359-65; al-Birūnī, al-Adhar al-Bahrīyya, ed. Sachau, p. 215-219, 222-223; Sīrāt-Ālāmīn, ed. Schefer, p. 38-40, etc.). According to these stories, the people on the days had the right to bring any complaint against the king before a commission of which the grand مبعد was the most important member; the first complaint was judged by the grand مبعد who thus had the right to condemn the king, the latter having pronounced a formula of submission, knuckling before him. The complaints that followed were judged by the king. According to al-Nawairi, the مبعد also offered to the king on these ceremonial occasions a basket of fruits over which he had uttered a prayer. Tansir's letter (J. A., 1904, p. 544-545) informs us that in the procedure laid down by Ardashīr for designating the heir to the throne the grand مبعد played the most important part, that is to say he proclaimed the new heir chosen by divine inspiration so that it happen that the other dignitaries summoned to deliberate with him were not in agreement. The position of the grand مبعد as intimate councillor and mentor of the king who placed complete confidence in him (he is often called "councillor of the king") is very clear in the شیخنوس as well as in the Arabic and Persian sources (cf. al-Tha'alibi, p. 504-505; al-Mas'udi, ماردان, ii. 171 where Bahram son of Bahram, son of Hormuz, addresses the grand مبعد: "Thou, support of religion, councillor of the king and the man who directs his attention to affairs of state neglected by him"). According to al-Mas'udi, تاهب, p. 230, the مبعد and a few other high officials of state possessed a copy of the شیخنوس or register of officers, a very large book, forming part of the آئینی (an آئینی was translated by Ibn al-Muqaffa' with the title Kitāb al-Rawān).

Among the details which are preserved in the sources about the grand مبعد, we are told that he was one of the three who shared the king's table in time of war when the royal meals were very frugal; and that when a victory was won, he along with other dignitaries pronounced a discourse (Kitāb al-Taṣdeeq, p. 173-174). A very marked feature in the sources is the wisdom of the grand مبعد and indeed of all the مبعدs (cf. below).

In the شیخنوس (we pick out only a few of the more interesting epistles) the Byzantine ambassador who was, the grand مبعد tells Khusraw, of the school of Plato, put seven questions to the مبعد which he answers (Mohl, vi. 3 sqq.) and thus excites the admiration of the king. In this story, as usual, the grand مبعد appears surrounded by other priests called مبعدs or معدیدs as the case may be, and he is also given the title معدید. Cf. also the questions put by the grand مبعد to Khusraw آشغران (Mohl, vi. 394 sqq.) and the assembly of the مبعدs under the presidency of the grand مبعد to put questions to Hormuz son of Anusharwan (ibid., p. 424-430). Another passage (Mohl, vi. 442 sqq.) describes the heroic act of the grand مبعد who consules a high official, a victim of king Hormuz, and is poisoned by the latter. The grand مبعد is also represented as interpreting the language of birds (cf. also al-Mas'udi, ماردان, ii. 169-170: the dialogue of the owls denouncing the cruelty of king Bahram son of Bathn son of Hormuz [276-293 A. D.]), and in al-Tabari (i. 905; Noldeke, p. 250) he explains the invasion of jacksals in the reign of Khusraw as a punishment for the impurity of the land.

The story is very well known among the Arabs of the dream of the grand مبعد in the night of the birth of the Prophet and his interpretation of other marvellous happenings of the same night (al-Tabari, i. 982 sqq.; Noldeke, p. 253: "Auszage der Islam", i. 150); Hamza al-Isfahāni (ed. Gottwaldt, p. 27) quotes a list of ساسانی kings drawn up by the مبعد Bahram son of Mardan (Noldeke, p. 401). In religious discussions the steps to be taken against heretics, in the persecutions and inquisitions against the Christians, the مبعدs and the grand مبعد are always most prominent (Hoffmann, "Auszage aus Persia", Patrologia Orient., etc.). Cf. also the articles مذبوح, إسحاق.

A list of grand مبعدs of the Sassanian period and of مبعدs contemporary with the last editors of the book is found in the کتاب‌شناسی, ch. 33 (Christensen, Empyre des Sassanides, p. 35). The first grand مبعد appointed by Ardashīr was, according to Tabari (Noldeke, p. 9), a man named Pālār(?). The مبعد Mabdān Mabdān Zartashīn lived, according to the Pelevi sources, 150 years and was grand مبعد for 90. Elisee (Langlois, ii. 230) mentions a grand مبعد, who had the honorific title of Hamakān ("he who knows all religion") on account of his vast theological learning; this title seems to have been often given to the...
mōbedh. A number of names of grand mōbedhs are given in various sources, among them the Acts of the Martyrs in Syriac, Greek and Armenian; some are also preserved on the seals published by Herzfeld in his work on the monument of Paikuli. Māzāk was according to some texts mōbedh or even grand mōbedh. In Ibn al-Fakīh, p. 216, we have a description in verse of pictures representing with other dignitaries "their mōbedh and their hāridh" who judges ignorantly and iniquitously. On the za'amah cf. the article Zoroastrianism and Goldhinter, Muhammedische Studien, i. 179 and al-Dājī, Bāyān, ed. Sandallū, Cairo 1927, ii. 7, on the Shūdāwī. It is known that the Zoroastrian clergy played an important part in the Shūdāwīya movement (Insostranez, Études sassanistes, St. Petersburg 1909, p. 10–15). After the Muhammedan conquest the importance of the grand mōbedh and of the mōbedhs diminished in proportion as Islam spread; our sources of course contribute to mention them and Arab writers give information obtained directly from mōbedhs (al-Tabarī, i. 2874, year 31 A.H., mentions the mōbedh who advised the governor Māhāwīhī not to kill king Yazdgerd; al-Masūdī, Kitāb al-Tanbīh, p. 104 gives the name of the mōbedh of all Persia in 345 A.H. etc.).

The organisation of the Parsa at the present day is different; mōbedh means a priest qualified to perform all the offices of worship. This, however, is beyond the scope of this article.


MODON, a town in the Morea on the south-west point of Messenia, about 20 miles N.W. of Cape Akritas, opposite the island of Sapinza at the foot of Mount Teneus. Modon is frequently mentioned in ancient times under the names Μαίλων and Μεσαίων; from the latter comes the Italian name of the town, Modon, under which it has been known since the middle ages in Europe. In the middle ages it was of much greater importance than in antiquity. The good harbour of the town, sheltered by cliffs of varying heights, has long been a haven of refuge and of supply for ships going from the west to the Levant. Hence pilgrims frequently mention the town and their accounts of their travels even contain maps.

The Arab Idrisi, in his geographical work finished in 548 (1153) for Roger II of Sicily, enumerates many seaports and towns on the mainland of Greece. Among these is Modon of which he records that it is a fortified town and has a citadel which commands the sea (Geographie d'Edrisi, ed. A. Jaubert, Paris 1846, p. 305). By the treaty of 1199 with the Byzantine emperor Alexius III, Venice was allowed to trade freely in Modon. The town had suffered severely at the hands of the Venetians in 1105 and of the Normans in 1146 but was recovering again slowly. After the taking of Constantinople by the Crusaders (1204) and the division of the lands which had previously formed the Byzantine empire, Modon fell to the Venetians, under whose rule it remained for nearly three centuries. It is this period that marks the golden age of the town, which, carefully administered by her merchant princes, developed a new prosperity and became an important and secure centre for trading with Egypt and Syria, while previously it had often been a nest of pirates. In the xvth century the population of Modon was a mixed one of Greeks, Jews, Albanians, Turks, Gipsies and Western Europeans. The Turks of the neighbourhood reared swine which they sold to the townspeople. According to some sources, at the end of the xvth century five thousand swine were exported annually from Modon to Venice. About the same time a settlement of gipsies in Modon is mentioned, who came from Gypsea, a district about forty miles from Modon, from which they said they had fled— for the sake of the Christian faith — and were seeking refuge in all lands with a letter of recommendation from the Pope (cf. Die Pilgerfahrt des Ritters Arnold von Habsburg, ed. E. v. Groote, Cologne 1860, pp. xxvii, 67 sqq.: Z.D.P. T., xvii., 1894, p. 144). The fact is, however, that the gipsies of Modon after 1500 went over en masse to Islam, about the end of the xvth century were again mainly Christians, outwardly at least, after 1715 again became Muslims and finally after 1821 became Christians again. During the second half of the xvth century the population of Modon increased considerably for many Christians and Jews of the Peloponnese, seeking to escape the Turkish yoke, took refuge here. While the town itself was immune, the country round, which was flat, suffered a great deal from the Turks. Thus for example about 1480, the Turks raided this plain and destroyed by fire the olive-trees there. In the last decades of the xvth century, the Venetian republic had much anxiety about Modon and her other possessions in the East, which the Turks had long coveted. In 1499 the Admiral Antonio Grimaiz was ordered by his government to see the defence of Modon against the Turks. In July of this year the Turks came to the vicinity of Modon and soon afterwards several naval encounters with the Venetian fleet took place. In a naval battle fought on Aug. 8, 1499, outside Modon, the heroic Venetian Andrea Loredano, governor of Corfu, was taken by the Turks and put to death. Another Venetian admiral, Melchior Trevisano, was now entrusted by the Venetian republic with the defence of Modon and her other possessions in the East. At the same time the republic endeavoured to make peace with Turkey, but the negotiations broke down in face of the impossible conditions laid down by Bayazid II. Among other things he insisted on the surrender of Modon. In the meanwhile on March 23, 1500, the Turks had occupied Merona, a little town near Modon. Marcus Gabbriel, the commander of Modon, had previously, on February 18, 1500, reported to the Venetian government the great straits of the town. According to his report, the garrison was not sufficient to defend the town against the Turks, and for a successful defence it would require four thousand trained men, in addition to artillery, arms, munitions and gunpowder, which the town lacked. In spite of her difficult financial
In 1531 the Knights of St. John endeavoured to take Modon from the Turks and to establish themselves there. To do this they equipped a small fleet under the command of the Abbé Fra Bernardo Sulpicius, a nephew of Pope Clement VII. Two Greeks employed in the harbour of Modon and Johannes Skandalis, a Greek from Zante, whose father was a customs officer in Modon, were to assist the enterprise. The fleet, led by Sulpicius with two merchant ships, which also concealed soldiers, sailed for Sapienza. The warships were hidden in the vicinity of this island, while the two merchant ships under the guidance of Johannes Skandalis, made for the harbour of Modon. Permission to land was given without trouble to the crews of the two ships, who gave themselves out to be some merchants and some janissaries, and were allowed to spend the night in the tower at the harbour. Johannes Skandalis and his little body of followers then succeeded in overpowering the Turkish garrison at the tower and taking nearly the whole town. The rest of the Turkish garrison shut themselves in the palace which had once housed the Venetian governors of the town, and offered a stubborn resistance. In order to overcome the Turkish garrison on the warships hidden at Sapienza were necessary. These now came up, although very late, and bombarded the town with their guns Scarcely had they begun when a strong Turkish fleet appeared. The Knights and John Skandalis therefore abandoned Modon but not without carrying off some sixteen hundred prisoners.

The years 1532—1534, during which a Spanish force in the service of Charles V occupied the adjoining Coroni, were a critical period for the Turks in Modon. But after this, it was left in peace for a considerable period. The Travels of Eutyches Celebi who visited the Morea in 1667 to 1668 contain valuable notes on Modon and its vicinity, while Hadji Khalifa (d. 1658) contains nothing essential.

During the war which broke out in 1682 between Turks and Venetians in which Germans, Poles and Russians also shared as allies, Modon with the whole of the Morea was restored to the Venetians General Francesco Morosini in 1686 broke the resistance of the Turkish garrison with the help of Greek and German troops and secured it for the Adriatic republic. The chief mosque of the city, i.e. the old cathedral, was once more dedicated to Christian worship. Only in 1699 after the peace of Carlowitz, did the Turks recognise the Venetian claim to Modon. Venice now did her utmost to restore the city which, with its commerce, had much declined during the Turkish occupation. Of the seven administrative divisions (camera) into which the Venetians had divided the Morea, the third was that of Modon. This district was again divided into four areas (Fanari, Arcadia, Navarino and Modon) From a Venetian record of 9 September 1699, giving the results of a census by the Venetian officials, we see that the district of Modon had been depopulated to an incredible degree. The 218 villages detailed in this list were inhabited by only 11,202 souls. Modon itself, including the citadel, had only 236 inhabitants of whom some must have been Muhammadans. A large number of villages which at the turn of the xviiith—xviiiith centuries belonged to the district of Modon, have
Turkish names, some of which survive to this day. These villages were originally fields granted to Turks whose names in time passed to the village (cf. S. P. Lambros, in Delton, publication of the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece, vol. ii., 1855, p. 686—710. pl. vii.; thereon Τοιχοβιοείες Μοντσικές, Athens 1887, p. 114 sqq.; Pier' Antonio Pacifico, Directa descrittione coro-grafica del Peloponneso o' Morca, Venice 1704, p. 125 sqq.).

After the conquest by Morosini whose services to Modon are commemorated in inscriptions still in existence, the town remained for some nineteen years under Venetian rule. In 1715 the grand vizier ʿAli Kumurtzi with the help of a number of Greeks took not only Modon but almost the whole of the Morca from the Venetians in a very short time. The Venetian garrisons of Navarino and Coroni as well as the inhabitants abandoned them when the Turkish army approached in the summer of 1715, in order to take refuge in Modon, which was much more strongly fortified. Soon afterwards the Turkish fleet and army began the siege of the town. After a brief resistance Modon surrendered voluntarily. After the capture of the town the grand vizier ordered a general slaughter of the Christians. Many in the district thereupon adopted Islam in order to save life and property in this way. The Turks who had formerly owned property in Modon or the neighbourhood were allowed by imperial edict to resume possession of it. The peace of Pessarowitz (1718) finally ceded Modon to Turkey. The town recovered from the catastrophe of 1715. From 1725 onwards a busy trade developed between Modon and the lands of North Africa, especially Algeria and Tunis; this trade had existed previously but not to the same extent. Modon played a certain part during the war between Turkey and Russia in 1768—1774. The Russian vice-general Georg Vladimir Dolgoruki in 1769 with 500 Russians, 150 Montenegrins and 100 Greeks (mainly Maimotes) besieged Modon. The Turkish garrison of Modon consisted of 800 janissaries and a large number of Turks of the town and vicinity able to bear arms. The walls of the citadel were in good condition, and the supply of food and munitions ample. The siege lasted a long time; the fighting was conducted mainly by the artillery on both sides. The Russians had also two warships co-operating on the sea. At the end of May 1769, Turks and Albanians from the interior of the Morea came to the help of the besieged who undertook a valiant sortie, when they learned of the approach of help. In the battle that now developed the Russians suffered heavily. They were forced to abandon most of their artillery and to escape to Navarino, from which they sailed with the rest of the Russian army and a few Greek notables. A few years later, the Turks in Modon were still displaying the guns which they had taken from the Russians in 1769. According to reliable sources, the Turkish population of Modon about 1820 was four to five hundred fighting men. About the same time ʿAli Agha was prominent among the Turks of the town for his wealth and in other respects also. The vicinity of Modon was almost exclusively inhabited by Greeks who cultivated the land, which mainly belonged to the Turks, and were despised by them as contemptible menials. During the Greek War of Independence of 1821—1827, all the attempts of the Greeks to take the town failed. At the end of March 1821, a Peloponnesian force led by the orthodox patriarch of Methone, named Gregory, and other notables, besieged Modon and the adjoining towns of Koroni and Neokastron. The besiegers were joined in the spring by Greeks from the Ioman islands and later by Philhellenes from Europe. On May 18, 1821, Greek ships, under the captains of the Spezios, Nikolaos Mpat- tasi and Anastasios Koladrusos blockaded Modon. But neither the Turkish garrison nor the armed Turkish civilians in the town were the least dismayed. On the contrary, they undertook raids in all directions and did their best to impede the progress of Greek emancipation. Many fierce encounters took place between the Turks of Modon and their besiegers. In July 1821, Turkish ships re-provisioned Modon but they were not successful in their attempt to repurpose Neokastron, the garrison of which was in dire straits from want of food and even water. On August 8, 1821, the Turks of Modon decided to attempt the relief of their compatriots in Neokastron, who had in the meanwhile been forced to capitulate to their Greek besiegers. On the road between Modon and Neokastron a battle was fought on August 8, 1821, in which the valiant chief Constantine Pierrakos Mavromichalis, a member of a notable Maimote family, fell. On the same day, the Greeks took Neokastron; but they gradually abandoned the siege of Modon. The town was able to continue to hold out, only, however, with the frequent help of the Turkish fleet.

When Ibrahim Pascha, the adopted son of Mejemed ʿAli, undertook to suppress the Greek rising and to pacify the Morea, Modon and its neighbourhhood formed his main base. There he landed troops on February 24, 1825, and dug entrenchments. Modon became an important base for Ibrahim Pascha's operations. On October 8, 1825 the town was taken from him by the French General Magon. Before 1833 the French left Modon and has since then belonged to the Greeks.

Mogador, a town in Morocco on the Atlantic coast. The Bay of Mogador, protected against the north winds by the rocky promontory on which the town is built, against those from the west by an island about 1,000 yards in length, forms a natural harbour which, although not large and inaccessible for ships of large tonnage, has however the merit of being accessible at all seasons, an advantage which secures it a favourable place among the anchorages of the Atlantic coast of Morocco which, generally speaking, inhospitable. This favoured situation was taken advantage of at a very early period. In spite of the lack of precision in the sources, it is probable that we should seek at Mogador the site of one of the Phoenician colonies founded by Hanno (5th century B.C.). The island seems to have been known as the island of Hera or of Juno. Herodotus records that at the end of the first century B.C. the king Juba II founded purple dye-works on the Forpuraria insulae, islands in the Ocean, "opposite the Autoleos," a Getulic people who lived in the north of the High Atlas. Getulic purple, which was celebrated at Rome, was supplied by the molluscs abundant on this coast. It is only at Mogador that we find an island and islets which can be identified as the Forpuraria insulae, but an archaeological discovery has yet been made to confirm the deductions made from the ancient geographers.

In the 19th century of the Christian era, according to al-Hakī (who finished his book in 1665), Amugdul, a very safe anchorage, was the port for all the province of Sās. We see in the name of that of a local saint, Sidi Mogulī, still venerated in this region, whose tomb is on the bank near the mouth of the Wādi 'I-Ḳubh. It is however possible that the saint of whom we know nothing, gets his name from an old Berber place-name. Mogador is only a Spanish or Portuguese transcription of Mogulī, though the forms Mogadul, Mogador, which we sometimes find in the texts. The harbour and the island bear the name Mogador or Mungdror on a series of portolans of the 14th and 15th century (publ. by Ch. de la Roncière, La Découverte de l'Afrique au Moyen Âge, 1925) but there was not a town here, when in Sept. 1506, the king of Portugal Dom Manuel I commanded a gentleman of his court, Diogo d'Alambuja, to build a fortress here which was called Castello Real of Mogador. Built with great difficulty in face of the hostility of the natives, the Portuguese stronghold did not last 1683. While at Safi and Santa Cruz of Cape Gueu (Agadir), the state of anarchy in which the tribes lived favoured the rapid progress of the Portuguese, it seems that at Mogador they came up against resistance probably organised by the old Berber marabout body of the Nağığa. The garrison had to remain blockaded in Castello Real, revictualled with difficulty from Portugal and Madeira, until in October or November 1510, the tribes were strong enough to seize the fortress in circumstances which we do not know.

A sketch of the 16th century and plans of the 18th leave no doubt as to the site of Castello Real. It was situated, not at the mouth of the Wādi 'I-Ḳubh, where is now shown an alleged Portuguese fort which however only dates from the end of the 16th century, but on the shore of the northern passage opposite the island, on the rocky point which supports the mole west of the present harbour. Sometimes abandoned, sometimes more or less restored by the rulers of Morocco, who from time to time kept a small garrison there, the old Portuguese castle survived till 1764 or 1765 and was only destroyed when the town was built.

In spite of the lack of success of the Portuguese attempt, this privileged situation continued to attract the envy of European nations. At the beginning of the 16th century, Spain, fearing that Moroccan, Algerian or even European corsairs would establish themselves at Mogador, thought of seizing it herself to protect the route to the Indies. At the same time, English agents were thinking of making Mogador a base against Spain. The Sultan Mawlây Zādīn in 1611—1612 and his son 'Abd al-Malik in 1628 drew up a scheme to fortify the place to prevent foreigners from establishing themselves there. This was the time when in France Richelieu and Pére Jœph were drawing up schemes for a colonial policy. The Chevalier de Razilly in 1626 suggested to them the occupation of Mogador and the organisation of a factory and fisheries there. He had it reconnoitred in 1629 but found it impossible to take it by surprise.

In spite of so many projects and attempts against it, the island and the shores remained practically deserted. Ships however frequented the roadstead. It was through Mogador that in the first quarter of the 17th century, the greater part of the trade between Marrākūsh and Holland took place. Later, in the time of Mawlāy Ismā'll, the harbour was mainly used as a refuge for corsairs who came there to rest and repair their vessels.

In 1751, Sidi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāth, then ẖālīf of his father for the district of Marrākūsh, desiring to develop commercial relations between his subjects and Europe, ceded the island of Mogador to a Danish company, which however preferred to establish a centre at Agadir and was not successful there. A few years later, in变成 sūlah and having made Marrākūsh his capital, Sidi Muhammad declared himself to found a town at Mogador and to conduct all the commerce of
the south of his kingdom through it, to the greater benefit of the royal treasury, which would obtain not only the customs from this increased trade but also profit by the rents of the buildings, most of which had been built by the sovereign and were his private property. The harbour also served as a base for corsairs who, through the menace they offered to the fleets of Europe, forced the Christian nations to conclude treaties with the sultan by which he received valuable presents and even sums of money. In order to populate the town and start business in it, he demanded that European consuls and merchants should settle there and have houses built at their own expense.

By 1760 he had begun work but it is from the autumn of 1764 that the foundation of the town really dates; it was given the name al-Suwaïra (Sousa), the little fortress, by which it is known to the natives; the name Mogador is only used by Europeans. We also find a Herbeinse form (Tasutiri). The sultan went in person to choose and distribute the sites for the buildings. He had asked the English to send him an architect. They sent him a French "engineer", a native of Avignon, called Nicolas Cournut, who had made the plans for the fortifications of some places in Roussillon.

He was an adventurer who, after working in France as a contractor, had entered the English service during the Seven Years' War. He was living at Gibraltar where he entered Sidi Muhammad's service. The sultan did not gain much by his services and sent him back to France at the beginning of 1767. None of the present buildings in Mogador can be attributed with certainty to Cournut, for after him a number of European architects and masters worked for the sultan, notably a Genoese architect who built the battery called the "Skala" situated on the western rampart facing the sea. Mogador owed to its builders the narrow streets, massive gateways and bastions of European type, the like of which cannot be found in other Moroccan towns and which give it quite a specific character.

Sidi Muhammad, also built outside the town, a country palace which still stands, but which, after his death, was buried in sand opposite the little village of Diyabat.

The dreams of the sultan were only imperfectly realised. The merchants, attracted to Mogador by the promise of a reduction in the export duties on goods, were soon undeceived when they saw that the sovereign did not keep his promise, but constantly imposed new burdens on trade. The prosperity of Mogador remained insignificant under Sidi Muhammad and declined under his successors.

The situation of the town, a long way from great cities and main roads, made it frequently used in the sixteenth century as a political prison and compulsory place of residence for high officials in disgrace. Mogador remained however the starting place for the caravans to Sûs, Mauritania and the Sûdan and has retained from this position a certain commercial importance, to which the opening of the port of Agadir to commerce will now do considerable harm.

On August 15, 1844, after the battle of Ily, a French squadron commanded by the Prince de Joinville, who had just bombarded Tangier, came and bombarded Mogador. It was intended to make an impression on Sûtan Moulay 'Alîd al-Rahmân by striking at a town which belonged to him personally and from which he drew considerable revenues. A three hours' bombardment silenced the batteries; the French army then disembarked on the island, the garrison of which, entrenched in the mosque, made a vigorous defence until the next morning. On August 16, a detachment of 600 men went to spike the guns, threw the gunpowder into the sea and destroy the last defences of Mogador. The town, which had suffered very little from the French shot, but had been evacuated by the inhabitants, was burned and plundered by the tribes of the country round (Shirâdima and Hája).

Mogador is now the headquarters of a contrôle côte. It had 18,401 inhabitants at the census of 1926. The Jewish element is particularly large, numbering 7,720.

The extremely temperate climate is remarkably equable; but it is spoiled by the wind which blows almost incessantly, laden with the sand from the neighbouring dunes.


Moghul stands for MUGHAL.

Mogur, an Indian gold coin. The name is the Persian mohur, which is a loanword from the Sanskrit mûtra, seal or die. The earliest occurrence of the word on coins is on the forced currency of Muhammad b. Tughlak where it has the literal meaning of "sealed" or "stamped". By the xvith century it had come to be used as a popular rather than precise name for gold coins in general.

Very little gold had been issued in India for two centuries before the reign of Akbar. One of his reforms was the issue of an extensive coinage in gold. In addition to many pieces which had only a brief circulation, he revived the old gold tanka [q.v.] of the Sultans of Delhi on a standard of 170 grains (112) grammes to which he gave the name mohur. That the name at first could be applied to any gold coin is shown by Djalângâr, in his Memoirs (transl. A. Rogers, O.T.F., vol. viii., p. 10) to mohurs of 100, 50, 20, 10, 5 and 1 dinar. After the numismatic experiments of Akbar and Djalângâr, only one gold piece was struck, occasionally with subdivisions so that the general name acquired a particular meaning, especially among the English merchants in India. Mogurs continued to be struck to the end of the Mughal Empire and by the states into which it broke up in the xvinth and xixth centuries. Akbar and Djalângâr issued
square as well as round pieces and the former also struck a few mohur pieces, so called from their shape. Of the numerous large denominations recorded by Abu 'l-Fadl and Dāhillīr, only 5 ten pieces of Akhan and of Dāhillīr are known to exist. The silver rule was the standard unit of India; the value of the mohur fluctuated with the price of gold. In the latter half of the xvith and early sixteenth centuries, the East India Company endeavoured to make gold the standard of India and issued mohurs (called gold rupees in Bombay) with the legends of the Mogul Emperor. None of their attempts to keep gold and silver in currency at a fixed rate were successful. When in 1653 a uniform currency was introduced for British India a gold mohur or 15 rupee piece with English types was struck in name of William IV but never trained general circulation; this was the last attempt to restore the mohur to circulation. The mohur occasionally seen of Victoria of 1861, 1862 and other dates are patterns.


MOKHĀ, a small seaport on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea in 15° 19' 50" N. Lat. and 45° 12' 10" East Long. (Greenwich). The once imposing town lies on a small bay between two promontories with forts on each about one and a half miles apart. The wall which surrounds the town in a semicircle is pierced by four gates. In the north the Bāb al-Ḥamīyli leads to the citadel of the town and to a tongue of land which runs out into the sea; in the east roughly in the centre of the wall is the Bāb al-Ṣāhidī through which the front of al-Būṭān is reached and to the east the road to al-Tāizz from it, while the road to al-Hudaydah runs north via Bāt al-Fakih. In the south the Bāb al Sundallāh admits to the fort of al-Bahr and the road to A'dan: in the west through the Bāb al-Bahr the harbour is reached; its stone breakwater is now much decayed. This also holds of the wall which connects the city-gates. Seen from the sea the town, which covers an area of about half a square mile, still looks very fine: the white mass of houses stands brightly out from the dark blue waters of the Red Sea. But as one approaches, the damage which wars, dilapidation and turbulent times have done to the often sore tried town, is apparent; the houses, for the most part deserted, while the inhabitants, consisting of Arabs, Sāmilis, Danakils, few Persians, have settled in huts outside the town. East of the Bāb al-Ṣāhidī, for example, there is a large group of huts inhabited by Arabs, south of this another group belonging to Sāmilis, while farther south and on the other side of the Wadi 11-Kelīr is the Jewish quarter (Ka'ah al-Yahūd). In the north lies the great cemetery and a white-

The island, about 3 miles in length from north to south and nearly the same distance from east to west, is remarkably compact in shape and so placed in the deep inlet formed by the converging of several creeks as to be almost entirely surrounded by the mainland, only presenting its south-eastern angle

by a conduit from the Mawzā' twenty-four miles to the north. The population has varied considerably in the last hundred years. In 1821 it was 20,000, in 1875-1876: 5,—8,000, in 1882 it was put at 1,500 inside the town and in 1901 it had sunk to about 400.}

al-Mokhā is briefly mentioned by al-Hamdānī in connection with al-Mandāb as lying in the land of the Banū Madjīd; al-Mas'ūdī also refers to it briefly in his geographical work. The Portuguese gave the town the name by which it has become known in Europe: Moca. P. Manoel d'Almeida calls it Moguda in his Historia geral de Ethipia a shee te B leeser Telle (Coimbra 1660).

About 500 years ago Mokhā was an insignificant village, but rapidly grew in importance when Shaikh Sa'idhī discovered the peculiar qualities of the coffee bean and introduced the habit of drinking coffee. In 1513 Alfonso Albuquerque found Mokhā still a modest place but by 1610 it had become the most important port for trade with Abyssinia, and England was endeavouring to trade with it while the Dutch had a factory here. Coffee was the chief article of export along with other specialties of the Yemen. And received its name from the town. As late as 1763 Nieuhof found the town very prosperous; but the capture of A'dan by the English put an end to its prosperity. A'dan and al-Hudaydah attracted all the trade of Southern Yemen. Under Turkish rule Mokhā was a kadār in the sandjak of Ta'izz but its trade was insignificant. In 1916 for example, only about £ 10,000 worth of coffee was sent to A'dan. There is a minimum of industrial activity and that only to supply local needs. Indigo dyeing and the manufacture of spirits may be mentioned: the latter is in the hand of Jews. Mokhā is connected by telegraph with Sa'īdīn (via Ta'izz), al-Hudaydah (via Zābīd), Shaikh Sa'id and Petrin. Mokhā has acquired a new importance by the creation of the imamate of al-Yemen and is now beginning to share the trade with al-Hudaydah.


MOLĀ. [See Mova.]

MOLĀ KHUDRAW. [See Muḥammad R. Faramarz.]

MOMBASA (ムバサ, anciently Mvita), an island and town on the east coast of Africa, in lat. 4° S., Long. 39° E. The island, about 3 miles in length from north to south and nearly the same distance from east to west, is remarkably compact in shape and so placed in the deep inlet formed by the converging of several creeks as to be almost entirely surrounded by the mainland, only presenting its south-eastern angle
to the Indian Ocean. This peculiarity of its situation suggested to the late W. E. Taylor the derivation of the name Mvita (the "Curtained Headland") from *wa*ta "point". The more usual derivation from *vita* "war" seems inadmissible on phonetic grounds: another explanation connects it with *wa*ta "hidden", either from its hidden position, or from the inhabitants, as it is said, having hidden themselves in the bush during a raid from Pate. The town of Mvita is situated at the eastern end of the island and, being the terminus of the Uganda railway and the only port of the colony, is of considerable commercial importance.

The population, according to the latest information available, is something over 44,000, of whom 26,906 are classed as "Africans" (i.e. the permanent residents, mostly Swahili, and a floating contingent of labourers belonging to other tribes). The remainder includes 7,523 Arabs, 7,556 Indians, 1,000 Europeans, and a proportion of "other races". The Arabs, Swahili and many of the Indians are Moderns; the two former chiefly Sunni of the Şafī'i sect, though a few of the older men belong to the older schools. There are several mosques, very plain buildings, as a rule, and devoid of minarets; the *mu'allaq* stands on the flat roof to give the call to prayer. The largest and most imposing of these structures is that belonging to the Khódjas.

The origin of Mombasa is involved in some obscurity. It is certain that Arab trading stations existed on the East African coast at the beginning of the Christian era, and we learn from the *Périplu of the Erythraean Sea* that the traders frequently married native women. This indicates a fairly early origin for the Swahili race. The first permanent settlements, however, seem to have been post-Islamic: *69* (689) is given as the date for the settlement of Pate; and, as Lamu is said by native tradition to have been founded by colonists sent out by Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (A. D. 682-705), these two towns were no doubt contemporary.

There is no mention of Mombasa in the traditions of Lamu or Pate, at this period, except for a statement made to the late Captain Stigand (Laud of Zinj, p. 28), that "Abd al-Malik sent out Syrians, who built the cities of Pate, Malindi, Zanzibar, Mombasa, Lamu and Kilwa". Other authorities place the founding of Kilwa much later, viz. 365 (760). The *Chronicle of Kilwa* states that 'Ali b. Ḥasan of Ṣafīr, the founder and first *Ṣalāḥ*, installed one of his sons as ruler of Mombasa, no doubt the first of the "Ṣhirāz Shāhīhs", the last of whom was deposed by the Portuguese. It would appear that Mombasa was for some time under the suzerainty of Kilwa; but how far the "King of the Zanj" described by Idrisi and, later, by Ibn Ṣa'id as residing at Mombasa, was independent is not clear. The names of the twelve tribes (called indifferently *kabila* or *fā'il*ī) said by native authorities to make up the Swahili population indicate a composite origin and possibly a late one, as the bulk of the people came from settlements already founded. It is possible that the Wachangwane (who either take their name from the city or give theirs to it) go back to the alleged foundation under 'Abd al-Malik; but against this is the assertion, repeatedly made, that the Wachangwane, Wakiilinduni and Watangana are the *taifa* taking the "three" — i.e. the three aboriginal "tribes". Some native authorities give these three as "Kilindini", separate from Mombasa. Changamwe is a village on the mainland, a mile or two from the crossing at Makupa; Kilindini (now important as the principal harbour for steamers from Europe) is at the western end of the island. Tradition says that Kilindini was a city before Mombasa existed, and, in fact, the jungle near the present port contains numerous ruins of uncertain date, which, so far as I know, have not yet been competently examined. Tanganyika is on the island of Mombasa, now included in the town. The remaining tribes are those of Kilifi! (a town to the north of Mombasa; its inhabitants are said to have come from "Ṣhirāz", either Shiraz in Persia or a town of the same name in Tanganyika Territory, a colony from the original Shiraz, Pate, Paza (or Faza, in the island of Pate), Shaka (a Persian settlement near the mouth of the Tana), Mtswapa (between Mombasa and Takaungu), Omvia (on the creek known as Port Tudor), the Wagunya (the people on the mainland north of the Lamu archipelago) and the Wakatawa (the Somali). Another account omits this last name and substitutes that of the Wamalindi. Krapf (Dictionary, p. 246) mentions a tradition that the town was built (not on the present site but at the ancient Port) by one Shebe Mvita, whose tomb was pointed out to him; but it seems probable that this eponymus was invented to account for the name. When that of Mombasa was introduced we have no information, but it was used by the Arab geographers as far back as the sixteenth century. It is mentioned, as already stated, by Idrisi. Ibn Ṣa'id speaks of "a great estuary" to the west of Mombasa, by which must be meant the creek now known as Port Tudor", and says it is distant about one degree from Malindi. Ibn Batūta, who spent one night there, on his way to Kilwa, describes it as "a large island, two days' journey by sea from the Sawahil country. It possesses no territory on the mainland. They have fruit-trees on the island, but no cereals, which have to be brought to them from the Sawahil. Their food consists chiefly of bananas and fish. The inhabitants are pious, honourable and upright, and they have well-built wooden mosques". This would imply that the coast opposite Mombasa was not reckoned as part of the Sawahil. Present-day Swahilis restrict the term "Sawahil" to the strip of coast between Malindi and Lamu, which they look upon as the cradle of their race and this might be taken as intended by Ibn Batūta, but for his reference to cereals being brought from "Sawahil", which would place it in the south, since the drought laden with millet come up from that quarter with the S. W. monsoon (cf. Taylor, Aparisits, p. 128).

The first European to reach Mombasa was Vasco da Gama, who touched there, April 7, 1498, but did not land, owing to the real or suspected treachery of the Arab pilot sent by the Shaikh. He went on to the rival state of Malindi and established friendly relations with its ruler, who hoped to find in him an ally against Mombasa. Mombasa — after the city had been repeatedly destroyed, in whole or in part, by Almeida in 1505, by Nuno da Cunha in 1528 and by Continho in 1589 — was rendered tributary to the Portuguese in or about 1590, after the adventurer Mir 'Ali Bey had induced the Shaikh to tender his allegiance to the Turkish Sultan and had been

---
1) In these names of places, I omit the *wa* which is the prefix indicating plurality of persons.
driven off by Continho’s fleet. At the same time occurred the invasion of the Zimbans, an unidentified tribe who had spread desolation on their march north-eastward, “probably from some locality on or near the West coast” (cf. Thel., l. 352). From Mombasa they passed on to Malindi, where the Portuguese garrison, with the help of native allies, effectually resisted them, and, if not exterminated, they ceased to exist as a tribe. The fort, still in existence, was erected between 1593 and 1595, and Mombasa was held by the Portuguese for some sixty years. The last Shīratā Shaikh, Shaho Mshaham b. Hisham, was deposed and the Shaikh of Malindi, Ahmad, installed in his stead with the title of Sultan. Immigration from Portugal was encouraged, but in 1615 the settlers, apart from the garrison, only numbered 50 (cf. Strandes, p. 175). In 1605, a convent of Augustinian monks was founded, which, with other ecclesiastical establishments, was under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa till 1612. In that year a separate diocese of Mozambique was created. Shaikh Ahmad died in 1609 and was succeeded by his son Hasan, whose treatment by the Portuguese authorities ranks among the scandals of Colonial history. He was finally murdered, at the instigation of the governor, De Mello Pereira (1615). His son, Yusuf, aged seven, was sent to Goa to be educated and there baptised by the name of Geronimo Chingulula. After an inquiry held at Lisbon in 1618, the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in Portugal pronounced Hasan innocent and decreed that Yusuf should be restored to his inheritance. In 1630 he was sent home and installed as Sultan, continued for a time to profess Christianity, but, being accused of apostasy because he had been seen praying at his father’s tomb and apprehensive of being sent to Goa (the seat of the Inquisition), revolted, openly declared himself a Moslem and massacred all the Portuguese in Mombasa (cf. Faria y Sousa, vol. iii., iv., p. 391). His example was followed by Tanga, Mtangata and some other towns (1651). Mombasa was besieged for three months by F. de Mowra, with a fleet from Goa, but without success. Yusuf, however, probably seeing that he would be unable to hold out permanently, retreated to Arabia after dispersing the fort and de-straying the town. The new governor, Seixas de Cabreira, subdued the revolted towns and repaired the fort, as recorded in the inscription still legible above the gateway. The Portuguese rule becoming more and more oppressive, the Coast Arabs appealed in or about 1660 to Sultan b. Seif al-Yarabbi, Imam of Omnân, who had already expelled the Portuguese from Maskat. He took Mombasa after a long siege and various operations: and though it was retaken shortly afterwards, the power of Portugal was already on the wane, and Seif b. Sultan again captured Mombasa in 1668 and in-talled Nasyr b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Mazrù as governor. Internal quarrels and a revolt against this governor laid the town open to a last Portuguese attack in 1728, when Luis de Mello Sampayo, sent to Zanzibar with the help of Bwana Tum Tum (Abu Râki b. Muhammad), Sultan of Pate. This occupation lasted but a short time and was terminated by another massacre, probably that commemorated in the tradition recorded by Taylor (Alphonius, § 401).

A period of anarchy ensued, which became so intolerable that not only the “Twelve Tribes” of Mombasa but the chiefs of the pagan Wanyika on the mainland, appealed to Seif b. Sultan for help. He sent three ships and appointed a governor.

In 1739 this office was held by Muhammad b. Othman al-Mazrù, the first of a line who became practically independent rulers of Mombasa. When the Ya’arabbi Imams were ousted by the Al Bit Saldi, the Mazrù refused to recognise the new dynasty. They were left undisturbed for a considerable time, but the more energetic policy pursued by Seif b. Sultan (1801—1846) induced them to seek British protection in 1823. This was provisionally granted by Captain Owen, but withdrawn three years later, as the Home government refused to sanction it. Saldi finally gained possession of Mombasa in 1837, when the leading Mazrù were captured by treachery and deported to Bander ‘Abbad. From that time till the establishment of the British protectorate in 1890, Mombasa remained subject to the Saliyid (now called Sultan) of Zanzibar, who indeed retains a certain jurisdiction over the ten-mile strip of coast leased from him by the British East Africa Company in 1887. The principal event in its history since that date is the rising of the Mazrù in 1895, coincident with, but not caused by the proclamation of the British protectorate over the mainland territory, which was taken over from the Company by the Imperial Government. Since then the completion of the Uganda Railway and the harbour works al-Kilindini have noticeably changed the character of Mombasa, which is now a flourishing seaport, much frequented by European shipping.

The dialect of Swahili spoken at Mombasa was considered by the late W. E. Taylor “the truly central” language, “the best fitted for accurate statement and grave discussion”; though that of Zanzibar has now attained a wider currency. The art of poetry was, till recently, much cultivated there: the best known of the native poets being Muyaka b. Mwinyi Haji Muulama Skeina (died 1891), and Hemedi b Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Mombassì, who was still living during the last decade of the 19th century (since deceased), Muhammad b. Ahmad, ‘Abd Allah Borashidi, Mwinyi Mugwama.

MONASTIR (pronounced Monstir, Mastir; ethnic Moustul), a town in the Sëhel, the eastern coast of Tunisia, on the site of the ancient Ruspina at the end of a cape which runs out to the south-east of Sësa. The Arabic name raises a problem which is not yet solved. The name clearly conceals the Greek word monastirion which suggests that there was an important Christian monastery here at one time. This is however a pure hypothesis, supported by no text, although Tissot (Geographie compare de la province d’Afrique, ii. 165—166) seems to take it for granted. It is on the other hand also possible that the Arab Monastir from the end of the eighth century was a great Muslim monastery and probably the first to be founded in the west, it is tempting to accept the explanation (suggested by St. Hasan ‘Abd al-Wahhâb) that the name was given to the Muslim foundation by the Greeks of the country or Berbers speaking Greek, still Christians or recently converted to Islam.

It was in 180 (796) that Harîshama b. A’ïya, who ruled the province of Irfîqîya in the name of the Abbasid caliph Hârûn al-Rashîd, founded the ribât of Monastir. This fortified monastery obtained considerable importance in Western Islam. A century after its foundation, ka’dîs were quoted which proclaimed its great importance and promised the highest rewards to those who came there to fight the infidel or to prepare themselves for the holy war. The Prophet foreseeing the foundation of al-Monastir is said to have said: “On the coast of Irfîqîya, there is one of the gates of Paradise which is called al-Monastir; one enters it by the grace of God’s mercy and leaves it by the effect of his pardon”; or again: “He who keeps watch in the frontier town of al-Monastir for three days has the right to Paradise” (cf Abu l’Arab, Clases des scvants de l’Ifriqya, transl Ben Cheneb, s. 7, 9, 14, 15; Ibn ‘Idhâr, Bayân, transl. Fagoun, i. 1). In the 10th century al-Bakri gives a description of Monastir, “the substance of which is taken from al-Warrak” (t. 991), which is not quite clear to us. It is a large fortress (kârâk) he says, which contains a quarter (rabûh) of considerable size. In the middle of this quarter stands a citadel (kâmil) which contains suites of rooms, oratories and castles (kizâb) of several stories. To the south of this citadel is a great court (shem) with kalâbas, called kîshâ sâmil, around which women who wish to devote themselves to religion come to live. It seems that the fortresses was the town itself with its ramparts, still known by the name, common in Tunisia, of bled. Outside the bled is the quarter also encircled by ramparts and turrets in which we have the ribât. This occupies the north-east angle of this “fortress”; its walls and high tower called nîdâm dominate with their proud silhouette the shore and the country round. To the south is a courtyard with tombs; here no doubt we have to locate the abodes of the pious women mentioned by al-Warrak. The interior of the ribât shows traces of frequent attention and repairs which makes its plan singularly complicated. We can however perhaps recognise the general arrangements of which the ribât of Sësa, founded twenty-five years later, gives us a clearer scheme on a smaller scale: a central rectangular court surrounded by two storeys of cells. On the first floor on the south side, the cells are replaced by a hall for prayer of no great height, very simple with cradle vaulting. It is probably the same as is mentioned by al-Bakri: “On the first storey is a mosque where there is always a shibîb of great virtue and merit, who has the direction of the community.” The signal tower, circular in plan, occupies almost the same position as that which dominates the ribât of Sësa. In addition to the dwellings of the marabouts there are reservoirs, baths and “Persian mills” in the monastery. Every year a great fair was held at Monastir on the Ashura day when the pious began their temporary withdrawals from the world. Some however, shut themselves up for life and devoted themselves entirely to prayer and the defence of the lands of Islam. The people of Kairawan supplied them with provisions, in itself a pious work.

The ninth century was undoubtedly the golden age of the ribât of Monastir. Its importance however must have diminished somewhat as a result of the foundation in 821 of the ribât of Sësa, which was the starting point for the expedition to Sicily. Al-Bakri would regard the ribât of Monastir as a dependency on that of Sësa. It was nevertheless, as well as the land around it, an auspicious place. We can date to about 1000 A.D. the building of the Great Mosque, close to the ribât, and that of the little mosque of the Sâyida, both of which have preserved mîhrâbs of a very curious transitional style. It is probable that the Lady’s tomb has given its name to the central mosque. The Sâyida was a princess of the family of the Zirids of Kairawan. Monastir was, especially after the Hildâ invasion (middle of the 12th century), the St. Denis of the Sanhâda rulers. According to al-Idrisî (13th century), the dead were brought there by boat (the roads were by no means safe at this time) from the town of Mahdiya. The tombs of this period are numerous in the cemetery in which the patron saint of Monastir, Stûl al-Mûzârî, is buried.

Although Monastir did not play a great part in history after this period, the town and the ribât continued to be an object of care to various Tunisian dynasties. From the Hâfîsî al-Mustanîr (1260) date the two gates of the bled: Bâb al-Darb and Bâb al-Sûr. As to the ribât, one of the gates was rebuilt by the Hâfîsî Abu Fâris in 828 (1424); another dates from 1058 (1648) and is the work of the Turks.

Monastir is at the present day a town of some 7,000 inhabitants. Three little islands, one of which contains a number of puzzling artificial caves, shelter the roadstead outside, which is frequented by a considerable number of ships at the tunny and sardine fishing season.

II. Montenegro

Turk. Kara Dagh, Serbo-Croat. Crna Gora) is in its heart a steep rocky citadel, the interior of which is difficult of passage and much cut up orographically and hydrographically; it has only a gateway in the south from Lake Scutari and in the north from the Herzegovina; these two gateways are connected by a corridor, the valley of the Zeta. This route, which, as the main line of communication, has been the scene of fierce fighting between the natives and invaders, and is also the dividing line between western and eastern Montenegro or Crna Gora in the narrow sense, the oldest part of the modern state on the one hand and the eastern districts called Brda on the other, is formed by the undulating plain of Zeta on the lower course of the Morača, which flows into Lake Scutari, by its right tributary the Zeta, the large but little fertile basin of the Niskiç and the depression of the Đupa passes. Crna Gora and an adjoining strip of the Brda running north and south belong to the most desolate and poorest parts of the Dinaric or Illyrian limestone region which runs along the Adriatic, the forests of which, still existing down to modern times, have been sacrificed to get pasture land, lime, charcoal and tar, etc. Patsch, *Historische Wanderungen im Kärnten und an der Adria* (1, Vienna 1922, p. 28) and others, with a poor water supply, have only a little arable land in little hollows and cups on their cold rocky hillside. We also have the few little villages and towns of which Cetinje at the eastern foot of the Lovčen (7,570 feet) with 5,473 inhabitants is the largest. It is not till we come east of the Brda to the valleys of the Piva and Tara with their deep ravines, which join to form the Drina on the northern frontier, and on the Lim, around the massif of the Durmitor (7,200 feet) and Kom (8,000 feet), where the soil is of gravel, that we have favourable conditions for a regular water supply. Extensive forests of pine and other woods, rich meadows which enable cattle to be reared in large numbers; in many places in this region bread is dearer than meat. A very small fruit-growing region is the alluvial plain of Crnica, the "garden of Montenegro" which lies among the karstic uplands of Lake Scutari, which is full of fish, with a Mediterranean climate and vegetation, which is also found in the narrow strip of land along the Krst river Crnovečka Rijeka, to the north.

1. The oldest known inhabitants of the country were the Illyrian tribes of the Dréatos and Labiastes, of whom the former lived in the wilds of Montenegro and the latter in the Mediterranean area around Lake Scutari down to the coast. After the destruction by the Illyrian kingdom of the Ardiae whose last capital was Scutari, to which they, along with the Herzegovina, Southern Dalmatia and Northern Albania, had belonged, they came under the rule of the Romans and later formed part of the province of Dalmatia. In the first century B.C. we find the two tribal areas replaced each by a town organised on Roman lines, with the old tribal territories attached to them, but still defined: Dolecia, at the corner formed by the junction of the Morača and Zeta, and Scodra, now Scutari, which later, in the division of Dalmatia under Diocletian, became the capital of the *provincia Preradotiana* or *Preratiana* and has maintained a dominating position almost down to the present time [cf Scutari]. Dolecia, on the other hand, is representative for Montenegro of the economic and cultural decline of south-west Europe since ancient times. In spite of the step-motherly nature of the country, we know from the ruins of public and private buildings bleaching in the miserable desert of the Karst and from epigraphic evidence that it was once a prosperous city with considerable trade with the interior across Lake Scutari and along the Boyana which flows out of it (Patsch, in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyklopädie der Klass. Altertumswissenschaft, v. 1881, p. 399). It suffered severely in 395 when the Balkans suffered so much at the hand of the Teutons at the time of the migration of the Visigoths, but in spite of the plundering of the Adriatic territory which followed at other hands also, it was still the see of a bishop in 602, in the period when the towns of the peninsula were finally destroyed as a result of the raids of the Avars and Slavs and the permanent settlement of the latter, who having no understanding of town life, retained in their new homes their traditional poor and primitive mode of life, for the most part in family groups settled on the land and mainly engaged in cattle-rearing.

II. Its situation and tradition. Many place-names, remnants of the old population and the city walls, now much decayed, preserved, for the ruined town of Dolecia which hitherto had held the position later occupied by Montenegro, its old ecclesiastical position — there is a record of a bishopric of Dolecia subordinate to the Greek metropolis of Durazzo — and seem also to have given it a military and political preponderance, since the little Slav state which later grew up here bore after it the name of Dolecia, Slav Dobrička down to the 16th century. This originally comprised only southern Montenegro and the stretch of territory called Kravina along the west bank of the Lake Scutari. The Bitorif, itself wholly Cattaro-Budima, Antivari and Dulcigno) and Northern Albania, with many Roman towns like Skutari and Drivasto, remained Byzantine on the contrary, as part of the theme (province) of Dyrrachion down to the 10th century, while eastern and northern Montenegro belonged to Serbia and the north-west to the principality of Travunia (capital Trebinić).

Of the early obscure pre-history of Dolicia all that we have is a Byzantine seal of a ruler of probably the tenth century: ΠΡΩΤΟΙ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΙ ΑΛΜΑΤΩΝ [4]; the country was then not only ecclesiastically and culturally but also politically under Greek influence like the other Slav Adriaic states. From 1000 A.D. our information is fuller, if not absolutely reliable.
Prince John Vladimir, a figure much obscured by legend, is inextricably associated with the last efforts of the Western Bulgar state. First a prisoner, then the son-in-law of the Czar Samuel (d. 1014), he was murdered (drowned in Lake Prespa) by the last Czar John Vladaslav (1015-1018) in the Bulgar capital. Remembered in Montenegro as a saint by Christians and Muslims alike, he now rests in the monastery of Shen Jon near Elbassan in Central Albania.

In the years that followed, Byzantium, after the Bulgars, its opponents for centuries, had been finally disposed of by the Emperor Basil II (1025)-1085), the Bulgars being again in possession of the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula, enforced its suzerainty to the northwest also. Dioclia under three able rulers not only survived this danger but attained an importance never reached by Montenegro itself in its best days. Prince Stephan Vuyislav — it is not known in what relationship he stood to John Vladimir — in spite of great opposition from the Byzantines (1036-1042) obtained Travunia (see above), Zachlumia adjoining it (on the central and lower Narenta), almost the whole Adriatic coast between the Narenta and Boyana along with Cattaro and Antivari as well as Northern Albania with Skutari and established the still existing Latin bishopric in Antivari, out of political hostility to Byzantium. His son Michael was the first to take the title of king; the choice of his son Constantine Bodin as Bulgar Czar by rebels in Macedonia (1072) ended however in a — temporary — humiliation of Dioclia. Michael and Bodin, who succeeded his father presumably in 1082, made an alliance with the Normans in Italy and supported Robert Guiscard in his fighting in the west of the Balkan peninsula (1081-1085) with Alexius I Comnenus. Bodin succeeded at the same time in extending his rule over Bosnia also (then practically only the territory on the lower course of the Bosna, the Vrhas and the Narenta) and Serbia or Rassia (in the modern north and eastern Montenegro, the sangjak of Novi Pazar, S. W. Serbia and S. E. Bosnia). The kingdom of Bodin had attained its greatest extent with the conquests of Stephan Vuyislav — but only for a brief period. Bodin's good fortune faded away. After the restoration of Byzantine rule on the Adriatic, reprisals were begun (1085-1094) under the personal direction of the emperor Alexius. The king was defeated; the links that bound the various parts of his kingdom together were loosened and quarrels broke out within the royal family itself. In 1096 Bodin could still receive Crusaders in his capital Skutari: Provencals under Raymond of Toulouse, who had marched through Dalmatia and probably through the Zeta valley (cf. above) and were making for Durazzo in order to reach Constantinople from there by the old Via Egnatia. After this we have no certain information about him and his successors. All that is certain is that Dioclia was driven from the coast and out of Northern Albania by the Byzantines and became tributary to them, while Serbia, which had hitherto been politically insignificant in comparison, began to expand at the expense of Dioclia under the Grand Župan Vilkan, Bodin's governor, and his successors, especially after the Byzantine empire fell steadily into decline from 1180 onwards. The Grand Župan Stephan Nemanya, a native of Dioclia, deprived it of the former possessions of Dioclia in Northern Albania and on the coast from the eastern shore of Lake Skutari to Cattaro, disposed of the last Dociolan prince Michael in 1189, and united his territory with Serbia. From the xiii century the old name of the country was replaced by that of the river Zeta (Latin: Zenta, Genta).

III. Under Nemanya's dynasty Zeta (with Northern Albania and the coast) remained for 170 years under Serbia and was frequently governed by princes, repeatedly by heirs to the throne. Widows of kings also had estates on this sunny strip of coast. A benefactress of the land as a builder was Helena (d. 1314), the French wife of Stephan Loj II (1304-1371), who had the town of Lake Skutari restored, which had suffered severely from the Mongol storm which in 1242 had swept southwards along the Adriatic, and built and repaired numerous churches and monasteries in the predominantly Roman Catholic territory around the Lake and on the coast which was under the bishops of Anti- vari and numerous suffragan bishops, including also the great Benedictine Abbey of S. Sergioius and Bacchus on the Boyana (now the ruins of Kisha e Shiritji), at which there was an important trading centre with much visited animal markets. St. Sava (d. 1236) created an Eastern Greek bishopric for the Zeta on the island of Prvekla on the Gulf of Cattaro; the land also had many well-endowed monasteries of this creed on the islands in the Lake Skutari (like Vranjina), and what fertile soil existed elsewhere belonged for the most part to monasteries in Serbia, on Athos and in Jerusalem, granted by the, in this respect, extravagant Serbian ruler. The population received a considerable admixture, now completely absorbed, by the immigration of Wallachians and Albanians.

A grave danger to Serbia was the power of the nobles, which had increased out of all proportion as a result of the constant feuds in the royal family. When after the death of the Czar Stephan Dušan (d. 1355) a general collapse of the great but only loosely knit state began, the centrifugal forces led in Zeta also (1360) to the formation once more of an independent principality by the brothers Štefan, George and Balsa, sons of Balsa, a nobleman of Wallachian origin, to whom the government of the country was entrusted.

IV. The break-up of Serbia took place just at the time when the Ottomans were vigorously extending their power in the Balkan peninsula. Their victories at Crim on the Marica (1371) and at Kosovo ("field of the blackbird", 1389) destroyed the independence of the petty Serbian states in Macedonia and reduced Serbia itself to the district of the Morava, where it however not only maintained itself till 1459 but, as a result of the Turkish defeat at the hands of the Mongols at Angora (1402), was able for a time to rise to considerable power again. In spite of the danger which threatened Zeta also, George and Balsa exhausted their strength in continual feuds with their neighbours over pieces of land, and in the reign of George II the turbulent nobles, among whom the most prominent were the Crnovjević and Gyurašević between Budna, Cattaro and the lower Morava, broke the kingdom up into little baronies. The result was that when the Ottomans under Khai al-Din entered Albania from Macedonia, Balsa in 1385 lost a battle and his life north of Valona, and George II after fighting with varying
fortune, realising his own weakness, handed over his Albanian possessions in the south and east of Lake Skutari as far as Tuzi (S. E. of Podgorica) for an annual pension of 1,000 ducats (1396) to Venice, who thus became till 1479 the southern defender of Zeta against the Ottomans. George retained Duleigno, Antivari and Budna for himself as well as the lands west and north of Lake Skutari.
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But even this reduced territory found no peace. Under Balsa II, the last of his warlike but unimportant house, two long and trying wars with Venice were fought: during the second, the prince died (1421) and left his lands to the despot (Duke) of Serbia, Stephan Lazarević, who lost Duleigno to the republic.

V. The second period of Serbian rule very soon alienated the sympathy with which it was at first received and had to fight increasing difficulties caused by the influential Crnojević (see above). In addition there was an invasion by the Turks in 1430 and the demands of Venice. The latter took Antivari and Budna and appointed the warlord Stephan Crnojević its salaried governor in the little mountain country now quite cut off from the coast; he (1455) induced the people to take the oath of fealty to the republic in the island monastery of Vranjina (cf. above). The end of Serbia (1459) seemed to secure Venice complete possession of the lands round Lake Skutari, but soon afterwards the Ottomans surrounded this land on all sides, for the conquest of Bosnia (1463) was followed (1466) by the annexation of the Herzegovina and of the present Northern Montenegro as far as Nikšić, which then belonged to it.

Like Stephan Crnojević (d. 1465) his son Ivan (1465-1490) who called himself Gospodar Zetki (lord of Zeta), was also a vassal of Venice, who gave him so little support in the wars with Muhammad II over Upper Albania that, after the evacuation of Skutari (1479), he had to fly to Italy, and Zeta was occupied by the Turks, which was the beginning of their long rule here. The contest for the throne after the Sultan's death (1481) induced Ivan to return and renew the struggle, which however ended in 1482 with the recognition of Turkish suzerainty. His youngest son Stanislav, a hostage in Constantinople, adopted Islam in 1485, and took the name Skender Beg. Ivan, also called Ivan Beg — his country was also known as Ivanbegovina — resided in Cetinje where he built a small monastery in 1484—1485, to which the Eastern Greek bishop of Zeta (see above) moved. The state suffered from the great independence of the tribes, who bad strong separatist tendencies, like the Nyegusi, Bilejice, Ozmice, and Ceklević; each formed a political entity with a well-defined territory, its own chief chosen for life courts, tribal and family feuds, blood-revenge, etc., institutions which survived in Montenegro down to the sixteenth century and existed in the north Albanian highlands until quite recently.

Not even the greatest submissiveness earned for Ivan's elder sons, at constant enmity with one another, the goodwill of the Turks. George (1490—1496) who introduced the printing-press into Cetinje and in 1493-95 printed beautiful Cyrillic ecclesiastical works, died in Ansa Minor in exile. Stephan (1496—1499) was interned in Skutari, where he is said to have ended his days as a monk. On the other hand in 1514, a separate sandjak with capital Zabljak (to the north of Lake Skutari), was created for the Muslim Stanislav Skender Beg Crnojević out of Zeta, which had been incorporated in the sandjak of Skutari. The latter did not deny his descent; he was also tolerant in matters of religion, used his Slav mother-tongue in his correspondence and was in regular communication with Venice, although their relations were occasionally overclouded; in Venice Božidar Vuković of Podgorica (d. 1540) and others from 1519 printed Cyrillic ecclesiastical works. Skender Beg's title Sandžak Crnogradski naturalized the name Crna Gora for the country, which we find as early as 1435 and as Montenegro in 1496 for the highlands above Cattaro. In 1528 all notices of this remarkable Montenegrin-Turkish ruler cease. Crne Gora again becomes a kâdîlik of the sandjak of Skutari.

Montenegro under Turkey, under the unassuming ecclesiastical suzerainty of the bishop or Vladika of Cetinje chosen by the tribal chiefs, formed five mahāiyas or districts in the shape of a small triangle between Cattaro, Podgorica and the N.W. end of Lake Skutari, which in 1614 contained 90 villages with 3,524 houses and 8,027 men capable of bearing arms, of whom however only 1,000 had guns. The poll-tax was readily paid and they shared in the wars of the Porte against Venice and in suppressing rebellions in the adjoining lands, such as the closely related Brda, which had much more desire for independence. This long stereotyped monotonous did not change till 1688 when the Montenegrins with the Vladika Vizarić placed themselves under the protection of Venice, whose lands marched with those of the Turks, and who since the failure of the siege of Venice had been fighting with the Turks from 1684 to the peace of Carlowitz (1699). After the failure of his first attacks Sulimânm Pasha, Sandjak of Skutari, as a punishment destroyed Cetinje in 1692 with the support of a number of Montenegrin tribes.

VI. The process of liberation thus begun found vigorous support in the warlike Vladika Danilo Petrović Nyeguti (1697—1755) 1) after whom the dignity of bishop became hereditary in the family, and his holder gradually increased his importance at the expense of the tribal chiefs. In 1711 an embassy from Peter the Great introduced relations with Russia, which however were only occasional of benefit to the land. Even in the great war on the Porte which immediately followed, Montenegro was left in the lurch at the peace of the Pruth (1711). The protection which fugitive Montenegrins found in Dalmatia was used in 1714 as a pretext by Turkey for declaring war on Venice. In the same year Sulimânm Pasha Koprušić laid waste Montenegro entirely, Cetinje which had been rebuilt in 1704 being once more destroyed. As a result of the peace of Passarowitz (1718) more peaceful conditions

1) The story that all Muhammadans in Montenegro who would not be baptized or leave the country were put to death as partisans of Turkey on Christmas Eve 1707 is however a patriotic fable.
began to prevail except for the almost daily guerilla fighting on the frontiers. Danilo took advantage of the peace to build up the country again after the overthrow of the Turkish administration, with the help of Venetian subsidies, so far as the poverty and the intractable nature of the people permitted. In 1724 Cetinje was rebuilt.

Under his incapable successor Sava Petrović Nyegits (1735—1782), there was a complete relapse into the previous barbarism: no authority, clan and blood feuds, murders. No one dared to leave his house unarmed. The whole people lived by murder and robbery. In addition there were several conspiracies with the Turks against their own countrymen, abject appeals to Venice and journeys of appeal to St. Petersburg, notably that of the able but powerless episcopal coadjutor Vasilije (d. 1766).

In the general distress the Vladika only thought of enriching himself. Some relief was afforded Montenegro in 1767 by the south Slav Štefan Mali (Little Stephen), the Lažni (false) Czar, who was accepted as the Czar Peter III murdered in 1762, and received such general recognition, out of respect for Russia, that in spite of his unmasking by the mission of prince Yuri Vojodinovsic Dolgorukiy (1769), he was tolerated by Russia also until he was murdered by a servant in 1773.

Able, unselfish, strict and just, he restored for a time unwonted order and security.

There was no considerable war with Turkey for a long period. All the more serious then were the relations with the suzerain in the reign of Peter I the Saint (1782–1830). The hereditary waizar of Skutari, Kara Mahmud Pasha Bushati, taking advantage of tribal feuds, laid waste the whole country in 1785, forced it to pay the poll-tax again and burned down Cetinje. During the Austro-Russian-Turkish war of 1787–1792, there were only trifling encounters, for which in 1795 Kara Mahmud Pasha again threatened serious reprisals. He was however at Slatina and later killed in the great battle of Kruše; his head was long preserved as a trophy in Cetinje, in keeping with the Montenegrin head-hunting custom which had become a regular practice in war. The consequence was that the tribes of Biyelopavlići and Pupeti, in the Bria east of the Zeta valley, joined Montenegro.

A welcome and more profitable change were the wars of 1806—1808 and 1813—1814 in alliance first with the inhabitants of the Bocce di Cattaro and the Russians, later with the English against the French, who had occupied Dalmatia under General Marmont after the peace of Pressburg (1805). Numerous ruins stretching as far as Ragusa still testify to the horror of the Montenegrins for destruction and plunder even on Christian soil.

Peter I, a cultured ecclesiastic educated in Russia, full of good intentions, endeavoured throughout his life by legislation (1798 and 1803) and personal effort to unite his people, raise their moral tone and avert distress by introducing the potato, but in spite of great patience he met with bitter hostility, contributed to also by Russia which, only after being appealed to for a long time, in 1799 granted 1,000 ducats a year for public purposes but did not pay it regularly.

The first ruler over the Montenegrins, Gospodar Crnogorski i Brdasi, was Peter II (1830—51), a highly gifted man of the world, bishop only in name, one of the greatest of Serbian poets and also of unbending vigour which did not hesitate at severe punishments and death sentences. The Radonjić family which claimed secular (governor) power for itself had to leave the country. Supported by Russia from 1837 by a grant of 9,000 ducats yearly and occasional gifts of grain, and on this account more highly esteemed by his coveted countrymen, he concentrated the government in his own hands. The powers of the tribal chiefs were restricted. A senate of 12 regularly paid members under the presidency of the Vladika henceforth formed the supreme governing body and court of justice: its authority was enforced by well-paid troops stationed throughout the country, the Guardia, in addition to whom the head of the state had a bodyguard, Peryanici. The building of the first public school and a small state printing-press in the capital, the purchase of two cannons and the building of a powder mill, show the small scale of the state but mark the desire for progress. The innovations, and still more poverty and a great increase of population, as in earlier times led to the emigration of numerous families to Serbia and Russia.

Foreign politics were mainly characterised by troubles on the Austrian frontier, continual fighting, celebrated in song, with the neighbouring Muhammadans, especially in the Herzegovina, which was then ruled by Ali Pacha Kozanbegovic (d. 1851) as a practically independent sovereign, under whom Smail Aga Čengić (d. 1840) distinguished himself in the fighting.

VII. Centralisation and reforms generally formed the programme of the next two reigns, which was firmly and successfully carried through in spite of much opposition. Under Danilo II (1852—60) the clan system was dealt a shattering blow, when the chiefs were replaced by captains of princely birth and legislation regulated by the code of 1855. His accession however marks the close of a period as much as its beginning as a hereditary secular power now replaced a theocracy. Danilo renounced his spiritual rank and with the approval of Russia and Austria had himself proclaimed Kuyaz i Gospodar Crne Gore i Brdasi. The attempt of the Porte to obtain by force under Serdar Ekrem 'Omar Pasha in 1852—1853 recognition of her suzerainty thus threatened was vigorously opposed by Austria after giving ample assistance in 1853 through Feldmarschallleutnant Count Leiningen's mission to Constantinople. During the Crimean War (1853—1856) Danilo remained neutral. On the other hand, he became involved in a war in 1858 because he supported the rebels in the Herzegovina; this ended in the defeat of the Turks in the valley of Grahovo (north of Risano) and in an enlargement of Montenegrin territory in 1859. In 1860 the ruler, who had previously had to put down conspiracies, some led by relatives, was murdered in Cattaro by a Montenegrin emigrant.

His able nephew Nicola I (1860—1918, d. March 1, 1921) who had been educated in Trieste and in France, son of the doughty Woiwo Mirkos (d. 1867), completed the building of the state. By long steady work, first as an absolute and from 1905 as a constitutional ruler, and by very skilfully managing foreign relations, he created out of the ill-famed, unfertile, rocky little country a kingdom which was enlarged by the addition
of fertile valleys with its own sea coast, good communications and post routes, a busy economic life, modest prosperity increased by emigration to America, more law abiding and secure since the institution of the civil code of 1888, with a good system of education and a well organised soldiery with modern equipment to be reckoned with in Balkan questions. Relationship by marriage, notably with the Austrians, gave increased glory to the pretty little capital of Cetinje which had also become a centre of culture; 1910 crowned the work by raising Montenegro to a kingdom.

While interested great powers, notably Russia, gave grants of money, arms, munitions, etc., which were readily accepted and also requested, this development was conducted mainly at the expense of Turkey, with whom three wars were waged at longer intervals in addition to minor friction in 1869-1870, 1872, 1874-1875, 1895, 1896, 1911, 1912. The first (1862), a combined attack by Derwish Pasha from the north and Serdar Ekrem Omar Pasha from the south in the Zeta valley as a reprisal for the support given to the rising led by Luka Vukalov in the eastern Herzegovina, forced Nikola by the threat to Cetinje to conclude an unsuccessful peace in Skutari. The second war was declared in 1876 by Montenegro in alliance with Serbia because of the refusal of the newly recognised Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovaks to recognize the Montenegrin independence. The Treaty of Sarajevo (July 13, 1876, Articles 26-33) recognised the independence of Montenegro and granted it, after cutting down very much the terms of the preliminary peace of San Stefano, a broad ring of land around the original land of Montenegro with Antivi, Nikola, Banyani, Piva, Kolasina, Spuz, Podgorica, Zabljak and the district of Gusine. The latter, as a result of the opposition of the Albanians, was exchanged for Dulecino in 1880. The area was increased from 4,366 to 9,050 square kilometres with over 200,000 inhabitants, including 12,500 Catholic Albanians; there was on the other hand a considerable emigration of Muslims from the new territories.

The third war with Turkey was the first Balkan War, which Montenegro began on Oct. 8, 1912, before its allies, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece; but while the sandjak of Novi Pazar and Upper Albania were easily occupied, Skutari, the main objective, was only taken after a long siege and with the help of treachery on April 23, 1913. After the allies had quarrelled among themselves, Montenegro also took part in the second Balkan War against Bulgaria. By the peace of Bucharest (Aug. 10, 1913) it received the south-western half of the sandjak of Novi Pazar (with Pijevica, Bijela Polje and Brane), the greater part of the Metohia plain (with Peć and (Jakovica), the valley of Gusine and lands round Lake Skutari, increasing its area by 5,937 square kilometres to 15,017 square kilometres, with 437,000 inhabitants.

In the Great War, king Nikola reluctantly declared war on Austria-Hungary on Aug. 5, 1914. After the capture of the Lovćen (see above) the Montenegrins laid down their arms unconditionally on Jan. 16, 1916 and the country, which had gone back a great deal since 1912, was administered by an Austrian military general-government. The king went first to Italy, then to France, never to return again, for after the War he was deposed along with his sons on Nov. 29, 1918 by an assembly in Podgorica on the charge of treachery.
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(C. PATSCH)


The name Moors has also been given to the Arab or Berber peoples, pure or mixed with negro blood, who live to the north in the Senegal in the province to which the French now give the name Mauritanie (see below), and to the offspring of the marriages of Arabs from South Arabia and Cingalese who form an important Moslem colony in Ceylon (c. 200,000).

(E. LEVY-PROVENCAL)

The land of the Moors is Mauritania or Mauretania. This name which has been derived either from a Phoenician word MAHARIM “the western”, or with more probability from the name of a tribe living before the Christian era in North Africa, was applied in ancient times to northern Morocco (Mauretania Tingitana) and to the north-west of Algeria (Caesarea Mauretania). At a later date, by bending the application, Europeans have given the general name of Moors to the Arabo-Berber peoples of Mediterranean and Saharan Africa. Then gradually they came to distinguish out of this mass the groups with which they came more frequently into contact (Tripolitans, Tunisians, Algerians, Moroccans), so that the name Moors came to be limited to the people of Spanish (Moslem), Jewish or Turkish origin of North Africa and particularly to the nomads of the western Sahara, who traverse what Ahmad al-Shinkiti (in al-Wasit, Cairo 1329 A.H.) calls the “Land of Shinkiti”, from the name of its chief villages, this country is bounded, says the author, by the Atlantic Ocean, the valley of the Sankat al-Hamet, the plain of Ibn Háiba (plain of the Bráka) on the right bank of the Senegal and by the two towns of Walata and Na’ma (Nema); if, like him, we take into account all inhabited areas, we ought to extend it to the east as far as the meridian of Timbuktu.

Mauritania, which now forms one of the eight colonies of French West Africa, is only a part of this vast area. It lies to the north of the Senegal between this river, the Atlantic Ocean and the margin of Karakoro; to the north and east, a frontier settled by agreements separates it from the Spanish Sahara (June 27, 1906; Oct. 3, 1904; Nov. 27, 1912) and from the territories of the south of Algeria (agreement of June 7, 1905) and was annexed to the French Sudan (Decree of 23d April, 1913). It has an area of 835,000 square kilometres, 289,000 inhabitants, the density of population being 0.34.

Except for the banks of the Senegal, the country is steppe or desert, and only suitable for stock rearing. To be brief, it is a military frontier district defending on the north the more favoured lands of the Senegal rather than a country suitable for development by colonisation.

I. GEOGRAPHY.

A semi-circular range of hills of no great height, worn by erosion but often difficult of access, starts as it were, out of the ocean to the south of the Rio de Oro and reaches the middle course of the Senegal after running round the contours of an ancient gulf of the quaternary period. The Adrar Tamir and the Tagant separated by the depression of the Khat form as it were the cornerstones of this system and are continued to the north-west in the “petrified sea” (a plain scattered over with rocky islets) of the Tiris and by the arêtes of the Adrar Suuf, to the south by the Rigaiba and Asaba.

The interior of this gulf consists almost entirely of sands, brought from the desert by the predominating north-east winds. The dunes in the south are all fixed and are called “dead”; in the north they are “alive” and constantly changing. Like the other dunes of the western Sahara, they run in the direction of the wind, N.E.—S.W., and are separated from one another by contours of firmer soil along which traffic can go.

The Shamamah is a plain, formed of lands of alluvial origin, along the lower Senegal and as such particularly suitable for cultivation; as we go up the river it is known as Litama and then as Gidinaka. Other plains, those of the Brâka and the Gorgol, are more remote from the river; they contain permanent pools of water to which their girdles of high trees gave a characteristic appearance (sâmar). To the north of the Shamamah and the land of the Brâka stretches a series of dunes among which may be mentioned those of Amatilgh. The couloir of the Inshiri continued by that of the Amsaiga separates the latter from the similar ranges, the Akshar and the Azefâl, which stretch to the Tiris; they are difficult to cross, but between them the Tijirah supplies an easy route. Beyond to the north-west, the Tasiast and the Swihel al-Abyad are great plains of denudation.

On their convex face, the Adrôr and Tâgant are prolonged to the north in the massif of the Kudiat Ijjel and by that of the Zemmur, separated by the Tizel-kaf, towards the north-east by the cliffs of the Dhar Adrôr and the Hank and by the plateau of the Eglab, which stretches to the
great sand-dunes of the Igdí, to the east by the Dhar Téburt which runs to Walata. Between these lines of rock, great ridges of moving dunes make passage difficult but provide good pastureage for the rocks; these are from north to south, the Erg almamamp, the Maktér, the Waran, the Aïsfar and the Aukar. Lastly, to the north of all these masses of sand, the Îlléllamam, a mass of sand, is between the north and the Erg al-hammar, which run as far as the Jama'âm of the Dta.

The coast consists of dunes and plateaus with numerous sabkhas or salt lakes. There is usually a large sand-bar; nevertheless, the sea, which is very rich in fish, gives a livelihood to a population of fishermen.

The Sahara in the proper sense of the word hardly extends beyond a line marked by Cape Timatou, Mejriya (Moudjeria), the northern bank of the Téburt (recession of Khat), the southern margin of the Aïsfar and Walata. It is especially dry on both sides of the Aïsfar: to the west in the region of Port Eternence and in the dunes bordering on the Téburt, and especially to the east where to the north of Walata, the Mraya, Lqgit and the western part of the Erg Shesh, still almost unknown, form a waterless no man's-land; this district is visited only by antelopes, gazelles and ostriches, and by the Shii hunters who can manage to go for days without water and live like their game on green stuffs.

To the south of the line above given, the Sophie gradually changes to forest as we near the river. The climate is very hot: the influence of the sea is not felt beyond a score of miles inland. Subtropical rains fall as far as the north of the Aïsfar.

II. POPULATION.

At the earliest period to which the chronicles and native traditions go back, Mauritania seems to have been peopled by negroes. Later, in the course of centuries, it received various immigrations of Berbers, especially Saḥhāja and Zanata, Arabs and probably also of Jews. The Saḥhāja came first, certainly before the Ilhaj; later the development of Trans-Saharan commerce brought to the few towns that had been built, merchants of varied origin (Arabs, Berbers, Zanata, Naṣānas, Lwata, Naṭawa, etc.); at different periods also Jews came there to seek refuge from persecutions, the last of which drove them out of the Iltat at the end of the eighth century; lastly the Arabs belonging to the Maškil group in turn invaded the country from the eighth century onwards, bringing with them more Zanata or driving them in front of them.

The Jews have been completely absorbed into the Berbers (they form, it is believed, the foundation of the caste of smiths, mat'ayyim or into the Fula, so that it is not possible to estimate their numbers at the present day. The negroes, who have been gradually driven towards the river, are now represented by approximately 20,000 Tuaregs (Iktar), 21,600 Sarakole 13,000 Wolof, Fula and Lambara. The Arabo-Berber Moors number about 210,000.

III. HISTORY.

a. PREHISTORY. Such researches as have been made in Mauritania, notably in the Aïsfar and in the Aukar, have revealed there, as throughout the Sahara, the existence of important prehistoric sites; if it is not possible to date them, they are at least evidence of a very early population whose utensils seem to connect them with the negroes. These conclusions are further confirmed by the native chronicles and traditions, and perhaps we ought to connect with these remote inhabitants of the country the Sâju, to whom the Moors attribute the creation of the palm-groves of the Aïsfar and who are said to have built a town, the "city of the dogs", on the site of the present Aouaga, ten miles N. W. of Aïsfar. What seems probable in any case is that these black Mauritanius were more or less subjects of the first kingdoms known to the southwest of the desert: that of Lakkur, which ruled Senegalese Futa, that of Tijana, the capital of which was on the site of the modern Kendi, 100 miles S.W. of Walata and that of Duna which succeeded them and ruled the whole of the western Sudan. To the north, the lands of the negroes no doubt marched with the lands in which the Saḥhāja and Zanata Berbers led a nomadic life in the south of Morocco.

b. THE SÂHHAJA INVASION. We do not know at what date the Saḥhāja invaded Mauri- tania; but it was certainly a very early one. It is possible that expeditions by the Arab emirs to al-Maghrib al-Aṣṣi, beginning in the latter years of the seventh century, which marked the first contact of the Saḥhāja with Islam, may have driven them to the south but their first incursions into the Téburt, into the Aïsfar and to the Téburt were probably much earlier. Their conquest of the country, it is true, seems to have been fairly slow and it was not, it appears, till the eighth century that they succeeded in reaching the banks of the Senegal for the first time.

c. THE FIRST SAḤḤĀJA KINGDOM. At the beginning of the ninth century, a certain number of Saḥhāja tribes among them the Lemtoua, the Ghudhâ and the Beni Warej occupied the Aïsfar, with them advanced posts in the Téburt, and made raids into the Hajri (Hodj) against the negro Soninke empire of Ghana. The Lemtoua supplied them with chiefs at this time, and one of them, Timtan (d. in 850 or 857), succeeded in imposing his authority on all the Berbers and making twenty negro kings pay tribute to him. The chiefs of his dominion were Aouclas and especially Aouddhâ, forty miles N.E. of the site of the modern Kifâh (Kufa). Aouddhâ seems to have been formed in the seventh century by the Soninke and its fame as a centre of trans-Saharan trade brought it a large foreign population, already in part converted to Islam. Berbers of different branches and Arabs.

In spite of this brilliant start, this Lemtouan dynasty lasted only a short time and disappeared in 919. Each tribe then led an independent existence and the emperors of Ghana were able to extend then power towards the Togu and to take Aouddhâ at the end of the tenth century.

d. THE SECOND SAḤḤĀJA KINGDOM. Towards 1020, the chiefs of the various Saḥhāja tribes agreed to combine again as in the time of Timtan and thus to resist the encroachments of the Soninke. The power was placed in the hands of a Lemtoua called Tarass, who seems to have been the first really Muslim Zâbî ruler. He went to Mecca and his enthusiasm as a new convert led him to a holy war on the negroes, in which he lost his life (1023). His son-in-law Yalây b.
Ibrahim of the tribe of the Guddala succeeded him, according to the custom which made the supreme command go to the two tribes alternately. Like Tassina, he was a zealot and on returning from the pilgrimage, he brought from Morocco a holy man, Abd Allah b. Yasim, to whom he entrusted the task of educating his brothers, who were still ignorant of the principles of Islam. The saint was at first well received by the Sanhaja and he made them build the town of Aretzenna near the site of the modern Tifhit. But soon his commands appeared too difficult for the nomads, who rebelled against him. He sought refuge with his disciples in a rifat or fortified monastery on an island in the ocean (sometimes identified with Tidra) and they were henceforth known as the al-Murabitun (the men of the rifat), a word which has been corrupted in Europe to Almoravids under which name they have become famous.

5. The Almoravids. Their reputation for sanctity spread very rapidly and attracted many disciples to them. When Abd Allah had gathered around him a sufficiently large body of men, he led them against their rebellious brethren and against the negroes. In a few years they subdued the whole of the western Sahara, from Tafilelt and the Dra to the Senegal. In 1050, Yahiya b. Ibrahim died, and Yahiya b. Umar, chief of the Lemtuna, became the political head of the confederation, "Abd Allah b. Yasim remaining the religious chief. While the first recaptured and plundered Audaghist, the second attacked the conquest of the Maghrib. But soon they were both slain, Yahiya in a rising in the Adrar in which the negroes of the Takrir tried in vain to help him, and "Abd Allah in fighting the Bargha-wa heretics of the plains of Morocco. Abu Bakr, brother of Yahiya, was then for some time supreme chief of the Almoravids, then to gratify his ambitious nephew Yusufl, Tajjiltu he handed over to him his conquests in North Africa, keeping only to himself the sovereignty of the south. He devoted himself to a holy war against the negroes and to their conversion to Islam. He succeeded in bringing them back towards the river and in taking Ghana in 1076 and the capital of the Takrir in 1080, extending his teaching, the tradition says, as far as the lands of a Mandingo prince of the Upper Niger. He was slain in the Tagnet in 1087 and his death marked the break up of the Sanhaja confederation in Mauritania; each tribe regained its independence.

6. The Tashumsha and the negro reaction. Between this date and the end of the xiiith century we know very little of the history of Mauritania. We only suspect that the influence of the negro kingdom of Mali must have extended up to the Adrar and Tagnet and that a new Marabout Berber element formed by the Tashumsha of Nub came and settled in the country.

The Tashumsha seem to have at first taken upon the mantle of the Almoravids and to have made themselves the champions of the djihad against the negroes. But after a few successes, they were driven back from the region of the river and fell back upon the Tiris and Adrar, where they gave up fighting and devoted themselves to study and religious devotions. The successes of the negroes then became serious: Wolofs, Soninkes and Tuculors recaptured a whole part of Mauritania and might perhaps have succeeded in subjecting the Berbers, who were exhausted by their campaigns of conquest in the Mediterranean region, if the coming of the Maqil Arabs had not checked them.

8. The Maqil invasion. It is not possible to date this new invasion exactly; it is, however, certain that it was not a single effort. It went on almost down to the sixteenth century with bands of negroes groups filtering into the Sanhaja enclaves and at length submerging them.

Setting out from Egypt, the Maqil passed along the northern border of the desert and reached the Ocean to the south of Morocco in the first half of the xiiith century. They then entered the service of the Marinid rulers of Fas, who used them to keep in subjection the provinces beyond the Atlas and to collect taxes. These undisciplined nomads very soon took advantage of their privileged position. Measures had to be taken against their brigandage and their threats to overrun Morocco, and military expeditions were sent against them. Either as a result of these repulsions, or because they were called in by the Sanhaja to help them against the negroes, or because a year of drought drove them in search of new pasturage, some of them, belonging to the confederation of the Dwi Hasan or Beni Hasan, went down towards Mauritania. But the chronicles do not say why. In any case, having helped to drive the negroes back towards the river, supported by the Zanita Kunta who came from Tuat at the same time as the first of them, they reduced to vassalage the Sanhaja of Upper Mauritania (Ijjel and Zemamr) in the xiiith century, Western Mauritania, Wadan and Tagnet in the xvith and the Adrar and Lower Mauritania in the xvith century. Throughout the long period from the xiiith century to the present day, we find the authority in the hands of a certain number of Udaya tribes: the Ulid Rug, the Mihalla Ulid Mmark, the Brakna, the Tinaga and the Ulid Yahia b. Ummam. Other Beni Hasan also went south, but barely reached Mauritania. The Ulid Dlim have always remained in the desert zone and the Brabigh seem to have passed some years a little to the north of the Senegal before migrating to the region of Timbuktu.

9. The Maqil of the Sultan of Morocco. From their first sojourn in the south of Morocco, these Maqil long retained the character of Makilen tribes; under the Sa'dians and Alawites, many of them supplied contingents to the gilb tribes. This status gave their migration southwards the appearance of a conquest in name of the Sa'dians. This was no doubt the legal justification of the tribute which they exacted from the conquered Beduins; it also explains why the rulers of Fas or Marrakesh sometimes claimed as theirs the territory of Mauritania, why they sent several expeditions there in the xivith and xvith centuries, why they granted investiture to certain chiefs and lastly why the author of al-Wanis, after consulting several learned Western Marabout, Wadan and Tagnet in the xivith century, thought that the "land of Shingilt" should be included with the Maghrib and not with the Sudanic.  

1. The Sanhaja reaction. Whatever was the actual success of the Arab conquests in Mauritania, it were not effected without violent reaction on the part of the Sanhaja. The poverty of the Tashumsha. the negro danger and the looseness of links between the various bodies of invaders facilitated the settlement of the early Arab invaders. But the tyranny of the Maqil towards the Berbers
brought them in the xvith century to such desperation that a general rising broke out in the form of an attempted restoration of the Almoravids led by Nasr al-Din, a marabout descendent of the Lamtuna. This individual, who camped in western Mauritania, first preached a holy war there against the negroes, being sure of re-uniting the various contigants against the traditional enemy. Then having given the troops sufficient training in a campaign which brought them across the river to plunder the left bank, he turned openly against the Arabs. This was the celebrated "War of Ebay" in the course of which the Arabs were held in check for thirty years; but in the end the Moors within the Sanhaja ranks destroyed their strength and in 1674 the defeat at Tin Yeblei doomed them to vassalage.

In much the same way in 1745 the idealist Berbers of the Adrar had to bow before the Mañil and at the end of the xvirh century we find them again rising against the Arab amir and assassinating him. Finally in the Tagant, the Sanhaja Idâab well led by their chief Muhammad Shahem regained their independence at the end of the xvith century. They almost succeeded in seizing the Adrar in 192, drove the Zanita Kunta out of the Tagant and extended their power to the Senegal under the able rule of amirs who are still reigning and claim to be true descendants of the Almoravids.

The rule of the amirs. All over, from the xvith century, the political situation of the tribes became stabilised, and regular little nomad states seem to have been formed, usually under Arab chiefs. Thus we now find the dynasty of the Ulid Ahmad b. Damam ruling among the Tuareg with distinguished sovereigns like Ali Shandura (1703-1727) who, supported by some Moors, established over three years a regime of nearly 40 years. Finally the trade of these states became so much more regular that it was considered profitable to extend it to Europe. Among the Brakna also, the Ulid 'Abd Allah amirs played a preponderating role after the war of Baiball and their possessions extended from the Tagant to the Atlantic. Later, and particularly from the xvirh century, their power declined, in spite of the brilliant reign of Ahmad I (1318-1341), and their desperate resistance to the advance of the French caused them to disappear from the political scene. In Adrar the Ulid Yağja b. Ullim also furnished great leaders: Ahmad ibd Muhammad (1871-1891) who was able to keep his turbulent subjects at peace with their neighbours and who tried to develop trans-Saharan commerce, and Ahmad ibd Ull Ahmad (1891-1899) who by his military successes earned the title of amir of war. Lastly in the person of Taka b. Tawal Ahmad, a descendant of Muhammad Shahem, the Tagant produced the greatest Moorish ruler of the xvirh century.

The rule of these amirs was continually beset with great difficulties, produced by their rivals - the lack of discipline, rebellion and mutiny among their subjects, by the warlike raids of the negroes, and particularly by the efforts of Europeans to establish their rule on the Atlantic coast and on the banks of the river.

European rivalries on the coast of Mauritania. It was in the first half of the xvirh century that the Portuguese visited the coast of Mauritania and the north of the Senegal for the first time. At the instigation of the Infante Henry the Navigator, expeditions followed which brought back slaves, gold and guns. After João Fernandez had gone to Wadan in the eastern Adrar, where he spent some months among the Sanhaja in 1449, a permanent settlement was founded in 1445 on the island of Arguin, which afforded excellent conditions of security. From there the Portuguese endeavoured to extend their power into the interior and to command the great caravan routes which led from the Julde to Morocco; to them are attributed the fortresses, now in ruins, near Wadan and at Azezzi. But if it is certain that for a short time they extended their relations as far as the capital of the negro empire of Mali on the Upper Nigar, it seems that they did not own factories for any length of time except on the coast.

The trade of Arguin flourished for two centuries in the hands of the Portuguese, then of the Spaniards and it extended as far as Lower Mauritania through Portendik (corruption of "Port d'Addu" from the name of an emir of Trarza), a not very good roadstead where carpet was carried on. The French at a later date established themselves at the mouth of the Senegal (1929), the Dutch at the war with Spain took Arguin in 1938, which the English took from them in 1665 and a struggle for influence began among these three nations which lasted for a century. Arguin and Portendik continually changed hands, while France developed her trade along the Senegal by building factories. Finally the Treaty of Versailles (Sept. 3, 1793) recognised her exclusive sovereignty over the Atlantic coast from Cape Blaue to the mouth of the Julde. The wars at the beginning of the xvirh century brought the English back there for a time, and it was only in 1817, three years after the treaty of Paris, that France definitely took possession of the country. Arguin and Portendik had in the meantime been almost completely ruined as a result of these vagaries.

The French conquest. Down to 1857 England reserved the right to trade at Portendik, which allowed the Trarza chiefs and in particular Muhammad al-Jalib to play off against one another the two nations who seemed to threaten their independence, and thus to gain a footing on the left bank of the Senegal. The position of the Europeans with regard to the natives was however difficult and trade with them was permitted only on payment of heavy customs duties. It was only in 1854 with the appointment of Fehdeh as governor of Senegal that a more vigorous policy was introduced into Lower Mauritania. In four years he reduced Walo on the left bank to submission and drove the Morcom out of it and forced the emirs of Trarza and Brakna to sign a treaty, which if it did not abolish the customs, at least recognised that France had a right of sovereignty over the peoples living near the river and guaranteed freedom of trade there.

For nearly fifty years, these treaties were respected and the Moorish chiefs, too much occupied in maintaining peace among their subjects and in defending themselves from the intrigues of pre- tenders, no longer thought of coming into conflict with French troops; commercial agreements were made which extended as far as the Idaih of the Tagant and one treaty was even made with the emir of the Adrar. This period also saw a great deal of exploration of the interior. After
Mungo Park (1795—1796), Caillé (1825), Caillé (1843) and Panet (1850), Vincent, Bu al-Mudgal, Bonnet, Aliun Sal, Mage, Fulcrid, Aube, Soleillet, Quiroga and Cervera, Douls, Sollee, Fabert, Donnet, Blanchet, Gravel and Chudeau contributed to our knowledge of this country and prepared the way for its occupation.

In the last years of the xixth century the troubles of which Lower Mauritania was the centre finally had repercussions on the trading centres on the river which became daily more serious. The insecurity hampered commerce and in proportion as the memory of the vigorous policy of Saidherbe became obliterated, marauders ravaged the country down to the left bank of the river, right into the administered country. The conquest of Mauritania had to be planned in order to protect effectively the colony of Senegal and with this object an endeavour was made to use the influence of the marabouts, tired of a perpetual warfare, of which too often they bore the expense. The diplomatic action of M. Coppolani, Commissaire Général of the government since 1902, judiciously supported by police operation, brought about the occupation of the wind country in 1903, the Dakhra country in 1904 and of the Targant in 1905.

This rapid advance, however, was checked before the anti-foreign propaganda of a marabout of the Haou, Mâ al-Amin, son of Muhammad Fâdîl, who after spending a long period in Upper Mauritania, had been settled for some years at Smara near Sagat al-Hasan. His prestige as a magician, supported by the veneration shown him by the Moroccan sultans, was not long in winning him the support of the greater number of the Moors tribes and especially of those of the Aïr, the emir of which had been brought up in his entourage. At his instigation, Coppolani was assassinated and a cousin of the Sultan Mawllî Idris came to lead the jihâd in Mauritania. A success gained by him at Nyamli led to nothing, but on the return of a delegation of Moorish chiefs who had gone to seek help from the sovereign of Morocco, a general offensive was begun against the French troops (1908). To put an end to an agitation which threatened to become dangerous, Colonel Gouraud conquered the Aïr in 1909 and his victory was completed in 1910 by the death of Mâ al-Amin in 1912 by the capture of Tissit and joining up with the troops of the Hasr. The conquest of Mauritania by the French was thus practically completed. The march of el-Held, son of Mâ al-Amin, on Marrakesh in 1912 revived some inclination to rebel among the Moors, but the destruction of Smara in 1915 checked this, and France now only had to secure the protection of her colony from raiders from the Sahara.

IV. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE.

The negroes are settled agriculturists who have their villages mainly in the Shasmanah and the Gorgol and in the main they belong rather to Senegal than to Mauritania.

The Moors have a few villages (the principal are Ajar, Shingui, Wadam, Toppia, Tissit) with palm groves and a few farms in the Aïr, the Targant and the Dakh. They are great nomads who live under cone-shaped tents of camel-skin and follow the rainfall with their stocks. Those who wander in the zone of the steppes oscillate between the river and the desert, except the Iârza of western Mauritania, who, on account of the dryness of their country, move over a much greater area and sometimes even reach Tris and Aïr Saguia. The people of the Aïr go down as far as Targant, and on the north at one time were in contact with the Tekna of the south of Morocco around the Sagat al-Hasan. Their supply of meat is very scanty and it is not an exaggeration when Pschari calls them "the most wretched of mankind.

Their groups have been much gradated by the constant influx of Moroccans. Before French rule, the Hasans, pure Arabs, were the noble and warrior class who protected the encampments and lived by cattle-rearing and marauding. The Zaouia or marabouts, generally Sanhàja or Zenàta Berbers, paid an annual sum called ghâfer to the Hasans for their security; they were likewise breeders of cattle, but also included among them merchants and men of letters who were regular travelling universitites: the more or less open practice of sorcery served them as a means of defence against the exactions of the Hasans. The Zâna or tributaries (Zanata), Sanhàja Berbers, were the feudal dues which they paid to the Arabs (gherm) did not always exempt them from periodical payments to the marabouts nor from arbitrary sums levied upon them by one or the other. They were in part agriculturists. Thaârjin, freed slaves, formed tribes of serfs, usually better treated than the preceding. Finally the Hasans and the marabouts owned numerous slaves in which they did a busy trade. On the fringe of all these groups, the Mahfîlm, the ghâfirs and the N mâdi were respectively the workmen, poets and singers and hunters who supplied the encampments of eastern Mauritania with meat.

The barriers between these castes were in theory rigid. A certain number of marabouts, however, and even of Zaugas succeeded in escaping from Atlas tutelage, like the Idaâish of the Targant, and devoted themselves to the adventurous life of the N mâdi hunter (geinir) just as "penitent" Hasans sometimes adopted the pious life of the Zwaya (Tisab).

French administration has left this traditional organisation intact, only suppressing slavery; it has, however, checked the abuses of the Hasan by putting a stop almost everywhere to the payment of the horna and ghafers.

Economic Life. Mauritania has only one port, Port-Étienne, on the peninsula of Cape Blanc; it is, however, only a fishing centre. The course of the Senegal is used as far as Podor in the dry season, as far as Bâkel in the winter months. No road has yet been made, but the important points are linked up by automobile or caravan services. The telephone is in use only in the south, but its place is taken by the wireless, which connects Mauritania with Dakar, Casablanca, Agadir, Bamako and Timbuctoo.

The principal source of wealth of the country is stock-breeding: 51,000 camels, 3,800 horses, 239,000 cattle, 2,000,000 goats and sheep, 66,000 asses. The abundant game (antelope, gazelle, ostriches, guineas fowl and bustards) supplies further food for the inhabitants. Among agricultural products, special mention may be made of the date-palms in the north (3,000 tons of date a year), along the river and in a few favoured valleys of
the plateaus, millet, rice, maize, wheat and barley. In the south gum is a traditional article of export (1,250-2,500 tons a year).

The natural resources of the country have hardly been investigated as yet. We may mention, however, the salt of the Sebkhet Ijeil, which has for long supplied the caravans to the south; along the coast a few salt-pans are worked by the Moors. The annual export is 4,700 tons.

Industry is in a very rudimentary stage and confined almost entirely to the manufacture of leather goods which form the equipment of the camel and the furniture of his tent. Fishing forms the encumbrance near the coasts.

A certain number of caravans transport merchandise from the north to the south along the Adrar and Tàgant to the trading centres on the river and the Stûn. They take with them animals, gums, salt, dates, ostrich feathers, skins and leather, and bring back cloths, arms, powder, candles, sugar, tea, spices and cereals, and supply the markets of Aatar, Shugut, Wadain and Tagji. As a result of the insecurity in the desert there is no longer any regular trans-Saharan trade.

V. POLITICAL LIFE

The negroes are ruled by their village headmen and chiefs of districts. The Moors are grouped in tribes under the authority of a chief assisted by a council of notables or qurppu. Sometimes several tribes are combined in a hereditary amirate, the ruler of which surrounds himself with a regular guard generally recruited from among the Zanga or Hafit. The shikh or amir is practically all-powerful; only the right to judge in civil matters is not completely his; the kâfût exercise it. The amir further reserves to himself a kind of right to supervise their judgments through the intermediary of his private kâfût who forms a court of appeal.

The French administration has been superimposed on this traditional organisation. A Lieutenant-Governor, residing at St. Louis, on the right bank of the river, is the head of the colony and is assisted by a military commandant, an inspector of administrative affairs, a secretary for military and political affairs, a secretary for finance and a department of public works. The local administration is carried out by administrators or officers divided into eight districts (Trarza, Bikanta, Guelde, Gudimaka, Assala, Tâgant, Adrar and Bort, Lévidert) and seventeen sub-divisions or administrative posts. It controls the native administrative and judicial organization.

The Moors pay the Kurânic taxes (zakût and asbar) from which their ruling-camels and gums alone are exempt. The negroes pay a poll-tax and a tax on cattle. Indirect contributions are paid by the merchants, the salt-pans, the carrying of arms, the exploitation of the woods and ferrets. The Budget for Mauritania for 1930 was 14,623,000 francs.

VI. LANGUAGE

The language spoken in Mauritania is Arabic, the nubara or language of the Tarija, the "whites". Some 7,000 Zanga in the south have retained a Berber dialect related to that of the dialects of southern Morocco. At Wadain and Tshut, the language amir (Arat) which is a form of Soninke is now spoken only by a few individuals. Lastly the negroes of the river have retained their own language.

VII. RELIGIOUS AND INTELLECTUAL LIFE

History does not tell us what was the religion of the Sânhûjja before their conversion to Islam; we can only think that they had to some extent been influenced by a monotheistic faith like Judaism or even Christianity. Their first contact with Islam probably dates from Ukba b. Nafi's expedition to the south of Morocco (681), but it is certain that their real conversion was much later and can hardly have been earlier than the energetic proselytising campaign of 'Abd Allâh b. Yâsin.

At the present day all the inhabitants of Mauritania are Muslims of the Malikite rite, but many of them and more particularly the warriors and the Némidi have only a very superficial acquaintance with their religion and take little interest in it; superstitions and sorcery further corrupt their Islam almost everywhere, revealing the primitive state of the people and negro influence. Islam is not really known and practised, except among the tribes of marabouts; among the latter, a mystical tradition and a fairly advanced culture have always made themselves felt and for this reason they play in Moorish society the part of a kind of sacred body such as is found nowhere else in the Muslim world of the west. This is no doubt a remote consequence of the Almoravid movement, revived for a time in the war of Bâbah, and of the peculiar situation of these Muslim nomads, who have here long been the advance-guard of the white race, face to face with the negro fez-bin-hippiss of the Senegal and Sudân. Perhaps, like Renan and Petchari, we ought also to give credit to the influence of rûdrîb'î in the desert. In any case in this, as in assuming a kind of sacred character and surrounding it with a magic prestige, certain Berbers have had a regular revenge of their amour-propre on the pride of race of the Arab invaders and have opposed to their tyranny and brigandage a defensive weapon which has not been without effect.

The principal brotherhoods of Mauritanians are those of the Tjilinjâ, and of the Kâdîria: their influence extends into the lands of the negroes. The first are represented by the Ila u Ali of the Tràza, of the Tàgant and of the Adrar, who claim to be shorfa and say they came from Tabelhala at the end of the sixth century. Since the early years of the sixth century they have been connected with the branch of the Tjilinjâ in Faso. The second are much more numerous and influential; they have several branches: that of the Bokkâya dates from the seventh-eighth centuries and is represented from the head of the Niger to the Tàgant and Adrar by the tribe of the Kunta. About a century ago it received fresh impetus in a new "path" and its autonomy in lower Mauritania was secured by the great prestige of the Sâkhî, called the "Usel Bâli" (1924). We may also mention the branch of the Fàli, founded in the early years of the sixteenth century, which enjoyed particular fame some 20 years ago under the direction of Mî al-'Ajinah and his brother the Sakhî Sa'd Bâ. These two branches have lost their importance since the deaths of these famous individuals. Lastly the Kâdîria are still represented by the 600 members of the
MOORS — MOREA

Ghidfiya brotherhood, whose practices are regarded as heretical by the other Muslims.

Shingiti, benefiting by its situation on the routes of the caravans which came from western Morocco: or Selâkht Eljel down to the Jâdâr or the Senegal was at one period an intellectual centre, the reputation of which extended to all the western Sahara and to the Oudâ. We see this in the fact that it was able to give its name to all the Moorish tribes (Shingiti) and to the territory in which they led their nomadic life and that the tradition of the country makes it one of the "seven holy cities" of Islam. It has now lost its old prestige. In the xvth century the fame of the medersas of Timbuktu must have offered serious competition to it. At the present day Shingiti is seriously threatened by the sands of the Waran and its trade is much reduced. Aatar is assuming an increasing importance; the insecurity and eccentric development of North Africa and the Oudâ have led to the almost complete disappearance of the trans-Saharan trade by which it lived and in particular, as is natural in a land of nomads, it has been rather under tents and particularly in the marabout encampments of western Mauritania that intellectual culture has developed. Universities have been created there where the teaching of the Korân, theology, law, grammar and logic still flourishes. Some of them have known outbursts of glory under famous teachers, who have sometimes created schools of mystic initiation, like those directed by the Shaikh Sidiya, Ma' al-'Ainî or Sa'd Bîrî or that of the Agh Muhammad Sâlem, which is a kind of university in the Tiris which produces almost all the jurists of Mauritania.

A whole original literature has been able to develop, Kuranic matter, Hadîth, law according to Stîl Khâlîc and his commentators, are its essential elements, with the doctrines of the Sâîfis and their mysticism. But historical studies have also had and still have their eager followers, especially among the tribe of the 'U'd Daman (Trâôra). Lastly poetry is held in honour among all the tribes, warrior and marabout alike, and supports a whole caste of troubadours, the griots, who enjoy the favour of the courts of the emirs.


(F. de la Chapelle).

MORADABAD (Muradâbâd), a district in the Rohilkhand division of the United Provinces of India and also the chief town in it. The district has an area of about 2,300 square miles and a population of 1,200,000 of whom over 420,000 are Muhammadans Nothing is known of the early history of the district. In the Muhammadan period it was successively ruled by the Sultâns of Delhi, from whom it was occasionally taken by the Sultâns of Delhi, the Moghuls, the Rohillas, and the Nâwâbs of Oudh until it was ceded to the British in 1801.

Moradâbâd is the principal town in the district; it is situated on the Delhi-Bareilly road and on the main line of the Oudh-Rohilkhand railway. It has a population of 75,000 of whom over half are Muslims. The town is a Moghul foundation of the second quarter of the xvth century. Its founder was Rustam Khân who also built the Djamî Masjîd, as an inscription testifies, in 1632. The town takes its name from Murâd Bâsh, the ill-fated son of Shah Djamîn. It rapidly ousted Sambhal from its place as the chief town of the district. Its industries are flourishing (chiefly textiles and brass-work). It was a mint of the Moghul Emperors and also of Ahammad Shâh Durrânî during his invasion of India in 1760. Sambhal is a very ancient site but has lost much of the importance it possessed in mediaeval times. It has an old mosque, an interesting example of Pathan architecture which has even been claimed as a converted Hindu temple. It is said to have been built by Bâbur but it is undoubtedly earlier. Amrola is the great Muhammadan centre of the district, the majority of its population being Shaikhis and Sanyâvis. The chief saint of the Sahâyids is Sharaf al-Dîn Shâh Wâliyât, a descendant of the tenth Imam, who came here about 1300. His tomb is still shown here. The Djamî Ma'sjîd is a Hindu temple converted into a mosque in the reign of Khalîgâbâd. It is much visited by pilgrims, mainly Hindus who seek relief from mental diseases through the power of Sadr al-Dîn, a former mutâkhallîn of the mosque, whose virtues are still believed to be efficacious. There are over a hundred other mosques in the town.

Bibliography: H. R. Nevill, District Gazetteer of Moradabad, Allahabad 1911. (J. Allan)

MOREA is the usual name in mediaeval and modern times for the peninsula of the Peloponnesus, which was regarded in ancient times as the outfall of Greece. The name Morea is first found in 1111 A.D. in the subscription to fol. 143 and the Greek manuscript Brit. Mus. Add.
with the mulberry-tree. This is evident for example from Joh. Unleuchlinus (Annales Saxonarum Otho-
monidarum a Turciis sua Ensign scripti, 1596, p. 63):

"Nomen ipsum (= Moreas) derivavit Graeci nunc
ah arbore novo quod tota regione sillicet Arbor
hace frequentius ev".

In the mediaeval Muslim writers there is a
confusion between Amureia = Amorion in Phrygia
and Lamureia = Moreas, Peloponnese. But Am-
ureia (or Amurcia, Amorit, Amurca, etc.) in Abu 'Kāsim Firdawsī can only be Amo-
rian, which used to be described as the capital
and eye of the kingdom of the Rūm. In the
geographical tables of the Nast al-funūn (middle
of the xiiiith century) and of Umrān Beg, Amureia
should rather be identified with Amorion than
with Morea = Peloponnese (cf. P. Karolidis, in
Wissenschaftliches Jahrbuch [Periodika] der
Universität Athen, iii. 1909, p. 288—297: A. Hantzis,
in Byzantinisch-Naevirischisches Jahrbuch, i.,
1631, p. 65 sqq.) In the little map by the Arab
Abi, of the year 1192 A.D., Behbûne = Pelo-
ponnese is given (i.e. the old classical name of
the peninsula). On the other hand, we find Morea
= Moreas = Peloponnese (i.e. its mediaeval and
modern name) in the Arabic geographical table
of the Paris MS. 2214, which is supposed to contain
the cosmography of Ibn Sa'd of the year 1276 A.D.
(based for the most part on Idrīsī (1154 A.D.;
cf. K. Müller, Mappae Arabicae, i., Stuttgart 1926).

The Muḥammadan peoples really only became
acquainted with the Morea in the xiiiith century
A.D. Hellenistic culture was long extinct there
and Christianity had become predominant. At
the end of the fourth century (395 A.D.), Alaric
had had almost the whole of the Morea waste
and destroyed many towns and sanctuaries famed in
ancient times. About two centuries later, c. 580 A.D.,
the Avars (a Turkish nomadic people) allied with
Slav tribes are said to have invaded the Morea
and settled permanently. It should be expressly
noted that it is only late and tendentious sources
which tell us this. What scholars of the xiiiith
century put forward as a historical fact, namely
that an independent Avar or Avar-Slav kingdom,
intangible to Byzantine or Greek Christian influ-
ence, existed in the western half of the Morea for
248 years (580—827), must be relegated to the
realms of fable (cf. E. Curtius, Peloponnes, i.,
Gotha 1851, p. 86) It is certain, however, that
considerable ethnological changes took place in
the middle ages in the Morea. In the xiiiith
century in the reign of the Byzantine emperor
Constantine V (741—775), if not earlier, numerous
Slav tribes had pushed their way into the Morea,
which had been much depopulated from 746 by
a terrible pestilence. This epidemic had also
made great gaps in the population of the Const-
tinople, which Constantine V is said to have endeav-
oured to fill with people from the Morea: this imperial
effort must have further contributed to reduce the
Greek element in the peninsula. It may be assumed
that the Slavs who at this time were settling
predominantly in Arcadia and Mesenia, Flik and Laco-
nia, sought and found new homes in the Morea, which
had been favoured by nature with a milder climate,
not only as hostile robbert hordes but also as
peaceful colonists from the north.

According to Schäfli (Slavische Altertumer,
German transl, by Wuttke, vol ii., p. 192), the
spread of the Slavs over the Morea can be fixed
between 746 and 799. Nevertheless there can be no question of a complete slavisation of the country nor of a complete annihilation of the Greek element in it — as Füllmayer and his followers hold. The immigrant Slavs in Greece proper cannot have been very numerous. They were really nomad herdsmen and peasants, who settled here and there in the open country. Their level of culture much have been very low. On the other hand, the Hellenic element in Greece proper and no less in the Morea had always had control of the coasts and of the towns and fortresses in the interior, and it was moreover strong enough as regards culture to assert itself through the centuries and even to leave its mark on the foreign Slavs. The Slav settlers often caused trouble to the Byzantine government, so that the latter found themselves forced to send expeditions against them. For example in 783 A.D. the Athenian empress Irene ordered the Patriarch Staurakios to punish the Slav tribes of the Morea and the rest of the mainland of Greece. He appears to have had numerous troops at his command and was able to carry out his task satisfactorily in a few months. He also forced the Slavs to pay an annual tribute to the imperial treasury. He returned to Constantinople with many prisoners and considerable booty and celebrated a triumph in the Hippodrome there.

After some time, the Slavs again rose in the Morea against Byzantine authority. They became a great danger and even threatened the towns on the coast. Supported by Saracens from Africa, the Slavs in 807 (805 by another reckoning) blockaded Patras from the land. The citizens of this important town defended themselves bravely in spite of a shortage of provisions, water and other supplies. When the help sought from the imperial strategos in Corinth did not come, the citizens of Patras made a vigorous sortie. They put the enemy to flight and drove them far from their town. Greek superstition seems to have ascribed the victory won at Patras over the Slav hordes to St. Andrew, the patron saint of the town. Nothing is recorded of the fate of the Saracen allies of the Slav besiegers of Patras. It is supposed that it was they who ravaged not only Patras but also Rhodes and other islands by the caliph's order in 807 A.D. With the defeat at Patras the strength of the Slavs of the Morea was broken. It is true that they again and again attempted to win their independence of the Byzantines by force of arms but without success. In 859 A.D., the doughty Byzantine general Theoklitos Byzantios subdued all the Slav districts of the Morea as far as the mountains on the Tagetos and Parnon, where two rebel Slav tribes, the Ezerites and Melinges, had settled. These two tribes survived longest, sometimes as vassals of the Byzantines and sometimes as their open enemies. As early as the ninth century A.D. began the conversions of the Slavs to Christianity to which is due also their gradual hellenisation. The intermixture of the Greek Meseotes (Turk. Moralî) with the Slavs undoubtedly contributed considerably to the former process.

The Normans in Sicily in the following period disturbed not only the coasts of the mainland of Greece but also the interior of various Balkan provinces of the Byzantine empire. The Norman king Roger II in his campaign in 1146 against Greece sailed round the Morea and occupied with-
its way into the Morea only after 1204. It had already existed in the country in the time of the Comneni.

The Frankish rulers built new citadels and forts in the plains and on the mountains, most of which survived into the period of Turkish rule. A number of fiefs which were formed by the Franks in 1205 became after the middle of the 14th century hereditary possessions of the Ottomans.

It must also be pointed out that the Venetians after the Fourth Crusade had secured important trading centres and depots on the Morea. The Republic in this way acquired the province of Lacedaemonia, Kalabryta, Modon and Patras, and in the case of the last two ports, some of the surrounding country, including the possessions of a number of distinguished families of the Byzantine aristocracy. During this period, Venice succeeded in extending her territory and commercial influence and privileges further in the Morea and even in taking possession of the whole of it (cf. below).

The fourth prince of Achaia (Morea), William of Villehardouin (1245—1278), the second son of the above-mentioned Godfrey, had vigorously completed the conquest of the country. In 1245 he forced Monembas, which had so far remained independent in alliance with the Greek kings of Nicaea, to capitulate under certain conditions. The same ruler also conquered a number of Morean tribes who had shown themselves hostile to Frankish rule and who played a prominent part in later times when the Turks occupied the country. To keep in check the wild tribes of Zaconia and Laconia, William II of Villehardouin in 1249 built near the ancient Sparta, on a hill jutting out in front of the Taygetos, Mystra (Mystra), the fortress of the same name. A Frankish-Byzantine town soon grew up around this fortress which became a centre of art and classical studies. The town of Mystra was destined to be the capital of the later dependencies of the Morea, and even in the period of Turkish rule it did not completely lose its old importance. Frankish rule in the Morea, which reached its zenith under William II, was destined to suffer a severe reverse within his reign. In October 1259 a fierce battle was fought between Castoria and Monastir (Pelagonia) at Longos Vorilla. In this battle fought, the armies of the Despots of Epirus Michael Angelos and of the king of Nicaea and later Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus. As a result of treachery on the part of an illegitimate son of the despot Michael Angelos, the Sela-tokrator Johannes, the troops and allies of the latter suffered a reverse. Even William II of Villehardouin sought safety in flight only to be shortly afterwards induced from his hiding-place and captured. He was released till 1262, after taking the oath of vassalage to the Byzantine emperor and ceding him four important fortresses of the Morea: Mystra, Maima, Geraki and Monembas, as well as a considerable part of Laconia. The Byzantines thus gained important bases in S.E. Morea from which they were able to reconquer the whole peninsula, which was all the more necessary as William II of Villehardouin only kept his pledge of fidelity for a short time.

Relations between the Muslim peoples and the Morea now became closer. At the end of 1262 the Seba-tokrator Constantine, a step-brother of the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus, landed in the Morea at the head of a large army which consisted mainly of Macedonians and Turks. This step-brother of the Emperor came to the Morea as administrator of the Byzantine lands there and occupied all the citadels of which William of Villehardouin had been forced to eke in order to secure his release. The Byzantine governor took up his residence in Mystra. Soon afterwards open war broke out between the Franks and Byzantines. To strengthen the latter there landed at Monembas in the spring of 1263 a new Turkish army corps of 5,000 (according to others, 3,000) mercenaries in the service of Michael VIII Palaeologus, led by two men named Malik and Shalik. We have no accurate record of the Turkish chief, who, so far as we know, were the first to appear in the Morea. They must have been either Seljuk or Turks of other descent who had no shame about selling their services to Christian rulers. The Turkish mercenaries under Malik and Shalik contributed greatly to the successes which the Seba-tokrator Constantine gained over the Franks at the beginning of 1263. Along with Greeks, mainly from Zaconia and other provinces of the east, Slavs from the Morea, Dasmuls (of Greek-Frankish descent), the Turkish mercenaries attacked from Laconia and, which was the capital of the Frankish principality. The bands of Malik and Shalik then pressed into the highlands of Skorta. Here they ravaged at will. With the approval of the Seba-tokrator Constantine, they plundered the country, carried off and slaughtered the cattle. In these circumstances the Skortians were forced to pay homage to the Byzantine emperor and to operate with his army against the Franks. Constantine's army, composed of so many different racial stocks, occupied the market-town of Veligosti (near Megalopolis) and burned it, without however being able to take its citadel; they then conquered Kalabryta and burned the famous Latin monastery of Isova. But soon afterwards they suffered a terrible defeat not far from Olympia.

In the spring of the year following (1264), the Seba-tokrator Constantine continued the war on the Franks. He had no success and was quarrelled with his Turkish allies, whose pay was six months in arrears. Malik and Shalik at once left him with their men for this reason and retreated undisturbed to the district of Karytaina. Constantine tried to win them over again but they went to William of Villehardouin who accepted their assistance. Thereupon Malik and Shalik with their followers went over to the camp of the, as they thought, generous Frankish leader in the conviction that the latter would keep their word. By the accession to the Franks of this Turkish force, the title was turned in their favour. The Turkish chiefs who were inspired by an ardent desire to avenge themselves in battle on their false employers, now advised William II of Villehardouin's knights to meet the imperial Byzantine army on the frontiers of Messenien and Arcadia. While the Frankish-Turkish army was going through the pass of Makryplagi (between Megalopolis and Kalamata, i.e. the line of the modern railway), they were attacked by an ambush of the Byzantine army, whose leader was no longer the Seba-tokrator Constantine but the strategos Alexius Phylus, Makrenos and Alexius Kabellarus. Twice the vanguard of the Frankish-Turkish force led by Ansem de Toncey had to give way before the numerous Byzantines who occupied the heights of the pass of Makryplagi. But finally they won the
hotly contested summit of the pass, from which they ousted the enemy. The Turks under Malik and Shalik followed up and completed the victory. The leaders of the army so disastrously defeated sought refuge in the neighbouring caves of Gardiki where they were be-seiged by the Turks. The latter took the caves and led their occupants prisoners to William II of Villehardouin. The latter thereupon ordered the Turks to raid and plunder the districts of Morea previously occupied by the Byzantines, notably the districts of Zacoon, Helos, Vatika and Monembasia.

After the battle in the Makryplagi pass came the news that Skortinians had again taken up arms against the Franks and stormed the fortress of Buchelet (Araklovon) and Karytaina. As the valiant Godfrey Brunieres, Baron of Karytaina, who had always been able to keep the turbulent Skortinians in check, was no longer in the Morea, William II of Villehardouin ordered the Turkish leader Malik and his men to go to Skorta to put down the rising. Terrified by the ravages and cruelties of the Turks, the surviving Skortinians submitted to the Prince of the Morea and begged for mercy which was granted them.

The Chronicle of the Morea, which has survived in four languages (Greek, French, Catalan and Italian), is the only source which tells us of the activities of the Turkish mercenaries in the Morea (1262—1265). The same Chronicle adds that the Turks in 1265 sought permission to leave the Morea and to be allowed to return to their Asiatic home. Malik took his leave in the friendliest fashion from the Prince of the Morea and began his journey home. The Chronicle however specially mentions that individual Turks preferred to settle in the Morea. They were baptised and married morean women. About the first half of the sixteenth century, there were still descendants of Malik's followers there, baptised Turks settled in Elia. It is natural to think that the modern villages in N.W. Morea of Maliki (Demos Vnopration) and Turkoehori (= village of the Turks", Demos Trinitas) owe their names to the Turkish settlers in the time of William II of Villehardouin. This prince gave two of Malik's followers who remained in the Morea the rank of knighthood and even granted them fiefs. According to the Catalan version of the Chronicle of the Morea, Malik himself married a noble Frankish lady, a widow, through the intermediacy of William II of Villehardouin. It is a historical fact that Turkish-Moreote relations date from the second half of the sixteenth century. After the death of William II in 1278 we find a reference to estates which this prince had given to his Turkish vassals and which were occupied about 1280 by the soldiers of Galiero d'Ivry, who acted for a time as governor of the Morea for Charles of Naples and Sicily. Charles I and his immediate successors in rule over the Morea had not infrequently Turkish warriors in their service. From the beginning of the sixteenth century it not infrequently happened that Muhammadan pirates from Asia Minor raided and plundered the coastlands of the Morea. Sometimes they had allies of the Christian faith, notably Catalans.

About the middle of the sixteenth century, an important change took place in the administration of the Byzantine possessions in the Morea. The Emperor Johannes Kantakuzenos in 1349 created an appanage for his second son out of these lands which he called the despotate of Mystra and which lasted till the Ottoman conquest (1349—1380). In this period fell the rule of the first despot of Mystra, Manuel Kantakuzenos, the second son of the Emperor. He assisted the Franks of the Morea to ward off the Turkish attacks which had reduced the once flourishing Corinth and the country round to such misery that the Corinthians in 1358 were forced to send an urgent appeal for assistance to their sovereign, the titular Emperor of Constantinople and prince of Achaia, Robert II. The latter gave a ready ear to their appeal. On April 23, 1358, he gave the Florentine Grand Seneschal Niccolò Acciajoli and his descendants the extensive district of Corinth as a hereditary barony. The princely family of the Acciajoli survived in the Morea and on the mainland of Greece for two centuries, during which they had much to do with Muslim peoples. A series of circumstances, including the irruptions of the Turks as early as the middle of the sixteenth century and the advance of the Ottomans, whose strength was steadily increasing, brought numerous Albanians to Greece. The first despot of Morea, Manuel Kantakuzenos, had, for various reasons, commissioned or even invited them to settle in various desolated regions where they became distinguished as warriors, agriculturists and as hunters. Thus we find them in Arcadia and Lacedonia where they seem to have come in large numbers. Later another 10,000 Albanian families were peacefully settled by another despot of Mystra, namely Theodoros I Palaeologos (1384—1407), son of the Byzantine Emperor John V. According to reliable sources, these 10,000 families left Thesaly and Acazania with their cattle and goods and chattels on account of the Turkish raids and for other reasons and reached the isthmus. There they pitched their camp and sent messengers to Theodore I with the request that they might be allowed to settle in his Morean territory. Theodore I acceded to their request and allowed them to spread over a considerable portion of the Morea. The story of G. Bosso (Dell'istoria della Sacra Religione et illustrissima Militia di S. Gio. Giao- solinitana, vol. ii., Rome 1594, p. 126—129) to the effect that the Turks had occupied Patras by 1378 and conquered the Morea shortly before must be relegated to the realm of fable. About this time, there were again great changes in the Morea. The Company of Navarre, which in 1380 had entered the service of the titular Emperor Jacob de Baux of Constantinople and prince of Achaia and were seeking their fortune on Greek soil, became after the death of the Emperor in Tarso in 1385 absolute masters of a great part of the Morea. In 1386 the Company made Captain Pierre de St. Exupery (Bordo d'F. Superan) their leader. The latter was able to extend his power and influence in the Morea by inciting the Turks and also the Greek archons against Theodore I. During the period 1396—1402 he even bore the title of hereditary prince of Achaia (which was given him instead of money by king Ladislaus of Naples). Sometimes before, a vigorous and enterprising Florentine, Nerio I Acciajoli (Sept. 29, 1394), had been playing an important part on the mainland of Greece. This man, a nephew of the Niccolo I Acciajoli, already mentioned, had acquired considerable territory in the Morea, partly by inheritance and partly by purchase. Shortly before his death he attained the height of his glory when he was appointed by king
Ladislaus of Naples as hereditary Duke of Athens and the lands belonging to it. In 1389 the Venetians occupied the important fortress of Nauplion and set about the conquest of Argos. The despot of Mystra, Theodores I Palaeologos, the son-in-law of Nerio I Acciajoli, at his father-in-law's instigation anticipated the Venetians and occupied Argos. As a result, hostilities broke out among the Christian states, which could end only to the advantage of the Turks. The despot of Mystra replied to the demands of Venice to give up Argos by saying he could only do so with the Sultan's approval. Later the Venetians joined up with the Navarrese. Through treachery Bordo of S. Superan succeeded in taking Nerio I Acciajoli prisoner on Sept. 10, 1389. The latter remained for nearly a year in the hands of the leader of the Navarrese but in the end obtained his freedom.

An epoch-making event was the great battle on the field of the blackbird (June 15, 1389) at Pristina, which decided Turkish rule for centuries in the Balkans. A Turkish army appeared in the Morea at the end of 1392 under Ewrenos Beg in order to aid, at their request, the Navarrese against the despot of Mystra. The Turks thereupon occupied a number of strongholds in the peninsula, Nerio I Acciajoli, who had been appointed governor of the Morea, now pledged himself to pay tribute to Sultan Bayazid and to he his vassal. After the death of Nerio I Acciajoli, a fatal quarrel broke out between his sons-in-law Theodores I of Mystra and Charles Tocco, during which the Turks won important successes on the mainland of Greece. The fear of the danger from the Turks probably induced Charles Tocco and Theodore I to make up their quarrel. After long negotiations with the Greek national party in Athens, who hated the Latins, Turkish forces under the Pasha Timurtash entered Attica from Thessaly. At the end of 1394 or in the first seven weeks of 1395, the Venetians occupied Athens including the Acropolis, after driving back the Turkish besiegers. Theodores prepared to advance against the Turks on the isthmus. The latter, however, defeated on Sept. 28, 1396 at Nicopolis the flower of the chivalry of Hungary, Germany, and France and thus laid the foundations for their dominion over the lands below the Danube. Bayazid thereupon decided to attack the remnants of the Byzantine empire as well as the little principalities of the mainland of Greece. He therefore sent his generals Vačkib, Pasha of Rumelia, and the already mentioned Ewrenos Beg with an army of 50,000 men to cross the isthmus again. Vačkib occupied Argos; Ewrenos Beg at the same time fell upon the Venetian possessions in Messenia. The prince of Achaea, Bordo of S. Superan, and Theodore I of Mystra found themselves forced as a result of the Turkish successes to pay tribute to the Porte. Laden with incalculable booties the armies of Vačkib Pasha and Ewrenos Beg returned across the isthmus and in 1397 even occupied Athens for a brief period. In addition to Greek sources, Turkish writers record that the "city of the wise", as Athens is frequently called in Muslim works, was taken by Sultan Bayazid's men (cf. J. II. Mordtmann, in Byzant.-Vorichr. Tabr., iv. 1103, 346 sqq.). As a result of his troubles, especially the Turkish raids, Theodores I of Mystra became utterly tired of his position. He therefore resolved to sell his towns and castles to the knights of St. John of Rhodes, who after negotiations readily purchased Corinth, Kalabryta and Mystra in the years 1400—1402. But they could not establish themselves permanently in the Morea, for the Greek national party in the country, especially in Mystra, rebelled against the sale, which the Sultan, the suzerain of Theodores of Mystra, also declined to recognise. Theodores therefore cancelled the sale and compensated the knights partly in money and partly by ceding the country of Salona and the barony of Zituni. Theodores I had been able to take these lands from the Ottomans after their defeat at Angora in 1402.

Sulujan Sulaiman I (1403—1411) abandoned any claim to suzerainty over the Morea. At this time the influence and power of the Venetian colonies in the Morea were increasing. In 1407 the Venetians occupied Lepanto. In the following year, they seized Patras and the country round it and from these two strongholds which lay opposite one another, the so-called little Dardanelles, they were able to keep in check the Turkish pirates who made the Gulf of Corinth unsafe. At an earlier date, the Albanian family of Spata had settled in Lepanto and had occasionally made common cause with the Turks. Patras at this time was ruled by the archbishop Stephan Zaccaria in name of the Pope. As he suffered a great deal from the Turks, he pledged the town and the country round it with the Venetians. The latter also occupied the fortress of Astros in Zaconia. They restored the fortifications of Nauplia and other strongholds in their possession. The Republic of St. Mark in 1406 and 1411 concluded treaties with Sulujan Sulaiman I, by virtue of which they secured their colonies in the Morea and the East generally. But in the reign of Murat II (1421—1451) danger again threatened from the Turks. The Venetians were however able to take the necessary measures for the defence of their possessions in the Morea. In the districts of Nauplia and Argos as well as in their flourishing Messenian colonies they settled numerous Albanians who loved fighting. In Corinth and Attica also the Albanians were welcomed by the Acciajoli. The Albanian element was therefore very strongly represented in the Morea in the first half of the 15th century; later they spread to the islands around the Morea. In the wars of the Greeks and Venetians against the Ottomans, the Albanians frequently distinguished themselves; on the other hand, their morals left much to be desired. To this day we still can find descendants of these Albanian colonists in the Morea and in the adjoining territories.

After the battle of Angora, at the time when Frankish power in the Morea was declining, the Byzantines vigorously resumed their efforts to reconquer the whole peninsula. Theodores I of Mystra had previously wanted, with Venetian support, to erect on the isthmus a great bulwark against the Turks which would make access to the Morea impossible for them. Manuel II Palaeologos again took up Theodores' plan and began to put it into execution with vigour. Not far from Corinth on the isthmus, which was usually called "Hexamilion" in the middle ages, he built a wall 24 stadia long from sea to sea with castles at each end and in the middle and no less than 157, strong towers besides deep ditches. The building material was taken from older walls and defences. In the course of 25 days (April 8—May 3, 1415), i.e. at a most rapid rate, the great wall was completed which, like the
isthmus itself, was called "Hexamillion"; the greatest hopes were built upon it, but they soon proved deceitful. The Turks usually called the wall Gez-
meštir. In 1416, Manuel II left the Morea after reimposing his suzerainty upon the prince of Achaea Centurione II Zaccaria and hamstringing several Græco-Albanian barons of whom he carried off with him to Constantinople.

The peaceful relations which had existed between the Byzantines and the Ottomans, under Salaiman I and Bâyazid suddenly ceased when Murâd II ascended the throne. In 1423 he ordered the celebrated Pacha Turâkhan to clear up the small states. With an army of 25,000 men, which was joined by the Duke of Attica Antonio I as the Sultan's vassal, Turâkhan set out from Thessaly to obey his master's orders. The celebrated Hexamillion wall proved an insufficient bulwark against the onslaught of the Janissaries. Turâkhan had the most of it destroyed and advanced into the Morea. The despot Theodoros II of Mystra could scarcely have checked the Ottoman flood which swept into his land, plundering and murdering. Murad's lieutenant Cardilki (on the Makryplagi pass) and other Byzantine and Latin towns fell into Turâkhan's hands. But he suffered one serious reverse. The Moreotes caught a portion of his army in the pass of Lonsari, where they were victorious and took much booty or, to be more accurate, recaptured their own property. In the Arcadian town of Tavia (the modern Dovia, on the road from Tribolitza to Wytilna), the Albanians assembled and chose one of themselves as their leader and decided to attack Turâkhan on his way back from the south. In the battle that followed, the Albanians did not stand their ground but fled. Turâkhan pursued them and slew many besides taking some 600 prisoners. These he put to death and, according to the Turkish practice, built towers of their skulls. Heavily laden with plunder, Turâkhan returned soon afterwards across the isthmus to Thessaly. He had however in 1423 not yet completed Murâd's order to subdue the Christian states of the Morea.

Soon after the withdrawal of the Ottomans, Manuel II Palaeologos besought Murâd II for peace and concluded a treaty with him, by which the despot of Mystra was to pay an annual tribute of 100,000 hyperpyra to the Sultan and further to declare his readiness to give up the Hexamillion wall. Venice, whose colonies in the Morea had suffered much from Turâkhan's raid in 1423 and were continually troubled by Muslim pirates, recommended all the Christian powers interested to form a united front. This appeal for unity, however, fell on deaf ears. The various Christian rulers of the Morea quarrelled among themselves in spite of the critical times and even took up arms against one another. The Albanian inhabitants followed their own inclinations entirely and even began separatist movements of a political nature.

It is remarkable that the Greek political consciousness was strengthened in the Morea in this period of political confusion. Mystra became the centre of a kind of renaissance and a centre of learning and study of classical antiquity. In this period there appeared in the Morea a great scholar who was a philospher of the Platonic school and also a fervent patriot of radical tendencies in social and political reforms. He was Georgios Gemistos or as he called himself "Plethon". His teaching was of a mystical nature. It was directed against Chris-

anitary, indeed against every positive religion. His followers who are said to have been numerous, formed a secret society. Plethon (d. between Feb. 1449 and July 1450) had also lived in Brussia where he had as a teacher a few named Elisios, who rejected Christianity, Judaism and Islam as the positive religions. In the reign of Sultan Bâyazid, he was burned at the stake as a heretic about 1390.

It is supposed that the teaching of Plethon and the secret society thus formed was suggested by a similar school of thought in old Turkey, that of the "akhbus" (cf. Fr. Taeuscher, in Isl., xvii. [1929], 236-243; Islamica, iv. [1929], 1 sqq.; Byzantinisch-

Neuropische Jahrbucher, viii. [1929-1930], 100-113 and Nikos A. Bees, ibid., vii. [1928-

1929], 237). Plethon's works were disseminated not only among the Christians west and Greek east but also among the Turks. The MS. Enderum 1896 in the library of the Top Kapu Serai contains an Arabic translation of a fragment of Plethon's chief work Nomos. This translation is said to have been made by Sultan Mehmed II and is anonymous (for Ahmad Makryplagi, the "Venistas" [Plethos], in Bull, d' l' Inst. d' Egypte).

The son and successor of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II, Johannes Palaeologos (1425-1448), concluded a treaty with Murâd II. The Turkish danger now threatened the Morea more seriously than ever. Since Nov. 1427 the despot Constantine Palaeologos had been ruling there. Alongside of this vigorous, enterprising and self-sacrificing ruler (afterwards Byzantine emperor), we find at this time also his brothers Thomas and Demetrius as princes in the Morea. They had less ability and strength of character and facilitated the conquest of the peninsula by the Turks. The three brothers, especially Constantine, succeeded in bringing the whole Morea except the Venetian colonies under Greek rule; but there was no unity among them. In 1429-1430 Constantine took Patras, which at this time was held by the archbishop and clerical prince Pandolf Malatesta as a vassal of Murâd II. The Sultan protested but Constantine was able to dispose of the claims of the Sultan and his advisers by a skilful ambassador. This envoy was Georgios Phrantzes, whose chris, an is exceedingly im-

portant source for Greek and Turkish history in the sixteenth century. In 1431 Turâkhan again reached the northern frontier of the Morea to destroy the Hexamillion wall a second time, for it had been restored by the Palaeologos. The first care of Constantine who now ruled over the greater part of the Morea and cherished ambitious plans, had been to restore the defeences of the isthmus. His aim was to unite the Morea with the mainland of Greece and if possible to found a Greek national state. In the west a new league had been formed against the Turks by Pope Eugenius IV, Venice and Hungary. At the same time the ri-ing of the Albanians under Skendarbeg roused a strong feeling against the Turks and encouraged the Christians. Constantine Palaeologos who at the request of the Pope, Venice and Hungary had joined their league against the Ottomans in 1444, crossed the isthmus with a well equipped army to invade the mainland of Greece. He had con-

siderable success. He forced the Duke of Athens Nero II Aeciajoli, who was a vassal of the Sultan, to recognise his suzerainty and to pay an annual tribute. He occupied many towns (including Thbes, Livadia, Zitum and Lidoriki) and encouraged the Christians of the Piadius to take up arms against
the Turks of the Thessalian plain. An Albanian clan settled in Phthiotis, whose autonomy had been recognised by the Sultan, joined the victorious Palaeologoi. The latter also occupied the little town of Witrimitra (on the Gulf of Corinth) which the Turks had ceded to the Venetians. He installed a chief of the Pindus Wallachians who lived in Fanar (at the foot of the Ithome mountains).

The battle of Barna (Nov. 10, 1444) brought a change in the Balkans which was fateful also for the Morea. The Turks reinforced once again turned their attention to the south. Nero II Accajoli of Athens found favour with Murad II after most humbly promising to be his vassal and to pay the usual tribute. In order to save their colonies in the Morea, the Venetians also made a treaty of peace with the Turks soon after the battle of Barna. It thus came about that the Palaeologoi were left to face the Turkish onslaught quite isolated, a danger which they apparently did not clearly realise. After Nero II Accajoli had again recognised Turkish suzerainty, Constantine Palaeologus with a large force invaded Attica and besieged Athens. The consequence was that Nero II Accajoli turned for assistance to Murad II. The latter demanded that Constantine should evacuate not only Attica but also all the Turkish territory which Constantine had seized in the course of 1444 on the mainland of Greece and in southern Thessaly. Constantine repulsed to Murad II through his ambassadors that he would keep the lands he had won. Murad II was furious at this manly attitude of Constantine II. Incited by Nero II and Turakhan, the Sultan resolved on a campaign into the Morea. By his command powerful Turkish forces were assembled in 1446 at Serres in Macedonia from Europe and Asia. Constantine Palaeologus and his brother Thomas also raised a very large army for that time which was assembled on the isthmus. In the winter of 1446, Suljan Murad II led his army from Macedonia to the isthmus, without meeting opposition. He encamped at Manglea (the modern Mykrit) and began to get his artillery and other arms ready. On his able picked staff was the experienced old Turakhan who, as already mentioned, had been twice in the Morea and therefore knew the country and the people. According to the historian Chalcokondyles (ed. Darké, ii. 114), Suljan Murad's camp on the isthmus was the best organised that had ever been known. A bloody battle developed for the gateway to the Morea. The Turks with their artillery bombarded the Hexamilion wall for days. A Serbian Janissary succeeded in leaping over the wall under the eyes of the Sultan and others followed him. The defenders so far as they were not killed by the Janissaries took to flight in a panic. The wall was thus in the hands of the Turks, who entered the Morea either through the gates or through the breaches their guns had made. In the Chronicle of Geoglossos Phrantzes the date of the capture of the Hexamilion wall, the "last bulwark of liberty in Greece", is given as Dec. 10, 1446. The Chronicon breve of Ioanninicus Cartanous gives Dec. 14, 1446, a date which has been accepted as correct by most modern historians.

The brothers Constantine and Thomas endeavoured to collect the scattered and flying troops, but in vain. The brothers therefore fled into the interior of the Morea. Sultan Murad II ordered Turakhan to pursue the Palaeologoi with 1,000 men and he himself with his army marched along the south coast of the Gulf of Corinth towards Patras. He burned the lower town, laid waste the country as far as Clarina and then turned eastwards to Corinth. In the meantime Turakhan had returned from his pursuit of the Palaeologoi with much booty and many prisoners. The Palaeologoi now began to negotiate for peace with the Sultan. They declared themselves ready to cede the lands in Greece proper and in Thessaly which they had acquired in 1444 and to pay an annual tribute. On these conditions the Sultan left them in possession of their lands in the Morea. The Emperor John VIII Palaeologus died on Oct. 3, 1448, and on Jan. 6, 1449 his brother Constantine, the despot of the Morea, was solemnly hailed as Byzantine Emperor in the Metropolitan church in Mystra. Of course he ascended the throne with the permission of Murad II, whose tributary he was. An event of importance in the history of the world soon afterwards took place on the Bosphorus. On May 29, 1453, Constantineople was taken by the Turks; the valiant Constantine died defending the city and thus the line of Byzantine emperors came to an end. When his brothers Thomas and Demetrius heard of the fall of Constantinople they sent envoys to Muhammad II asking to be allowed to retain their lands in the Morea, on payment of the usual tribute. After many humiliations, their request was granted them. The remainder of the period of Palaeologoi rule was a brief one and their authority only nominal. In 1455 30,000 Albanians in the Morea rebelled against the Palaeologoi. In July 1454 Venice sent Vettore Capello to the Morea, to settle certain business of the republic and at the same time to make peace between the Palaeologoi and the Albanians. But their effort failed. In the meantime Muhammad II had ordered Turakhan's second son Omar to intervene in the Morea on behalf of the Palaeologoi (end of 1455). He succeeded in putting down the Albanians. The Palaeologoi were now able to enjoy their lands as vassals of the Sultan. For a few years they paid their tribute regularly, then they refused to do so with various excuses. At the same time they endeavoured to form alliances with western rulers against the Turks, a thing to which the Sultan could not but remain indifferent.

The rule of the Palaeologoi was gradually approaching its end. The west scarcely troubled itself about the brothers of the last Byzantine emperors, who were not united and yet had to gather their last forces against the Turks. When a fleet belonging to the Pope Callixtus III appeared in the Aegean, Thomas Palaeologus took courage and announced his refusal of tribute to Muhammad II. Already the latter had received no tribute from the Palaeologoi for the past three years in spite of repeated warnings. He therefore thought it was time to settle matters himself in the Morea and to teach his rebellious vassals a lesson. In the middle of May 1458, Muhammad II came to the Morea with a large army, laid siege to Tarsus, a village in two parts N. W. of Nemea and N. E. of the Lake of Pheneos, and forced it to capitulate. The citadel of Rupeli in Arcadia, to which many Greeks had fled with their women and children, surrendered after two days' stubborn defence. Muhammad II turned from Arcadia to N. W. Morea. Patras, the headquarters of Thomas Palaeologus, was abandoned
by its citizens. The garrison left in its citadel did not dare to offer resistance. The Sultān treated the town of Patras very generously. By July 1458 Muḥammad II had reached Corinth after taking Basitza (Neaon) on the way. On Aug. 6, 1458, its commanders left the citadel to negotiate its surrender with the Sultān. The loss of Corinth to the Turks seriously alarmed the Palaeologoi. The nego-

by itself with 109 ziamets and 342 timar. Down to about 1570, the residence of the governor was by turns in Corinth, Loundar or Mystra, then in Nauplion and in 1780–1821 in Tropothra (cf. below). The division of the country under Turkish rule, usual from the middle of the xvith century, into 22 or 25 provinces or beyliks is partly suggested by nature and partly a survival of the older Byzantine organisation.

There is no doubt that the Turks introduced their own feudal system after their occupation of the Morea. The Turkish-Muslim element in the country was thus able to expand. Even during the first period of Turkish rule (1458–1687), other factors contributed to this, like the immigration into the Morea of Muslims from other parts of the Ottoman empire, the conversion of Christian Moreotes to Islam, the carrying off of Christian women into Turkish harems, etc. While in the north of the Balkan Peninsula and in Asia Minor, countless Christians had adopted Islam either voluntarily or under compulsion, the Christian element in the Morea at the time of the Turkish conquest was morally strong enough to remain intact and was faithful to the Christian religion. comparatively few Moreotes became Muslims. These were either Albanians, who always adopted Islam more readily (cf. thereon: C. Jirele, Studies sur Geschichte und Geographie Albaniens im Mittelalter, Budapest 1916). As in Asia Minor, Bosnia, Crete etc., so in the Morea also members of the nobility and middle classes, especially those of Frankish origin, had adopted Islam in order to retain possession of their estates. There were also in the Morea crypto-Christians, as well as people whose Islam was very superficial. These were usually called murādat (impure) in the Morea. These superficial Muslims, who continued to retain much that related to Christian worship, lived mainly in what is now the province of Olympia and were almost all exterminated during the Greek War of Liberation (cf. the articles by Phivos Chrysanthopoulos-Photakos in the Athens periodical Epistēmē, vol. ii, 1886, p. i). The Barduniots were also for the most part superficially Muslims. As to the survival of the Greek Moreote element, there are theories current in modern literature which can hardly be right. It is said for example that Sultān Muḥammad II’s ordinance regulating the relations of the Christian subjects to the Ottoman empire benefited also the Christian Moreotes. But it is wrong to credit Muḥammad II with any such ordinance (cf. Fr. Giese, in Isl., xix., 1931, p. 264 sqq.). It is however a historical fact that the Greek Orthodox Church contributed a great deal to maintain the Christian element in the Morea as in the East generally. The Christian clergy of the Morea were frequently able to maintain a privileged attitude towards the Turkish officials and thus to further the interests of their co-religionists. The Christian Moreotes were also often cleverly able to avoid paying the taxes their children taken by the Turks for the Janissaries. The Christians of the Morea held this, the “blood tax”, to be the greatest degradation they suffered under the Turkish yoke and a dreadful disgrace to their race. After the death of Sultān Sulaimān the Magnificent (1566), the lot of the Christian Moreotes gradually became worse. Ownerless lands were confiscated by the Sultān and given to his soldiers or allotted to the mosques as wa’fs or given to private individuals as gifts. During the
long period of Turkish rule in the Morea, the largest and best part of the land was in Turkish hands. As a rule, Christians were not allowed to own large estates. The peasants had to pay over annually the fifth of the produce of the land and pay all kinds of annual taxes, were never sure of their property, nor even of their wives and children, and suffered unspeakably in every way from arbitrary Turkish rule.

In view of the abuses of the Turkish authorities, the Christian Moreote preferred to abandon the fertile regions and retire to barren lands and into the mountains, where he could breathe more freely and more easily escape the despotism of his rulers and shape his course of life a little more pleasantly. We thus find that within the period 1560-1821 the mountains of the Morea were predominantly inhabited by Christians. Of the factors which contributed to the survival of Greek culture in the Morea during Turkish rule special stress must be laid on the political concessions which were made to them by the Ottomans. These lay mainly in the freedom to govern their own communities. Greek local government, as we find it during Turkish rule, is said to have been a continuation of old Greek institutions. In the period from 1715 to 1821, if not earlier, the freedom of the Greek community was not infrequently limited by the Turkish authorities. They interfered indirectly in the appointment of local officials and made propaganda for their favourites. It even happened that the Kojjabaghis, through the influence of the Turks, were not only appointed for a number of years, but also able to hand down their offices to children and grand-children. Undoubtedly, those Moreotes who were better off who lived in townships and villages which were allotted to the several places of Islam or to members of the Ottoman imperial family. The town of Dimitsana in Gortynia for example was originally a wall of Mecca under the protection of the Sultan's mother.

The peace between their Turkish rulers and Christians could only be external. In the Morea also there were the so-called "Klefs" who would not submit to the existing government and took up arms against it. Against them the Turks used the Armatoll force, a gendarmerie of Christians organised on military lines. In the period from 1715 to 1821 the Turks for the security of the country built watchhouses (deribent) in which a garrison was stationed to watch those who passed, especially at the passes. The Derbeneka (kiaruk deribent) between Corinth and Argos and the Derbenka of Lontari, the passes between Arcadia and Messenia (Makriplagi, cf. above) were all very important. The Mainotes in their wild mountains felt little of the Turkish yoke which weighed heavily on the rest of the Morea. The Mainote tribes who were distinguished for their valour, were from 1460 to 1821 in constant rebellion against every foreign power. The Porto found itself forced to recognise officially the independence of Maima, in return for which the Mainotes were to pay tribute, but did not always do so. Although the Christians in the Morea were exempt from military service, the warlike spirit which they had so often displayed in the Frankish period continued to survive. An eloquent testimony to their love of freedom was the fact that they continually took up arms against their Turkish oppressors, sometimes alone, sometimes with allies.

For a long period after the year 1460, when Sultan Muhammad II had made the greater part of the Morea a province of his empire, this land became the scene of desperate fighting between Turks and Venetians, in which the latter had the majority of the Christian population on their side. The great champion of the Christians, Skanderbeg [q.v.], the leader of the Venetian mercenaries, died in 1468. Two years later, Turkish rule over Euboia was firmly established and they could record further successes in the Morea.

In the spring of 1499 a new war between Venice and Turkey broke out. On Aug. 29-30, 1499, Lepanto had to surrender to the Turks. In 1500 Sultan Bayazid II ordered Yağhiş Paşâ to blockade Modon with his fleet, while he himself set out by land from Constantinople with a well-equipped army for the Morea. On Aug. 9, 1500 (according to Hâdivî Khalifa: on 14th Muḥarram 916), Modon [q.v.] fell after a long siege in the presence of the Sultan. Bayazid II turned the cathedrals at Modon and Koron into mosques and offered up thanks in them and gave these towns to Mecca as ważfs. He then paid attention to the defences of the newly acquired towns and to the repopulation of Modon. In 1502-1503 Venice concluded a treaty of peace with Turkey in which she surrendered her Messenian colonies and also Maina, which had in the meanwhile been taken by a son of Krokondios Kladas in name of the Republic. In 1532 the Morea became the scene of notable battles. The emperor Charles V had decided to intervene in the Morea. A considerable fleet assembled in Messina in June 1532. The Pope and the Knights of St. John, the Genoese and the Sicilians also showed a readiness to join in the expedition, the leader of which was the Genoese Andrea Doria (Andreusius).

After repeated and costly attacks, the allies succeeded in taking a considerable part of the lower town of Koron. The Turks who had retired into the citadel of Koron were forced to capitulate. From Koron Andrea Doria turned his attention to Patras, which also capitulated. He then returned with rich booty. Sulaimân I, who was now on the throne, gave the sanâḳ of the Morea to Muḥammad Beg, a son of Yağhiş Paşâ and commissioned him to reconquer the fortresses taken by Andrea Doria. Sulaimân I declared war on Venice in 1537. Kâsim Paşâ, the sanâḳ-beg of the Morea, was commissioned to conquer the Venetian colonies in the Morea. Nur al-Dîn Barbarossa had inflicted several defeats on Venice in her colonies, and she had besides every reason to complain of the Venetian tendency to populate once more their new possessions in the Morea. About 1550, there were about 42,000 Christian families in the whole Morea. We know nothing definite of the Muslim population at this time. It may be assumed however that, then as later, Muslims were in a minority. Even when Ottoman power was at its height, the oppressed Moreotes, always desirous of liberty, rose against their oppressors. In the xviii century the lot of the Christians in the Morea is to be found unbearable. Two Turkish sources of the xvi-xvii century are of considerable importance for the history of the Morea. These are the "Survey of
the World" (Qizhân-name) of Hādji Khalīfa (d. Oct. 1657) and the Travels (Siyyâhat-name) of Ewliya Celebi, who visited the Morea in 1668 and 1670. There is no fuller work on the Morea than the latter among Muslim sources. Ewliya Celebi's narrative was based on personal observation and is distinguished by a vividness of description and to some extent by a tendency to exaggerate. In the treatment of the Morea, given in his vol. viii., it is hardly possible to trace his literary sources. What he tells us about Muslim buildings and religious orders is of importance, and his account of the Christians is also of value. He naturally takes the Ottoman point of view (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Siyyâhat-name, vol. viii., Stambul 1928; Fr. Labinger, G. O. W., p. 219 sqq.; Fr. Taeschner, in H., vol. xviii., 1928, p. 299 sqq.).

When Ewliya Celebi visited the Morea, various Muslim orders and corporations had settled there. They included jāzirā, brotherhoods, dervish orders, some of which were anti-Islamic, and Şîxi Bekâşıyane. The existence of such brotherhoods, which were widely disseminated in the Greek east from the xvi century, can be proved for the Morea as late as 1828 (cf. F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, vol. i.—ii., Oxford 1929).

At the end of 1683 another coalition against the Morea was formed by Venice, Poland, Germany, Russia and the Pope. Francesco Morosini was appointed by his government to begin operations against the Turks as speedily as possible. He was given command of the allied naval forces. After 42 days of fighting by land and sea, Koron was stormed by Morosini. In the period from the late summer of 1683 to July 1686 Morosini, Count Otto Wilhelm von Königsmarck and Haanbal von Degenfeld took from the Turks Old and New Navarino, Kalamata, Modon, Zernata, Passava, Celefa and Viitlo as well as other fortified places in southern Morea. The Serasker Isma'il Pasha was defeated in several battles and had to retire to the interior of the Morea. Hasan Pasha, who was in Maina, negotiated with Morosini and surrendered voluntarily. The Turkish garrisons of many towns, on the other hand, offered a desperate resistance. It cost the Venetians and their allies much time and heavy sacrifices to take Nauplion. The capture of the latter contributed a great deal to increase their confidence. By the end of 1687 Morea up to Monemvasia was Venetian. Continued Turkish raids, however, continued to disturb the security of the peninsula. By the peace of Connaught (Jan. 26, 1699), the Porte had to cede the Morea to Venice. The seas of the Morea and of the mainland of Greece were now open to Turkey as well as to Venice. For the last period of Venetian rule in the Morea (1699—1715 or 1718), the reader may be referred to L. Ranke, Zur venetianischen Geschichte, Leipzig 1878, p. 277—361. The services of Venice to the peninsula in the period 1688—1714 must not be underestimated, especially as she had found it at a very low level.

The occupation of the Morea by the Venetians now attracted the attention of western scholars to the celebrated peninsula. The Turkish empire, which had been able to profit a good deal by the troubles in Europe at the beginning of the xvii century, resolved at the end of 1714 to reconquer the Morea. Many Greeks felt that the Venetians had not respected their rights in religious and family matters, were hostile to their own government and even wanted the Turks back again (cf. De la Montray, Voyage, vol. i., p. 462). Except for a few larger towns which offered a resistance, the land was easily taken by the Turks and so the Morea once again became Turkish. The history of this conquest was written by several contemporary writers.

The peace of Passarowitz (June 10, 1718) ceded Morea finally to the Turks. We are most fully informed about their rule from 1718 to 1821. The extant sources, especially in Greek, enable us to study the period to the smallest detail. After 1715 many Christians again adopted Islam. A census taken in 1720 gave 60,000 male Christians of 11 years of age and over. The Muhammadan inhabitants are said to have been in the minority at this time. On the other hand, the Turkish element increased in the period 1709—1780 while the number of Christians diminished considerably, as did the total number of the population. From 1715 to ca. 1750 the Morea was governed by a Pašha, the Morowales, who had three muqtaš and the title of Pasha. He was usually assisted by two other Pašhas, who were under him and were granted two muqtaš. A change was made in 1780. From this date to 1821 the government of the Morea was no longer given to a particular Pašha but to a simple muqtaš of the Porte, who was however given the title of Pasha. The higher offices were held by a muqtabeledi, a defterkachya and a Christian dragoman. Under the official system of administrative divisions, the Morea was divided into 22 districts. In this period Christian local autonomy gained more strength. After the many disappointments they had suffered from the western powers, the Moreotes now looked to Russia to liberate them from the Turkish yoke. From the time of Peter the Great the bonds between Greeks and Russians had been growing stronger. In the middle of the xviii century, Russian propaganda increased very much among the Orthodox of the Balkans. Under Catherine II, the Russians easily succeeded, with the help of Greek agents, in stirring up Greek notables and clergy in the Morea to rebel against the Turks. Among these the most distinguished was the influential and wealthy Panayotis Mpenakis of Kalamata. This secret propaganda did not escape the Turks. By 1767—1768 the Christians were preparing for rebellion. On Oct. 15, 1768, Turkey declared war on Russia. Russian fleets, whose equipment left much to be desired, appeared in the Mediterranean. On Feb. 17, 1779, Theodoros Orloff landed at Vitylo and received a warm welcome from the Mpanites; but as the ships had neither sufficient men, guns or munitions, the first enthusiasm of the Greeks soon died down. On July 21, 1774, a treaty of peace was concluded at Kucuk Kainardji between Russia and Turkey. Full religious liberty and other concessions were granted to the Christian subjects of the Turks. About three months later, the Porte granted a general amnesty to the Christians of the Morea and resolved to clear the land of Albanian bandits. After 1770 the Porte had confiscated a number of Christian estates in the Morea and granted them to mosques and imaretars. By the treaties of Kucuk Kainardji and Kaimalı Kavak (10th March 1779), the Turks now promised to return these or to compensate their owners, but the promises were not kept. Nevertheless, the Moreote
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P. 432b, l. 11 ab infra, add.: According to Ibn al-Athsir (ed. Tornberg, i. 314, 375, cf. Yakut, iv. 294) Kusmîn deposed al-Mundhir b. Ms' Saltama because of his refusal to accept Mardakism and appointed in his place the Kindite al-Hārith b. 'Amir, who had embraced the new faith. Whatever may be the truth, the relations between the king of Persia and the Arabs have been influenced by Mardakism.

P. 496b, line 11, 12 ab infra, read: Tanur who stayed in Balat (Milet) on his return from Smyrne in the winter after the battle of Angora (1402) (Oxen, p. 96, cf. Bosan, various readings).


P. 504b, l. 19: instead of Nukai, read Nukat.
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MOREA — AL-MUHALLAB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>W. Gött. = Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM = Archives maroc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN = Allgemeine Missionszeitsschrift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anth. = Anthropos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO = Acta Orientalia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQR = Asiatic Quarterly Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARW = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Fr. B = Bulletin du Comité de l'Asie française</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAH = Bibliotheca Arab.-Hispan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGA = Bibliotheca geographorum arabicorum ed. de Goeje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIE = Bulletin de l'Institut Égyptien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIFAO = Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale au Caire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTLV = Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned.-Indië</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ = Byzantinische Zeitschrift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA = Corpus inscriptionum arabicorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC = L'Égypte Contemporaine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL = Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGA = Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJ = Geographical Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS = Gibb Memorial Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOR = Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOW = Babinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. Ph. = Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAI = Giornale della Soc. Asiatica Italiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOP = Gibb, History of ottoman poetry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG = Indische Gids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRM = International Review of Missions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAS = Journal Asiatique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAS = Journal of the African Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. OS = Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author = Journal of the Anthropological Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB = Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Soc. of Bengal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE = Jewish Encyclopedia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPBS = Journal of the Punjab Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR = Journal of the Royal Geographical Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF = Ogagna della Società Italiana degli Scienze Orientali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE = Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK = Koloniale Rundschau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS = Keleti Szemle (Revue orientale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach. = Al-Machiq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDPV = Mitteilungen und Nachr. des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFOBT (beyrouth) = Mémoires de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGG = Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Wien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMS = Mit. z. Geschichte der Medizin und Naturwissenschaften</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGWJ = Monatschrift f. d. Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judentums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI = Mir Neve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEG = Mémoires de l'Institut Égyptien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI = Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Inst. d'Arabologie et d'Archéologie Orientale au Caire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIH = Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vergleiche**

- **MSL** = Mémoires de la Société Linguistique
- **MSOS Afr.** = Mittheilungen des Sen. für oriental. Sprachen, Afrika
- **MSOS As.** = Mittheilungen des Sen. für oriental. Sprachen, Asien
- **MTM** = Milli teşvîh-i medium'da
- **MW** = The Modern World
- **NE** = Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi
- **NGW Gött.** = Nachrichten d. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. in Göttingen
- **NO** = De. Neue Orient
- **OA** = Orientalisches Archiv
- **OC** = Oriens Christianus
- **OLZ** = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
- **OM** = Orient Moderno
- **PEQOS** = Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement
- **PELOV** oder P. Ec. Lang. Or. Vire = Publications in l'école des langues orientales vivantes
- **Pet.** = Pettersens Mitteilungen
- **QDC** = Questions diplomatiques et coloniales
- **RAAD = Revue de l'Académie Arabe de Damas**
- **R Aff. = Revue Africaine**
- **R E = Revue des Études Juives**
- **RE Isl. = Revue des études islamiques**
- **RHR = Revue du Histoire des Religions**
- **RIG = Revue Indigène**
- **RMM = Revue du Monde Musulman**
- **RO = Revue Orientale**
- **RO = Revue des Orient latins**
- **RAAH = Rev. dela R. Académie de la Historia, Madrid**
- **RRAAL = Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei Classe di sc. mor., stor., e biol.**
- **RSO = Rivista degli studi orientali**
- **RT = Revue Tunisienne**
- **SBAK, Held. = Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wiss. in Heidelberg**
- **SBAK, Wien = Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wiss. in Wien**
- **SB = Bayr. Ak. = Sitzungsberichte der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften**
- **SBPMS = Sitzungsberichte d. Phys. -medizin. Gesellschaft zu Erlangen**
- **SB Pr. Ak. W. = Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin**
- **TBGK = Tijdschrift van het Bataviasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen te Amsterdam**
- **TOEM = Török-i Othomâni (Türk) Endüjmeni Medenî Mutsav, Revue Historique publiée par l'Institut d'Histoire Ottomane**
- **TTEM s. TOEM**
- **Verd. Med. Ak. = Verslagen en Mededelingen der Koninklijke Academie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam**
- **WI = Die Welt des Islams**
- **Wiss. Veröff. DÖG = Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft**
- **WZKM = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes**
- **ZA = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie**
- **Zap. = Zapiaki**
- **ZA+W = Zeitschrift f. alttestamentliche Wissenschaft**
- **ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft**
- **ZDPV = Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins**
- **ZGEO = Berl. = Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin**
- **ZI = Zeitschrift für Islamistik u. Iranistik**
- **ZK = Zeitschrift für Kolonialgespräche**
- **ZKG = Zeitschrift für Oberitaliensische Geschichtswissenschaft**
Christians benefited considerably by the treaties between Russia and Turkey; this was not however the case with the treaties later concluded (June 10, 1783 and Dec. 29, 1791). The day the Christians of the Morea to trade under the Russian flag contributed to their economic expansion in the period 1775–1821. Intellectual relations between western Europe and the Greeks of the Morea became closer and closer after 1790. A new generation grew up among the Greeks of the Morea and other provinces. Since the peace of Paris of 1815, the Moreotes and other Greeks had become convinced that only their own liberation could save them of the Turkish yoke. Careful preparations were made in anticipation of the right moment. In the spring of 1821 open rebellion broke out among the Greeks of the Morea, when the Turkish governor Khurhad Pāshā was besieging the rebel 'Ali Pāshā at Yanina. Soon after the beginning of the rising, in which a prominent part was played by Theodoros Kolokotronis of a famous Klef family, the Moreotes were masters of the lowlands and even occupied several towns and fortresses. In July, the Porte commissioned Ibrahim Pāshā, the adopted son of Mehmed 'Ali of Egypt, to put down the Greek rising. Ibrahim Pāshā landed his forces in Messenia. He was able to restore Turkish rule over most of the Morea, but he failed to put down the Greek rebellion. In the meanwhile, philhellenism had made progress in Europe and America, and it thus came about that the cabinets of Europe began to take an interest in the question of Greek freedom. On July 6, 1827, England, France and Russia concluded a treaty in London, by which the Morea and other parts of the Greek mainland were to form an independent principality but to pay tribute to the Porte. The Turks insisted on their point of view and declined the interception of the great powers as regards the rebel Greeks. On Oct. 20, 1827, the combined fleets of the above mentioned powers destroyed the Turko-Egyptian fleet at Nava-rin. On Jan. 18, 1828, Johannes Kapolistias came to Nauplion, having been elected President of the Greek Free State by the National Assembly at Troizenoe. On Aug. 6, 1828, England concluded a treaty with Mehmed 'Ali of Egypt for the evacuation of the Morea by the Egyptian troops. French troops, led by General N. J. Maizoi, soon afterwards landed in Messenia by order of Charles X to drive the Turk-Egyptian troops out of the Morea. In the autumn of 1828 Ibrahim Pāshā withdrew to Egypt after turning the Morea into a heap of ruins during his 3½ years in the Peninsula. After long diplomatic negotiations, much quarrelling among the great powers and disagreement between the Moreotes and the other Greeks, Prince Otto, the second son of the philhellenic Ludwig of Bavaria, landed at Naupilon on Feb. 6, 1832 as the first king of Greece. Henceforth the Morea formed a part of the kingdom of Greece. During the rise of 1821–1827 and later, many Moreote Muslims adopted Christianity. To this day, many buildings and inscriptions and especially place-names recall the days when the Morea was under the Crescent.  


(NIKOS A. BEES) [BnE]  

MORISCOS, (MORISCOS), the name given in the country after the capture of Granada by the Catholic Kings, Ferdinand and Isabella, on Jan. 2, 1492 and the dethronement of the last ruler of the Nasrid dynasty.  

It is mainly from Spanish sources that we learn the history of the Moriscos down to their final expulsion from Spain. Arabic texts relating to them are very rare: the only record at all detailed is that of the Maghrībi al-Maṣṭar, a contemporary of the exodus of the Moriscos, in his Nafīṣ al-Thīb.  

In proportion as the Spanish "reconquest" proceeded, groups of Muslims gradually increasing in

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLĀM, III.
From the beginning of the xvi century, Islam was definitely uprooted from Iberian soil. According to the Arab authors, the great exodus at the beginning of the xvirh century was a most cruel hardship for the Moors. A large number died on their enforced journey. Many went to France, from which they tried to reach Muslim lands. A few colonies of Muslims from Spain settled in Egypt and Constantinople. But the majority went direct from Spanish ports to North Africa, their nearest refuge, where they were known as Andalusis and where they were not always welcomed, at least in Morocco, with open arms. The principal settlements were those at Sfax and Rabat on the one hand and Tetwân on the other, where their descendants still form the most prosperous and most industrious section of the population. The Andalusis of the seaports of the Atlantic coast of Morocco soon began to devote themselves to piracy: the celebrated Moroccan corsairs were almost all Moors, who had retained the use of the Spanish language. On the other hand, the Moroccan Sultans organised corps of picked troops from the Andalusis and they played a prominent part under the Saûdians, especially in the conquest of the Sûdân. There was also very soon a large colony of the Sierra Nevada Moors, who settled in the towns of Temucen, Oran and Algiers. At Tunis they were well received by the Dey Uûmân: they settled together in two quarters which took their name (cf. TUNIS, iv., p. 886). Those who had not been town-dwellers settled in little villages which soon became prosperous and still have a characteristic Spanish look. Such are the villages of Solmân, Grombalía, Dèjedia, Zaghwân, Teburbba, Testur and Gafét el-Andilés (Kâât al-Andalûs).


(E. Lévi-Provençal)
MOROCCO, a country and Muslim state of Northern Africa. The name (Spanish Marruecos, French Maroc) is a corruption of Marrakesh, the largest town in southern Morocco [see the article Marrakesh].

1. Geography.

Morocco occupies the western part of Barbary; it corresponds to the Maghrib-al-Alkā of the Arab geographers [see the article MAHRIB]. Lying between 5° and 15° W. longitude (Greenwich) on the one hand and between 26° and 28° N. latitude on the other, it covers approximately an area of between 500,000 and 550,000 square kilometres. On the North it is bounded by the Mediterranean, on the West by the Atlantic and on the South by the Sahara. On the eastern side it stretches to the Tell and to the plateau of Oran. The boundary which separates it from Algeria is quite conventional and fixed definitely only on the northern side, for a length of 80 miles, from the mouth of the Wādī Kīs to Thenyet-al-Sūt.

Although Morocco forms one with the northern part of Africa it is chiefly oriented to the West. It is, one might say, the Atlantic slope of Barbary; it is nevertheless a continental country. The coast does not lend itself to a maritime population; the Mediterranean coast is steep and inhospitable, the Atlantic coastline straight and lacking in natural shelters. The estuaries of the rivers are of very little value because of the sandbars which obstruct their entrances. The geological structure is somewhat complicated. Below the folds of the primary age, of which there still exist much eroded evidence covered by secondary deposits, have risen strata contemporary with the Alps. The actual relief which has resulted from these movements of the earth's surface and from these successive modifications consists of folded mountain chains, plateaux and plains. The chains are two in number, the Rif and the Atlas. The Rif is the continuation of the Anti-Atlas from the other side of the Strait of Gibraltar of the Baetican Cordillera [cf. Rif]. The Atlas chain forms the backbone of Morocco. It breaks into the High Atlas oriented West-North-East, linked by the volcanic massif of Sīrāw to the Anti-Atlas which lies more to the South, and also to the Middle Atlas running in a diagonal line from the South-West to the North-East, as far as the country of the outer foothills of the Rif, from which it is separated by the corridor of Tārā [see the article ATLAS]. From these different chains stretch plateaux. Those of the East connect the High Atlas to the Saharan Atlas of Algeria; those of the West gradually descend towards the Atlantic. Amongst the latter some are only the vestiges of the primary layer raised and eroded; others are composed of sedimentary deposits of varying origins. In consequence of the oblique orientation of the middle Atlas, which gradually draws away from the coast, the plains, which occupy in Morocco a more important place than in the rest of Barbary, lie mainly on the Atlantic side. They are composed of two series, the one stretching diagonally from the mouth of the Wādī Temsīf to that of the Muluya (the sub-Atlantic plains, the plain of Sebūl, the corridor of Tāzā, the plain of the lower Muluya). The other stretches to the foot of the High Atlas (Hawz of Marrakesh) and disappears in the heart of the middle Atlas.

Climate. The climate of Morocco has been defined as "an Atlantic variety of the Mediterranean climate" (Gentil). This however must not be taken to apply to the whole of the country; the different regions differ as much in regard to temperature as in the distribution of rain. On the Atlantic coast the climate is relatively mild in winter and cool in summer; only small differences are recorded between the coldest month and the warmest (5°7 at Mogador and 10° at Rabat). In the interior on the other hand, the seasonal variations and even the daily ones increase the farther one goes inland. They become excessive under the influence of convection currents. The climate of Morocco where the climate is distinctly continental. The rainfall is equally lacking in uniformity. Brought by the West and S.-W. winds, the rains are abundant in the autumn, the winter and the beginning of spring but they are very rare during the summer. The Atlantic coast has everywhere a copious rainfall although the quantity which falls decreases as one goes from North to South (Tangier: 32 inches, Casablanca: 16 inches). It also enjoys the benefit of an atmosphere which is saturated with moisture even in summer. The interior is not so well served. The rains diminish in quantity from West to East. The mountain masses always form an exception. They condense the moisture in the form of rain and even snow which, although it is by no means perpetual, nevertheless covers the high summits of the Atlas mountains until the beginning of the summer. Eastern Morocco on the other hand, isolated by the barrier of the Middle Atlas, is not subject to oceanic influences and only receives, except in the immediate neighbourhood of the Mediterranean, rare and irregular downfalls of rain.

The flora reveals a striking fashion these variations of climate. Forests of evergreen oak, of oak and of cedar clothe the peaks of the High and the Middle Atlas and of the Rif. The cork tree is found in extensive forests in the massifs of Za'īr and Zayān and as far as the region of the Atlantic (forest of the Ma'mūra). The thuya and the arganier (a tree peculiar to the S.-W. of Morocco) are already more disseminated. Poplars, willows, elms and tamarisks form a fringe of verdure along the wādīs. The olive tree is met almost everywhere in its wild state. But, as the rain-fall decreases, the forest gives place to scrub where the jujube tree and the mastic abound, then to prairie and steppes. The prairie, which hardly goes beyond the limits of the maritime plain, is the home of plants which are used for fodder and of bulbous plants. The steppes is the home of shrubs and bushes (amarak, drin, alfa) which are almost adapted to a dry soil and to extreme variations in temperature. The steppes cover a part of the interior plains of Western Morocco and practically the whole of Eastern Morocco, where they extend to the neighbourhood of the Mediterranean. As regards the desert, it is devoid of vegetation in the ḥammāda [see AFAKH], although the oases form spots of verdure in the midst of the general desolation.

Hydrography. The structure of the country and the relative abundance of rainfall affect the hydrography. Morocco is much richer in running streams and in submerged water than any other country in Northern Africa. Wādīs (wells) are more numerous; their courses are longer and their volume larger. A number of them even deserve the name of rivers. The waters flow in three different
directions: towards the Atlantic, towards the Mediterranean and towards the basin of the Sahara. The Atlantic rivers are in all respects the most important. They can be divided into three groups: those of the North (Lükkos and Sebû), those of the centre (Bû Ragrag and Umm al-Kabîr), and those of the South (Tensift and Sûs). The Lükkos drains the district of the Gharb; the Sebû, those of the Middle Atlas, of the Zarhûn, and the southerm slope of the Rif. On emerging from the mountains it takes numerous turns and windings across the alluvial plains and reaches the ocean after a course of 300 miles. The full extent of the drainage system is not traceable in volume, according to the season, it never dries up completely. It is even navigable in its lower course. The Bû Ragrag and the Um al-Kabîr run for a part of their course through the Central Plateau, the Moroccan “Meseta”. The irregularity of their courses makes them useless for navigation. The Tensift, to the North of the High Atlas, the Wâd Sûs to the South, which are much less in volume approach more nearly to the classic type of wâd of Northern Africa. The watercourses of the Sahara (Wâd Mir, Wâd Zir, Wâd Darâra) diminish in volume as they go farther away from the mountains and end by disappearing in the sand. The Darâra alone reaches the Atlantic, but it only contains running water in its lower course [see the article Darâra]. As for the Mediterranean rivers, they are only torrents with violent and rapid floods. The Muluya alone forms an exception. It collects water from the slopes of the Middle Atlas but only reaches the sea in multi-diminished volume on account of the loss it suffers in crossing the steppes.

Although the common characteristics of all the countries of Barbary are found in Morocco, the greater or less differences in relief, the differences in climate, the peculiarities of vegetation bring in their train a diversity more marked than in Algeria or Tunisia. The combination of these different elements determines the existence of regions which differ one from the other in their configuration, their resources, the density and manner of existence of their population. We may distinguish six such regions: Northern Morocco, the basin of the Sebû, Central Morocco, the country of the Atlas, Eastern Morocco, and Moroccan Sahara.

Northern Morocco. Northern Morocco comprises a mountainous zone (the mountains of the Rif properly so-called which are to the North-West continued in the “domes” of the Djebala as far as the Strait of Gibraltar) and regions less rugged in character which to the South-East and the West form the transition into the adjoining countries. The mountains split into deep ravines by the courses of the wâdis, for the most part only leave between their last escarpment and the sea-shore a narrow strip, or a few bays enclosed between the rocky promontories. A few cuttings which run across the ranges afford communication between the two watersheds. The Rif, therefore, must seem to be a world very little accessible to influences from without. Arab influence has scarcely grazed it. The population has always vigorously opposed the political measures of the sultans as well as the attempts of Europeans to settle themselves there. Crowded into a limited territory, since the highest parts of the mountains are useless, the Rifans find their chief means of subsistence in the cultivation of vegetables and fruits. A number of them gain from temporary emigration an addition to their resources. They are not nomadic but inhabit villages perched on the slopes. Towns are represented only by Shafsâwân and Wazzân, religious and commercial centres, situated the one on the northern side and the other on the southern side of the Djebala. Towards the South-East, plains interspersed with mountain masses extend as far as the Muluya. The lack of rain gives to these plains (Salwân, Gâret) the aspect of steppes more fitted to a pastoral life than to agriculture and a settled life. Towards the West the lowlying coastal, still a very narrow border at the strait of Gibraltar, increases from the North to the South between the Atlantic coast and the last slopes of the Djebala. This district commonly called the Gharb is a corridor. It still keeps in this respect its historical significance, but its economic value is diminished by the stagnation of its waters in the hollows in the flat bottoms of the valleys, and by the insecurity resulting from the proximity of the warlike tribes of the high mountains. A few townships have however succeeded in establishing themselves, either at the crossing of roads such as al-Ḳâṣr al-Kabîr [q. v.] or in proximity to the coast like Ceuta, Tangier and Larache [see the articles Iṭṭeṣwân, Ālifta, Tângier, al-Ḳabîr]. The Wâd al-Râbi, the valley into which the Sebû falls, lies between the Rif, the Middle Atlas, Moroccan Meseta and the Atlantic. The situation of the region, the abundance and variety of its natural resources makes it of exceptional value. The Sebû links up the whole of it. Through its tributary the Innâwân, the valley of which leads to the pass of Tâzit, it makes communication with the rest of Barbary easy. The mountain masses there (Zerhûn, Zâlûghû, mountains of Gerwan) offer no insuperable obstacles to communication. The high plains of Sâšîs and Meknes are contrasted with the lower plains of the Shârda and the alluvial plains of the lower course of the Sebû. The influence of the Atlantic is felt far into the interior and combines with the numerous streams that flow into the Sebû and its tributaries and the subterranean waters to promote the development of all forms of vegetation. Forests cover the higher slopes of the mountains; fruit-trees flourish on the sunny slopes and cereals on the high plains; the meryâa, temporary marshes produced by the Sebû, in its lower course are used for grazing until they are sufficiently dry to be of use to agriculture. This combination of circumstances, so auspicious for human habitation, has made the valley of the Sebû a centre of intensive settlement. The most diverse ethnic elements have settled together and mixed there. All types of habitation are found in all degrees of mixture, to descend from a nomadic to settled town life. Human activities are displayed in the most varied forms (grazing, agriculture, arboriculture, commerce, industry). The country villages, douars of “nuwâlas” in the plains, villages of houses of clay in the mountains, are numerous, the towns are flourishing. Mawâli Idris is the sacred city of Morocco, Sebû on the borders of the plain of Sâshîs and the high limestone plateau lives by trading with the people of the mountains and the industry of its weavers and makers of slippers, Fas and Meknes are among the great cities of Morocco.

The first of these towns has remained to this day the political, religious, intellectual and economic centre of Morocco. It has resisted all the usual
causes of decline. From all time the ownership of the high plains of the Sebû has been bitterly contested. Their possession has been the condition for the establishment and survival of the dynasties which have succeeded one another in Morocco. Their political significance and role in history correspond very closely to their geographical position and economic value.

Central Morocco. Between the valley of the Sebû, the ranges of the Atlas and the Atlantic, covering about a quarter of habitable Morocco, lies the region called by the geologists the Moroccan Meseta. It includes districts of very different character, the only feature uniting them being the possession of a common substratum, the Hercynian paenoplain covered almost everywhere by sedimentary horizontal formations. Differences of structure and of climate distinguish clearly the various parts: the Atlantic plain, the plateaux of the centre, and the interior plain of the Haiz. The maritime plain lies along the Ocean from Rabiat to Mogador. Very narrow at its northern and southern ends, it broadens near the centre (Dukkala, Shâwiya) to a width of 50 miles. To the rains and the constant moisture from the vicinity of the Atlantic, the abundance of running streams and subterranean waters, the natural fertility of the soil further adds to the conditions for prosperity. The Atlas or black lands which run in an unbroken line behind the coast from the Bû Ragrag to Tensift are admirably suited for the growth of cereals. Their rural population, almost everywhere settled, is therefore considerable. The land of the Dukkala has 40 people to the square kilometre, a density very much greater than that of the other districts of Morocco. The towns of the coast, Salé, Rabat, Casablanca, Mazagan, Azemmûr, Safi, Mogador [q. v.], benefit by the richness of the hinterland. The exportation of agricultural produce has at all times been a branch of commerce, and has been much developed since the settlement of Europeans there. While facility for communications and the continental relations with the valley of the Sebû opened the plain to Arab influences, the ports of the coast maintained contact with abroad and permitted the infiltration of European influences.

The Interior is much more broken. The ground rises gradually to a height of 2,000-2,500 feet. The predominant formation is plateaux terminating on the north in the very old masses of the Zaîtir and Zayân, which are really mountains in character, in the south in the equally old but less elevated massif of the Rahdûna. These plateaux deeply cut into by the course of the Umm Rabût overlook on the west side the lowlying coastalands from the top of cliffs, and slope gently on the S. E. to the plain of Tâdilâ. This is a depression, over 120 miles in length, running to the north into the heart of the Middle Atlas where it terminates in a cul de sac, while it broadens greatly in its southern part. A low pass enables communication to be made between the Tâdilâ and the Haiz of Marrakush, a basin shut in by the High Atlas in the south, the Middle Atlas in the east, the Ujjilût in the north and the hills of the Shiyyûna in the west. The economic value of this inner region is very unequal. On the mountains of the north the rains and streams support forests and the natives devote themselves to cattle-rearing. The plateaux of the centre covered with a surface of limestone have great stretches of bare rock and cultivation is barely possible. The Tâdilâ is no better favoured except in the zone adjoining the Atlas, watered by torrents descending from the mountains. The plain of the Haiz would also suffer disastrously from drought, had human industry not averted this danger. An ingenious system of irrigation has transformed the country round Marrakush into a vast palmgrove and resulted in a particularly dense population (100 to the square kilometre). Comparatively large towns (Amâsîr, Demnît, Tânasûtâh) and especially Marrakush [q. v.] have been enabled to rise and prosper. Between this region, already half Saharan, and the high lying plains of the Sebû, the plateaux of the centre and the mountains of the north which come down to within a short distance of the shore, interpose a barrier which the attitude of its inhabitants makes still more difficult to cross. The Zayân, the Zaîtir, the Zemmûr, over whom the authority of the Maghribien has never been very securely exercised, have more than once cut direct communication between Fas and Marrakush. These two cities have been at different periods the capitals of distinct and even hostile kingdoms.

The region of the Atlas. In spite of the marked differences between the different elements of the Atlas, the whole region nevertheless has general characteristics of its own. Between Atlantic Morocco on the one hand and Saharan Morocco on the other, the Atlas lies as an almost continuous barrier. Only the few transverse fractures in the Middle Atlas permit passage between the basin of the Sebû and the Saharan zones, while in the High Atlas valleys running right into the heart of the massif give access to passes opening on the valleys of Sûä and the Wâdi Darû. Moister and colder, the Middle Atlas is covered with forests which are denser and more extensive than those of the High Atlas. Both however are great water-heds. From the Middle Atlas come the great rivers of the Atlantic slope (Sebû, Gighû, Umû Rabû, Wâdi T-fâhûdi), from the High Atlas the Tûnût and the Tensift. The lands of the Atlas are nevertheless poor. The high mountains offer little to support mankind. Human activities are confined mainly to the zones of contact between the mountains and the plains (dârs) of the Middle Atlas and in some specially favoured valley-of-the High Atlas. Except in the Middle Atlas, where the nomadic mode of life results in the exodus in the bad season of the inhabitants who lead a pastoral life, and on the plateaux of the High Atlas on the Atlantic side (Hûhâ, Shiyyûna) the inhabitants of which are mainly engaged in cattle-rearing, the natives are settled. They live in villages perched on the slopes and terraces between wads or scattered along the valleys. There is nothing approaching a town in size. These regions, defended by the nature of the country, have almost completely escaped outside influence, they are still almost exclusively the domain of Berber tribes (Berâberîî in the Middle Atlas and Shûtûh in the High Atlas). The customs and institutions peculiar to this people [cf. Bersiers] have survived to a greater extent here than in any other region of North Africa. In particular their political organisation is still most rudimentary: municipal republics administered by a qamûlî in the Middle Atlas, feudal lordships ruled in patriarchal and despotic fashion by a few powerful families in the High Atlas. The people of these regions also have always opposed vigorously the
central power; the authority of the Mekhzen over the Berbers of the High Atlas has never been exerted except through the local chiefs. As to the tribes of the Middle Atlas they have retained to the present day almost complete independence. Even the most vigorous sultans have never succeeded in forcing them into obedience for any length of time.

Eastern Morocco. Eastern Morocco may be described as the continuation of the Central Maghribi of which it has the distinctive characteristics. In it, as in Orania, we have a tell zone and a zone rising by successive stages up to 6,000 feet. The upper valley of the Muluya separates them from the Middle Atlas. The monotony of these vast spaces is only broken by the outcrops of gîr, flat beds of rocks cut up by erosion and by the depressions of the shufi [q.v.]. Beaten by the winds, exposed to the rigours of an extreme climate, these lands are only fit for the pastoral life led by the nomads who raise sheep. The valley of the Muluya is no better favoured, except in the vicinity of the Atlas, where villages surrounded by vineyards with a settled population are found along the tributaries of the river. As to the Tell, hills of no very great height (the most important being that of the Beni Snassen which does not exceed 3,500 feet) divide it up into compartments occupied by plains (plains of the Aulfiḍ Maṣṣūr, on the coast, of the Triṭa, of the Angād which in the south reaches the cliffs in which the high plateaux end). The dryness of the climate frequently gives these plains a steppe-like character; only the western part of the plain of the Angād has a fertile and well watered soil largely devoted to the cultivation of wheat to procure grain. But this region owes its importance less to its natural resources than to its situation on the natural route between Atlantic Morocco and the rest of Barbary. Uṣada [q.v.] which commands the passage, has thus been enabled to escape various causes of decay that have threatened it. A border district, eastern Morocco has always been a disputed region, a march for which the lords of Tiemcen and Fès have contended. The authority of the latter was never solidly enough established here to impose itself on the settled inhabitants of the mountains and on the nomads of the plateaux and plains. The Down to the French occupation the country was left to anarchy and disorder.

The Moroccan Sahara. The Moroccan Sahara is the N.W. corner of the Sahara. There we find the general characteristics of this desert region [cf. Sahara]. Only the parts adjoining the Atlantic and the threshold of the mountains offer favourable conditions for man. In the plain of Sus [q.v.] shut in between the Atlas and the Anti-Atlas, the rivers and the irrigation canals enable shrubs to grow. The Darā, Ziz and Gīr are in their upper courses fringed by a thin border of cultivated land, pastureage, vineyards, and in their middle course assure the growth of palmgroves of which the best known, if not the most prosperous, is that of Tafṣīlīt [q.v.]. The richness of the region is relatively one, it is true — of these cases is in contrast with the desolation of the rocky plateaux (hammāda) which form the greater part of the Moroccan Sahara. These natural conditions determine the mode of life of the inhabitants. Some lead a nomadic life and drive their flocks up and down the plateaux; others are permanently settled on the Sus, in the high valleys and in the oases. Sus contains numerous villages and even towns (Agādir, Tiznit, Tarudant); the oases have a settled population in the ḫūr. Those of Tafṣīlīt, Tamgrūt, Bū Darb and Yigig carry on a certain amount of commerce between Atlantic Morocco and the Sahara. But this very circumstance has prevented them escaping as completely as the lands of the Atlas from the political and intellectual influence of Western Morocco, especially Tafṣīlīt where considerable groups of Arab ṣharīf have been long established in the midst of Berber populations. But, although the present dynasty actually came from Tafṣīlīt, the people of this region have frequently escaped Shārīfian authority.

Begun in the last years of the sixteenth century, methodically pursued since the French occupation, the scientific exploration of Morocco is not yet completed. From the results so far attained one thing is clear: the lack of uniformity in the country. Thus its geography may explain to some extent the historical development of the country.


Cf. also: Archives Marocaines; Villes et tribus
II. HISTORY.

Morocco before Islam. Morocco, like the other parts of North Africa, has probably been inhabited from a very remote period. We know, however, nothing definite about its earliest inhabitants. The traces which they have left, weapons and tools of chipped flint, pottery, rock-paintings, some of which represent animals of the quaternary period, now extinct, megalithic monuments identical with those found all round the Mediterranean basin, give us no information in this respect. At most, we may suppose that the primitive population consisted of emigrants from southern Europe, the Sahara and perhaps from Egypt. The fusion of these diverse elements gave birth to a race, the members of which, frequently different in type and physical features, were united by a community of language. The ancient writers called them Libyans and Moors. They were the ancestors of the present Berbers [q. v.].

The first historical fact known, and that only imperfectly, is the appearance in the 12th century B.C. of the Phoenicians on the Moroccan coast. The sailors of Tyre and Sidon built factories there, where they exchanged goods of eastern origin for local products (cattle, wool, hides) and slaves. But Phoenician influence was exercised mainly through the intermediary of Carthage when it in turn had become the metropolis of a great maritime empire. The Carthaginians rebuilt the ruined factories and added new ones. In the middle of the fifth century, Hanno in the course of his celebrated "periplus" established on the Atlantic coast seven colonies of which one was at the mouth of the Sebti, Rusaddir (Melilla), Septem (Ceuta), Tingis (Tangier), Likus (Larache), Sala (Sale) were the principal Carthaginian establishments. It does not seem, however, that Carthage sought to extend her power into the interior. She was content to conclude treaties with the native chiefs and to recruit mercenaries from that country. Morocco remained independent, but the tribes who inhabited it were not organised into states, except perhaps in the east, where ancient writers mention in the period of the Punic Wars the existence of a kingdom of Mauretania or Marua, extending along both banks of the Muluya.

The destruction of the Carthaginian empire hardly altered this state of affairs. For two centuries Rome administered only the "Province of Africa," directly and left the other regions of Morocco in the hands of native chiefs under a more or less severe protectorate. Northern Morocco shared the fate of Mauretania down to the annexation of this kingdom in 42 A.D. The region to the east of the Muluya formed part of Ceaurean Mauretania. The lands stretching from the Muluya to the ocean formed Mauretania Tingitana, an imperial province governed by a procurator. When the empire was re-organised by DIOCLETIAN, IT was attached to Spain.

Roman Morocco never covered more than a small portion of the modern Morocco. On the Atlantic coast, it barely extended beyond the mouth of the Bu Rrag, and in the interior to the massif of the Zerihoun. The plateaux and sub-Atlantic plains and the mountains of the Rif, Middle and High Atlas escarpments, the authority of Rome. It was the same with the Sahara. The expedition of Suetonius Paulinus, who in 42 A.D. advanced as far as the wadi Ghr, remained an isolated incident.

To defend herself against the rebellions of her own subjects and to protect the country from Berber inroads, Rome had to keep in Tingitana an army of ten thousand men, to build strategic roads and to establish fortified posts on the sides of the triangle: Sala, Zerihoun, Tingis. With the exception of Volubilis, the importance of which has been revealed by its ruins, methodically excavated in recent years, and which was undoubtedly a centre of influence of Roman culture on the people of the interior as well as a military base, the towns were all on the coast. They were Likus and Tingis raised to the rank of "colonies," and Celsea. They owed their prosperity mainly to trade with Spain to which were exported oil and wheat, the two main products of the country. On the whole, however, Rome's influence on Morocco was superficial and has left little trace.

Without any really firm hold on the country, weakened by native risings and by the quarrels between the donatists and the orthodox, Roman rule was to collapse suddenly at the beginning of the fifth century. Germanic invaders, the Vandals, came from Spain and in 429 A.D. conquered without opposition Tingitana which they gave back a few years later to the Romans. Soon afterwards the western empire disappeared and the natives seized the opportunity to become independent. The Byzantines, who in the sixth century destroyed the Vandal kingdom, were content to re-occupy the two strongholds of Cessa and Tangier. The rest of Morocco was in the hands of the Berbers. The latter were divided into a large number of tribes, of whom the principal were the Ghomara on the Mediterranean coast, the Barghawat and the Omeyyades on the Atlantic coast between the Strait of Gibraltar and the mouth of the Sebti, the Munkassa, in the central district, the Mamrida, on the western slope of the High Atlas and on the coast from the Sebti to the Safs; the Hasraka between the Safs and the Darra; the Lamjua and Lamitina on the left bank of the Darra. These Berbers were all of Sanhidja stock; some preferred Chri-riani or Judaim but the majority still followed the old nature worship. The Arab conquest brought them a new religion: Islam.

The Introduction of Islam. The Arabs appeared in the extreme Maghrib at the end of the 7th century A.D. Tradition relates that Sidi Othman, the founder of Tàrâwan, in 684-685 undertook an expedition which carried him as far as the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. This raid, however, if it ever took place, was too transitory to have any permanent results. But at the beginning of the following century, Musâ b. Nuṣair [q. v.] who had just completed the conquest of Ifrikiya, took Tangier, installed a governor there and set himself to conquer and convert the natives. He succeeded without much trouble. Attracted by the hopes of gain, the Berbers adopted Islam and enrolled themselves in the armies which were invading Spain. They were not long, however, in
rising against the Arabs. Dissatisfied with the share allotted them of lands taken from the Christians in the Peninsula, and exasperated by the exactions of the governors of Tangier, they took up arms in 740 on the call of the porter Maísara [q. v.]. The rebellion was both religious and political in character. With the same readiness with which they had adopted Islam, the Berbers adopted Ktâb Túthif doctrines from the east, teachings which also appealed to their egalitarian tendencies and to their spirit of independence. The army sent from Syria to establish order was destroyed on the banks of the Sebâ (742) and the extreme Maghrib was lost at one stroke to the caliph and to orthodoxy. Berber principalities were organised in the Rif [see SIDIHMÉSA]; in the west, the Barghawâta [q. v.] recognised the authority of a certain Sîhu, founder of a rival religion to Islâm, who had composed a Kur'an, that is a sacred book, in Berber. None of these little states was strong enough to impose its authority on the others and to collect all the Berber tribes under one rule. A longer time was required for the establishment of the Idrisid dynasty [q. v.] to play this rôle. Idris I and his immediate successor Idris II, actually enforced their authority over the greater part of the tribes of northern Morocco and successful expeditions extended their kingdom from the shores of the Mediterranean to the High Atlas and from the Atlantic to beyond Tlemcen. Ardent champions of Islâm, they imposed their religion on those peoples who did not yet practise it or who had abandoned it after once adopting it. The conversion of the extreme Maghrib to Islâm is their work much more than that of the Arab conquerors, zealous defenders of orthodoxy, in spite of their ʿAlid origin, they fought the Ktâb Túthif with the same vigour but did not, however, succeed in completely extirpating the heresy. It is not without good reason that legend has transformed these rude warriors into saints, the one Idris I, patron saint of Morocco, the other Idris II, the patron saint of the city of Fès [q. v.] which he had founded. The building of this city had enduring results. It gave northern Morocco a religious, political and economic centre which it had lacked since the disappearance of Roman rule. Favoured by its position, Fès prospered rapidly. It survived all causes of decline, even the collapse of the Idrisid power.

The Idrisids indeed rapidly declined. The various groups which had recognised the authority of the founders of the dynasty were not long in casting it off and fighting with one another. These rivalries were taken advantage of by the Fâtims of Ifríkiya and the Umayyads of Spain, who during the tenth century A. D. disputed the possession of the extreme Maghrib. With the assistance of the Mikhâs, the Umayyads in the end remained masters of the country. They were in their turn ousted by the Maghrâwa [q. v.], whose chief Zir b. ʿAtiya, abandoning the cause of the Umayyads, seized Fès where his descendants ruled for three quarters of a century.

The Almoravids and the Almohads. The extreme Maghrib seemed to be condemned to anarchy and to be broken up among small factions when the Almoravid invasion came [see ALMORAVIDES]. After having first of all subjected all the lands south of the High Atlas, they established themselves solidly on the northern slopes, at the foot of which Yusuf b. Tâshfin founded Marrâkush [q. v.] in 1062, these Saharan hordes turned to the centre, east and north of Morocco, sweeping everything before them: Fès, Tangier, the Rif, Oran and Ténès fell before them. The Berber principalities of the Maghrâwa, the Barghawâta and Bânû Idris disappeared. In less than twenty years, Yusuf b. Tâshfin became sole master of the extreme Maghrib as far as the Gulf of Cadiz. The Almoravids were soon to be added half of Spain. Summoned by the Muslim emirs who were threatened by the king of Castille, Yusuf b. Tâshfin checked the Christian advance at Zallâkâ (1086), then possessed the petty Muslim rulers to his own advantage. Morocco was thus extended across the Straits of Gibraltar as far as the Ebro and to the Balearic Islands. The fortunes of the Almoravids were, it is true, as ephemeral as they were brilliant. In contact with Andalusian civilization, the Saharan rapidly became decadent. The rigid orthodoxy, which had been their strength, relaxed; they in their turn were regarded as infidels, “anthropomorphists” (muqjâṣâmîn), whom it was lawful and even meritorious to fight. It was in the name of orthodoxy that Al-Muâth, viceroy of Tashfin, and Al-Ḥâfiz of the High Atlas under the leadership of Ibn Tûmart and ʿAbd al-Mùʾmin entered into the struggle against the Almoravids.

This struggle ended in the displacement of the Almoravids by the Almohads [see ALMOHADS and ʿABD AL-MUʿMIN]. In seven years (1139—1146 A. D.) ʿAbd al-Mùʾmin conquered all Morocco; Sidîlmâsa, Oran, Tlemcen, and Ceuta fell one after the other into his hands. Next came the turn of the Salè, Fès, and finally of Marrâkush, the gates of which were opened to him by the treachery of the Christian mercenaries. Muslim Spain was also conquered with the exception of the Balearic Islands. Even in Africa, the Ḥâmâmadî kingdom of Bougie was conquered in 545—546 (1151—1152). A few years later (554—555 = 1159—1160) a new expedition led ʿAbd al-Mùʾmin into Ifríkiya and secured him possession of the interior and of the coast, which he took from the Normans of Sicily who had occupied it some time before. Morocco in the strict sense of the word was now merely a province in the vast Berber empire. The unification of these territories under one ruler had important consequences for the Maghrib. It facilitated the diffusion in North Africa of the Hispano-Moorish civilization, which was to be perpetuated in Morocco after it had disappeared from the Peninsula itself. Further it brought into the extreme Maghrib a new ethnic element: the Arab, ʿAbd al-Mùʾmin, as well as his successors, on several occasions deported ʿAlîthi tribes from the Central Maghrib and Ifríkiya, where they continually created unrest, to the sub-Atlantic plains where other groups of Arabs joined them of their own free will.

The Almohad empire was too vast, it comprised regions of too different a nature, peoples too foreign to one another to last long united. The Almohad caliphs were powerless to restrain the separatist tendencies which revealed themselves on all sides. In the first half of the xiiith century A. D., the Almohad empire broke up. Ifríkiya and the Central Maghrib recovered their independence; local dynasties set up in Tunis (Ifâṣids) and Tlemcen (ʿAbd al-Wâlidîs). The Almoravid Maghrib ended by slipping away from the descendants of ʿAbd al-Mùʾmin who were replaced by the Merîndas [q. v.].
The Merinids. Berbers of Zanata stock, driven by the Ifilâli Arabs on to the plateau of Oran and into the central valley of the Muluya, the Banû Merin had at first entered the service of the Almohads, then turned against them, when the power of the dynasty began to decline. By repeated razzias they made themselves masters of almost all northern Morocco. After the death of the caliph al-Safid, who had been able to arrest their progress for a time, their leader Abû Yahyâ (1243-1258) seized Fâs, Meknes, Rabat and Siûmlââs. The capture of Marrâkush (1269) by Abû Yusuf, successor of Yahyâ, marked the final triumph of the Merinids. Heirs of the Almohads, the first Merinids endeavoured to reconstitute the empire of their predecessors. In Spain, they enforced their authority on the Muslims of Andalusia. In Africa, they endeavoured to take the central Maghrib from the ʿAbd al-Wâdids. They were successful when Tlemsen, besieged seven times in sixty years, finally fell into the hands of Sultan Abû ʿl-Ḥasan (1337-1347). Ten years later, the same ruler took Bougie, Constantine and Tunis, but this was only temporary. At the end of barely a year, Abû ʿl-Ḥasan, defeated by the Arabs, found himself forced to abandon Ifriqiya, the Ḥafsids returned to Tunis and the ʿAbd al-Wâdids to Tlemsen, while the sultan’s own son Abû ʿInan rose against him in Morocco. Attaining to power, Abû ʿInan renewed his father’s efforts. He recaptured Tlemsen and Tunis, it is true, but could not retain them (1560 A.D.). The Ḥafsids and ʿAbd al-Wâdids recovered their kingdoms almost at once.

Separat tendencies thus triumphed and on this occasion in a most definite fashion. The extreme Maghrib, the history of which had hitherto been so often that of Barbary, began to live its own life. The Merinid kingdom, while its boundaries in the east were still vague and changing, already corresponded roughly to modern Morocco and the Merinids may be regarded as the first strictly Moroccan rulers. Lacking the religious prestige of their predecessors, they endeavoured to secure the moral authority which they lacked by taking as their patent saints the apostles of Islam in the Maghrib. The cult of Mawlâ Idrîs in the xivth and particularly the xvth century assumed an importance which it has retained to the present day. No less characteristic is the development of intellectual life and the arts. The Ifispano-Moorish civilisation never flourished more brilliantly in Morocco than in the Merinid period. The rulers attracted to their court the poets, men of letters and lawyers of the Iberian Peninsula and of the Maghrib. The university of al-Karawiyin attracted students from all the lands of the western Muslim world. Fâs, which the Merinids, abandoning Marrâkush and Rabat, the capitals of their predecessors, chose as their royal residence, was given splendid buildings by them, palaces, mosques and madrasas. It was at the same time a commercial city in which African and Spanish merchants mixed with Christian traders.

This brilliant exterior, however, was quite deceptive. Merinid Morocco was never able to organise itself on a solid basis. The central power was very weak and did not succeed in imposing its authority everywhere. The accession of each sultan was an occasion for outbreaks. The pretenders who arose always found supporters readily, either among the Arabs or the Berbers. Powerless in the interior, the sultans were no more fortunate in their enterprises against their neighbours of the Central Maghrib or against the kings of Granada. Their prestige and their authority could not survive these checks. The Merinids in the strict sense disappeared from the scene in 1492, after the assassination of the sultan by an Idrisid shârif. The Banû Wattés, descended from a collateral branch, the chief of whom seized the power in 1470, had themselves a wretched existence. Their kingdom broke up into a large number of independent little groups, principalities at Fâs and Marrâkush, Berber republics in the Atlas, Marabout seats in the Rif, the Gharb and in Darâ and Sûs. The sultans were quite powerless to prevent this decomposition.

The Christian offensive and the revival of Islam. Of all the causes which combined to enfeebles and discredit these rulers, the principal was undoubtedly their impotence against the offensive of the Christians against the Maghrib. In 1415 the Portuguese took Ceuta, in 1465 al-Kasr al-Saghîr, in 1471 Tangiers. They were contented with the occupation of the north while by the occupation of Azâlî and Anfa (Casablanca; q. v.) they secured a footing on the Atlantic coast. In the early years of the xvth century, they built fortified posts at Santa Cruz (Aqâdir) and Mazagan (q. v.) and took by force of arms Sâfî and Azemmûr (q. v.). Holding all places of importance except Larache [see Al-Arbiyyâ] they brought under their protectorate all the lands near the coast (Shawiya, Ḥifâ, Dukkanâ), forced the natives to pay them tribute and to hand over to them strategic points up to the environs of Marrâkush. Their expeditions had no other aim than plunder, no other result than to exasperate the inhabitants who saw their towns destroyed, their donars burned, their women and children massacred or sold as slaves.

Menaced in the west by the Portuguese, Morocco was threatened in the east by the Spaniards also. The latter completed the reconquista by the taking of Granada (1492). Thus free to go farther afield, and still fired with the religious enthusiasm of Ximenes, they too went over to fight the Muslims on African soil. The occupation of al-Marsâr al-Kabîr (1507) and of Oran (1509) and the establishment of a Spanish protectorate over the kingdom of Tlemsen constituted a serious danger to the Muslims of Morocco. The threat from the Christians produced an awakening of religious sentiment. This renewal of Islam in the xivth and xvth centuries, the results of which are still to be felt at the present day, is beyond question the great event in the history of Morocco since the Idrisid period. The way for it had, moreover, been prepared by the Sufi teachings imported from the east and by the development of the brotherhoods in which the adepts of these doctrines were organized. It also found a favourite soil owing to the persistence of maraboutism among the Berbers. The khâlîf or the charlatan, who had always been an object of public consideration, became readily identified with the shârif, the possessor of the khâlîf. Cooperating with one another, these pious individuals became the religious leaders of the people of Morocco. They strengthened orthodoxy, excited the zeal of the faithful, preached the holy war, and led the defenders of the faith into battle. The ascendency
which they exercised, the wealth they accumulated in their zawiyas, made them independent of the sultan. They thus became temporal leaders also, all the more readily as the sovereigns could not fulfill their office of defenders of Islam owing to lack of energy and also of means. The activity of these religious leaders was always of a local nature; it was only effectively exercised within a limited area and did not extend over the country generally. The religious solidarity thus established, the kind of common conscience thus created, did not put a check to the political decline until the time when the Sa’dians took direction of the movement and exploited it for their own benefit.

The Sharifian dynasties.  

a. The Sa’dians [q.v.]. The Sa’dian shorfa benefited by the prestige which the religious awakening had restored to the descendants, real or presumed, of Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet. Coming from Arabia at the end of the sixteenth century and settling in the valley of the wadi Daf’a, while another branch of the family settled at Tafallalt (Hasan or ‘Abid shorfa), they were not long in acquiring a considerable inﬂuence over the tribes of the south. Thus they were naturally led to support the people of the south, who were exposed to the attacks of the Portuguese of Santa Cruz. In 1511, the gharif of Tagmedt, requested by the Muslims to put himself at their head against the Christians, agreed to do so. Supported by the marabouts who gave him valuable assistance, he began hostilities against the Portuguese. The holy war regularly waged secured to his sons, Ahmad al-Aradj and Muhammad al-Mahdi, the possession of the whole of southern Morocco up to the Umm al-Rabif. The intervention of the Merind sultan in the quarrels which broke out between the two brothers only resulted in his own downfall being hastened. Muhammad al-Mahdi took Fas in 1550; the foiling of an attempt to restore the Merindids in 1554, with the help of the Turks of Algiers, secured the definite triumph of the Sa’dians.

The coming of the Sa’dians meant a regular reconstitution of Morocco. Muhammad al-Mahdi and his successors imposed their authority on the whole country, protected it against foreign foes and increased the extent of their territory by distant conquests. They finally triumphed over the difﬁculties caused by the Turks of Algiers, and at the battle of al-Kar al-Kabir in 1578 arrested a counter-offensive of the Portuguese. Ahmad al-Mansur (1578–1601) occupied Timbuktu [q.v.] and destroyed the Asira empire of Gao. For half a century the Moroccans were masters of the Western Sudan, from the banks of the Senegal as far as Born; the plunder taken on this campaign of conquest enabled the sultan to keep a splendid court, the hierarchy of which was modelled on the Ottoman court, and to adorn his capital Marrakesh with magnificent monuments.

To the same period also belongs the organisation of the makhten [q.v.]. The early Sa’dians had relied for support on the Arab tribes of the south. To these al-Mansur added the Arab tribes of the region of Tlemcen and Udja driven into Morocco by the Turkish conquest. These shrigga, as they were called, received lands around Fas in return for the military service they were forced to give. Reinforced by a regular army formed of renegades, Spanish Moors and negroes, trained by Turkish deserters, the makhten provided the sultan with the means of preserving order and levying taxes; it was thus the essential instrument of the sharifian government and tended to become the government itself.

This instrument proved sufﬁcient in the hands of an energetic ruler but was insufﬁcient in weaker hands and in moments of crisis. The Sa’dians very soon found this out. The tendencies to disruption which had been strong were accentuated by the energy of al-Mansur broke out again on his death. The dispute for the throne set his sons against one another. One of them, Zaidan, ended by triumphing over his rivals but could not prevent the break-up of the empire. Larache was occupied by the Spaniards; Fas cast off sharifian authority. The Andalus of Rabat and Salé [q.v.], enriched by their piracy, formed an independent republic. Finally the Sa’dians, although they had owed their elevation to the religious movement, now found the marabouts rising against them. Delivered from the restraints which the distrust of al-Mahdi and his successors had placed upon them, the latter began to gain more and more hold over the people and contributed to the ruin of the sharifian authority. Sis was in the control of one of them, Sidi ‘Ali; Tafallalt was under the Hasan shorfa, the Gharb under al-Aiyashi, leader of the “volunteers of the faith”. In the centre, the power of the marabout of Dil (a zawiya on the upper course of the Wadi ‘Abd) increased. Muhammad al-Hadji, their leader, victorious over the Sa’dians and over al-Aiyashi, lord of Salé and Fas, seemed on the point of founding a new Berber empire from the Atlantic to the Muluya. Incapable, in spite of the support given them by the English and Dutch, of disposing of their adversaries, the Sa’dians now held only Marrakesh and its immediate environs. The last representative of the dynasty died in 1660, assassinated by the shaikh of the tribe of Shabbanat.

b. The Hasan Shorfa. The disintegration of Morocco was arrested by the coming of the Hasan Shorfa. The latter had taken advantage of the disorder to assert their authority in Taffilalt, then by expeditions, which par took of the nature of brigandage as much as of warfare, they had conquered eastern Morocco. One of them, Mawlí Muhammad, had even tried, without success, it is true, to take Fas from the Dil’s. His successor Mawlí al-Rashid (1660–1672) was more successful. He took Fas, disposed of Ghailan, an adventurer who had established himself securely in the Gharb, destroyed the zawiya of Dil, reconquered Marrakesh, thus rebuilding as it were piece by piece the sharifian empire. Installed by force of arms, the new dynasty recognised the necessity of securing the moral prestige which their origin could not give them. They therefore sought to attract to their side the sharifian families. They heaped favours on the shorfa of Wazzan, whose patronage was a guarantee even for the rulers.

The work begun by Mawlí al-Rashid was continued and brought to a successful conclusion by his successor Isma’il (1672–1729). During the first fifteen years of his reign, he did not cease to wage war on the rivals who disputed the districts of Marrakesh and Sis with him. While fighting his enemies, he was engaged in building up an army which would work marvels on his will. To the meagre wealth endowed on by the Shrigga and Udaya he added a body of black slaves, the ‘Abid al-Bukhāri (Blākher), the property
of the sultan; their children were specially trained for military service. The number of effective in this corps by the end of the reign numbered one hundred and fifty thousand men. The sultan was thus able to reduce to obedience the Berbers of the Atlas and the upper Muluya. Defeated and disarmed, the latter were kept in control by garrisons placed in kasbas built at the exits to the valleys or commanding the lines of communication. The notable whom the sultan had taken into his service or united to himself by matrimonial alliances forced their tribesmen to live in peace. The bitild al-makhzen, i.e. the country where tribute was regularly paid, extended over almost the whole of the extreme Maghrib. The pacification of the interior did not cause Mawlawi Isma'il to forget the obligations imposed on every Muslim ruler to fight the infidels. He therefore continued the holy war against the Christians of the coast. He recaptured al-Mahdiya, Larache, Asilah, and Tangier, evacuated by the English in 1684, but could not take Ceuta from Spain, and so in spite of a siege or rather uninterrupted blockade for seventeen years. He was no more successful in his enterprise against the Turks of Algiers, who disputed with the Moroccans the possession of the plains of eastern Morocco and the 65ir of southern Oman. The expeditions which he directed against the Algerians ended in failure, and the lower course of the Muluya continued to be the boundary of the sharifian empire. In spite of his lack of success here, Mawlawi Isma'il is nevertheless the great figure of the Hasani dynasty, the model the Moroccan sultans have set themselves to the present day. Morocco, however, remained what it was before, i.e. an aggregation of different groups, the cohesion of which depended on the personal energy of the sovereign. The processes of administration were in no way altered: the sharif enforced obedience by drastic executions; he squeezed his subjects to the utmost to get the money necessary for the building of his capital, Meknes [q.v.], the palaces of which were built by the forced labour of the natives and of Christian slaves.

On the death of Mawlawi Isma'il, a reaction set in. For thirty years his sons fought with one another. The real masters of the situation were the 'Abd who made and unmade sultans as they pleased. One of them, Mawlawi 'Abd Allah, was proclaimed and deposed six times. He succeeded, however, in triumphing over his competitors by playing the Berbers off against the 'Abd, the importance of whom gradually diminished with the wars. The remedy, however, was not much better than the disease. This period was for Morocco one of misery and ruin. The authority of the sharifs emerged much weakened from it.

Mawlawi Muhyiyyad (1577—1592) succeeded, however, in restoring it. Inheriting the energy and vigour of his grandfather Isma'il, he brought the rebel Berbers back to their allegiance, and by the taking of Mazagan in 1696 destroyed the last trace of Portuguese power on the Atlantic coast. Convinced, on the other hand, that the weakness of the central power was mainly due to a lack of financial resources, he endeavoured to procure money by encouraging the development of foreign trade. He inaugurated a mercantile policy, concluded treaties of commerce with Denmark, Sweden, England, and France and endeavoured to attract foreign merchants to his kingdom by founding for them the town of Mogador [q.v.] in 1764. Heavy taxes, however, severely impeded the progress of this policy. Morocco remained a poor country and did not open itself as had been hoped, to European penetration. It also remained a perpetual theatre of war. Mawlawi Vaziid (1792—1794) the country was once more handed over to anarchy. Mawlawi Sliman (Salaiman) (1794—1822). after at first being able to restore order, had to spend the last ten years of his reign in putting down the continual risings of the Berbers of the middle Atlas; in the course of one of these expeditions he actually fell into the hands of the rebels. This rebelliousness caused the sultan much misgiving; he also wanted to prevent the infiltration of foreign and anti-Muslim influences which he believed would aggravate it. He forbade his subjects to leave the country and restricted to a minimum their intercourse with Christians. The diplomatic and consular agents were relegated to Tangier, and access to the interior was made almost impossible for Europeans. His successors followed his example. Down to the end of the sixteenth century, Morocco was more rigorously closed than it had been in the time of the Merinids and Sa'dians and even in the early days of the Hasani sharifs. In spite of this systematic isolation, the sultans had nevertheless to face the same difficulties as Mawlawi Sliman and had no more success than he in overcoming them.

For half a century the domestic history of Morocco was a series of rebellions which the sovereigns had great difficulty in suppressing. The regions remote from the centre, Rif, Tafilalt, Figkeit, eastern Morocco, escaped the authority of the makhzen. In the very heart of the country, the Berber inhabitants, communications between Fas and Marrakesh, forcing the sultans when they wanted to move from one capital to the other to make a great detour by Rabat. The empire broke up more and more. Mawlawi al-Hasan (1873—1894) postponed for a few years the inevitable collapse. His reign resembled that of Mawlawi Isma'il. At the head of his army, the artillery of which had been reorganised by a French military mission, he was continually in the field raiding the rebels and tearing down kasbas. He re-established order in the region of Udja, forced the people of Sūs to recognise his kāids, reduced to obedience the Za'īr and Zayān, endeavoured to extend the makhzen country by expeditions against the independent Berbers, endeavoured to develop his influence in the Saharan regions and to restore his authority in Tuat. But he died before completing his task and all had to be begun again.

Morocco and the Christian powers. The situation was the more critical that the fate of Morocco could no longer be a matter of indifference to the European powers. It increased the cupidity of some and aroused the cupidity of others. In spite of their desire for isoliation, the sultans had not been able to break every link with Europe. They had also to take account of the proximity of Spain, established for three centuries in the *presidio* of the Mediterranean coast, and of the French who had replaced the Turks in Algeria [q.v.] The conquest of the old Regency, destroying all the sharifs' hopes of extension eastwards, had caused great irritation in Morocco. 'Abd al-Kadir [q.v.] found followers among the peoples of this country and supported hardly disguised on the part of the makhzen. This hostile
attitude resulted in the Franco-Moroccan war of 1891. The sharifian army was beaten at the battle of Ily, the ports of Tangier and Mogador bombarded. The moderation of France alone enabled the makhzen to come fairly well out of this unfortunate escapade. Henceforth the relations between France and Morocco remained peaceful, although the impotence of the sharifian government to guarantee security on its borders forced France to military demonstrations like the B. Snassen campaign (1859) and the wādī Ghar expedition (1870). Spain in turn being unable to obtain satisfaction from the attacks directed against her garrisons decided also to resort to arms. The campaign of 1859—1860, ended by the victory of O'Donnell, revealed the military weakness of Morocco. The treaty of Tetwan (1860) granted to Spain, along with some trilling territorial aggrandisement, an indemnity of 100,000,000 reals. To pay this debt, the sharifian government had to raise a loan in London on the security of the Moroccan customs and to accept the control of European commissioners. For the first time foreigners intervened in the domestic administration of the empire. The breach thus made was continually enlarged. The exercise of the right of protection, the erection of a lighthouse on Cape Spartel, served as a pretext for diplomatic negotiations and for the extension of international control. European ambitions were not dissimulated. In order to protect itself against them, the makhzen tried to play one off against the other and confined itself to granting, as it did at the conference of Madrid (1880), concessions devoid of all practical significance. Mawlālī al-Hasan excelled in this difficult game and even the vizier Bū Ahmad, who directed affairs during the early years of the reign of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, Mawālī al-Hasan's successor, displayed no less skill. Morocco was thus the object of a very keen struggle for influence. England wanted to maintain her economic preponderance along with the control of the Strait; France wanted to ensure the security of her Algerian possessions and of the roads leading to the Saharan oases occupied in 1901—1902; Spain appealed to her "historic rights"; Germany lastly was preparing to seize the opportunity to acquire openings for her commerce and emigrants.

The Moroccan crisis and the establishment of the French protectorate. Such a position could not last. The imprudences of Sultan ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz precipitated the crisis. The whims of the sovereign and his immoderate desire for European innovations displeased the strictest Muslims. The modifications in the fiscal policy, made by the dīrāṣa disturbed the people already taxed to the utmost. Rebellion broke out everywhere. A pretender, the rūqāl Bū Ḥamārā, rose in the region of Tāzā and routed an army sent against him. It was in vain that France by the agreements of 1901 and 1902 endeavoured to organise the activities of the makhzen against the rebels and to postpone the inevitable catastrophe. On the failure of this effort, France decided to arrange with England and Spain to settle the Moroccan question and prevent the dismemberment of the empire. In return for recognition of the protectorate de facto exercised by England in Egypt and the granting to Spain of a sphere of influence in northern Morocco, these two powers recognised the right of France to act as her interests hest demanded. France hastened to propose to the sultan a plan for reforming the sharifian administration. The intervention of Germany prevented its realisation. On March 31, 1905, William II landed at Tangier and in a sensational speech posed as the defender of the independence of the sultan. On the advice of the German representative, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz appealed for the constitution of an international conference to study the reforms to be introduced into the Maghrib. The conference met at Algeciras (Jan. 15—April 7, 1906) and affirmed the three principles of the sovereignty of the sultan, the territorial integrity and economic freedom of Morocco. It did not, however, settle the Moroccan question. The two international bodies which it decided to set up, the police for the ports and the state bank, both capable of being of great service, could not take the place of the general reforms necessary for the salvation of the empire. Disorders continued, acts of hostility against Europeans in Morocco itself and acts of brigandage on the frontiers increased in number. Not being able to obtain satisfaction for outrages on its subjects, the French government ordered the occupation of Udja and Casablanca in 1907. The country was then pacified around these two centres and order restored in eastern Morocco and in the Shawaya to the great benefit of the natives themselves. The Spaniards in their turn for similar reasons intervened in 1908 in the adjoining region of Melilla and after a severe campaign in 1909 occupied Salwān and a number of strategic points.

During this period war broke out between ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and his brother Mawlālī ʿAbd al-Haffīz, proclaimed sultan at Marrākūsh and then at Fās. Supported by the anti-French party, the pretender was victorious. All the powers, including France and Spain, recognised him, after he had promised to respect the agreement of Algeciras, the international treaties and all the engagements entered into by his predecessors. France and Spain announced their intention of not prolonging their occupation of sharifian territory. The Franco-Moroccan agreements of March 4, 1910, and the Hispano-Moroccan of Nov. 19 of the same year, stipulated that the occupation should cease as soon as the makhzen should have a force sufficient to guarantee the security of life and property and peace within its frontiers. This settlement seemed all the more desirable as there had been occasional friction between France and Germany which had only been smoothed over with great difficulty, the most serious being the affair of the deserters from Casablanca in Sept. 1908. A disquieting state of tension remained between these two powers, although France had endeavoured to give satisfaction to Germany in signifying, by the agreement of Feb. 8, 1909, her willingness not to impede the economic freedom nor hinder the development of German interests.

The aggravation of the situation in the interior hastened the dénouement. The sultan's rule was no more effective than that of his predecessors; the exactions of the sharifian agents in the spring of 1911 provoked a rising of the Arab and Berber tribes in the region of Fās. Besieged in his capital and on the point of succumbing, the sultan appealed to the French. They decided to send an expeditionary force to the help of the sultan but ordered its commander to avoid any injury to the independence of the sultan and any occupation of new territory. Vigorously commanded by General
Moinier, the military operations had the desired effect. Fās was relieved on May 21, and after certain political operations necessary to secure the peace of the district, the expeditionary force returned to the coast. But, while the danger was thus banished from the interior, unexpected complications with Spain, taking advantage of the occasion to take possession of the sphere of influence reserved for her by the agreement of 1904, established herself in Larache and al-Kaṣī. Germany, feeling the moment was decisive, claimed compensation in her turn and sent a warship to Agḍīr. This demonstration provoked the greatest alarm in France and in Europe generally. In the end, however, a peaceful settlement was reached. After four months of difficult negotiations, the agreement of Nov. 4, 1911 put an end to the dispute. Germany abandoned all political claims to Morocco and admitted with certain reservations, chiefly of an economic nature, the principle of the French protectorate. There was no longer any obstacle to the establishment of this régime, which the sūlān accepted by the treaty of March 30, 1912. This diplomatic document stipulated the maintenance of the sovereignty of the sūlān, the representation of and protection by French diplomatic and consular agents of Moroccan subjects and interests abroad, the carrying out, with the collaboration of and under the direction of France, of a number of administrative reforms, judicial, financial and military, intended to “give the shi‘īfīn empire a new régime, while safeguarding the traditional prestige and honour of the sūlān, the practice of the Muslim faith and the institutions of religion”.

The French protectorate now extends over the whole of Morocco, but the Spanish sphere of influence enjoys by the agreement of Nov. 27, 1912 complete autonomy from the administrative and military point of view, while Tangier and its environs form an international zone, the status of which is not yet definitely regulated.

The establishment of the protectorate was to have had as its first result the restoration of the authority of the sharīf, whose support was essential for the carrying out of the reforms. This could only be attained by a considerable effort. The central power was weaker than it had ever been at the time when the conclusion of the protectorate treaty put an end to the crisis. The ḥlād al-makhzen was almost non-existent. France had to conquer Morocco for the sūlān. The name of Marechal Lyauty, appointed High Commissioner and Resident General, will remain inseparable from the history of the pacification of Morocco, like that of Bugueaud in the history of the conquest of Algeria. Very difficult in itself, for it brought the French into contact with warlike tribes, some of whom had never recognised the authority of the makhzen, the task was further complicated by events abroad. Order had hardly been restored around the chief towns, Fās, Meknes, Marrākush and communication restored between eastern and western Morocco, when the War of 1914 broke out. For a moment it was feared that the French were going to abandon the interior and fall back on the coast, but the progress of the pacification of the country was only slowed down and not interrupted. All the conquered positions were retained and the rebels held on all fronts. The counter-offensives of the rebels in the Tārāḥ corridor, along the Middle Atlas and in Sūs were crushed. The War finished, the offensive was resumed to reduce the districts still unsubdued (Middle Atlas, south of the High Atlas, upper valley of the Muluya). Three years of difficult fighting (1921—1924) ended in the occupation of “all Morocco of value”, i.e. those regions of economic, political or military importance. The Rifian offensive in 1925, however, threatened to compromise all the success achieved. A Rifian chief, Abūd al-Karīm, had gathered around him the greater part of the tribes of northern Morocco and inflicted serious reverses on the Spaniards and forced them to abandon a portion of the territory which they had occupied. Crossing the Spanish zone, he invaded the valley of the Wargha and threatened Fās. The resistance of the posts echeloned along the frontier gave reinforcements time to reach the scene of hostilities. Checked in the autumn, the Rifian advance was definitely crushed in the spring of 1926 thanks to the combined action of France and Spain. At the moment of writing, the conquest may be regarded as completed; only a few tribes of the Central Atlas and of the oases of the Sahara have not yet been reached by the French, but their reduction is only a matter of time.

The administrative reorganisation has kept pace with the pacification. The old machinery has been retained but submitted to a control which guarantees the natives against abuse of their power and excesses by the agents of the makhzen. Technical services have been created to give the country the works necessary for its economic life. The remarkable results obtained in all fields have been facilitated by the influx of European immigrants and capital. Morocco seemed condemned to vegetation. Now it is being completely transformed. A new epoch is beginning, very different from any that have preceded it.


(G. YER.)

III. Population.

a. Total population and density. It is difficult to fix with any precision the total population of Morocco. The attempts made at a census in recent years in the parts subject to the sharifian makhzen enable, it is true, comparatively accurate estimates to be made for the greater part of the country and corroboration for most districts the estimates made by European travellers before the establishment of the French protectorate. But the part of the sharifian empire still outside the authority of the makhzen and those whose southern boundaries are not exactly known have not been seriously investigated from this point of view, and until they have been scientifically studied it will not be possible to estimate the total population of Morocco to within a few hundred thousands.

The total usually given is 5,000,000, of whom a tenth, 500,000, are in the zone of the Spanish protectorate. This population is very unevenly distributed and its density varies with geographical conditions. The most thickly populated part is that of the plains of western Morocco between the massif of the Djebala in the north and the Great Atlas in the south: Gharb, Shâwiyâ, Tâdât, Dukkâla and 'Abdâ. The density of the population also varies with the fertility of the soil. The population of this region is estimated at two fifths of the total. The mountainous regions, Djebala, Rif, and Middle Atlas are not thickly populated, as we might have expected from the comparatively dense population of Kabylia, in another mountainous region of North Africa. As to the Saharan zone, outside the belts of oases in the Wâdî Gir, the Wâdî Ziz (Tâffûtât) and the Wâdî Darâ (Dra), it is very sparsely inhabited.

b. Elements of the population. The population of Morocco consists for the most part of Berbers and Arabs, the former being the older element and the latter invaders. As to the Berbers, who do not seem to be a homogeneous race and whose origin is obscure, see the separate article on them. As to the Arabs, they are in a minority, but it is often difficult to attribute an exact ethnic origin to certain tribes or confederations, so much have the Arabs and Berbers become mixed since the Muslim conquest, and intermingled either by peaceful or warlike methods. It will be more prudent and will give a more accurate result if we distinguish in Morocco between those who speak Arabic and those who speak Berber (see below VII. Languages). The former live entirely in the plains, while with the exception of the massif of the Djebala, the inhabitants of the mountains speak Berber.

1. Berbers. Three main groups may be distinguished among the Berbers of Morocco: in the north the ifâns and the Beni Znásen; in the centre the Zinaqa (Sanhadja) and the harîb (Harîbî), who form the population of the Middle Atlas; the third group is that of the Djâbi [cf. the article gjûtût] who occupy the western part of the High Atlas and the Anti-Atlas, as well as the plain of Sûs. In addition to these main groups, we may mention the Djebala, arabised Berbers, to the N.W. of Fès, and the Haratîn (plur. of the Arabic harîb), who seem to be regarded as an intermixture of Berbers and Sudânese and form the basis of the settled population of the zone of the Saharan oases.

2. Arabs. The early invasions at the time of the Muslim conquest do not seem to have appreciably modified the ethnology of the country. Down to the xiiith century A.D., the country districts of Morocco were almost completely Berber; it was the great AImohad ruler 'Abd al-Mu'mîn [q.v.] who was the first to introduce into Morocco Hilâlî Arab tribes hitherto settled in the Central Maghrib or in Ifriqiya; these imports, continued by the successors of this prince and by the Merind dynasty, soon drove the Berber element into the mountains or absorbed and arabised it. Evidence of such assimilation is still found in the fact that tribes with clearly Arab names contain sections whose names show their Berber origin.

These Arab tribes, who are all settled in the
plain, may be divided into two main ethnic groups: the Banū Hilāl [q.v.] and the Mašūl. The latter occupies almost exclusively the valley of the Upper Muluya as well as the lands south of the Atlas. The Banū Hilāl occupy the sub-Atlantic plains and the steppes of Eastern Morocco.

3. Jews. There are about 150,000 Jews in Morocco, mainly living in the towns. There are also a considerable number among the tribes of the Great Atlas. They also form the principal element in the population of the two little towns of Debdū and Demnāt [q.v.]. The origin of the earliest elements in this Jewish population is obscure: it is difficult to ascertain whether they were Jews who had migrated from Palestine or were judaiscised Berbers. The modern element is made up of Jews who fled from Spain to Morocco in the xvith century. The father called themselves philistin (Palestinians) and are called forasteros (foreigners) by the Spanish immigrants, who are practically all settled in the towns of the coast and are rapidly becoming Europeanised.

In Morocco, there are also negroes. The negroes, of whom there are considerable numbers in Morocco, do not however form a distinct group there. In the north we find many, who are almost all slave origin. The predilection of the townsmen of Morocco for black concubines, noted for their domestic virtues, has brought into the population, especially in bourgeois circles, a very considerable amount of negro blood. To the south of the Atlas in the oases, the intermarriage of negroes and Berbers has produced the Harāṭīn. Finally the negroes of the Sudān, since the Middle Ages, have always been esteemed as mercenaries to form the imperial guards, especially since the taking of Timbuktu by the armies of the Sudānīn Sulṭān Ahmad al-Manṣūr [q.v.].

Large numbers of Muslims from Spain, whether of Arab origin or descendants of Christian inhabitants of the Peninsula, have contributed to form the population of the towns at various times: Cordovans banished by al-Ḥakam I at the beginning of the third century A.H. after the "revolt of the suburb" and Muslims expelled from Spain at the "Reconquista".

We must not omit the influence that may have been exercised on the population of Morocco by Europeans (renegades, who had adopted Islām, mercenaries recruited outside Morocco and settled in the country), and finally we may note that frequently the sulṭāns have purchased women for their harems in Constantinople.

IV. Social and Economic Life.

a. Country. The population of Morocco, although for the most part rural, nevertheless has a larger proportion of town-dwellers than Central Barbary and, like the rest of North Africa, might be divided into nomadic and settled; this division does not at all coincide with that into Arabs and Berbers; there are still nomadic Berbers, while certain Arab tribes are becoming settled on the lands which they cultivate.

It has been shown that the nomadic or settled life of the country-people in North Africa does not depend, as was long thought, on ethnic factors, but is entirely conditioned by geographical considerations. It is the rule for dwellers in the mountains to be settled while the people of the desert steppes, forced to move about in search of pasture for their flocks, are nomads. There are however means between these two extremes and especially in Morocco, where we find many semi-nomads, who move only short distances, principally on the borders of the various mountains of the centre and south. But generally nomadism is the outcome of pastoral migration and its geographical area is in direct relation to the rainfall and therefore to the nature of the vegetation.

It is in eastern Morocco, in the steppes which lie to the east of the Muluya, and to the south of the Great Atlas, towards the Sahara, that we find the principal groups of nomads in Morocco. In eastern Morocco, we may mention among the large tribes which lead a nomadic life the confederation of the Benī Gil, between Bergent and Filg; on the other side of the Atlas, the Aḥ Sādhiḥ, the Aḥ Dhālāl, the Iḍā-ū-Hilāl, the Aḥtū-Mirīb; lastly to the south of the Darʿa (Dra) country, the ṭubā, the Shkārnī and the Awhād Dim. As to the semi-nomads, we find them, outside the Middle Atlas, in the great plains of the Sahāra and of the Shāhīlīn in the south, where a pastoral life has not yet completely disappeared before a more settled state of society.

Nevertheless Morocco is, of the three countries of Barbary, that which has in its rural population the largest proportion of settled people, of fixed habitat and living not only in tents but also in houses. The latter are rarely found isolated in the country, but on the contrary are grouped into villages of more or less importance and more or less near one another, according to the density of the population.

The type of dwelling varies with the district. In the mountains we find houses built of unbaked bricks or stone with a gabled thatch or a flat roof. In the plains, the tent predominates, more or less fixed to the spot, and with it we find more and more the hut of branches with a conical roof called ṭawwāda. In the Saharan oases, the population collects within a walled area or ḫāt (sg. ḫāt, from the class. batt); these conglomerations sometimes possess the elements of town-life. The villages are called duar (dauwā) in the plains, and ḫag in the mountains. In some hill regions we find survivals of cave-dwelling.

b. Town. Among the towns of his country, the Moroccan distinguishes a certain number that he definitely regards as cities (kaṭārīya). These are Fāṣ, Rabat-Salé and Temīn, which have been more than others subjected to the influence of Spanish culture. It must however be noted that in the majority of the other towns we can still find traces of the existence of colonies formed by Muslims from Spain, especially from the xvith century onwards. The population of the non-kaṭārīya towns is found to be composed of rustic elements but little urbanised. This is the case with Udīya and Mazagan (country Beduins) and also with Tangier (countrymen from the hills). Marrākush and Meknes owe their special urban character to the fact that as capitals they have contained the courts of two Sharīfīna dynasties, both of Beduin origin; they are makhzānīya towns in which the standard of civilisation does not reach the refinement of the kaṭārīya Spanish towns. The ports Tangier, Larache, Mazagan, Safi and Mogador were for long the only points of contact between Morocco and European influences, politically as well as commercially. Lastly in the mountains,
little towns like Sefzáwen, Wazzán, Sefrú, Debúdú, Demnát owe their existence to political reasons. The two first were founded as bulwarks against the Portuguese advance in northern Morocco in the xvıth century. Demnát and Debúdú are mainly Jewish towns. As to Sefrú, it seems probable that it is a survival of an old Berber town. We may also mention as towns of secondary importance, on the Mediterranean coast, Ceta, completely Europeanised for several centuries, on the Atlantic coast Azúla (Asalá), Casablanca, which owes its origin to the little port of Anfa, Azemmúr, Agádir. In the interior, al-Kar, al-Kabir, el-Ksar, Spanish spelling : Alcazarrquivir, Táza, Táridánt. Several ancient towns have now disappeared, e.g. Naktr and Béda in the Mediterranean, Tít to the south of Mazagan, the two Aghmat and Tínnallal to the south of Marrákch and several others, descriptions of which have been given by the geographers like al-Bakrî, al-Idráï and Leo Africanus.

As a rule, the Moroccan town is grouped round a citadel or kasba (pop. kásba) which is the seat of authority. Under the protection of the citadel lies the mellah or Jewish quarter. All around spreads the town proper or médina with its great mosque, markets and baruras [q.v.]. It is surrounded by a rampart (dir), beyond which there are usually the suburbs more or less rural in character. The town itself is divided into quarters (kauna) with streets (zanka), alleys (darb) and squares (rakhba).

c. Economic Life. The country people, whether settled or nomadic, who form at least four fifths of the population of Morocco, live on the land, either by agriculture or stock-raising, mostly combining the two. Those in the highlands grow cereals (wheat, barley), certain leguminosae (broad beans, chick-peas, vetches) and fruit-trees. They also exploit their forests in a very primitive fashion (thuyas, cedars). The people of the plains devote themselves mainly to cereals and the rearing of cattle, sheep, camels, horses and asses. In the oases of the south, the population cultivates the date-palm and understands the art of irrigating the land.

The rural industries are very primitive. They are limited to supplying the necessary implements of agriculture, and weaving wool into the material for garments, tents and carpets. The Berbers of Sús show a certain aptitude at metal-working (arms and jewels). Sús no longer exports the cane-sugar and copper, which formed considerable articles of trade under the Saadians. Each tribe has a certain number of markets (sık), which are held in the open country and bear the name of the day on which they are held. It is in the sık that the peasant sells his produce and buys the manufactured articles that are brought by the merchants from the towns. Cereals are preserved in siloes (matmura); in the Great Atlas and to the south of it we find fortified storehouses, which belong to the community and are called agádir.

It is in the towns that we find industrial activity concentrated. Each trade, which originally formed a guild (kanta), is grouped in one street which bears its name. In it the articles are made and sold. The stocks are kept in the fondús (Ar. fondús) which correspond to the khán and wahhāleh of the east. Some products, like grain, oil, coal, wool, are sold in special places called rahba.

The monopolies of exporting (ṣāku) corn and hules established by the sultans at the end of the xıxth century have now been abolished. Several European products have become of the first necessity in Morocco and form the subjects of an important traffic: cotton goods, tea and sugar and candles. For the history of the towns, measures and coins in use in Morocco before the establishment of the protectorate see the works by Massignan and Michaux-Bollaire quoted in the Bibliography. The very vivid picture drawn by Leo Africanus of the commercial and industrial activity of Fás in the Middle Ages is still very valuable.

The Jews, who devote themselves specially to certain trades that flourish in larger centres (gold-smiths, embroiderers), also play an important part as brokers. The citizens of Fás, who have a large number of converted Jews among their number, had almost a monopoly of the import trade of Morocco, especially from England, and for this reason had little colonies in the sea-posts.

The Berbers of Sús like to settle in the towns as grocers (baššāl) and having made their fortunes return to the country. Since the war of 1914—1918 a large number of them have migrated to France as labourers and they settle in groups, according to their original tribes, in the suburbs of certain large industrial towns.

V. Political Organisation.

It is only at rare intervals and for short periods that Morocco has been entirely under the authority of the sultán; whence the distinction between the territory subjected to the government (bílad al-makhzen) and the territory unsubjected (bílad al-saibá). As a rule, the makhzen territory included the towns, valleys and plains. The mountains, on the other hand, remained more or less independent, according to the degree of power possessed by the sovereign. For further details cf. the article MAHKZEN.

Outside the towns the population is grouped into tribes (khabīla). Several are sometimes grouped together under a common name, without however being a confederation in the strict sense of the word; this is the case with the Ghumāra in the north, the Hāba, the Dukkāla, the Shāwīya in the south. The tribe is subdivided into sections (rub', khams, jidhab), which are subdivided into sub-sections comprising a certain number of villages of tents or houses.

The tribes who own the sultán’s sway are governed by a bašl appointed by the makhzen. His duty is to allot and levy the taxes, to raise contingents of soldiers and keep good order. He has under his command a shākh for each section under whom are the makhkadam of the sub-sections.

For the distinction between makhzen, ṣaikh (vulg. sheikh) and nāba tribes see the article MAHKZEN.

In the tribes not subject to the makhzen, political activity is confined to the ḍāmā’a, i.e. an assembly of men able to bear arms. The ḍāmā’a deals with all the business of the tribe, civil, criminal, financial and political. It administers justice following local custom (Arabic ‘urf, Berber izzíf). It elects a ṣaikh (Berber amghar) who is only an agent to carry out its decisions. Alongside of the ḍāmā’a of the tribe, there are ḍāmā’as of the sections and sub-sections but their powers are limited.

All the tribes of the bílad al-saibá are divided into opposing factions or lāff. When a tribe of
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a certain laff is attacked, those neighbouring tribes who belong to the same faction take up arms and come to its assistance.

In the towns, the mahkzen is represented by a governor whose official title is kaid but in certain large towns he is often called baju. The title of amil has been sometimes given to the governor of Ujda. The kaid of the town, generally speaking, has the same powers as the kaid of the tribe. He acts as judge in case of any violation of the law. He has an assistant or khalifa. Alongside of him, the mu'tasib supervises the corporations, fixes their average prices and looks after public morals.

The kaid has under his orders the muhaddal of his quarter and his police (mekhazia) carrying out his instructions. Among the officials sent by the mahkzen to each town may also be mentioned the nazir or inspector of endowments (hubis), the trustee of vacant inheritances (wakil al-gharaba), popularly known as wakil al-loqafa, the collector of local taxes and market-dues (amin al-masafat).

Lastly in the harbour and frontier towns, the customs are collected by officials called amoons (sg. amin).

Justice is administered by the kaid or by the baju, as the case may be. The latter deals with questions of personal law; official reports on the cases are drawn up by the nazir. In technical cases he appeals to experts: master-masons, agriculturists, veterinary surgeons (muwallid en-naqar, arbaa et-turbi, fallah, ba'itir). The legal opinions (fatwa) given by eminent jurists on the same subject are often contradictory, the Sharifian government has recently created a court of appeal (muwallid al-alim) at Rabat.

A landed property takes a number of different forms. In the first place, there are the state domains; they are either managed directly by the mahkzen (crown-lands) or they are allotted to ghiti-tribes in return for the military service for which they are liable; others of these lands may be granted in temporary or definite ownership to private individuals by imperial edict (zahir or tanbihat).

The hubis lands may be urban or rural. In the towns, they not infrequently cover half the area. They are let out under special conditions which give the tenants special privileges, mafidh and gazi (class. Ar. gazi). In the country, the hubis lands consist mainly of fields and orchards. In all cases, the revenue from these lands is set aside for the maintenance of buildings of a religious character or of public utility (mosques, colleges, schools, fountains) and for the payment of the officials attached to these establishments.

In Morocco, there are vast tracts of land which are not the property of any one individual, either as a result of the insecurity prevailing or of the sparsity of the population. These lands belong undivided to the whole tribe; they are called common lands (blad al-qama). Lastly, lands which have come to belong to private individuals (muflk) by inheritance or purchase, their character confirmed by a certificate of ownership (muwallid).

The old Muslim imposts (zakat and 'udar) have recently been merged into a single tax, the terit. In addition to this tax, from which the state draws the essential part of its revenues, we may mention the duties levied at the gates of towns and in the markets (maka), unpopular with the people and not countenanced by religion, and the urban tax on buildings (dariba). In addition to these, the main taxes, there is the hadiya or present offered to the sultan on the occasion of the three great Muslim festivals. The qiyza or poll-tax paid by non-Muslims and the ni'ba or payment for exemption from military service by certain Arab tribes have been abolished.

VI. Religious life.

A. The Berbers before Islam. For lack of documents it is difficult to get any accurate idea of the religious beliefs and practices of the Berbers of Morocco, before their conversion to Islam and it is only from the survival of animistic cults which can still be observed in the country, that we can guess what the primitive religion was. The figures on two carved stones found in Morocco seem to evidence the existence of a solar worship. On animistic practices surviving in modern Islam in Morocco see below d. Islam in Modern Morocco.

b. Conversion to Islam. At the time of their invasion, the Arabs found a number of tribes around the towns the people were more or less under the influence of Jewish and Christian teachings; but there is little doubt that they did not practice these religions in their true form. It will be more correct to think of them as professing Judaism or Christianity rather than as real Jews or Christians. It seems evident that these influences had prepared the Berber population around the mountains to adopt the new monotheistic religion, which the invaders imposed upon them. The two earliest invasions, that of Uqba b. Nafi'i in 640 and that of Mas'ud b. Nuyair in 711, could result only in a very partial and superficial Islamisation, for very few Arab elements remained in the country. Islam, a town religion, was for long confined to larger centres. The Berbers generally became converted in the hope of escaping the excisions of the conquerors: but when the latter wanted to treat them simply as tributaries, they did not hesitate to apostasise, on seven different occasions, if we may believe the Arab historians. One thing is certain, that while remaining Muslims, they were not long in trying to cast off the authority of the caliphs of Baghdad by adopting the heterodox doctrines of the Kharijis (q. v. and the article al-sufiyya). The Berbers of Morocco went even further when the new local religions arose among them more or less based on Islam, with their own prophets and Kufans. After the attempt at rebellion by the Berber of Tangiers, Maisara [q. v.], which was quickly suppressed, the Barghawata recognised as their prophet one of their number, Suli b. Tarif, who gave them a religion and a Kufan in the Berber language. This religion, the progress of which was opposed by the early Moroccan dynasties, seems only to have been finally exterminated by the Almohad rulers of the 11th century. This Barghawata movement was the most lasting; we also note that which was created by Hafia Min [d. 313 A.H.] among the Qamata, near Tetouan.

In spite of these reactions, Islam, having become the official religion of increasingly powerful dynasties, gradually gained ground and penetrated slowly into the Berber mountains, but it is only from the death of Abd al-Munin, who destroyed the religion of the Barghawata and put an end to the rule of the "anthropomorphist" (muqassimun) Almo-
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ravids, that we can date the complete unification of Islam in Morocco. Till then, Islam had had in Morocco champions who were soldiers rather than theologians, and who after forcing the people to adopt Islam at the point of the sword, were little fitted to instruct them in it. It required a Berber of the Great Atlas, Ibn Tumarti [q.v.], a theologian who had been educated in the east, to come back to his country and to secure the devoted support of a mass of followers in order to found the movement, which was political as well as religious, of the Almohads [q.v.] or “preachers of the Faith” [q.v.]

If the Almohad reformation was only temporary in Morocco, it was nevertheless strong enough while it lasted to obliterate in the country all trace of schism or heresy and to establish thoroughly in it the school of Malik b. Anas [q.v.] which it still follows.

3. Evolution of Moroccan Islam. From the time of the fall of the Almohad dynasty, Moroccan Islam rapidly acquired features of its own. Islam, defeated in Spain, was gradually driven out of it, then attacked in Morocco itself by the Christians of the Peninsula. The western frontier of the Dar al-Islam was brought back to its own territory and then thrust farther back. Islam, in Morocco, attacked by Christianity and forced to djihād, became an active principle. It required all the moral forces of the country, even those of which the orthodoxy seemed doubtful; in order to utilise them, it did not hesitate to absorb them by covering them with a more or less superficial veneer of orthodoxy. It was at this period that the cult of dead and living saints, and to a certain point Shari’a, which had hitherto only existed alongside of Islam in Morocco, were adopted into it and received a kind of official recognition from the maghāzen.

Before the Marinids, Islam had required the constant assistance of the temporal power to maintain itself and advance. From the time of this dynasty, sprung from a Berber nomad tribe, the roles are inverted; it is now the sovereigns who utilise Islam to increase their own power, and try to monopolise it by creating official colleges for religious instruction (madrasas); the first of these (Madrasat al-Safīn) was founded in 679 (1280) by the Sultan Abū Yūsuf at Fas, the capital of the dynasty, which made it the great centre of Muslim culture in Western Barbary [cf. Fas]. The immediate successors of the Marinids, the Banū Wayṣ, established in the same town the cult of their founder Idrīs II. The mausoleum in which he is said to be buried was henceforth an object of great veneration. He is the earliest in date and the most important of the innumerable canonised Muslims who are the objects of a regular cult in Morocco, even on the part of the religious leaders and the aristocracy. When the cult of Idrīs was established, his descendants — more or less authentic — claimed the title of shorfa and soon played a preponderating part in Moroccan society, as a political and moral influence. The power of the Idrīsī shorfa was soon reinforced by that of other shorfas descended from ‘Ali through al-Hasan and this is the origin of the two great groups of shorfas in Morocco, the Idrīsī and the ‘Abd. To the latter belong the two Sharīfī dynasties, the Sa’dīn and the Fāṭīmī, the latter still in power. From the moment of their accession to the throne, the influence of the shorfa on the destinies of the country became more and more preponderant.

The phenomenon of shari’a is closely connected on the other hand with the development of religious brotherhoods [cf. the article Ṭarīqa]. Although we find evidence of their existence at the end of the Almohad dynasty (Hudjajjād, Mughirīyān, Amgāhīyān), it is only as a result of al-Ijābi’s [q.v., d. 1645 A.D.] campaign in favour of a djihād against the Portuguese, that we find the principles of the brotherhoods, as we know them today, first coming into existence.

4. Islam in Modern Morocco. Here we will only give a survey of the principal points of detail in which the people of Morocco differ from the rest of the Muslim community as regards the practice of their religion. With the exception of a few isolated groups, still little studied, who are credited with heterodox or heretical practices (Zkārī, in the neighbourhood of the Bni Znāen, in eastern Morocco, Biddawī, in the Gharb, not far from al-Ḳṣar al-Kabīr), all the Muslims of Morocco are Sunnis and since the Almoravid period have followed the Masīka rite, which prevailed in the west over that of al-Awzā’ī. It is in the towns that the population observes most strictly the duties of the religion. The plains and the Berbers of the mountains are rather lukewarm Muslims. The Dḍāla, however, between Fas and Tangier, are very devoted to Islam, show great piety, and Kur’ānic studies are very much in favour with them; it is from them that they are recruited a great number of schoolmasters who practice their calling in the plains [cf. Shāqīs]. It is also practically only among the hillmen of the north and south that we find a mosque in every village. In spite of the great distance they have to traverse, theMoroccans like to accomplish the canonical pilgrimage. A considerable number settle in the east (there are Moroccan colonies in Alexandria and Cairo); the importance of these colonies had even induced the Sultan Abī al-ʿAzīz to appoint a Moroccan consul, amīn al-Makārība, for Egypt.

In addition to the two canonical festivals of Islam (ʿĪd al-Kabīr and ʿĪd al-ṣaḥīr), the Moroccans celebrate the festival of the birth of the Prophet (mīlād, class. mawlid) and that of ʿAbd Allāh (10th Muḥarram). The mīlād, established in Morocco by the Marinids, has become a kind of national festival, since the accession to power of sovereigns claiming descent from the Prophet; this festival in Morocco almost surpasses in importance the two canonical feasts.

The peculiarities just mentioned would not be sufficient to give Moroccan Islam a special character, nor would its religious brotherhoods, if the latter were confined to the practices of religion or to the exaltation of the faith and to satisfying the need for an elevated mysticism among their adepts. These religious brotherhoods are fairly numerous: Talda, Darkawa, Taʿīlīya-Tubāma, Kattāmīn [q.v.] etc. But alongside of these brotherhoods, whose members are almost exclusively recruited from the literate or well-to-do classes of the towns and country, there are popular brotherhoods in considerable numbers, in which preoccupation with religion gives place to charlatanism practices and sangunary displays. Such are the Dḍāla, the Ṭaswa, the Ḥmadāga, the Dḥūghiyā. Some of these brotherhoods recruit their members ex-
exclusively from a particular class of society; thus the *râbi‘* (class, *râmilâ*) is a brotherhood of marksmen, and the *Gnawa*, a negro brotherhood. All these brotherhoods have this feature in common that their founder has become a famous saint (*wâlî*).

The cult of saints is highly developed in Morocco and undoubtedly was so before the introduction of Islam, which found itself obliged to tolerate it. There are however very different categories of saints, from the venerated patron saint of a capital or of a district to the local holy man whose name is forgotten, between whom comes the *sâyi‘id* whose tomb is marked by a *jâmih* (chapel) supported by a dome, more or less elaborate. The more humble saints are recognised by the circular wall (*haqiq*), which surrounds their tombs.

These venerated individuals, male and female, have attained sanctity by very different ways, in some of their lifetime, by their learning, devotion, asceticism, miraculous powers (*baraka*), sometimes even by more or less mystic mania (*maqâ‘âlî‘*); the others, after their deaths, have been distinguished by miracles, apparitions etc. The warrior in the holy war (*ârikî*; *râhîf*), slain fighting against the infidel is frequently beatified — hence his name of *murâblî‘* (pop. *morâblî‘* — French and English "marabout"). But the early significance of this term was frequently lost sight of and the term *murâblî‘* came to be generally applied to saints, who never took part in a *djâhâl* in their lifetime. *Murâblî‘* thus came into general use as a synonym of the other words used for saint in Morocco: *wâlî*, *sâyi‘id*, *gailî*. But it is the only one applied to the descendants of a saint, who possess the *baraka* of their ancestor. Among the Berbers, the saint is called *agurâm*. The names of great saints have *mawâlî‘* prefixed, the others the title *shî‘î*, while women saints of Berber origin are called *tâlîa*.

The saint to whom sanctuaries are most frequently dedicated — modest though they are (the *mâkîm*, *khalka*; *khâlî‘*) — was not a native of the country but the famous patron saint of Baghdâd, *Abd al-Kâdîr al-Gilânî, popularly called al-Djâlî‘*, who undoubtedly never visited Morocco. But the saint whose cult is surrounded with the greatest splendour is the famous Mawlâ Idrîs, founder and patron saint of Fâs. Among the other great Moroccan saints may be mentioned: Mawlâ *Abû al-Salâm ibn Masjîsh*, patron of the *djâhâl*, buried on the *Djâhâl al-‘Alâm*: Mawlâ *Alî Sulâm*, in the *Gharb*; Mawlâ *Abû 1-Shî‘î* al-Khanâmâr (Mawlâ *Buqîshîa*), in the north of Fâs; *Sâlî Muhammad ibn ‘Isâ*, patron of Meknès and founder of the brotherhood of the ‘Ishâ‘. Mawlâ *Abî Shu‘âb ibn Yûsûf*, at Azemnîr; Mawlâ *Abû Ya‘âsa* (Bu‘azzîa), in the *Tâdâl*; Sidi *Abû 1-‘Abbâs* al-Sabî (Sidi ‘Abd ‘Abd ‘Abîb), born at Céuta and patron of Marrâkûsh. All these and other less famous are the subjects of a hagiographical literature which will be dealt with later.

Devotion to individuals canonised in their lifetime or after their death is in Morocco not confined to Muslims. The Jews have also their saints, relatively as numerous as the Muslim saints. Some of the Jewish saints have acquired a reputation so eminent that even Muslims revere their tombs: e.g. those of the Rabbi ‘Amian in Aujen, near Wassân and of Rabbi Ben Zmuco at Safi. On the other hand, the Jews of Morocco show a special reverence for certain of the great Muslim saints of the country.

The area, surrounding the tomb of each of the principal saints is sacred (*hûrûm*) and hence regarded as an inviolable asylum; among the best known are the *hûrûm* of Mawlâ Idrîs in Fâs and that of Mawlâ ‘Abd al-Salâm b. Mâshîh in the mountains of the northwest. These pieces of ground are the exclusive property of the families who are descended or claim to be descended from the saint. They are exempt from state taxes: more than that, the descendants of the saints have the right to levy for their own benefit certain special dues, by a privilege officially recognised by the sultan. The levying of these dues is not the only way by which the saint's chapel benefits his descendants. The principal source of revenue is the offerings of pilgrims when visiting the tomb; this is the *ziyâra*. In general once a year, there is a kind of patronal festival at the tomb of the saint which is called *mâkîm* (class. *Ar. mawzû‘*); a vast crowd, some of them from a considerable distance, gather there to pay their devotion to the *sâyi‘id* and to see the display of fireworks given in his honour. On this occasion the offerings flow in and are shared among themselves or any important donation by the saint's descendants.

In these circumstances, it is usual for every sanctuary of importance to be regularly organised. The chapel which contains the tomb and the buildings attached to it, an oratory and guest-house, is called the *ziyârîa*. It is superintended by a *maâkîlâm* who collects and distributes the revenues. These do not come entirely from the *ziyâra*. The *ziyârîa* often own lands, sometimes extensive, which are let out and the profits shared with the tenants. They are called *âshî* and the tenants are called *âzâzî*. These farms, sometimes acquired by purchase, often come from bequests or donations (*hâlî‘* from pious private individuals.

We can thus see how certain famous and wealthy *ziyârîas* may exert a moral and political influence in the country round them, independent of their religious influence. The latter is however also very important. The great Moroccan *ziyârîas* are centres of orthodoxy and give life and vigour to Islam in the country. Some are centres of mysticism and they are always centres of religious instruction. This explains the enviable position occupied in Moroccan society by any group of descendants of a famous saint, or of marabouts. If their ancestor had, in addition to the virtues for which he was canonised, the honour to be a descendant of the Prophet, they are at the same time shofâ, which further increases their material privileges. The descendants of a saint who was not a shofâ try to claim this origin for him by inventing more or less fictitious genealogies. The marabouts who have in this way "infiltrated" into the social category of the shofâ are very numerous in Morocco. A Moroccan *ziyârîa* is not only a centre of hagiolatry; it is also in the majority of cases a body of shofâ and the centre of a religious brotherhood or of a branch of one, or of a secondary order affiliated to a brotherhood. The *ziyârîa* itself may have offshoots. Many of the establishments of this name are daughters of a mother *ziyârîa* and are sometimes at a considerable distance from it.

Hagiolatry, religious brotherhoods and sharifism thus form three special aspects of Islam in Morocco, which are profoundly intermingled, and it is dif-
cult to study them separately. For a detailed account of the principal families of šofrā in Morocco of genuine šarīf origin or simply marabout see the article SHOFRA. Here we shall only mention the principal ones whose origin is considered authentic by the Moroccan genealogists. They are descended from al-Ḥasan and ʿAbd Allāh al-Kāmil through the latter's three sons, ʾĪdrīs, Muḥammad al-Nafī al-Zaykiya and Muḥa ila al-Ḥajwa. The descendants of ʾĪdrīs or ʾĪdrīsids are subdivided into Dājjān (Shaḥibiyūn, Idrānāyūn, Tālībīyūn, Qāghūyūn, Dabbaḍāghūyūn, Kattānīyūn, ʿAlāʿīyūn (descendants of the Mawlā ʿAbd al-Salām ʿAṭ-Maḥfīz, brother to the Dājjān al-Ḥajwa), whose names and others are themselves divided into Shāfshāwānīyūn, Kasānīyūn, Khamāna (Lūḥānīyūn). The descendants of Muḥammad al-Nafī al-Zaykiya are the šofrā of Suṣīlīmīs or Fīshā (Fīlāhūyūn; niṣa from Taftālī) i.e. those of the reigning ʾIrābīan dynasty; lastly, the descendants of Muḥa ila al-Ḥajwa are the šofrā of Kādīrīyūn, who take their name from the great saint of Iṣlām ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Gīlānī. We also find in Morocco. but in small numbers, Ḥusainīd šofrā, also descended from ʿĀlī Ḥusain, the brother of al-Ḥajwa; these are the šofrā called Šiḥṣīyūn and Irākīyūn, who came from Ṣanā. The great marabout families are that of the Nāṣiriya from Tāmānṣ in Dārā, the Ṣaḥāṣwa [q. v.] in Tādāl, the Dar-kawa and Wāzānīyūn to the northwest of Fās. The šofrā Wāzānīyūn (şahrīs of Wezrān), whose chief is also head of the great brotherhood of the Taṭiyyūn-Tūḥāmī (cf. above), have for long played a considerable part in politics and have been the object of particular attention from the makhlūṣ. Even more than the other representatives of the great marabout families, they have in fact rendered great services to the central power by using for its benefit the great moral and political influence which they possess among that part of the population, which is lukewarm or hostile to the makhlūṣ. They have mediated in the most successful fashion between the sulṭān and the unsympathetic body of the people.

The šofrā are thus at the head of Moroccan society. Some have assumed the power, others are the auxiliaries of the ruler, who in return shows them great deference. We shall see that they have occupied a very high place in the intellectual life of Morocco since the end of the middle ages. Lastly ʾIrābīanism, an important social factor, has been able still further to strengthen itself by the support which maraboutism has brought it, by incorporating itself in it, and the religious brotherhoods which very frequently spring directly from it.

e. Survivals of Berber cults. The cult of saints, accepted and even recognised, as we have seen above, by Iṣlām, is in Morocco much earlier than the introduction of this religion. Indeed, alongside of saints of note, there are others who are essentially popular, in the country as well as in the towns. In the large cities like Fās, the great sāyiya=venerated by all classes of society rub shoulders with humble marabouts whose names show clearly their popular origin; these are Sīdī ʾl-Mukhīṣ (Rev. the Hidden One), Sīdī Amina ʾl-Khāṣr (Rev. Good Evening) or Sīdī Kāhā Ḥāǧa (the reverend gentleman who procures what is wanted) and notices are given of them by hagio-

...
particularly by women. The djinns are regarded as supernatural powers, who have to be conciliated to avert their evil influence or fought when one is attacked by them. The rites which deal with them are either propitiatory or intended to overcome harm done. In spite of the many sacred formulae of Islam, which are found in the celebration of these two kinds of rites, one gets a strong impression of paganism from them; they ordinarily remain practically what they were before the introduction of Islam into Morocco.


VII Linguistic Survey

Two languages are spoken in Morocco: Berber and dialects of Arabic. Berber is the oldest language attested in Morocco and we have no evidence of an earlier language being used; as to Arabic, it was introduced by the Muslim conquest of the viith and viith centuries. But until the arrival in Morocco of the Banu Hilal and of the Sulaimani (XIIth century), it seems that Arabic, the language of an essentially urban culture, was spoken only in the towns while the country people continued to talk Berber; it was only after the occupation of the plains by the Arab tribes that their languages spread there. With the exception of the region of the Jbala to be mentioned later, the highlands of Morocco alone have remained faithful to the Berber language, while the towns and lowlands are at the present day almost completely Arabic speaking.

In his Annuaire du Monde Musulman (p. 162) L. Massigou gives a proportion of 60% of Berber speakers (3,200,000 to 2,200,000). A. Bernard
thinks this exaggerated and reduces it to 40% (cf. Arabophones et Berbârophones au Maroc, 1924, p. 279).

A. Berber.

1. Berber dialects. According to the works of E. Destaing, the Berber dialects of Morocco can be divided into two main groups.

The first is the northern group which includes the dialects of Rif, those of the Bui Znassen and of the Berber speaking tribes of the neighbourhood and those of the Ait Seghârâhshen, Marâmûa, Ait Warain etc. to the north of the Middle Atlas. These dialects are characterised phonetically by their strong tendency to spurantisation of the dentals and palatals. In comparing these dialects with those which in Algeria the natives call Zmâyra. E. Destaing has been led to describe the group as the group of Zanâta dialects.

The second or southern group includes, according to the same author, the remainder of the Berber dialects of Morocco; he distinguishes two sub-groups:

a. that of the Tamasghit, the dialect spoken by the Brîber of the Central Atlas, from the vicinity of Meknes to the edge of the Great Atlas; the dialects of the north are also distinguished from those of the south. It is with this sub-group that we should connect the dialect of the Sanhdâja d-es-Srât, an important highland confederation to the northeast of Fas, and perhaps also the language of the sections of the Ghumâra who still speak Berber.

b. Sub-group of the Tashelhit, the dialect once spoken by the Masmûda of the Great Atlas and by the Belbè (usual French orthography: Chlûhû) of Sûs and the Anti-Atlas.

The three groups of Moroccan Berber dialects seem to correspond very exactly to the three main ethnic divisions of the Berbers of the country: Zanâta in the N. E., Sanhdâja-Zanaga in the centre and Masmûda in the south. Going back to the old division of the Berbers given by Ibn Khalûdûn, E. Destaing proposes to make the first group correspond to the Butr tribes and the two others to the Barânis tribes.

For the bibliography of Berber studies see the list of works given by E. Lavoût at the beginning of his Mots et Choses Berbères, Paris 1920, p. xvii.; since that date see the Moroccan bibliography annually published by Hespèris. A map showing the division of Morocco between Arabic and Berber is given in the articles by A. Bernard and P. Mousnard, Arabophones et Berbârophones au Maroc (in Annales Soc. Géogr., vol. 33, Paris 1924). For the north, there is a more accurate map by R. Montagne and Pennès published at the end of the Manuel de berbère marocain (dialecte rifjain) by Justnard (Paris 1926).

There is no evidence of the existence of another language before Berber in Morocco. Very few of those “Libyan” inscriptions have been found which, although they are not yet read, are admitted to be in old Berber; one was found in the Roman ruins of Tamuda, a few miles S. W. of Tetwân, and is preserved in the museum of the latter town. Other Libyan inscriptions have been found in the region of Pettijean.

The earliest evidence of the use of Berber in Morocco is given by the Geography of al-Bakrî (9th century) who says that the prophet Há-Mim, killed in 927 A. D., had given the Berbers a Qur’ân written “in their own language”. This can only refer to their Berber speech; the same author tells us that the Baraghwâta had also a Berber Qur’ân from their prophet Ġîlî (d. in 750). For the beginning of the Almohad period, a passage in Documents inédits d’histoire almohade, p. 67, says that at this time Berber was spoken on the Umm Rabî. It is in the same work that we find the earliest recorded phrases in Moroccan Berber (Tashelhit dialect) transcribed in Arabic characters (cf. p. 26, 30, 36, 35, 39, 67, 117).

Ibn Khalûdûn seems to have been the first to interest himself in the creation of a scientific system of trans-literation of Berber into Arabic characters. Using certain graphic methods used by specialists in romance, he invented compound characters to render sounds peculiar to Berber (g, x [emphatic] and ẓ). Unfortunately Ibn Khalûdûn, who in his Mukhtârima gives interesting chapters on the urban and Beduin Arabic dialects, does not seem to have devoted any attention to the Berber language; one of the few passages to be noted in his book, as far as Morocco is concerned, is his reference to the existence of Berber speaking peoples among the Sanhdâja tribes settled in the valley of the Wargha and around the fortress of Amargf (cf. Histoire des Berbères, ed. de Slane, text, i., p. 273, l. 11). For the beginning of the xvith century, Leo Africanus (p. 28) gives us more detailed information. The five Berber ethnic groups (Sanhdâja, Masmûda, Zanâta, Hawwâra and Ghumâra) have a special language which they call aqel amariq (= anîl amasqâ), i.e. “noble language” (cf. the present name of the Tamasghit dialect) (ed. Schefter, p. 273). Berber was still the language of a part of the Ghumâra, for, he says, Arabic is used by almost all the people (op. cit., i. 29). It even looks as if the Shâwiya (“Soava”) of the Tamasaû still spoke Berber (“African language”) like all the other Shâwiya of North Africa with the exception of some who lived to the south of Tunis (op. cit., i., p. 83).

We have to come down to the Danish Consul G. Host, in the xvith century, to find the first Moroccan Berber vocabulary collected from a flock of “Tamenar”, a place probably in the region of Agadir (cf. Etretningar om Maróskos og Fen, Copenhagen 1779, p. 128—133).

2. Berber literature of Morocco. Although Berber was the language of the Moroccan dynasties who followed between the Idrîsîs and the Sa’dîs, it does not seem that, contrary to what was done in Egypt for the Turkish of the Mamlûks, Berber was made the subject of grammatical studies in Morocco, nor that it was used for the purpose of literary expression. A passage in the Kifrâs recalls the fact that the khanîyas were pronounced in Berber in the great mosque of Fas but the text of them has not been preserved. The celebrated Almohad reformer Ibn Tîmîrat is said to have composed in Berber theological and legal treatises which have now disappeared. The Berber Qur’âns of the Ghumâra and Baraghwâta have also disappeared although al-Bakri has fortunately preserved some extracts in an Arabic translation. The only texts which we now have are translations of or commentaries on religious works of the type of the Risâla of al-Kairawânî or of the Mubâkhârât of Khalîf; all these Berber texts come without exception from Sûs, whether because this region
had a more advanced culture or its dialect with a more accossionate consoante system and cleaner vowed system was better suited than others for transcription in the Arabic alphabet. The Moroccan Berbers have a large stock of fables, legends, songs of love, war and work etc., many of which have already been collected by French and German students of Barber (on Barber literature, written and oral cf. Henri Basset, *Essai sur la littérature des Berbères*, Algiers 1920).

Among Arab authors the Barber language is Ṣaqānyā, the non-Arab language; nahrbarī, Barber; ṣafir, "jargon"; in the Documents indiges d’histoire almohade we several times come across the expression al-ašān al-ghārī, "the Moorish language". In Moroccan Arabic, Barber is usually called ʿāghāriyya.  

b. Arabic  
The Arabic dialects. The Arabic language was introduced into Morocco in at least two stages:  

1. in the eighth century at the time of the first Muslim conquest, then in the xith at the coming of the Banī Ḥīlāl and the Samma. Down to the coming of the latter, who were brought to Morocco by the Almohad ruler Yaḥyā b. ʿAlī, Arabic seems to have been spoken almost exclusively in the large towns of the north, where it was used by a considerable Arab population who enjoyed a double prestige, religious and political. It was the language of religion and law. From the towns Arabic spread among the people of the surrounding country, and al-ʿIrīs (Description de l’Afrique de l’Espagne, text p. 79, transl. p. 90) already notes that in the xith century the Barber tribes of the southern hinterland of Fāṣ (Bani Ḫūṣuf, Fandalawā, Bahnīl, Zawāwī, Maggāsī, Ghiyāṣīya and Sélimīya) spoke Arabic.  

It is this linguistic influence exerted by the country on the around them that explains the arabization of the mountainous country of the Ḥibāla (plur. of ḥibīla, "highlander") while the rest of the Moroccan highlands remained Barber speaking. The land of the Ḥibāla, in the wide sense, stretches in the form of a crescent from Tangier to Taza. It was surrounded by a cordon of towns: Nafīl, Ḫabātis, Tigūs, Tétwān, Cēta, al-Kabīr, Šaghūr, Tanger, Ḫarīsha, al-Ḳāṣir al-Kabīr, ʿArbaṣ, Azdīn, Bani Ṭawwād, Wāllī, Fāṣ, and Taza, which were the only ports or markets available for the tribes of the region; besides, the mass itself was traversed by the most important commercial routes of Northern Morocco: the roads from Fāṣ to Tangier, to Cēta, to Ḫabātis, to Nakūṭ and to Ghassāka; it was therefore natural that being subject to the direct and indirect influences of the towns, the highlands of Ḥibāla should be the first region of Morocco to be arabised. The process was further favoured by several other factors: 1. the existence in the mountains of numerous large villages, almost towns, which became secondary centres of ʿurūfā public; 2. the settlement almost everywhere in the xith century among the Ḥibāla of Ḫirādi sharifs who, driven from Fāṣ by Mūṣī b. Abī l-ʿAbīya b. Miḥkān, founded independent principalities in the mountains, which became centres of Muslim urban culture: 3. the tribes of the Ḥibāla furnished a considerable part of the contingents which went to wage the holy war in Spain and returned home after being more or less arabised by contact with the great Muslim towns of Andalusia; 4. lastly the rebellions and civil wars which so frequently disturbed Muslim Spain, the emigrations or expulsions caused by the progress of the Christian reconquest, brought to Africa, from the rising at Cordova (in 814) down to the xvii century, an important element which settled in the region of the Ḥibāla either in the towns around the mountains or in the villages of the highlands (resettlement of Ḥibāla, foundation of Shafshāwā) bringing there along with the Arabic language, the prestige of their cultural, intellectual and material superiority.

This rapid sketch of the spread of the Arabic language in Morocco explains why, after studying the question, three categories of Arabic dialects have been distinguished.

1. Urban dialects; 2. Highland dialects; 3. Beduin dialects; and we may add: 4. the Jewish dialects.

a. Urban dialects. In Morocco not all the town dialects are "urban dialects". There are towns like Casablanca, Mazagan, Safi and Mogador (and to a certain degree Mukānas and Marrākush) the population of which is entirely or for the most part of rural origin and where the absence of an old nucleus of town-dwellers has not enabled them to become urbanised. The Moroccans however distinguish quite clearly such places from towns with a really urban culture, more or less influenced by Andalusian culture. The principal towns with urban dialects are Fāṣ, Kabīl-Salāl, Tétwān, Taza, al-Ḳāṣir al-Kabīr; Tangier, Wazzān and Shafshāwā have urban dialects but these are much contaminated by the surrounding highland dialects. Mukānas and Marrākush have been influenced by the Beduin elements introduced by the maghārīn groups into the dialects of these two old capitals. It is interesting to note the case of Azemmūr where the old town (Azemmūr al-ṣāhr) has an urban dialect, while the new town, which has in recent years grown up beside it around the sanctuary of Mawlay Abī Ṣulāṭ (ṣulāṭ Bā Ṣulāṭ), uses a Barber dialect. The urban dialects of Morocco form one group with those of the western part of the Central Maghrib, notably with those of Tlemcen, Nedroma and Algiers. Their phonetic characteristics are the loss of the initialents of the Classical language, the affricative pronunciation of ṣa, the frequent attenuation of kāf to ha:wā. In Fāṣ, b, m, g and ḥalm assimilate the tām of the article and are treated as ṣolaris: the simple ḥalm is pronounced like the French j (Persian j), but when it is geminated, it gives j in Fāṣ and d in Tangier. The ḥalm is often pronounced very close to the French uvular r.  

As peculiarities of the dialect of Fāṣ, we may note the formation ḥatī/tī "he has written it" for khitī → khitī and the u-c of an invariable relative ḥatī representing the old dialectal ḥānī. Tangier and Tétwān have a preposition ṣal, "to" which is used before nouns (mokatā wá to the house) but not before prefixed pronouns To translate "of" Marrākush uses ṣal; the dialect of this town uses certain Berber adverbs: ḥakā "because"; ḥellī "only".

All the urban dialects use the characteristic prefix of the present indicative: ka in the north, kas in the south. Fāṣ uses one almost as much as the other.

b. Highland dialects. These are at least as well known as those of the towns. In 1920 I published notes on that of the Tālil and the
Bréa in the north of Taza; in 1922, E. Lévi-
Provençal published texts, prefaced by a grammatical
sketch, of the dialects of the middle valley of
the Wargha; since then I have had an opportunity
of studying those of the Bni Hòsmur (near Tétwàn),
of the Mes'asa (near Brèa) and of the Ghazwa
(near Shafshawan).

The highland dialects are of course more dif-
ferentiated than the urban dialects. The tribes
which use them belong to two political clans
probably originally of different racial origin: the
Ghumàra, the old inhabitants, and the Sa'nàja,
the invaders. In the present state of our knowledge
it does not seem possible to make the dialects
coincide with political or racial boundaries; but we
can nevertheless recognise two main groups of
highland dialects:

1. The northern dialects, extending from the
Strait of Gibraltar to the south of Shafshawan
and embracing in the east the confederation of the
Ghumàra; 2. the southern dialects, from
Wazaà to Taza, used by two great classes of
tribes: first, the Sa'nàja tribes of the valley of the
Wargha; Sa'nàja of the Central Wargha,
Sa'nàja of the Sun and of the Shade, of Mo-bâth
and of Ghèddor; secondly, the Butr tribes, more or
less closely related to the Zànta and occupying
the lands south of the region of Taza: Mermsa,
Brèa, Tsül, Maghèta and Mekànsa. It seems to
be a historical fact that these Zànàta and Sa'nàja
peoples only settled in their present habitats long
after the first Arab conquest; the Sa'nàja of the
Central Wargha certainly now occupy lands
which before the Almoravid period were peopled
by the Ghumàra. We should therefore regard these
southern highland dialects as younger than those
of the northern group. The slight differences noted
between the two groups may then be due to two
main causes: 1. an evolution of the neigh-
bouring urban dialects which would have taken
place during the period between the arabisation
of the Ghumàra and that of the Sa'nàja-Zànta; 2.
the influence of the Berber substrata.

To the two main groups: Ghumàra and Sa'nàja-
Zànta, we may perhaps add two 'little islands' in
the south: the highlanders of the region of
Shèfri to the south of Fès (Bhâuli, Bni Vâzga
etc.), and the Ghìyyata to the south of Taza; they
probably constitute the last vestiges of a contin-
uous Arabic-speaking bloc which stretched to the
south of the Fès-Taza corridor, the existence of
which in the xiiith century we know from al-Mârîf.

Phonetically, the Moroccan highland dialects
are characterised by the profound changes under-
gone by the Arabic consonantal system as a result
of the spirantisation of the dental and post-palatal
occlusives. We find the interdental âl and âl, which do not repre-
ent the classical interdentals: âl-'ala and âl-'alâl have given in these dialects,
âl and âl respectively, which remain occlusive only
at the beginning of the word or after a consonant
or gemination, but after a vowel we have âl and
âl: bunt 'daughter'; plur. buntâl: after a vowel also kaf is pronounced as a spirant like the z of
modern Greek. The representative of the group
ku- of the classical language is usually l, some-
times hardened to t; but among the Ghumàra we have
âl (as emphatic glal). The sound âl is
fairly common. The short vowels are commoner
than in the towns; many of the short vowels i
and u of the classical language are preserved:
this is how we find a considerable number of im-
perfects iR 1 R 2 uR 3 and a few iR 1 R 2 iR 3.

As to morphology, the fem. personal suffixes
-a (<-hâ) and pl. -em (<-hum) are characteristic:
they are the complement of the series begun by the
masc. -e, -e (<-hu). Among the northern Jbîla
we find the use of a suffix -tâ marking the plural:
which seems really to be a borrowing from Latin.
The dual, reserved for names of parts of the body
which occur in pairs and for names of various
measurements (of weight, length, volume and time)
is in -zen: ghâleen 'two months', gištâ-'his
hands'. The relative, pronoun and adjective, is l.
The classical construct state (lidâla) is very rare
and is only found in a few stereotyped phrases:
neither replaced by analytical constructions
in which the preposition l "of" is used, expressing
possession as well as the material of a thing.

Almost everywhere the prefixes of the 2nd pers.
com. and of the 3rd pers. fem. of the aorist are
d (and not te); dikeb 'thou writest, she
writes'. The passive participle of hollow verbs
is often of the type mef'âl: mebâs 'sold',
mebâse 'filled up'. Finally we may note a few
traces of a passive of the form f'al of: iâl
'to be taken'. As evidence of conservatism, we
may mention that in these dialects we have the
word 5a 'mouth' which seems to have dis-
ppeared since old Arabic.

Just as the urban dialects of Morocco may
be linked with a number of urban dialects of Algeria.
so have the highland dialects of Morocco cor-
respondents in the latter country. W. Marçais,
who is the first to have isolated and described
this group of Maghrîb dialects and prefers to
use the name of "parlers villageois" for them,
classes along with the dialects of the Moroccan
Jbîla two other similar groups, also characterised
by the detachment of the Arabic consonant system
(Roundation, affrication, spirantisation), by the use
of turns of syntax and structural forms taken from
Berber and by the juxtaposition in the vocabulary of
Arabic elements sometimes strangely archaic
and very abundant Berber elements. These are
firstly the oran group of the Tiara in the
country which extends from Lalla Maghlaya to the
sea, a mountainous country traversed by the
roads connecting Tlemcen, the capital of the Banû
Abd al-Wal, with the ports of Hmam and
Arshgîln. It is with the dialects of the Tiara
that the dialects of these Moroccan Jbîla show
most agreement.

The second group, which differs more, is that
of the highland dialects of Eastern Kabylia, a
mountainous region of the department of Con-
stantine, traversed by the roads connecting Con-
stantine with the ports of Hôdjet el-Collo; this
was also the old habitat of the Katam, whom
their support of the Fatimids movement must have
caused to be rapidly arabised. Alongside of these
three groups of highland dialects (Jbîla, Tiara,
Eastern Kabylia), W. Marçais classifies a fourth
in the villages of the Tunisian Sâbîl, which lie in the
coast zone traversed by the roads which connect
Kairâwân with the ports of Sîs, Mahliya and
Monastir. These Tunisian dialects, of which that
of Takrûna, studied by W. Marçais, is a specimen,
are however much arabised and hardly seem to
have been subjected in their phonetics, mor-
phology, syntax and vocabulary to the profound
Berber influences which characterise the first three groups.

In spite of their divergencies, which are due mainly to pronunciation and to the local use of words and phrases corresponding to two very distinct forms of culture, the urban dialects and the highland dialects cannot be either historically or linguistically separated. The fundamental disparity is that which exists between the urban and highland group and the Beduin group. It is the townsmen who have taught the highlanders to speak Arabic, but the urban dialects, used by individuals whose intellectual activity is greater, have evolved more rapidly. They are also more sensitive to external influence, literary and political. These facts added to the predominance of Berber blood in the highlands suffice to explain why the dialects of the Jbala still seem coarse and quaint to the townsmen. On the other hand, the towns have been frequently repopulated, wholly or in part by people from the neighbouring hills. All this explains the family resemblance which the linguist finds between the dialects of the towns and those of the hills; perhaps the latter, being more conservative, are also the more interesting for the history of the language. W. Marçais regards them as valuable representatives of the Arabic spoken in the country district of the Maghrib before the coming of the Banū Hilal and the Sulaim (cf. W. Marçais, Textes arabes de Tabrouna, vol. i, preface, p. xxviii.).

The principal features which are common to the urban-highland group and which distinguish it from the Beduin group are the following:

- loss of the classical interdental;
- pronunciation of kaf as k or hamsa (and not g as among the Beduins);
- tendency to the syllabic grouping Ra Ra is Ra, when Ra is not a laryngal nor a consonant;
- rarity of the construct state;
- suffix of the 3rd pers. masc. sing. in -u, -a (and not -e, as among the Beduins);
- relative rarity of the addition of personal suffixes, but regular use of the analytical phrase with ad-: ad-dar ad-dali, "my house";
- diminutive of Ra Ra e Ra becomes Ra Ra iy Ra: kīyyuq, "little dog";
- diminutive of adjectives of the types Ra Ra e Ra (class: afal) and Ra Ra e Ra becomes Ra Ra i Ra e Ra: kūmār, "a little red"; kūtār, "a little large";
- plural of the adjectives Ra Ra e Ra (class. afal) becomes Ra a Ra, Ra: kūhāl, "black" (plur.);
- reductions of the plurals C1 C2 C3 C4 to C1 C2 C3 C4: mīyālah, "keys";
- use of a verbal prefix to mark the indicative present: ka- or pū- in the towns and la-, ka- a- in the hills;
- in the singular of the perfect, the feminine person is in general used for the masculine: e.g. kēbtā, "thou hast written" (m.), whence we find in Rabat for the plural, an analogous form kēbtān, "you have written";
- in the vocabulary, ġhāl, "how much?"; dāba, "now"; ḫa (ṛḥa, ḫa), "to do", are characteristic;
- in the imperfect of the defective verbs, the plural is formed on analogy of the singular: yēḥ sân, "they remain"; yēḥ wīn, "they sleep".

**c. Beduin dialects.** These are in Morocco the dialects of the plains: the Atlantic plain from Arzila to Mogador and with its continuations into the interior, the valley of the Muluya, the plateaus of eastern Morocco and the region of the Moroccan Sahara (Wād Gḥir, Wād Zīz etc.); they are still little known; only that of the Hawwārāt of Sūs has been studied, but only in Europe and from authorities who had already travelled a good deal elsewhere. That of the Dukkala of the north (Jebel Batūn, Ulād Frejī), I have myself examined it corresponds in almost all its details to the dialect of the Ulād Brähīm of Sādā (Oranía) on which W. Marçais has written a monograph. There is no doubt that on examination one can divide the Beduin dialects into groups characterised by more or less conservatism; should those of the Mašīl perhaps be separated from those of the Banū Hilal? Perhaps a distinction should also be made between the dialects of the purely Arab tribes and those of the Atlantic regions where powerful Berber tribes (Jbala, Ragāğa, Dukkala, Baragbātā) have been arabised and more or less submerged by the Beduin. In spite of the historical period the latter have been infinitely less stable than the tribes of Berber origin (speaking Arabic or Berber): whether because they were taken to form the ġallah, which guards each large town (environs of Fās, Meknes, Rabat-Sale and Marrākush) or because they were transported far from their original homes as a measure of oppression (case of the Ḡhārdā), the Arab tribes of the Atlantic plains have become much broken up and mixed. The Beduin dialects which have most of having pre-erced their original character are those of the tribe of the Saharan steppes who have retained relatively stable and intact: Bai Gill, Mālah, Ḍāhir, Nāhī, Ulād Djihr etc. In any case, the following are the main characteristics of these dialects: firstly the kaf is pronounced as g (kaf mūkḥāda), and it is already this pronunciation which for Ibn Ḥaladīn characterises the Beduin dialect of his time. The ġl, ġhāl and ġfāt-ṯāl are retained with their interdental value. The short vowels are indistinct: the sound i is almost completely absent and many short unaccented vowels sound practically like a labial e. Characteristic are the appearance of an extremely short transitional vowel of ū character, which is developed after ā, ā, ā and ṯū placed before a consonant or an ū; e.g., kuṭār, "green" (plur.), ḥūd, "the sits down", ḏaḥa, "aile", Ḥaḥa, "gazelle", ḡaḥa, "saddle-bag", ṣaḥa, "indian" (plur.): a similar sound is found after ṣa, ṣa and ṣa, e.g. ṣoḥā, "the crows", ṣuyṣ, "a blow", ṣamān, "pomegranate", ṣubkāt, "sugar", ṣuḥa, "piece of (cloth)", ṣukkāb, "sound"; by analogy the combinations mū and fū when the ṣo corresponds to a normal ṣain, are reduced to mm and fū, e.g. ṣamēnum, "the (little) place", ṣaḥa, "the entails".

The retention of the accent on the first syllable causes "projected" syllabic forms. ṣīkāb, "he writes", plur. ṣīkābūn: meghābīlī, "Moroccan", mūkha, "musket", ḡeritu, "my cow".

The personal suffix of the 3rd pers. masc. is -ūb. The dialectal preposition translating "of" is ṣā or ṣ, from the classical matāṣ; according as the word before it is feminine or plural, this preposition becomes nīāt (ṣāt) or nīā (ṯā).
It does not seem that the Beduin dialects know the use of the verbal prefix indicating the indicative present. In the plural personal forms of the defective verb, there is a refection of the diphthong: śākā, from the verb śākī, "to fry"; ṣāw-pūtna, from the verb na-s "to forget".

We may al-o note the use of a preposition li, "to": ḥāl-līman, "he told us".

From the point of view of vocabulary, some words are character-tic of Beduin dialects: ḍārītī, "to make, do," ḥāšī, "to wish", yemata, "when", yām-n, "yesterday", ḍayāt, ḍābūk, ḍūm, "now", from the classical  נהנ-י. We may add the particle wāk used to indicate interrogation: ḍayī khān, "have you seen so and so?" and the phrase ma lān, "he no longer comes".

1. Jewish dialects. The Jews who emigrated from Spain have as a rule retained the use of an archaic Spanish; many have also learned Arabic for business reasons. Alongside of the Spanish Jews, we have in the Berber highlands, and also in the towns of the interior, Moroccon Jews of unknown origin whom the former called .foresters (Span "foreigners"); according to the district, they speak Berber or Arabic, but in the towns their dialects have not yet been studied. They have a literature in an Arabic dialect written in Hebrew characters (and called, certainly wrongly:  ידנ-א איקסב-א: ḥayyut, songs at family festivals (cf. Tadjouri, in Hastfūris, iii., 1923. p. 408-420), satirical songs and songs dealing with real happenings; some of these texts have been printed at Fās and Constantine; a newspaper written in an Arabic dialect and printed in Hebrew characters called  ידנ-א איקסב-א "The Liberty" has been published and sold for a number of years.

2. Relations of the linguistic groups of Morocco to one another. Morocco appears to the philologist a wonderful field for the study of the influence of the substratum on an imported language, since the language of the substratum, i.e. Berber, is still alive alongside of the Arabic and quite well known. The results of the examination are very meagre: the phenomena actually ascribable to the action of the substratum alone are infinitesimal; this may, however, be due to the fact that Arabic, a Semitic language, and Berber, a proto-Semitic language, are not sufficiently differentiated.

From the phonetic point of view, there is hardly any sound change found in the highland dialects of the arabised Berbers, for which a corresponding change cannot be found in the dialectal phenomena of old Arabic; only, perhaps, the tendency to spirantisation should be connected with the identical tendency observed in the northern Berber dialects found in the confines of the Jīdī country.

If we consider the morphology, we see that in the highland dialects the verb has lost feminine forms of the plural of the old Arabic, which still survive in some Beduin dialects and are still found in Berber. A Berber origin has been sought for the use of the verbal prefix indicating the present of the indicative; but similar prefixes are found in Egyptian and in Syria where there are very different substrata.

(Definitely Berber is the scheme to-... which forms nouns indicating ạs (a-benmāl, "trade of a mason") and names of abstract qualities (a-frām-it, "roguey"); it is however curious to note that in modern Berber, this scheme has not this significance and is only used to form the feminine and secondarily the diminutive.

In the syntax of the highland dialects, we find indi-putable traces of Berber influence: plural treatment of singulars applied to liquids (water, urine), phrases translated or stereotyped, e.g. alus in Kaddār, "Kaddār's brother", with retention of the Berber particle indicating belonging to, -nu.

But it is in the vocabulary that the Berber substratum makes its influence most felt. Whether surviving in the highland dialects or borrowed in the Beduin dialects, many of the terms relating to country life are Berber (names of plants, animals, rocks, agricultural implements and tools); they have often been taken in Arabic the Berber pseudo-article a-, which, still felt to have its original value, makes them unfit to take the Arabic article also; alongside of the singular in a-, we usually have a Berber plural in a—an also retained. It is curious by the way but intelligible to find in the highland dialects words of Arabic origin with the Berber article: these must be Arabic words borrowed and berberised at a time when the Jīdī still spoke Berber and which have been retained just as they were in their Arabic dialect after being arabised, e.g. a-hāf, "ditich", plur. a-hāfrān; in Tangier the nace of the mosque is called a-hāf; at Rabat two words imported from Europe have a Berber form: a-hāf, "the sulphur's boat" and a-lāy, "tea".

Some Berber words have survived in the administrative language of the Māhzen: a-frāg, "a wall of cloth surrounding the sulphur's camp"; a-gādī, "a pasture reserved for the sulphur's animals"; a-saf, "lash to punish the guilty"; merzal, "synedic (nakhli) of the sheriffs'"

The Beduin dialects naturally contain much fewer Berber elements than the urban dialects and still less than the highland dialects; their rustic vocabulary nevertheless made numerous borrowings from the technical vocabulary of the previous Berber tillers of the plains.

Within the Arabic area, the highland and urban dialects have borrowed a certain number of terms relating to the rural activities of the Beduins; they are as a rule revealed by the pronunciation of ḍāf as g. The Beduin dialects in their turn borrow from the towns their words relating to a more advanced culture; but, for economic, political and, to a certain extent, aesthetic reasons, they give more than they borrow.

Some words, which are used in the urban and highland dialects, as well as by the Beduin dialects but are unknown to the Spanish and Maltese dialects, are perhaps of "Hilāl" origin; the principal seem to be ānd, "horse", ḍāhlīf, "boar" and ḍāf-idāf, "to sec".

In addition to the Berber and Arabic elements, the Moroccan vocabulary contains a fairly important number of European loanwords. They come from the vocabulary of a higher culture and relate to the flora (in cultivation or its products), to agriculture, to foods and dress, to furniture and housing, sometimes even to parts of the body. There are Greek or Latin borrowings of the oldest period, Romance or Spanish for later periods; but neither their meaning nor their phonetic treatment enables us always to be able to date accurately the time of their introduction and their origin.

These "European" loanwords are naturally found in larger numbers in Northern Morocco, which
has been more subject to Mediterranean influences, which, through refugees from Spain, have been felt as far as the northern parts of the Middle Atlas. The Beduin dialects have escaped these influences (cf. 1. Simonet, Glossaire de voces berbères y latinas usadas entre los Morocabes. Madrid 1888; 2. Schuchardt, Die romanischen Lautspuren im Berberischen, Vienna 1918; 3. G. S. Colin, Ethnologie maghrébines, in Hespéris [1926 and 1927]; 4. A. Fischer, Zur Lautlehre der Marokkanisch-arabischen [chap. ii., iii. and Ex. urs.], Leipzig 1917).

Between the two extremes marked by the most-conservative Beduin dialects and the most characteristic highland dialects lies a whole gamut of intermediate varieties, which are in the transitional stages; they include the highland dialects whose characteristic features have been reduced through contact with the plains of the southern periphery of the massif of the Jbal, as well as certain dialects of Beduin type used in the Atlantic plains, notably in the non-ḥaḍyīya towns. "But however extensive and deep may have been the interpenetration of the types, it has not abolished their fundamental unlikeness" (W. Marçais).

In spite of the profound differences which separate them, the highland and Beduin dialects of Morocco (and of the Maghrib) agree in one essential and characteristic morphological feature: the sons. sing. n—, plur. n—a in the first persons of the noun; in fact this is attested in the 13th century for Almoravid Spain and Norman Sicily, i.e., in languages from which the Moroccan influence is clearly excluded; it is also found in Maltese; it must then be admitted that the two groups of dialects have independently brought about this innovation, which seems to have remained exceptional in the dialects of the east. The two groups agree also in the loss of short vowels in open syllables; this phonetic peculiarity is also found in many eastern dialects; but it is curious: that it has become general in the Maghrib while the dialects of Spain and Egypt do not have it.

It is in the Documents inédits d'histoire almohade that we find the first information about Moroccan Arabic [use of bīḏ, "in order that", wātā, "of", first persons of the arist in n—— (sing.), n—— n (plur.)]; but we have to wait until D. de Toreto find a few phrases transcribed (cf. French transl., Paris 1919, pp. 241, 373, 379). Mouette, who was captured at sea by the Moors in 1670 and was for a long time a prisoner, has left us a Dictionnaire arabesque in French and Moroccan, in transcription (cf. Relation de la Capitale..., Paris 1653, pp. 330—362). The first grammatical notes were collected by Host (cf. Études moraves..., 1779, ch. 8, p. 202—210), who has also given us a Berber-Danish-Moroccan Arabic vocabulary (cf. ibid., p. 128—133). It is to Fr. de Domby that we owe the first monograph on Moroccan dialects, which is also the first serious contribution to the study of Arabic dialects; the dialect which he deals with is that of Tangier (Grammatik der tunesisch-marokkanischen Dialekte, Vindolanae 1809). Since then, there have been a number of studies; for works before 1911 see the bibliography given by W. Marçais in his Textes arabes de Tanger, p. 207—213; for later works see the bibliography in Textes arabes de Rabat by L. Bruneau (now in the press).

2. Literature of the Arabic dialects. Like all popular literatures, the literature of the Arabic dialects of Morocco is essentially poetical. The only texts in prose are those which have been collected recently by European students of dialects. In the Arabic poetry of Morocco two periods must be distinguished: the first extending down to the beginning of the Sa’dian dynasty, the first known texts are those which Ibn Khaldūn gives at the end of his Muqaddimah among the specimens of the poetry of the towns. To these we may add a mass of poems composed in honour of the Prophet (Marhāl-iṣī’ī) of which numerous collections exist in manuscript. Ieco Africanus (ed. Schefer, ii., p. 150) says that under the Marinids, poets used to compose verses in "vulgar African" on the Mawlid and also on erotic subjects. These poems were recited in the presence of the sultan, who gave prizes to the winners of the competition, this group cannot be separated from the poems which accompany classical Moroccan music, "Andalusian" music, much of which must have been composed in Morocco; these were collected and classified by al-Hāfik, a musician of Spanish origin who had settled in Tetwān. All these poems belonging to this first period are written in the Spanish Arabic dialect, which after the great success of the Cordovan Ibn Kunāz (13th century) became the classical language of the new poetical genre called yūdil, which had this in common with the muraqqād, that, while employing like it new metres, its prosody was based like the classical metre on the quantity long or short of the syllables, but the ragāl differed from the muraqqād in that it was written in the Spanish dialect and not in the classical language.

The main characteristics of the poetry of the Moroccan dialects of the first period are attention to the quantity of each syllable as in Latin and the use of the Spanish dialect.

The second period, on the other hand, is distinguished by a system of prosody founded exclusively on the number of syllables in each verse (as in French) and by the use of a special language called melḥūn, a kind of xānī adapted to literary purposes, based on the Moroccan dialect but influenced partially by the Beduin dialects; it seems, moreover, that this poetry is of Berber origin and was under the bedouin dialects of the Sa’dians and Alawīs that it arose and flourished.

The first known author of a poesy written in melḥūn appears in the 16th century: he was Abū Fāris ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz al-Maghrawī, who was one of the poets of the Sa’dian Sulṭān al-Muḥammad al-Dhahabī (1578—1602). His fame is still great and is preserved in the proverb: Kull ḫalī ḫalī, ʾāhib an-nasab al-ṭarīq gūrūwa "Nothing that is long is of interest except the palm-tree and al-Maghrawī". Other poets followed him. It was at this time that the saint ‘Abd al-Khāṣṣīm al-Maghrawī al-Dākhīlī (d. in 1566) wrote his mystic ʿalifrat, in which the verses now attributed to him are apocryphal. After these we have the poets from Tlemsen, an important centre of melḥūn poetry; first ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Miṣrī al-Tlīmhī, author of the celebrated ʿAbīlī, who left his native town to live at the court of the first ‘Abū al-Muḥammad Muḥammad b. al-Sharīf (d. 1664) and al-Kalīfī (d. 1672); a pupil of al-Miṣrī, Abū ʿAbdāl islāh b. al-Tuniṣi, banished from Tlemsen in 1672 by the Turks, also came to settle in Morocco among the Bni Zānān. But we have to come down to the XVIII and especially the XIX century for the coming of a whole school of poets writing in melḥūn. The three principal centres of literary activity were Fāṣ, Meknes and
Marrakush. The subjects treated are most varied: love poems, mystic, erotic and satirical (discussion between a white woman and a negro, between a townsman and a Beduin woman etc.), political (on the occasion of the French conquest and the establishment of the protectorate), didactic (manufacture of powder, target-shooting, falconry) poems or burlesques (parodies of ḥuḥbas decried by the students at their fêtes).

Among the numerous authors we may mention: Si Muhammad b. Sulaimān, Si al-Thāhāmī al-Madaghrī, al-Gandūr, al-Hangh; we owe humorous ḱāṣidas to Si al-Madani al-Tarkumānī of Marrakush; Si Kaddār al-ʿAlami buried at Mekeis specialised in mystical and religious poetry. The Darṣāwī Muhammad al-Ḥasnāk of Tetwān (d. 1845) also wrote mystical ḱāṣidas in melāḥān which are collected at the end of the lithographed edition of his Dīwān (Tunis 1331; Fās, n.d.). At the beginning of the xvi century, al-Saddāmī of Fās was composing political ḱāṣidas.

Melāḥān poetry has completely replaced poetry in the Spanish dialect; it constitutes a very vigorous branch of literature, much in favour with all classes of society; we frequently find almost illiterate authors, and people say that their talent is a poetical gift given by God (waḥiḥū); on the other hand, even the rulers have not disdained this popular poetry and one of the last Ḥalwādī Sāḥūn, Mawlay Ṭāb al-Hafīz, wrote numerous ḱāṣidas in melāḥān which have been collected in a Dīwān lithographed at Fās.

Alongside of this men's poetry, there are the songs of the women (songs of women working at the mill, songs of gleaners, songs of family fêtes, lullabies), the children's songs which are often strangely conservative, epigrams and proverbs [cf. A. Fischer, Das Liederbuch eines marokkanischen Sängers, Leipzig 1918; C. Sonneck, Chants arabes du Maghreb. Paris 1902 (Nrs. 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 74, 84, 85, 88, 89, 94-97, 111 and 116 are Moroccan); L. Évy-Prevonge, Un chant populaire religieux du Dyébal Morocan, in Revue Africaine, 1918; H. de Caixeries, Les gnomes de Sidi Abd al-Rahman al-Majdoub, Paris 1906; on the poetry melāḥān in general, cf. Ābā Ṭāb al-Ghwāthī, Kāṭīb al-Kiwaṭī an Ābā al-Sīnān, Algiers 1904, p. 49-93; S. Barnay, Notes d'ethnographie et de linguistique nord-africaines, Paris 1924 (songs of women and children); L. Brunot, Proverbes et dictons arabes de Kabat, in Hespéris, 1926 (with Moroccan bibliography of the subject).

III. Other Languages. A sketch of the languages of Morocco which only took account of Berber and Arabic dialects would be incomplete; for three other elements of secondary importance have to be considered: a. Classical Arabic, the official language is used only in writing; for sermons, lectures and conferences: it is never the language of conversation. But as religious studies are considerably developed in the towns (especially Fās) and also among the ḫlāla (Kurānic studies and especially ḥisāb), many words of classical Arabic have been introduced into the popular dialect by the educated classes. The phonetic peculiarity to notice in borrowed classical words is the retention of the short vowels of the classical language, as a result of the process of elongation; e.g. classical ǧābir, plur. ǧābir, “deuce of the sulphur”, borrowed by the popular dialect in the form ǧābir, whence a dialect plural ǧābir. Several Kurānic expressions or phrases of exegesis hence passed into everyday language as adverbs: bālātī “guilty” (taken from Kurān vi. 153), bātīlātī “slowly”, lit. “in commenting on”, waḥiḥā “perhaps”. Morocco, as a whole being little arabised, seems incapable of borrowing a part of the classical vocabulary and adapting it to its own dialect. Its borrowings from classical Arabic almost always look like borrowings from a foreign language.

b. Spanish was the only language spoken by many of the Muslims of Spain, who in the xv century and especially in the xvi took refuge in Morocco, mainly at Tetwān and Rabat-Sale. Mouette, who was taken a prisoner to Morocco in 1670, says that Spanish was as common there as Arabic; his remark is probably true only of the towns already mentioned. The descendents of these emigrants from Spain later learned Arabic and forgot Spanish, under the influence of Islamic culture. Not having been subject to the latter influence, the Jews of Spanish origin still speak an archaic Spanish, sprinkled with Arabic terms moulded to the flexions of Latin morphology.

c. At the present day, in the palace of the sultaṅ, many servants of both sexes still speak Sūdānīse dialects, but these seem to have had no influence on the Arabic dialects of Morocco. No trace has so far been found of the existence in Morocco of secret languages; one could hardly put in this category the argots of certain guilds (butchers) nor those of the students, the originality of which consist simply in transposing certain letters of each word of the ordinary language and in the addition of certain prearranged syllables. (GEORGES S. COLIN)

VIII. INTELLECTUAL LIFE.

More especially since the end of the middle ages, Morocco has occupied a place by itself, often important, in the history of Muslim civilisation. From the point of view of intellectual life, it was for long under the tutelage, more or less marked, of neighbouring countries, and it was only from the time it became an independent state with well-defined frontiers that it began to show independence. In this respect also it has been a constant aim of the centre of learning in Arab Spain down to the end of the xvi century had undoubtedly an influence in Morocco, but it was after the return of the Iberian Peninsula to Christianity, that, owing to the migration of refugees from Spain to Morocco, where there happened to be ruling princes anxious to further Islamic studies, it was able to preserve the last and only centres of study in the Muslim west. In any case, in spite of the relatively large number of scholars which it has produced in various branches of ʿilm, this country is far from having inherited in the eyes of the rest of Islam the reputation and intellectual prestige, which Spain enjoyed when it was a Muslim country. However, it may be said that the towns of Morocco have always held in recent centuries a large proportion of men of letters, much attached to their traditional culture. Lastly, it may be noted that this culture, the greatness of which at least, never allowed the slightest place for modern sciences, the study of which, if it has gradually become more or less established in the Muslim east, has never interested the west.

The characteristic feature of this culture, which
in school Córdoba, Arabic teaching. the few A theology of these on Mariakush the did the is Bencheneb's the it is more numerous, e.g. the zawiya of al-Dila in the Middle Atlas, the zawiya of Tánger in the land of Dára and the zawiya of Wazzán in the north. The most famous scholars were frequently either heads of brotherhoods or shaykhs, who taught in the mother-house of their order.

We do not intend here to give a detailed sketch of the Arabic literature of Morocco, but will be content with a few general indication- and names distinguishing where possible, between Islamic and profane sciences.

It was not till the Muslim west adopted the Málikite rite that Morocco began to produce work in the domain of šī'ism in close accord, a-already mentioned, with the school of Spain. In this period of intellectual independence, the relations between the two countries were continued and the Maghrīb student, down to the ninth century considered a sojourn in Córdova, Murena or Valencia necessary to finish his course. The east did not yet seem to exert the attraction that it did later. Besides, the Islamisation and Arabisation of the Berber masses was still too recent. Only a few names may be mentioned for this early period, Darrāb b. Ismā'īl, of whom much that is recorded is legendary; the famous reformer Ibn Tūmārt [q.v.], creator of the Almohad movement and author of several riḍâ or taṣbih on his teaching, the kādī Iyād [q.v.], born at Ceuta in 476 (1083), d. at Marrākush in 544 (1149), author of numerous works on Muslim learning of which the most famous are the Kifāt al-shifā, and the Mağārib al-anwar with a collection of biographies of learned Mālikis, entitled al-Mādārī.

During the modern period, on the other hand, the number of learned Moroccans becomes more and more considerable. The best known are for zārāt: Ibn Barri (eighth century A.H.); Ibn Fakhkhar (ninth century); the scholar of Meknès Ibn Qaddi († 1019); 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Idrīs al-Qāsimi († 1082); 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Idris Mandlāra († 1179); Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Sālih al-Fāsi († 1214); for hadith: Vahīr al-Sa'rāīrī († 808); Nakran al-Asimī († 956); Ridwān al-Djāzuli († 991); Muhammad b. Kasim al-Kāzārī († 1012); Idris al-Turāqī († 1228); for fikr: Abu 'l-Haṣan al-Sughāyīrī, commentator of the Manvawīya; al-Djāzuli [q.v.] and Aḥmad Zaṭīf (ninth century) commentators of the Kullat of Ibn Abī Zaid al-Kaṣrāwī; al-Wanshari († 995): al-Mandjūr († 995); Ibn 'Aṣhir († 1040); Mūsā al-Ṣufi († 1072); for philosophy: al-Mawkūḥī († 807); Ibn Zakrī († 899). Their works have for the most part been recorded and will be found detailed either in Brockelmann, G. A. L. or in Benchekroun's work on the individuals mentioned in the igitur of 'Abd al-Khir al-Fāsi. Only a small number have found a place in eastern libraries; but on the other hand, they all form the foundations of the collections of manuscripts formed and preserved in the imperial palaces and mosques of Morocco.

Some Moroccan scholars have written works on adab or collections of poems, in addition to books of a strictly Muslim character. None of
them can claim any great originality and purely literary dwaints are rare. Poetry, as a rule — when it is not didactic (urgjud) —, is religious or mystic. At the courts, there were always a few literary men maintained by the princes, who were the panegyrists, very often lured, of their patrons.

It is at the courts also, especially from the xivth century, that we find the few historians who have given us original chronicles or compilations. Their works, planned on a singularly curious conception of history, have nevertheless the merit of giving us the only detailed information about the political history of the country in the period of the author or immediately preceding it. Those which date from the Middle Ages are however much the best. The kind of work not only did not improve later, but became simply dry chronicles in which events are related in a brief and colourless fashion.

The early historians of Morocco — if we except the Berber genealogists about whom we do not know very much — are contemporaries of the Almoravid dynasty. A little later, the Almohads find a historian in the person of a companion of the Mahdi Ibn Tumart, Abū Bakr al-Ba'dhī al-Ashtarī, author of the first of whose memoirs survives, strikingly, with many later historians. Alongside of the works of al-Ba'dhī may be placed the chronicles of Ibn al-Ka'rītī and of 'Abd al-Wāhid al-Marrākūshī as of high value. But it was in the Marinid period that the historian found most favour in Morocco. Leaving out Ibn Khaldūn, whom Morocco is not the only one to claim, we may mention Ibn al-Dhārī, a scholar of Marrākush, to whom we owe a history of North Africa and Spain, the Bayān al-Mughārī: that of Ibn Abī Zār, author of a history of Fās and the Moroccan dynasties, Rauwāt al-Kurāf; Ibn Marrākūsh, author of the Munād, a monograph on the sūkhun Abū l-'Enān, Ibn al-Ma'nī, of the family of the kings of Granada, author of the Rauwāt al-Nisīn. Under the Sa'dīans, the principal historians were al-Fihṭī, al-Ifrānī, author of the Nakīq al-Jābi; finally under the Alawīids, al-Zayyān and Akenīsī.

Geography is represented in modern Moroccan literature only in the form of riḥās or accounts of the travels of pilgrims, in which the description of the country passed through only occupies an insignificant place. Nevertheless, the geographer al-Idrīsī [q.v.] and the great traveller Ibn Bāṭītā were of Moroccan origin.

The biographical literature of Morocco is considerable. The collections of marāfīkh [q.v.] of saints, memoirs dealing with families of ṣafārī or religious brotherhoods, are abundant, especially in the modern period. There are also collections by town or century, some of which are of a certain interest, even from the point of view of history. All these biographies have been surveyed in E. Lévi-Provençal, Les Historiens du Chorfa. The most notable biographers down to the middle of the xivth century are Ibn 'Askār, author of the Dāsīq al-'Askārī; Ibn al-Kādī, author of the Durrat al-Kādī and the Lājjurīrat al-Dīdārī; the historian al-Ifrānī, author of the Sīra in Man intāshīr; and al-Kādī, author of the Naṣir al-Makhtūnī and the Biṭār al-Wādi. 

As to medicine and natural science, Morocco down to the xivth century was closely dependent on Spain. The physicians of the Almoravid and Almohad princes were from Spain, like Ibn Bāḍā (Avenpace), Ibn Tufail and the celebrated Ibn Rushd (Averroes) and Ibn Zuhr (Avenzon). In the modern period, we find at the courts of the sultans several physicians of Moroccan origin who have left works. The chief were, in the Sā'dīan period: Abū Muḥammad al-'Ālidī al-Wazīr al-Ghassānī, in the ʻAlawī period: Ibn S̩uṭrīn, Abū al-Waḥīb ad-Darāsī, Abū al-'Aṣṣāb al-Marrākūshī, Abū Ṣālim al-Sanhaḏī and Abū al-Sālim al-Ṣaḥīfī, in the Marinid period: Abū al-Muḥammad ibn Ḍa‘īfī, author of a treatise on astronomical instruments, part of which has been translated by Sādīlot, and Abū al-Munād al-Ḥanīfī, to whom we owe several works on arithmetic, geometry, algebra, astronomy, astrology and alchemy.

At the end of the xivth century, the reign of Mawūlī al-Ḥasan was marked by a kind of renaissance in Muslim studies in Morocco, particularly characterised by the need which writers felt of getting their works printed to make them more widely known. The lithographic presses of Fās acquired a certain importance at this time and began to publish texts which had long circulated only in manuscripts. A little later, there appeared at Fās the three volumes of the Salūsdt al-ʻAnfās of Abū Ḍa‘īfī al-Kattānī [q.v.], an excellent biographical dictionary of the celebrities of the northern capital. At the same time, there was published in Cairo the great Moroccan history of Abū Ḍa‘īfī al-Nāṣirī al-Salātī [q.v.] entitled Kitāb al-Jābi ʻl-Ma‘ṣārī al-Muḥārīb al-ʻAshīb.

The establishment of the French protectorate in Morocco and the remarkable spread of French civilisation in the large towns have already profoundly modified the intellectual ideals of the younger generation in Morocco. It is however still too early to foretell the orientation that Arabic literature will take in this country in the years to come.


MORÓN, Arab. Mawzār, a little town in the south of Spain, on the right bank of the Guadaira and at the foot of the Sierra de Morón to the S.W. of Cordova and S.E. of Seville. It was in the Muslim period the capital of a širā
or district and an agricultural centre with numerous olive-groves. At the beginning of the tenth century, it was one of the centres of resistance of the famous rebel 'Umar b. Ḥṣafān; its citadel was taken by the troops of ʿAbd al-Rahmān III in 311 (923). In the next century during the period of the petty kingdoms of the reyāt tājān, Morón was the capital of a little Berber dynasty, the Banū Dammar, Abādīs from the region of Gabes in Tunisia. The first member of the dynasty to declare his independence in 433 (1041) was Muḥammad b. Nūh; his father Nūh b. Abī Ṭāhir had lived at Morón from 1013 without actually recognising the government of Cordova. Muḥammad b. Nāḥi soon excited the jealousy of the ʿAbbādīs of Seville al-Muʿtaḍīd who made an attempt on his life. He died in 449 (1057). His son Mānīf ʿImād al-Dawla, who succeeded him, was soon besieged in Morón by al-Muʿtaḍīd and in return for his life and liberty surrendered the town in 458 (1066). Morón and its territory were annexed to the kingdom of Seville and henceforth shared the fate of the capital.


MOROS. [See MOORS.]

MOSTAGANEM (MUSTAGHAXIM), a coast town in Algeria, eight miles E. of the mouth of the Shelf (sʿE. Long. [Greenwich]) does not occupy the site of any known ancient town. There is no natural harbour here; two capes, not particularly well marked (Kharuba and Salamander), leave vessels without protection against winds from the north and west. It is therefore not as a port that al-Bakri (9th century) mentions Mostaganem for the first time. He describes it as a town situated "not far from the sea" (it is less than a mile away) living on the produce of its rich territory, notably the cotton plantations. From this time onwards it was surrounded by a wall which strengthened its natural defences. The old town occupies a triangular area formed by the sharp bend of the Aïn Sefra and the wall runs along the top of the ravine. On the point of this natural stronghold, the Almoravid ʿUṣuf b. Tashfīn is said to have built in 1082 a fortress which was later called Burdj al-Mahjūl, from the name of one of the tribes of the neighbourhood, and is now a prison. Like the other towns of the coast, Nedroma or Algiers, Mostaganem was probably given a small Almoravid garrison. Thus strengthened, the town would serve as a place of refuge against an attack from the sea and one could keep at a distance the Berber tribes of the hinterland, who belonged for the most part to the Maghribi confederation. It must thus have developed to some extent. In the middle of the 11th century, ʿIdrisī tells us that it had bazaars and baths; he emphasises the abundance of the water which irrigated the gardens and orchards and drove mills.

The name of Mostaganem does not figure in history throughout all this period when the Almohads in theory held the central Maghrib. The decline of the Almohads enabled the Maghrībī to become completely masters of the country. In 1267 and 1271 the Zayānids sulṭān of Tlemcen Yaghmorāsān reduced these turbulent tribes and incorporated their lands in the empire which he had founded. In 1338 (1338) he entrusted the government of Mostaganem to one of his cousins, al-Zā'im b. Yaḥyā, a descendant of one of the collateral branches of the family of the Banū Zayān, in spite of the lack of confidence he had in those relatives whom he had deprived of the throne. These fears proved well founded. Al-Zā'im, having roused the Maghribi to rebel, declared himself independent. Yaghmorāsān had to march on Mostaganem; he blockaded the town strictly and the rebel surrendered after obtaining permission to cross to Spain.

Like all the coast region, Mostaganem in 735 or 736 (1335-1336) passed to the Merīmī Abū Ḳarīf, who was engaged in the siege of Tlemcen. In 742 (1340) the victorious sulṭān built a mosque in Mostaganem. We have an inscription attesting this foundation of the interregnum of the Morcocco princes. Regained by the Zayānī of Tlemcen, the town suffered disastrously from their weakness. The Sūrāwī Arabs of the great Zoghba confederation became undisputed masters of the whole district. Mostaganem led a precarious existence. Leo Afrīcanus at the beginning of the 14th century says that it occupied only a third of its former area. He credits it with 1,500 hearths, however, tells us of the weavers and the roadstead to which ships from Europe came. He says the river runs "through the city", which shows that in addition to the old stronghold on the left bank there were now quarters on the right bank. In the Turkish period we know of two suburbs: Tīdīt (the New) and Matmora (the Silva). In 1515 Khar al-Dīn [q.v.] considerably strengthened its defences. Shaw at the beginning of the 16th century speaks of the citadel (the Fort of the East?) which, built on a height, commanded the town and vicinity. In 1530 the garrison consisted of some hundreds of Turks and Kalgūlīs. The French took them into their service and put them under the command of the Kādūr ibn Ḳābir. Disturbing the loyalty of the latter and thinking he had an agreement with the Modghīr, an unsubdued tribe of the neighbourhood, General Desmichels occupied the town in 1533. The troops whom he stationed there were attacked by Abī Ḳādir. The vexatious results of the treaty signed by Desmichels with the Emir forced Clauzel to retake Mostaganem (1835). Under Bugeaud, Mostaganem became the point of disembarkation and the centre of operations against Ḥār al-Ḳādir. It was there that in 1847 the first battalion of Algerian Tirailleurs (Turcos) was raised, and the town has since been an important centre for recruiting native troops.

Mostaganem has developed considerably since the early days of the French occupation; it has now over 27,000 inhabitants. Its harbour, which owes nothing to nature, has been improved by two jetties which still afford only a rather mediocre shelter to shipping.


Paris, 1924: On the dialect of the native fishermen cf. L. Brunet, La Mer dans les traditions et les industries à Rabat et Salé, Paris 1920. (Georges Marcât)

Mostar, the capital of the Herzegovina in the kingdom of Jugoslavia, one hundred miles S.W. of Sarayevo, on the Sarayevo-Mostar railway. By the new (Oct. 3, 1929) division of Jugoslavia into nine banats, Mostar passed to the coast banat, the capital of which is Split (Spalato). The picturesque town lies two hundred feet above sea-level on both banks of the Neretva (Narenta) between the slopes of the Podveli Hills and the Hum. The old quarters of the town are of Konak, Carabija, etc., are on the east, the new in the west. In 1929, the number of inhabitants was 18,938 (in 1921 a little more: 18,767). Mostar covers an area of 16 square kilometres, has 2,916 houses, 33 mosques, 2 Serlian Orthodox and one Roman Catholic church. Mostar has a district mutfi and a şarri at judge (şâhi). Its trade is considerable as is its production of fruit, wine and tobacco. The climate is warm and windy.

In the time of the Roman empire, there was a colony in the plain of Mostar, which was destroyed during the period of migrations. In the centuries following, the immigrant Slavs conquered the Zahumije district with its capital Blagay (near Mostar). According to the Dalmatian writers Orbini and Lucarelli (both at the beginning of the xviiith century), the new town of Mostari was founded in 1440 by Radivoy Got, a vassal of Stefan Vukčić Kosača, afterwards Duke of St. Sava. In historical documents the earliest mention is in 1452 of the two forts on the Neretva bridge (de castelli al ponte de Neretva); the name of the town itself is not found till 1499.

It was only after the Turkish conquest of the Herzegovina (1453; cf. v. Hammer, G. O. F., 1, 628), which resulted in the decline of Blagay that the new settlement began to develop rapidly, first as an important strategic point in the Neretva valley, then as a prosperous commercial town in addition. Since it grew up around a wooden bridge, it was called simply Most (bridge), Mostić or Mostar, properly Mostari (plur., "the bridges"). This "place of the bridge" was by 1522 the residence of the Turkish sandajbeg of the Herzegovina, who had previously lived in Foča. According to Hâdjiđi Khalîfa, the crossing of the Neretva was exceedingly dangerous: the wooden bridge, being on chains, had no piers and swung so that "one only crossed it in fear of death". The inhabitants therefore petitioned Sultan Sulamân to have a stone one built in its place. The architect sent by the Sultan, the celebrated Simân (q.v.), is said to have declared it impossible to build a bridge at this spot, whereupon a local architect built the fine bridge which crosses the river into a single bold arch, thirty yards in length and sixty feet high. This is said to have been done in 1564 (1566—1567). The two Turkish chronograms given by Elyiyâ Čelebi and Fârûd Aqrâb actually give this date. This bridge not only gave Mostar its name but formed its chief sight, as it still is. The French traveller A. Pouillet in 1658 says that its "fabric is plus hard, sans comparaison, & des plus d'écanche que n'est celle de Râta à Venise, que qu'elle y soit estimée une merveille". Katorčevski describes it as follows: (G. e. m.), xx. (1908), 49.

A modern traveller regards the old bridge at Mostar as the finest in the whole world (R. Michel, Fahrten in den Reichsländern, Bilder und Skizzen aus B. und der H. [Vienna and Leipzig, 1912], p. 31). In his earlier book on Mostar he describes this bridge as a "crescent in stone". The building of the bridge was often ascribed to the Romans and indeed its foundations perhaps date from them but the modern bridge undoubtedly dates from the Turkish period and "is the work of Dalmatian—Italian architects" (J. de Asboth, An official tour through Bosnia and Herzegovina, London 1896, p. 257).

Elyiyâ Čelebi visited Mostar in 1575 (1663—1665) and gives in his diary a number of details about the town, e.g. that it has fifty-three mahallahs, three thousand and forty solidly built houses of stone, three hundred and fifty shops and forty-five mosques. Of the latter he mentions eight by name: 1. Old mosque in the Carabija, built in 878 (1473); 2. Hâdjiđi Mehmedbeg mosque, built in 965 (1557); 3. Mustafa Hüdji alişâhi in the Carabija, built in 1016 (1607); 4. Deftandarpasha mosque, built in 1017 (1608); 5. Köşkül (Mehmedpaşâ) mosque, built in 1027 (1617); 6. İbrâhimâğa, built in 1044 (1634); 7. Rûznâmedji İbrâhim—Efendi—mosque and 8. Hâdjiđi alişâhi mosque. For the two latter mosques neither the chronogram nor the year of building is given. The finest and largest of all is the mosque of Hâdjiđi Mehmed Bey, which is usually called Karagyo/begova džamiya. This monograph, quoted below, by Pezz gives the names of twenty-seven mosques and twenty-six vakufs (vakf) and in each case he mentions whether their foundation records are preserved or not.

It was the course of the xvith and xviiith century Mostar was several times threatened by Venetian troops (1562, 1693, 1717). At a late date (1763), the Herzegovina was incorporated in the vilayet of Bosnia and Mostar was only the residence of the muselim. This lasted till 1832, when the land was again made a vilayet and Mostar became the headquarters of the newly appointed Herzegovinian wazir Ali Paşa Rizvanbegovic.

During the Turkish period Mostar produced a number of men of note in Turkish and Muslim literature and learning. Of poets we may note: 1. Dîya'i (d. 972 = 1564); 2. Derwish Paşa (Bayezidagic, 1599 and in 1601 governor of Bosnia); 3. his son Ahmedbeg Sabûhi and 4. Ahmed Rûşdî (born 1047 = 1637). The following learned men were natives of Mostar: 1. Ali Dede b. Muṣṭafâ (d. 1007 = 1598); 2. Muṣṭafâ Aiyyûbî, called Shelyuyo (d. 1119 = 1707), Mufti of Mostar, commentator of various works; 3. Ahmed Efendi Mostarî (Mostarîc, d. 1190 = 1775), whose fetwâs (Fetwâs of Ahmed) were very popular in Bosnia, and 4. Muṣṭafâ Şîqî (Karakeg), Mufti of Mostar (murdered...
in 1878), whose comprehensive Ḥādiyya . . . 'atīn Mi‘rā’t al-Uṯūl was printed in Sarajevo (1316).

A few days after the murder of the last-named, Mostar was taken without resistance by the Austrian troops (Aug. 5, 1879) and on Oct. 5, 1908, annexed to the Danubian monarchy, in which it remained till 1918. During these forty years (1878—1918) Mostar was frequently the centre of Muslim (and of Serbian Orthodox) opposition to the government. In Mostar originated also the Muslim agitation for autonomy in religious affairs (cf. i., p. 760), which went on for ten years (1899—1909). The leader of the movement, 'All Fehmi Džabic, the then mufti of Mostar, had to escape to Constanti-

nople at the end of January 1902, where he was appointed professor of Arabic literature in the University, in which capacity he published among other things his book Huṣna al-Sahaba fi Sarb Aḏḏar al-Sahaba (Constantinople 1324).

In connection with the struggle for religious autonomy, there was published from 1906 the Muslim political paper Maṣān̄at (in spite of its Arabic title written in the Serbo-Croat language). Shortly before the World War, a Muslim family paper Biser ("Pearl") (from 1920), was started in Mostar and a Muṣal̄imanska biblioteka (Muslim Library) which attained thirty volumes.

Since the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in 1918, Mostar has belonged to Jugoslawia.

**Bibliography:** Ḥādiyya Khalfān, Ruṃuli und Bosna, geographically described, transl. by J. V. Hammer, Vienna 1812, p. 175; St. Novaković, Ḥaṣi-Kalja ... o Balkanskom položenim (= Spomenik XVIII of the Rev. Serb. Ac., Belgrad 1892), p. 91a; Erlija Čelebi, Siyāṣat-nâmeh, Constantine 1318, ii. 481—486 (cf. also Gl. z. m., xx. [1905], 328—332); C. J. Jireček, Die Handlistenstrasse und Bergwerke von Serbien und Bosnien während des Mittelalters, Prag 1879, p. 79—86; M. H. Mahbubi, Šara lippa u Mostaru, Sarajevo 1879, part 3, p. 106 B. (in German in Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus B. und der H., i. 510—512); C. Pecoc, Mostar und sein Culturleben, Leipzig 1891 (with plan); H. Renner, Durch Bosnien und die Herzegovina kreuz und quer, 2nd ed., Berlin 1897, p. 297—316; S. beg Bašagić, Kratak uputa u prošlost Bosne i Herzegovine, Sarajevo 1900, p. 184—185 (= list of the Herzegovinian governors); L. Gregjić Belokosić, Mostar nekad i sad, in Zbornik, Belgrad 1901; Die osterreich. Monarchie in Wort und Bild: Bosnien und Herzegovina, Vienna 1901, p. 112—120; A. Walny, Bosnischer Bote fur das Jahr 1903 (Sarajevo), p. 224—225; Dr. M. Mandić, Povijest otkućenja B. i H., Zagreb 1910, p. 45—46; S. beg Bašagić, Bošnji i Herzegovci u islamskoj književnosti, Sarajevo 1912, s. index; V. Corović, Bosna i Herzegovina, Belgrad 1925, p. 165; V. Corović and M. Filipović, in Narodna enciklopedija, Zagreb 1926—1929, ii. 889; Almanah kalixvijenje Jugoslave (Zagreb since 1930), i. 99 and 433—434.

**MOSUL (AL-MAWIṢIL), the capital of Diyar-Ramla [q.v.] on the west bank of the Tigris, opposite the ancient Nineveh.**

Whether the town already existed in antiquity is unknown. E. Herzfeld (Archaeol. Reise, i. 207, 259) has suggested that Xenophon's Mērōnā reproduces its old name and that we should read **Mēsīlā** (= Mawsiliy), but against this view we have the simple fact that this town lay on the east bank of the Tigris (F. H. Weissbach in Pauly-Wissowa, R. E., xv, col. 1164).

The Muslims placed the foundation of the town in mythical antiquity and ascribed it to Kēwān b. Bēwarās Jatdash. According to another tradition, its earlier name was Khusṣaṭ. The Persian satrap of Mōsul bore the title Bēlāsh-Ardashir, so that the official name of the town was Bēlāsh-


As the metropolis of the diocese of Aṯīr, Mōsul took the place of Niniveh whither Christianity had penetrated by the beginning of the second century A. D. Kabban Isha‘-yiḥiḥ called Bar Kūsra about 570 A. D. founded on the west bank of the Tigris opposite Niniveh a monastery (still called Mār Īṣṭa‘y) around which Kusraw II built many buildings. This settlement is probably the fortress mentioned in the Syriac chronicles (edited by Guidi and Herzfeld) (according to Herzfeld, "citadel on the opposite bank") (Noldeke, S. B. Ak. Wien, xxviij., fasc. ii., 1893, p. 29; Sachau, Chronik von Arbelas, chap. iv., p. 48; Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 208) which later was developed into a town by the Arabs (Chronicle of Sĉerî, at the end).

After the taking of Niniveh by 'Utb b. Fārikād (20—641) in the reign of 'Omar b. al-Khaṭīb, the Arabs crossed the Tigris whereupon the garrison of the fortress on the west bank surrendered on promising to pay the poll-tax and obtained permission to go where they pleased. Under the same caliph, 'Utb was dismissed from his post as commander of Mōsul and Harqama b. 'Arafja al-Bārīk succeeded him. The latter settled Arabs in houses of their own, then allotted them lands and made Mōsul a camp city (muṣāf) in which he also built a Friday Mosque (al-Balādūrī, de Goeje, p. 322). According to al-Wāṣīkī, 'Abd al-Malik (65—86) appointed his son Sa‘d as governor of al-Mawsil while he put his brother Muhammad over Armiyina and al-Diẓāra. According to al-Muṣāfī b. Ta‘īs on the other hand, Muhammad was also governor of Aḏẖardīḏān and al-Mawsil, and his chief of police Ibn Talîd paved the town and built a wall round it (al-Balādūrī, op. cit.). His son Marwān II is also described as a builder and extender of the town; he is said to have organized its administration and built roads, walls and a bridge of boats over the Tigris (Ibn Fakhī, ed. de Goeje, p. 128; Yāḥya, Mu‘āṣim, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 682—684). The foundation of a Friday Mosque was also ascribed to him. Mōsul became under him the capital of the province of al-Diẓāra.

After Mutawakkil's death the Khārūdīja Musāwir seized a part of the territory of Mōsul and made al-Hadiṣa his headquarters. The then governor of Mōsul, the Khūṣayn 'Akwah b. Muhammad, was deposed by the Taǧhībi Ayyūb b. Ahmad who put his own son Hasan in his place. Soon afterwards the 'Ardi 'Abd Allāḥ b. Sulaimān became the governor of al-Mawsil. The Khārūdīja took the town from him and Musāwir entered into possession of it. Mu‘tamid appointed the Turkish general Aṣṭaḡān governor of the town, but in Dījmādī I 259 the latter sent his son Aṣḵūṭān there as his
deputy. The latter was soon driven out by the citizens of the town who chose Yahya b. Sulaiman as their ruler.

Haitham b. 'Abd Allah whom As'ad bin then sent to Mosul had to return after achieving nothing. The Taghlibi Is'hak b. Ayub whom As'ad bin sent with 20,000 men against Mosul, among whom was Hamdan b. Hamdun, entered Mosul after winning a battle, but was soon driven out again.

In 261 the Taghlibi Khijar b. Ahamad and in 267 Is'hak b. Kundafl was appointed governor of Mosul by Mu-tamid. A year after Is'hak's death, his son Muhammad sent Harun b. Sulaiman to Mosul; when he was once again driven out by the inhabitants, he asked the Banu Shamal for assistance and they besieged the town with him. The inhabitants led by Harun b. 'Abd Allah and Hamdan b. Hamdun after an initial victory were surprised and defeated by the Shamalis; shortly afterwards Muhammad b. Is'hak was deposed by the Kud b. Dawa.'

When Mu'tadid became caliph in 279, Hamdan (the grandfather of Saif al-Dawla) managed to make himself very popular with him at first, but in 282 he rebelled in Mosul. When an army was sent by the caliph against him under Wa'if and Nasr, he escaped while his son Husain surrendered. The caliphate of Mosul was stormed and destroyed and Hamdan soon afterwards was captured and thrown into prison. Nasr was then ordered to collect tribute in Mosul and thus came into conflict with the followers of the Kharijite Harun; Harun was defeated and fled into the desert. In place of Takcirn, who was imprisoned, the Caliph appointed Hasan b. 'Ali governor of Mosul and sent against Harun, the main cause of the strife, the Hamdanid Husain who took him prisoner in 283. The family thus regained the caliph's favour.

When after the subjection of the Kharijites, raiding Kurds began to disturb the country round Mosul, Muktafi again gave a Hamdanid, namely Husain's brother Abu 'I-Hasan b. 'Abd Allah, the task of bringing them to book, as the latter could rely on the assistance of the Taghlibis settled around Mosul, to whom the Hamdanids belonged. Abu 'I-Hadid came to Mosul in the beginning of Muharram 293 and in the following year subdued the Kurds whose leader Muhammad b. Baha submitted and came to live in Mosul.

From this time the Hamdanids [q. v.] ruled Mosul, first as governors for the caliph, then from 317 (Nadir al-Dawla Hasan) as sovereign rulers.

The Khirulis who followed them (386-459) belonged to the tribe of the Banu Khu. Their kingly rule, founded by Husain al-Dawla al-Mukhaidir, with which independence was recognised by the Buyids, extended as far as Tu'aq (Ishkuq), al-Madain and Kufa. In 489 (1095-1096) Mosul passed to the Saljuqs.

The town developed considerably under the Atabeg Imad al-Din Zangi who put an end to Saljuq rule in 521 (1127-1128). Mosul, which was for the most part in ruins was given splendid buildings by him; the fortifications were restored and flourishing gardens surrounded the town. Under one of his successors, 'Izz al-Din Mas'ud I, Mosul was twice unsuccessfully besieged by Saladin (1182 and 1185 A.D.); after the conclusion of peace 'Izz al-Din Mas'ud II however found himself forced to recognise Saladin as his suzerain.

The town was at this time defended by a strong citadel and a double wall, the towers of which were washed on the east side by the Tigris. To the south lay a great suburb, laid out by the vizier Mudjaffor al-Din Kattamiz (d. 595). From 607 his son Baibar al-Din Lui' [q. v.] ruled over Mosul first as vizier of the last Zangids and from 631 as an independent ruler. In 642 he submitted to Hulagu and accompanied him on his campaigns, so that Mosul was spared the usual sacking. When however his son Malik Salih Ismail joined Baibars against the Mongols the town was plundered in 660 (1261-1262); the ruler himself fell in battle (van Berchem, Festschrift f. Th. Noldeke, 1906, p. 107 f.).

The Mongol dynasty of the Djalr succeeded the Ilkhan in Baghdad and Sultan Shahk Uways in 766 (1364-1365) incorporated Mosul in his kingdom. The world conqueror Timur not only spared Mosul but gave rich endowments to the tombs of Nabi Yunes and Nabi Djirjis, to which he made a pilgrimage, and restored the bridge of boats between Mosul and these holy places.

The Turkoman dynasty of the Aq Koyunlu whose founder Baba al-Din Kurru 'Othman had been appointed governor of Djirar by Timur, was followed about 920 (1514-1515) by the Persian Safawids. After long fighting the Ottomans in 1047 (1637-1638) finally took the town from them. In 1077 (1667) it was visited by the great earthquake, in 1156 (1743) besieged by Nadir Shah Afshar and heroically defended by Christians and Muslims. It was then under a Pasha of the local family of the 'Abd al-Djalil who had ruled the town for a long period, fairly independent of the Porte. In the sixteenth century Mosul was an unimportant provincial town of the Turkish empire. After the World War the wilayet of Mosul after long negotiations was placed in the mandated territory of Iraq. The town has now about 70,000 inhabitants.

The Arab geographers compare its plan to a headcloth (tallabuq), i.e. to an elongated rectangle. Ibn Hawkal who visited Mosul in 668-669, describes it as a beautiful town with fertile surroundings. The population in his time consisted mainly of Kurds. According to al-Ma'muni (c. 375 = 985-986), the town was very beautifully built. Its plan was in the form of a semi-circle. The citadel was called al-Murabbaba and stood where the Nahr Zubaida canal joined the Tigris (now Yasha or Bash Tibeia; cf. Herzfeld, Op. cit., p. 209). Within its walls were a Wednesday market (Shuk al-Arkaq) after which it was sometimes called. The Friday Mosque built by Marwan stood on an eminence not far from the Tigris to which steps led up. The streets in the market were for the most part roofed over. Al-Ma'muni (Op. cit., p. 136) gives the eight main streets of the town (discussed in Herzfeld, Op. cit., p. 209). The castle of the caliph (Kajir al-Khulfa) stood on the east bank, half a mile from the town and commanded Nineveh; in the time of al-Ma'muni it was already in ruins, through which the Nahr al-Khwasa flowed.

Ibn Lujbir visited Mosul on 22nd-26th Safar 580 (June 4-8, 1181). Shortly before, Nuri al-Din had built a new Friday Mosque on the marketplace. At the highest point in the town was the citadel (now: Bash Tibeia); it was known as al-Habib "the hunch-backed" and perhaps as the synonymous al-Daffal (G. Hoffmann, Anzeige aus
MOZARABS, the name given in the middle ages to those Christians who lived in districts under Muslim rule and bore the stamp of Spanish Moorish culture. The word comes from the Arabic muta'abb, the meaning of which is exactly that of the Spanish mohárab; the Arabic form itself is found in documents in the archives of mediaeval Spain.

We know that in principle at the time of conquest the new subjects of the Muslim conquerors could either adopt Islam or continue to profess their own faith, in the latter case falling into the category of tributaries (dhimmī; q.v.). The early Arab rulers of Spain showed considerable tolerance in this connection and the treaties of capitulation were definite on this point, at least if we may judge by one of them of which the text has been preserved and which was concluded between the Visigoth Theodemir, lord of the district of Murcia [q.v.], and 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Muḥāb b. Naṣr. This attitude of Spanish Islam to the Christians hardly altered in the centuries following until the coming of the Almoravids and Almohads. It is true there were occasional anti-Christian reactions under the first Umayyads which found vent in persecution. But these persecutions seem to have been dictated by political considerations rather than by the fanaticism of individual rulers. The Christian communities of the large towns were the most active nurseries of the nationalist movements which broke out in Spain mainly in the ninth century. Among the most important we may mention that led by the Mozarab 'Omar b. Ḥafṣūn [q.v.], which passed far beyond the limits of a purely religious movement. At Cordova in particular a few illuminati had to be sent to the scaffold because they insulted the religion of the Prophet. The Muslim judges seem to have sentenced them to the supreme penalty with considerable reluctance and the central authorities took the initiative in summoning a council, so that the church itself put a stop to the demonstrations of certain mystics like Iulogio and Alvaro.

In any case in the tenth century the Mozarabss of the caliphate were living in harmony with all classes of Muslim society and were themselves considerably influenced by Arab culture. They spoke Arabic, just as the Muslims spoke the Romance language, and were acquainted with Islamic literature. The reciprocal influences were therefore considerable and were to continue so till the end of the middle ages.

As regards administration, the Christian communities of Muslim Spain under the Umayyads were under the direct authority of officials chosen by themselves from their own number and appointed with the approval of the Muslim authorities. Their head, who is sometimes given the Latin title of defensor or protector, was most frequently called Count (Comes, Sp. Comte, Ar. قاض). The taxes which the Christians had to pay were collected by an agent called exceptor. To settle their differences they had a special judge (Ar. كيش, لٖع، or كيش, c. cemur) who administered the Visigoth code (Eiber Judicium, later the Fuero Juzgo).

The Christian communities of Cordova and Seville were among the most important, but were less important than that of Toledo, which was during the caliphate the residence of the metropolitan (metrītan) of Spain. The clergy were under bishops (usūf). Public worship was celebrated.
in the churches: there were monasteries (dair) with monks (sikhs) in the neighbourhood of the larger towns: for example that of Aminil (Quadr- 
mellato) near Cordova.

The history of the Mozarabs of Spain is of course closely connected with the political history of Islam in Spain and with the "reconquista". But its development is mainly interesting as showing light on the peculiar culture of Moorish Spain which remained alive even after the fall of Muslim power. The recent publication of a considerable number of documents from the archives of the cathedral of Toledo mainly of the xith and xith centuries enables us to estimate how great was the arabicisation of all classes in reconquered Spain, which we find influencing civil, military and economic institutions and even ecclesiastical ritual (Mozarab rite). It is similarly to the Mozarab communities and their representatives who went to the north of the Peninsula that we must attribute the origin of a special art. Mozarab art, directly derived from Cordovan art and characterized by almost regular use of the horse-shoe arch and the vault.


MSHATTÁ, a ruined palace in Transjordania.

Description of the building. The ruins of al-Mshatta (the winter camp) lie east of the Jordan about 130 miles south of Damascu and 25 east of the northern shore of the Dead Sea, near the Darb al-Hadjil, the pilgrims' road from Damascu to Medina and Mecca. It consists of a rectangular outer wall, defended by towers at the corners, each side being 157 yards long. The entrance gateway is in the centre of the south side and is flanked by two pentagonal half-towers rising out of an octagonal base, across which runs as far as the next round tower the long frieze 16 feet high of the 45 yards long, which has for the most part been taken to Berlin and which made Mshatta a world-famous monument of early Muslim architecture and decorative art and a much discussed centre of interest in Oriental archaeology. The building of the whole area within the wall was planned in three sections of which however only the central one was carried through, at least in part. The plan by B. Schulz (cf. Jahrbuch d. preuss. Kunstdenkmulungen, vol. xxv., 1904) shows a gateway and an entrance half, both of which were intended to be vaulted, and a series of surrounding rooms, of which the oblong room to the right of the entrance has been said by Herzfeld and others to be a mosque because it has a niche in it which is taken to be a mihrab. Only the foundations of the walls of this part however are still standing. In the large quadrangular court on the western side is a water-basin built of brick and traces of a second one mentioned by Tristram on the opposite side, so that Schulz thought there were originally intended to be four for the sake of symmetry. The palace consists of a great hall with three aisles, a domed chamber and the living rooms at the sides. The walls are about five feet high, of blocks of limestone and above that of brick (21 × 21 and 27 × 27, 65 cm. thick). The rooms at the sides to the left and right of the great hall with its three aisles, are barrel-vaulted, the smaller vaultings still exist and, like the relieving arches of the doors, are remarkable for their pointed arches. Schulz was able with certainty to reconstruct the façade which had fallen and was still lying on the ground. It consisted of three round arches on pillars corresponding to the three aisles. The hall was divided into three sections by pillars of which a few shafts and a Corinthian capital with painting and remains of gilding have been found. Holes and gutters at the bases and on the shafts suggested to Schulz that the columns had originally been taken from another building and used again here. The horizontal termination of the façade also shows that this hall was intended to have a flat, and not a basilical roof, or actually had one. To give it its height the two supporting rows of pillars had a second story of pillars placed upon them, an arrangement usual in Syrian architecture also. The quadrangular hall of audience and ceremonial, entered from the oblong hall by a second door, was covered by a dome and three half domes of brick, all of which have collapsed. Dovetailing on the inside of the surrounding wall shows that it was intended to build on to the sides of the palace dwellings for soldiers and other retainers. On the evidence of these projections from the wall, Schulz has prepared his reconstruction of the plan of these wings. The two quadrangular surrounding walls with the round towers had barely been half built when the half-finished work was stopped. The principal motive of the great frieze at the part of the wall containing the main gateway is a zigzag pattern in high relief which forms 44 half triangles. These triangular areas are, wherever the frieze was finished, thickly covered with tendrils in low relief. In the centres of the pairs of interlocking perpendicular and suspended triangles, bosses are set in high relief decorated with acanthus rosettes. The socket of the frieze is in the form of a modified Attic base consisting of a plinth and two toruses. The border which frames the frieze at the sides and above consists of a leaf kyma at the foot and a second larger crowning it. According to Schulz's photograph, before the frieze was removed, the half left of the door up to the main border was finished but the right half only up to half height of the frieze.

The patterns of foliage in the fields of the triangles show great variety. Here we follow the scheme of the official publication in the Jahrb.
The triangles A and B have within circles vines with birds picking grapes; in the apex of triangle A there is also a Chinese fabulous animal with a human head such as was very popular in Chinese sepulchral plastic art. In C the circles are interlaced and lotus flowers appear in addition to the vine-tendrils. In D—1 the vines which are here more realistic grow out of vines which are flanked by lions and winged griffins; buffaloes, panthers, lynxes and gazelles also relieve the foliage. In triangle F the tendrils grow straight out of the ground; this area also has the remarkable addition of men picking the grapes. Triangle L is the first right of the door and is the last to contain animals. The areas of the triangles of the right half show a quite different style. M—T have, it is true, still vines but of the greatest, lace-like delicacy and closeness of pattern which varies from triangle to triangle. U and V lastly are filled with palm-leaves and cone-shaped figures instead of vines and crowned with spirals.

Form and purpose of the building. The plan is that of a hira, i.e. the Arab type of camp, reproduced in building materials, and so called after the Lakhmid capital, with the prince's tent or house on the central axis just as is described by Mas'udit in his account of Sūmarrā (cf. E. Herzfeld, Erster vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen von Samarra, Berlin 1912, p. 39 sq.). Mshatta, Qasrul and Sāmarra are descendants of this eastern type of palace. Just as the form could only be recognised as typical after the examination of Qasrul in the Iraq, and by the excavation of Sāmarra, so it was the investigations of H. Lammens that first elucidated the purpose of these buildings (La Bâbîla et La Hîra sous les Omeyyades, in M.F.O.B., iv.). Following Lammens, Herrfeld explained Mshatta as a bâlîya [q.v.], i.e. a country palace which was built in the form of a hira for an Umayyad as an occasional residence.

History of exploration, bibliography and date. After its first discovery by H. B. Tristram in 1872, Mshatta was explained by his archaeological adviser J. Ferguson as a Sājānian palace, built by Khusraw II after his conquest of Syria in 614 A.D. It found a place in literature with this description in Tristram's The Land of Moab (London 1873). It was not till about the end of the century that Mshatta became a subject of archaeological study and discussion when it was visited in 1898 by A. Musil and soon afterwards examined by R. E. Brannow and A. V. Domasewski and published in their Provincia Arabia (1904—1909). In the meanwhile the French expedition sent to take it down under B. Schulz had already been there and the Berlin publication by Schulz and Strzygowski appeared in the Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunst., 1904. To Professor Strzygowski is due the credit of having urged W. Bode to bring the façade to Berlin. Thanks to the interest displayed by the Emperor William II in the plan and his friendly relations with Salūn 'Abd al-Hamīd, the latter, with the traditional generosity of an Oriental despot, gave the German Emperor a present of this ornament of the desert. As a result of his study of the architecture and decoration, Strzygowski dated Mshatta between 500 and 600 A.D. M. v. Berchem with Clermont-Ganneau and Dussaud decided on historical grounds for the Lakhmid dating, i.e. that it was built as early as the fourth century A.D. (Aux pays de Moab et d'Edom, iv., J.S., 1909, p. 401—428) while Brannow and Musil assumed a Chassànids origin. On the other hand in his review of Strzygowski (Z. A., xix., 1905—1906, p. 419 sqq. and Islamstudi en, p. 276 sqq.), C. H. Becker championed the Umayyad dating, which E. Herzfeld in his Genius der islam. Kunst und das Mshatta problem (Ist., i., 1910, p. 27—63 and 105—144) supported with evidence from the history of art, and was strengthened by the appearance at the same time in M. F. O. B., iv., 1910, p. 91—112 of H. Lammens' study Râdia et Hîra. This Umayyad dating Herzfeld tried to make more convincing in his Mshatta, Hîra und Badîya (Jb. d. preuss. Aka., 1921) and finally crowned his work with the discovery of an inscription drawn up by Walid II himself recording repairs done by him; Walid II was murdered after a year's reign (126 = 743—744) and work on the building was not completed. This attribution found further support in a story quoted by H. Lammens in (J. A., 1915) from Ibn al-Muṣaffa, according to which Walid II was murdered by a man named Ibrahīm while building a "town" in the desert, which was to bear his name. Lammens identifies this town with Mshatta. Recently the Syrian desert palaces were again thoroughly investigated by the two fathers and teachers of the École Biblique St. Étienne in Jerusalem, Jaussen and Savignac (Mission Arch. en Arabie III, Les châteaux Arabes de Qezer Amra, Haran, et Taba, 2 vols., Paris 1922). As regards Taba and Mshatta the two students came to the same conclusion as earlier scholars, namely that they belong to the same period. As it seemed to them impossible to attribute them to the Umayyad period, they attributed them to the pre-Islamic period; as both buildings were left unfinished, they must have been built towards the end of a dynasty or kingdom. The discovery of idols at Mshatta also, they said, prevented its being attributed to the Umayyad period (cf. Dier, Die Kunstd. islamischen Volkes, 11th ed., 1926, p. 153).

Establishment of the Umayyad date of Mshatta. The archaeological material at Strzygowski's disposal when he wrote on Mshatta in 1904 was still insufficient for the proper appreciation of the historical position. It was not yet possible to have a complete conception of Umayyad art. Herzfeld who knew the lands in question by long residence and frequent travels was able six years later to approach the problem from much more solid premises. The most important monument from which deductions could be drawn was the Miḥrāb of the Dājmi al-Khāṣṣaki, discovered by Sarre and Herzfeld in the meanwhile in Baghīlând, which must be either pre- or early 'Abbasid, and the decoration of which formed a parallel to that of Mshatta (Ist., i. 33 sq. and plate 1.). The explanation of the niche in the chamber right of the gateway as a miḥrāb had to be decisively rejected and indeed less emphasis had been laid on it by Herzfeld than by superficial writers on the question for whom the "miḥrāb" meant an easy proof of their point. Schulz had previously ascertained on the spot that this niche is not a miḥrāb, and a study of the plan and Schulz's measurements shows a piece of masonry jutting 65 cm. out of the wall, containing a niche 1.62 m. broad and 1.48 deep. The fact that the miḥrāb is never in a projection from the wall (an exception
would prove nothing) as well as the brevity of the niche which would be exceptional, even in very large mosques of late date (such a depth is hardly ever found anywhere), prove that this can only be a tribunal niche or something of the kind. Ka'ir al-Tuba has in its south wall four similar semi-circular apse-like niches about 10 feet broad, which surely no Muslim archaeologist would claim as mi'rasb. Mshtatta, however, does not require such illusive evidence to prove its Umajjad date. These carved proofs are found in the variety of material used and architecture styles in the application of the principles of the minor arts to the decoration of buildings, already noticed but not correctly interpreted by Strzygowski, and the variety of styles in the areas of the trangles which fall into four groups.

The combination of 'Irak brickwork with Syrian stonework in the royal residence proves the cooperation of different groups of workmen working on the system of con-cippion which was revived by the 'Umayyads. The construction of the brick arches is also 'Irakian in form and, besides, they are pointed arches which were unknown before the beginning of the seventh century, so that it is impossible to put the date before 600 A.D. It was only in the early Muslim period that these were spread. We find Syrian torus profiles on the basilical building and North Mesopotamian profiles on the friese. The pillars in the basilical hall are taken from older buildings as was the custom wherever possible in the early Muslim period. In the pre-Muhammadan period neither wooden brances in the arches nor material from older buildings were used (Herzfeld).

On the signification of the decorative façade we may add a little to Strzygowski's and Herzfeld's observations. Two points were hardly touched on in the previous discussion: that the façade is to be considered and understood only as the basis of a great façade which was planned but was never finished, and the origin of this system of decoration from Persian textile art, which alone could supply the foundation for it and explain the sudden appearance of this completely new world hitherto unknown in architectural ornamentation. The façade proper planned above this architectural border would have contained a pattern on a much larger scale just as we see on carpets. The th-manifold oppo-ed groups of animals still to be found on Russian carpets and textiles influence from Persia and the Caucasus of the xlvth-sxth centuries and the rug-yag frizes filled with tendrils, each with a cypress (in place of a rose-tte) in the centre show the popularity and wide distribution and permanence of this motive. From it was taken over for architectural decoration, the popular texture form, however, were translated into the traditional forms of the art of the land and time. This explains the different stylistic execution of the same plan by the stone-masons.

This historic breach with tradition, this surprising control over a differently oriented artistic tendency pre-posses a radical change and re-organisation of society and outlook. An artistic creed to perfect and complete in itself cannot possibly be explained by the ambition of some upstart of a desert sheikh but it presupposes in addition to enormous wealth and far-reaching power a highly trained artistic sense, which was only possible at the time of the 'Umayyad Court and actually existed there, as we know from many sources. Only a passionate builder and lover of architecture could visualise such a work and only at a court filled with scholars, poets and artists from all countries could the plans for it be drawn up. This illuminating emancipation from the Hellenistic façade with its pillared niches is only to be explained as the expression of a new outlook rooted in religion and proudly conscious of its quite different ideals, as was the case with young Islam. For the first time, the new teaching of the Koran and the new religious expression, in a design on a figured ground, which was to develop into the frieze of inscriptions on the Ibnu in Khargid in the xth century (cf. Diez, Chusansche Baukunst, Pl. 15/2).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(M.E. Diez)

MU'ADHDHIN. [See Masudi, I, II, 4 and Abyan]

AL-MU'AIYAD. [See Hisam II.]

AL-MALIK AL-MU'AIYAD SAIF AL-DIN, Shaikh al-Mamluki (so-called after his first owner) al-Husayn (member of the bodyguard), a Cussanian by birth, was brought as a slave to Cairo and purchased by the Atabeg Brikiz. When the latter became Sultan in 801 (1402) he gave him his freedom, put him in the corps of pages (iqran, q.v.), moved him to the corps of cup-bearers (sabit, q.v.) and later appointed him to the bodyguard (al-Mustatir, whence his nickname). Brikiz's son, Nasir Faraj (q.v.), on his accession in 801 (1359) appointed him emir of a thousand and in the following year governor of Tripoli. He served as a troop commander in the battle of Damascus against Timur, was taken prisoner, soon after his release again became governor of Tripoli and later of Damascus. The reign of Sultan Faraj was a period of uninterrupted fighting between the Sultan and his governors and Shaikh was always in the midst of intrigues; often he was on the Sultan's side, more often in rebellion against him. His relations with his rival, the powerful governor Nezir, were similar. Finally the Sultan succumbed to the emirs, was deposed and put to death: the caliph Abbas b. Muhammad al-Musta'in succeeded him in 815 (1412). The governor Shaikh who was in Cairo at the time, was appointed first minister (ni'sm al-malik) and retained power by filling all available offices with his followers. A rebellion of the Egyptian Bedouns gave a pretext for deposing the Sultan al-Musta'in. The emirs demanded that a man of vigour should occupy the throne and in Shalil of the same year chose Shaikh al-Sultan. While he encountered no difficulties in Egypt, the governors of the Syrian provinces refused to recognise him. He had himself to go to Syria to bring them to reason. He gradually succeeded in taking one after the other prisoner, and after he had executed his chief enemy Nezir his throne was secure. The last rebellion in 818 (1415) he put down with comparative ease.

The defeat of the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid in 804 (1402) by Timur and the civil strife in the Mamluk kingdom had been utilised by the neighbouring rulers in the buffer-states between Egypt and the Ottoman empire to capture a number of towns and fortresses in southern Asia Minor up to a line Laredo-Abulustain-Darende, which had previously been under Mamluk rule. Sultan Shaikh regarded it as his duty to recapture these fortresses and again force these former vassals to recognise
his suzerainty in order to give his kingdom the necessary strength to resist its enemy, the Ottoman Sultan, and to protect the northern frontiers against the plundering raids of the Turkomans. The first campaign took place in 820 (1418) because, in spite of repeated demands, the prince Muhammad b. 'Ali of the house of Karaman would not surrender the town of Tarzi', which he had taken, although he was ready to recognize the Sultan's suzerainty on the coins and in the khatla. The Sultan set out from Cairo, receiving in Syria envoys from the families of Dhu 'l-Ghādir, Karaman and Ramadhān, who brought the submission of their chiefs. Malaiya, Abūlujun, Darenda and Tarzi were successively occupied, then Behesmah, Kahtā and Karkār west of the Euphrates; the cities of the two last-named were besieged, but the siege was raised when the commanders recognised the suzerainty of the Sultan. In the following year, a dangerous enemy of the Sultan, Kārā Yūsuf, chief of the Black Sheik, invaded Northern Syria in pursuit of Kārā Yelik, chief of the White Sheik (both called after their banners), plundered the towns in the N. E. of the Shammar empire but the return was cut short by a severe storm. The Sultan's successes were rendered useless by his return to Egypt, as the Syrian governor did not succeed in retaking the cities. The Sultan therefore sent his son Ibrahim with a strong army to Asia Minor. The latter reached Kaisaria, appointed friendly chiefs as governors, while several hostile chiefs were taken prisoners and put to death and others slain in their flight. Ibrahim himself returned to Cairo in triumph but died there in 825 (1421) to the great grief of his father (the story that the latter poisoned him out of jealousy of his fame is absurd). Kahtā Yusuf was threatening the eastern frontier, but he had to turn his attention to his enemies, a rebellious son and Timur's grandson Shāh Rukh, and at the end of the year he was poisoned. The Sultan himself had suffered for years from an affection of the foot; his illness (probably inflammation) became so serious that he could scarcely leave his bed. He had installed his eighteen months' old son as his successor and three of his emirs formed a kind of regency. His death took place on the 8th Muḥarram 826 (Jan. 14, 1427). His kingdom was secure, the frontiers consolidated, but at home there was a lack of order. Bedouins were plundering the country and Alexandria was not infrequently exposed to attacks from the sea by Frankish pirates. Offices were freely sold and the people suffered much from the extortion of the officials. From time to time the Sultan deprived high officials of the profits of their extortions or imposed severe punishments on them. Taxes oppressed the country. The Sultan himself was brave and to the end of his life fulfilled his duties as a ruler in spite of his painful affliction — he had frequently to be carried. Although he led a life of pomp and gave popular entertainments, fireworks and feasts with great splendour, he was outwardly a pious and humble Muslim, who in times of famine and pestilence took part in prayers in the penitential garb of the Sufis on the bare ground and like a pious Muslim observed a three days' fast in times of drought. He was harsh on Jews and Christians, dismissed them from government offices where they had clerical and administrative posts, and punished them in addition. The old strict regulations about dress were again enforced and all kinds of humiliations heaped on the "unbelievers".


(M. SODERHEIM)

AL-MU'A'IYAD FI 'L-DĪN –[Welsh?], Abu Nūsār Ḥaṣan Allāh b. Ḥaʾī Ḫaṭīr al-Tars, a Fāṭimīd dāʾī of high rank, d. 470 (1077). At the beginning of his mission al-Mu'ayyad propagated the Fāṭimīd doctrine in the East, especially in Shiraz. He succeeded in converting the Buwayhid amir Abū Kālidjār [q. v.], but on account of opposition at home he went to Baghchād and Mawṣil, and thence to Cairo, where he was received after some time at the court of al-Mustansīr il-Īlāh [q. v.]. He now became chief dāʾī and hīb of the Inām, and was probably in relations with the other great dāʾīs of Mīrūr. Khushnaw [q. v.]. Al-Mu'ayyad was sent in command of an army to help al-Baṣīt [q. v.], against the Turkomans. With his assistance a severe defeat on the Turkomans at Sinūrā, took Baghchād, and read the khatla in the name of the Fāṭimīd Caliph. Al-Mu'ayyad was also in direct communication with the leaders of the Fāṭimid da'wa in Yemen. In addition to his capacities as a general he was possessed of great literary ability and a poet of no mean talent. His dirān, which consists of panegyrics on the Fāṭimīd Inām al-Mustansīr-ir and al-Ẓāhir, deals partly with philosophical subjects. Another important work, al-Maĥālī, contains 300 "assemblies", dealing with different theological and philosophical questions, including his correspondence with the poet-philosopher Abū l-'Alā al-Maṣrī [q. v.] on the subject of vegetarianism (see D. S. Margoliouth, in J. R. S. 1902, 289 sqq.). His autobiographical work, al-Sīra, gives a detailed account of his mission in Shiraz and his admission to the court of al-Mustansīr, and is carried down to 451 (1059). Besides being one of the few autobiographies in Arabic literature, it is of considerable interest for the history of the Buwayhids and their relations with the Fāṭimids. The MSS. of these works are preserved in some collection of Ismāʿīlī works in Yaman and India.


MU'A'IYAD-ZADE, 'ABD AL-RĀHMĀN ČELEBI, an important Ottoman theologian and jurist. Born in 860 (1456) in Amasia of the family of Mu'ayyad-Zade (his father 'Ali was one of the three sons of Dūrūkī-zade Shams al-Dīn Mu'ayyad Čelebi [d. 851 = 1447]. Shāhī of the Yaquṭ Pāsha Zāwiyes Amasiya), he became, as a young student of theology, acquainted with prince Bāyazid, the younger son of Sultan Mehmed al-Fāṭih and afterwards Sūlīn, who had been appointed wāli of Amasia as a seven year old boy, and became a member of his circle. It is to this period that his relations with the famous poetess Mīhri Khávan [q. v.] belong. The relations between the gifted youth and the prince who was about 9 years older than he (born 854 = 1447), became so intimate that Mu'ayyad soon became the in-
separable comrade of Bayazid. When Sultan Mehmed heard from various sources, especially from a complaint in verse by Hafiz Lu'uf Allah, Kadi of Siwads, who had been gravely insulted by the entourage of the prince, of alleged abuses at the prince's court, especially the orgies of drug-taking (mar'jafta: bori, ajrān, murباك), he sent a commission of enquiry which arrived in Amasia when the prince was with Mu'ayyad on a pleasure-trip to Ladik. The result of the enquiry was the issue of an order for the execution of the two chief culprits, one of whom was Mu'ayyad (this hukm-i sharif is given in Feirdun, Melûk-i Muhammed, Constantinople 17274, ii. 270-271). From a note by Mu'ayyad in a book bought by him during his stay in Ladik in Kâbi1 1852 (June 1477) (the Ziyâ of Shems al-Din) the date is exactly fixed (the date in Feriðûn should therefore be altered from 884 to 883; cf. Hujjûd al-Din, Anwaûr Tâhirî, Istanbul 1927, iii. 230 note 1). Mu'ayyad, receiving timely warning of the fate threatening him, escaped from Amasia, provided with everything necessary by Bayazid, and after a short stay in Halah went to Shiráz, where he completed his theological studies under the celebrated Ḥâfiz al-Din al-Dawârînâni.

When Mu'ayyad returned home, on hearing of Bayazid's accession, he received an iqâba (teacher's diploma) from Daywarî. In 887 (1482) he reached Amasia where his father had died three months earlier. After staying six weeks here he went to Constantinople where his extensive learning soon gained him a reputation among the theologians. Bayazid appointed him muhâdarî at the Kalender-khâné-medrese in Constantinople. In 891 (1486) Mu'ayyad married the daughter of the famous jurist Mu-lî al-Din Kaštellâni (Mawliâna Kestelli) who was the last Kâfi'-asker-general of the Turkish empire and after the reforms by which this office was divided became Kâfi'-asker of Rumelia. Mu'ayyad had a brilliant career: in 899 (1494) he became Kâfi of Adrianople; in 907 (1501) Kâfi-asker of Rumelia; in 910-1 (1504-5) Kâfi'-asker of Rumelia and head of all the al-dâms. In 917 (1511) the Janissaries who had taken part of the prince Selim plundered his house because his sympathies were with Alâmî, the favourite son of Bayazid. He himself was dismissed by the now senile Sultan under pressure from the Janissaries, Selim I soon after his accession recalled however him to his old office as he saw in him the right man to carry through the important duties of a Kâfi'-asker. Selim took him with him on his campaign to Persia against Shah Lâmî. But on the way back Mu'ayyad was deprived of his office in Constantinople as symptoms of a mental breakdown had begun to show themselves (920 = 1514). He died in 922 (1516) in Constantinople and was buried in Eiyûb.

Mu'ayyad wrote a number of treatises on law and theology especially on Kurânic exegesis. Brockelmann, G. A. L. 1 227 and Brusalf Mehmmed Tahir, 'Oğluncü Muellîferî, Istanbul 1333, i. 355, gives a list of his works that survive in MS. Under the nom-de-plume of Khâtemî, Mu'ayyad also wrote poetry in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. His great service to Turkish literature lies however less in his own original work than in the magnifi-

Bibliography: In addition to the works already quoted: Tâshîkpruzade, Shekh-i Ku'mânî, Constantinople 1925, pp. 308-311; transl. into German by Rescher, Constantinople 1927, p. 191-194, 86; Schi, Hugt bihidâk, Constantinople 1925, p. 27-28; Lattàf, Tekere, Constantinople 1914, i. 238; Habib, Khâfi-i Khâtîmî, Constantinople 1925, p. 165; Thurciya, Suffîh-i 'aliyânî, iii. 310; Sâmi, Kânâmî al-'Alâm, iv. 30, 70-71; Hammer, G. O. D., i. 205; Gibb, H. F. P., ii. 29-31. MÜ'AVIDIA AL-DAWALA, Abd AEXUVER BEVE B. RUKU AL-DAWALA, Bâyîd govern or born in Djumâlî 230 ( = February-March 942), died in Djurdjân in Shâbân 373 ( = January-February 984). See the article FERH AL-DAWALA.

AL-MU'AKHKHIR. [See ALLAH, I.] AL-MU'AMMA, an anagram, sometimes charade, a kind of enigma propounded in verse and rarely in prose; its meaning is made "blind" or obscure with the object of misleading the wits and the eye. It is formed by designating one or more words by various allusions to the letters forming it or them or by allusions relating to the pronunciation: the alphabetic value, the numeral value of the letters, misinterpretation or inversion (yath). Very frequently no notice is taken of the vowels or of letters only connected with the spelling. Good taste is the rule.

There are several varieties of mu'amma which will be found enumerated in the works given in the Bibliography.

The invention of the mu'amma is attributed to Kâhil b. Alâmî, the inventor of prosody, while the Persians of course attribute it to Abî b. Abî Tâlib. The following is an example of a mu'amma on the name Alâmî: Aeswâladulâ al-lâllân tuflûhâḍ, zu-râbî 'l-tûflûhâḍ al-lâlîhî. Weâawulâ al-'âlîkû lâllânâ, zu-zâhûm awârâdâ lî-bâkhîhî, *Its first is of the [word] tûflûh (apple) = A; and the fourth of the [word] tûflûh (apples) is its second = H; and the first of the [word] musk (musk) is its third = M; and the last of the [word] word (loses) is the remainder of it = V." Here is a Persian example on the word wâshk: Nâm-i betun in mîh trâyî, haft aêtâlîstî a-zâtû, "The name of my idol, this [woman] fact as the moon, is seen in Persian and Arabic." The word wâshk divided into six gives sat or sit which in Arabic means "six" and i or yek which in Persian means "one", whence we have 6-1 = 7. Bibliography: Kušâ al-Din al-Navârâhî, al-Kân al-'Alâmî fi Fann al-Mu'amma (Brockelmann, G. A. L. ii. 383); 'Abî al-Munîm b. Ahmad al-Bakka, 'al-TÂrâ al-'Alâmî al-îlâ Kân al-Mu'amma (Brockelmann, G. A. L. i. 285, 381); anonymous, Dîvân al-Dawârî ú 'l-Mu'amma-yât wa-l-'Aqzhâz wa-l-'Adâbî, Barûtî 1882; Tahir b. Salih al-Hasanî, Tarîkh al-Mu'amma fi Fann al-Mu'amma wa-l-'Alîshâz, Barûtî 1320; 'Abî al-Hâleemî al-'Abâr, Shi'rî al-Mu'amma, l-Sûrî al-Mu'amma, Bûlât 283, i; Tâshîkpruzâde, Miftâh al-Sûdâ wa-Misâbî al-Siyahâ, Haidarîâbâd 1329, i. 224 (No. 35); 'Abî al-Kâdir b. Muhammâd al-Tâbâri, Cîvâna al-Mu'âmîl.
MUĀWIYA, the first 'Umayyad caliph, son of Abu Sufyān [q. v.] and Hind [q. v.], was born in Mecca in the first decade of the seventh century A.D. Under the training of his father, the most influential personage in, if not the actual leader of the merchant republic of Mecca, he had an opportunity to be initiated into the principles of government as the Meccans understood it. Converted to Islam in the year of the fast or surrender of Mecca, he made himself useful to the Prophet in the capacity of secretary. Here he gained an insight into the workings of the new regime and learned to know the men with whom he was later to work or struggle: the autocrat 'Omar, the presumptuous 'Ali, a whole crowd of ambitious people, like Talḥa, Zubair and 'Aṣiba, sometimes redoubtable for their talents and capacity for intrigue, like 'Amr b. al-Āṣ [q. v.] and Mughira b. Shu'āb [q. v.]. This dual training early matured the young Mu‘awiya who was remarkably gifted, and prepared him from the first for his high destiny.

In the caliphate of Abū Bakr he was sent to the conquest of Syria as second in command to his brother Yazid; in this new field he displayed an astonishing activity and distinguished himself by military successes, like the taking of Caesarea and other cities of the Phoenician coast. On the premature death of Yazid, he took his place as governor of Damascus. In 'Omar's reign, with the advance of Arab arms, he added to this office the governorships of the other provinces of Syria. 'Othman, who was related to him, confirmed him in these offices and still further increased his authority. Mu‘awiya gained the attachment of those under him and established in Syria during the twenty years of his governorship a model province, the best organized, and with the best disciplined troops of the young empire. Not having been able to prevent the assassination of 'Othman, he was able cleverly to take upon himself the task of avenging him. This was to lead him to the caliphate and bring him into open conflict with 'Ali. Delaying his attack, he let his rival use up his forces and lose his prestige in civil strife and in intertribal conflicts with the dissenters ('Uqaba, q. v.) and other tribes, who accused him of impunity in the murder of his predecessor. The indecisive battle of 'Siffin [q. v.] resulted in the arbitration of 'Abd al-Malik [q. v.]. In pronouncing that 'Ali should lose the caliphate, the verdict restored to Mu‘awiya liberty of movement. He had won over 'Amr b. al-Āṣ to his side and at once used this valuable supporter for the conquest of Egypt. Encouraged by his military and diplomatic successes, he allowed his troops to proclaim him caliph and continuously harassed the provinces that still recognised 'Ali. Ibn Muljam's crime removed the last obstacle separating him from the throne. Mu'āwiya profited by it to inaugurate his reign in Jerusalem. To him the title of caliph merely meant official recognition of a fait accompli; the result of twenty years of labour and devotion to those under his governorship in Syria. To law-abiding men, he alone seemed capable of putting an end to the anarchy in which the empire had been struggling for more than ten years. In the course of a rapid campaign in the Ḥishāq in 661, he acquired from Ḥasan b. 'Ali a definite renunciation of his family's claims. The submission of the provinces to the east of the Tigris restored the unity of the caliphate. This
year is known as the year of reunion (al-jum‘a‘a). One man continued to sustain in Persia the flag of the ‘Abids, Ziyād b. Abīhi [q. v.]. Mu‘awiya won him over by wifilah, a procedure by which he recognised him as his half-brother, son of Abū Sufyān. This bold stroke secured him the support of the ablest governor of the caliphate, a worthy rival of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āq and Mughīra b. Shu‘ba, already supporters of the caliph. Against the combination of these four brains all the plots hatched by the anti-Umayyad opposition were to come to nothing. On the death of Mughīra, Ziyād added the governorship of Kūfa to his own of Basra and for eight years ruled the whole of the eastern provinces. By his ability and loyalty, Ziyād showed himself most worthy of the confidence placed in him. Freed from anxiety about this half of the empire, Mu‘awiya devoted his energies to the pacification and development of the prosperity of other parts of his vast empire and to removing the traces of the long struggle from which it had emerged. He organised the Arab navy while his lieutenants actively pursued the work of foreign conquest. He took Cyprus and Rhodes and on two occasions his son Yazid closely blockaded Constantinople. His great work was the creation of the Syrian army of tribute (al-a‘lām), a band of cavalry devoted to their sovereign. It formed the great military reserve of the empire for his successors, an inexhaustible nursery of soldiers and leaders. He was able to keep it in training by annual invasions of Byzantine territory: razzias on a large scale rather than campaigns with a definite plan of conquest. By thus keeping the enemy engaged at home, he managed to defend his own frontiers very efficaciously. Taken at a disadvantage during his tense struggle with ‘Ali by an invasion of the Mardaites [q. v.], he did not hesitate to purchase the withdrawal of these adventurers from the emperor. If after his elevation to the caliphate he rarely left Damascus — henceforth the official capital — to lead his armies in person, he nevertheless was still the "real organiser of victory". He saw to the comfort and equipment of the troops, doubled their pay and saw that they were paid with a regularity hitherto unknown. His rival ‘Ali said that on the call of Mu‘awiya the Syrian army "would take the field without demanding pay, not two or three times a year only, wherever it pleased its leaders to take them". His intuition everywhere chose the ablest administrators, the best leaders among the Kūraish and other tribes. To the names already mentioned we may add those of Dahrung b. Kais, Abū ‘l-A‘war al-Sulami, Muslim b. ‘Ukba, Basr b. Abī Arjāt, Ἀσλομ b. Mashama [q. v.]. By the help of enormous subsidies and by his magnanimity he was able to keep the members of the Prophet’s family, the ‘Abids and the Hāshimīs, quiet: Ibn ‘Abīs and Ibn Dā‘far, ‘Akil, the brother, and "the two Huṣain", al-fā’ālim, the sons of ‘Ali. He used the business experience of the Sārdjūnīs to organise the financial administration. This fiscal reform gave him the resources required to maintain his armies, carry out desirable public works and pay the subsidies necessary to secure the success of his plans. He continuously interested himself in agriculture. He paid special attention to the development of the province least favoured by nature, the Hādhrā‘. His example, which was copied by his relations and most influential contemporaries, brought this region a century of prosperity under the Umayyads such as it was never to see again. In the lands of Medina and Mecca and Ta‘if, Mu‘awiya carried out great irrigation schemes, sank wells and built dams.

In Syria he strengthened his authority by a close alliance with the fellow-tribemen of his Kalbi wife Ma‘ṣūn [q. v.] and through them with the other tribes of Kūfah and those from the Yemen; these groups formed the bulk of the Arab population of Syria. It was on these foundations that the hegemony exercised by Syria throughout the Umayyad period was built and consolidated. His policy towards Christians was a tolerant one. Lastly, he endeavoured to train his son Yazid to be an heir capable of continuing his traditions of government, by checking certain tendencies of his well-endowed but impetuous nature with its fondness for pleasure. Seeing his end approaching, he skillfully succeeded in getting Yazid recognised as his successor, first of all in Syria and then in other provinces. These difficult negotiations were the last of his political successes. Mu‘awiya was now entering on the twentieth year of his caliphate, in 60 (Oct. 679) and probably was in the 80th year of a life which had been marked by constant success. By the year 3 or 4 of his reign, contrary to the predictions of the ghulāt, he had succeeded in not merely resisting, but including the rebellions which he must have reckoned manhood, for four years later he was secretary to the Prophet. In the course of the forty years of his public career, no serious check ever interrupted his progress. After the abdication of Hasan b. ‘Ali, he had "reigned without a rival, without losing any of the conquests of Īslām. Neither ‘Abd al-Malik, nor Maṣūr, nor Ḥarūn al-Rashīd earned this praise, unique in the annals of Īslām" (Dhahabī). He died at Damascus in the month of Ra‘āb of the year 60 (April 680) and was buried in the cemetery of Bāb al-ṣaghīr where his tomb still survives. Before his death he entrusted the regency to Dahrā‘ b. Kais and to Muslim b. ‘Ukba until Yazid should return from Anatolia. Companion and secretary of the Prophet, brother of Imām Ḥabībī [q. v.], "the mother of the believers", these claims have not preserved him from the hatred of the Shī‘īs and the official malcontents pronounced by certain ‘Abīl‘āhidī caliphs. More tolerant to his memory than to that of his son Yazid, orthodoxy generally agrees to recognise his right to the respect which is due to the Shāhīds. The Syrians long cherished the memory of his glorious reign and even beyond the bounds of Syria he had partisans among the Hanbalis, called zhālīlī, the enthusiasts for Mu‘awiya.

II. Mu‘awiya’s policy. In the historical and anecdotal literature of the Arabs there are few collections which do not devote a paragraph to Mu‘awiya in the title “wise mildness and complete self-control” (Wellhausen). Qualities which the Arabs include under the term hilm. By this supreme virtue they claim to recognise the true statesman. The Sufyānid sovereign is said to have owed the great success of his career to it. “Mu‘awiya’s hilm” thus became proverbial. A somewhat mixed virtue, essentially opportunist in character, it may be combined with astuteness, or the less scrupulous forms of diplomacy. In our hero this quality has been found even in the most difficult trials inflicted on his amour-propre. His smiling imper- turability was able to disarm the proudest of his adversaries, who were then completely won over by his generosity. With the golden chains of pensions
and rich gifts the ruler was able to hold in leash his most intractable enemies. When his friends expressed surprise at the vastness of certain donations, he would reply "a war costs infinitely more". This was his favourite method of dealing with the Ālids and Ḥāshimids. He has been unjustly accused of having introduced the custom of publicly cursing the name of 'Alī from the pulpit of the mosque. There is no certain evidence of this practice before the time of the Marwānids.

The collateral branches of the Umayyad family supplied him with distinguished assistants. He was careful not to bring the more ambitious of them too much to the front or to leave them too long in one office. He was studious to inculcate into all his relations the feeling that they must stand by one another and that this consisted in the blind execution of his orders. The Umayyads formed his natural supporters. He could not do without them. But the unsettled problem, of the dynastic succession made him distrustful of relatives called upon to share the responsibilities of power. He did not fail to keep a close watch over them. With men like Ibn 'Amir, Sa'd b. al-Ẓāhir, Marwān b. al-Ḥakam [q. v.], of remarkable gifts and considerable influence, who did not conceal their aspirations, he came to a method of action that effectively discouraged them from following the dictates of their ambitions. As to the sons of the Caliph Ṭāhā, they seemed to him too insignificant to cause him any disquiet. On the other hand, Marwān and Sa'd were appointed to succeed one another at about regular intervals in the government of the Hijāz, the cradle of Islam and of the ruling family. Mu'āwiyah was unwilling to give them time to create in such an important centre a position for themselves and connections which might have compromised the future of the dynasty.

Ultimately he decided to replace these two relatives by a nephew of his own, now almost grown up, the Sufyānī Walid b. 'Uthmān, the latter's son 'Uthmān b. ʿUthmān. In the important governorship of the Ṭāriq, which controlled the eastern provinces, Mu'āwiyah showed his preference for the Ṭāriqī officials, Mughira, Ẓiyād and the latter's son 'Uthmān b. ʿUthmān. He appreciated the devotion of these men, who came from the shrewd society in Ṭāriq. suspected by the other Umayyad families, compelled to rely on their sovereign, the author of their fortunes. For a moment, the extraordinary promotion of Ẓiyād and the confidence the Caliph showed in him suggested that he had him in view as his successor. In this attitude to his relatives, the interests of the dynasty surpassed all other considerations. The heir apparent was 'Abd al-Malik. Mu'āwiyah wanted to save his Umayyad cousins from the temptation to set up as rivals of his successor. The first step was to do Ẓiyād rather a bad turn. If, instead of the inexperienced Walid, Mu'āwiyah had retained or restored for another period of office in the government of the Hijāz the energetic Marwān, there is no reason to think that this would not have turned the incensed Ḥanifa from the hopeless exploit of Karbala.'

In the traditional view Mu'āwiyah appears as the perfect type of Arab ruler. When writers, jurists, and historians all and alike have to quote a trait or a saying illustrating kingship, or the conduct of states, they rarely hesitate to credit it to our hero. This unanimity which reflects so much to his credit has been transformed into censure by orthodoxy. Mu'āwiyah is reproached with having transformed the ḥālaf, the viceroy of the Prophet, into muḥk, into a temporal sovereignty, with having, if we may use the term, secularized the supreme power, really a purely lay one, in the heart of Islam. This criticism is an attempt to throw odium on Mu'āwiyah while in reality it calls attention to his great merit. In him the ruler, "the king", i.e. the organizer and administrator, appear very distinctly while they are difficult to find in his predecessors, painfully fighting against the outbursts of Bedouin anarchy. This transformation of the patriarchal power had begun with 'Umar b. al-Khattāb who was the first to realize it, and attempted to realize it. Mu'āwiyah endeavoured to hasten its evolution towards more effective centralization, an extension of the powers and personal authority of the sovereign. To secure for the latter the advantages of external pomp, the prestige given by formalities, he gave more ceremony to the hitherto democratic appearance of the caliph at the Friday services. He appeared in the minbar or pulpit, surrounded by a gherēta or guard — 'Alī had already had one — and remained seated while delivering his address, the ḥālaf. Some have thought to see in this attitude a sign of pride. This is to forget the primary nature of the minbar as the seat of the ruler, the sovereign's throne, before it became of liturgical significance as the pulpit of the mosque, after the latter had become a building for religious worship. This charge of muḥk was also intended to render suspect the sincerity of the faith of the Sufyānī monarch. But austerity characterised his morals and private life. He was a good father and a devoted husband. We find him conscientiously performing his religious duties and dying at length a good Muslim.

The chroniclers unanimously find in the complex character of Mu'āwiyah another trait besides ḥīlaː political finesse, what the Arabs call dihālīya. To be credited with this it was necessary to have in addition to diplomatic skill, a remarkable gift of eloquence, force of decision, a resourceful nature and a conscience broad enough not to shrink from the use of trickery. Mu'āwiyah was reckoned among the five best Karāish orators of his time. He was fond of saying "I have won more success with the tongue than Ẓiyād (b. Abīhi) with the sword". Arab writers prefer to attribute these successes to the Machiavellian nature of the sovereign. He is said never to have shrunk from recourse to violence or the use of poison when he wished to get rid of troublesome adversaries. To support this charge the cases of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Khālid, Husain b. 'Ali and Ashār b. Mūsik [q. v.] are quoted. But each of the examples is capable of a more natural explanation. We would readily put Mu'āwiyah in the category of those statesmen to whom useless crime is naturally repugnant. It was wise to allow themselves to be tempted by violent solutions but not scrupulous enough to hesitate in such an extremity, if reasons of state seemed to advise it. One of his successors, 'Abd al-Malik, called him the cunning (sulṭānī) caliph". The pleasure-loving son of 'Alī, ruined by his easy life, forgotten and retired to Medina, did not deserve to be feared. The two other individuals above mentioned died by accident or were victims of private vengeance.

The poets, the "journalists" of the period, had an undoubted influence on their contemporaries. This influence the sovereign succeeded in controlling
and subjecting to dynastic interests. Himself very susceptible to the charms of verse, he would have liked to see poetry confine itself to developing patriotism, and renouncing satire which was a source of dissension among the tribes. The restorer of jumâ’ a, national unity, felt more than anyone the necessity for this concord to heal the wounds caused by anarchy. Powerless to prevent the incursions of poetaets into the field of politics he endeavoured to win them over to his side by gifts and the use of tact. To win them over was to have “a good press”; and at the same time gain their tribes to the cause of order, for the tribes usually agreed with the ideas spread by their bards. He exploited his son Yazid’s relations and friendships with the poets to compromise them in favour of the Umayyads and make them less amenable to the advances of the reactionary parties. He paid for their panegyrics: he took them under his protection whenever their lack of discipline brought them into trouble with the local authorities. He did not hesitate to shut his eyes to some of their poetical outbursts, which seem to compromise the reputation of his own hearth; under the ‘Abbasids such audacity would have meant death. He further left it to these indirect auxiliaries to deal with abuses by officials and found in them a useful check on arbitrary exercise of authority by his retainers. It was at the same time a satisfaction of their amour-propre, allowed to the vanity of these rhapsodists, who were courted by all parties and intoxicated by the terror which their wit inspired. In return for this toleration, he was able to get less distinguished services from them. He imposed on them the duty of preparing public opinion in favour of the ba’ta, the recognition, of Yazid as heir-apparent.

To accustom the Arabs to this step so repulsive to their democratic instincts, to give the caliph leisure to calculate its chances of success, there was nothing so useful as the intervention of these heralds with their echoing phrases. It enabled the government to remain discreetly in the background, ready to come out at the opportune moment.

The biased Mas’âdi himself cannot help admitting the plain case of Mu’awiya’s policy, “his great generosity to his subjects and the benefits which he heaped upon them; winning their sympathies and seducing their hearts with such skill that they put him before their kinsmen and natural affections.” Firmness in administration, skill in managing men according to their rank, cordiality, these are some of the qualities credited by this historian, the friend of ‘Ali, to the successful rival of Fâtimâ’s husband.

Let us now deal with the charges brought against him by orthodoxy. With the object of making them more readily accepted, the indictment is carefully put in the mouth of the austere Hasan al-Bayrâ

*Mu’awiya committed four crimes — one of them alone would suffice to cover him with dishonour: —

he abandoned the nation to men of no repute, deprived it without consulting it (by the ba’ta of Yazid) of the control of its destinies and that in the life-time (i.e. to the detriment) of numerous Companions and virtuous individuals. He chose as his successor an incorrigible drunkard, robed in silk and playing the harp. He adopted Ziyad. Lastly he condemned Hudr b. ‘Adi [q.v.] to death.”

The impartial historian will have little difficulty in clearing the sovereign from these charges, which reveal his political skill, his instinct for rulership which raised him high above the prejudices of his contemporaries. The measures for which he is blamed secured the caliphate twenty years of peace and prosperity, the longest period it ever knew.

To sum up, Mu’awiya appears in the series of Muslim rulers as one of the most attractive individuals and one of all round ability. In him the Arabs see the very incarnation of sovereignty. In the opinion of Mas’âdi his successors at best could only try to copy him without being able to equal him. In spite of their little liking for the able Sufyânî, the Marwâns frequently appealed to his traditions and the methods of government inaugurated by him. He was, beyond doubt, the least oriental and the most modern of the rulers of Islam. He did not disdain public opinion. One must be grateful to him for not having believed in the power of force alone in the management of men, for not having sought to reestablish, as the ‘Abbasids were to do, the old Asiatic autocracies, for having preferred that his subjects should become voluntarily attached to him by winning their sympathies, for proclaiming that “the world is more surely led by the tongue than by the sword”. This conviction led him to adopt several institutions of Beduin democracy — such as the wa’d, deputations from the provinces and the principal tribes — to consult the views of such assemblies on as many occasions as possible, to associate them openly with public business by recognising their right of remonstrance. The ardentness of the sovereign knew how to direct these manifestations of the old individualism of the nomads and to bring them to cooperate with his designs. To quote the comparison of the Byzantine historians, he appeared as a πρωτοτύπος in the midst of his σωφρόνες; in the deliberations of his Syrian parliament, he posed as primus inter parcs. He was gradually able to advance the political education of his subjects and to control the signs of lack of discipline. He was never perturbed by their criticisms nor by the satires of the poets. “I do not trouble” he said “about words so long as they do not lead to deeds”. These liberal principles became restricted under the Marwâns and disappeared with the coming of power of the absolute monarchy of the ‘Abbasids.

As is frequently the case with men who have grown old in politics, a long period of power — he exercised it without interruption for 40 years — had made him a sceptic. This benevolent scepticism was revealed in a knowing smile when, with eyes half closed, he used to listen without missing a word to the petitions and recriminations of his visitors and pretended to be taken in by their customary excesses. From his youth, passed in the cosmopolitan city of Mecca, then in Medina in the very mixed society of the Companions, he had been in too close contact with his contemporaries to be under any illusions about their disinterestedness. He had not to invent, but no one managed better than he, that instrument of government, the mawlid, the rallying of the crowds, an ingenious euphemism of the Kurân, meaning the art of purchasing hesitating adherents. Other caliphs surpassed him in courage, in outward austerity, sukhû, in love of knowledge and other qualities that dazzle the eyes of the multitude. No one possessed to such a degree as Mu’awiya the gifts of the founder of an empire: vision,
energy and promptitude in action, breadth of view, logical thinking, absence of antiquated prejudices, skill in adapting the prestige and ceremonial of his position to Arab taste, ability to use men and to deal tactfully with their prejudices so as not to offend them directly. This rare combination of qualities enabled him to extract order out of the chaos of Beduin anarchy. If we endeavour to appreciate fairly Mu‘awiya’s work with its inevitable defects, one must take into account the intractable material on which he had to work and the resistance opposed by the inveterate individualism of the nomads. He succeeded not only in disciplining them but also in transforming them into conquerors, able to rule over peoples of superior culture, heirs to the oldest civilisations.

For achieving this result, the son of Muhammad’s old opponent has deserved well of Islam. In the list of those responsible for this great revolution his name should come after that of the Prophet beside the name of the caliph ‘Omar. Orthodox tradition likes to exalt the latter and present him as the second founder of Islam. There are, however, writers, Sprenger and von Kremer have popularised this view. In it we may recognise the reply of the schools of the Hidayaz to the ‘Irak legend woven round the memory of ‘Ali. To their work we owe the fantastic proportions assumed by the personality of ‘Omar; it absorbs not only Abu Bakr, but even throws its shadow upon the Prophet. ‘Omar is brought into the origin of all religious and administrative institutions, especially of all those that cannot decently be credited to the author of the Kur'an. This exaggerated admiration of the Hidayaz was to provoke the protestations of the Abbâsids. The counterblast of Shâ‘a tradition was to place ‘Ali alongside of ‘Omar to direct him and if necessary to correct him. The indisputable merits of the second caliph lie elsewhere. In the midst of the terrible confusion that resulted from the conquests he was able to maintain the unity and cohesion of the empire, inestimably enlarged, to bring the Arabs into being with success under comparative conditions. Closely watched over by the selfish claims of his Medine senate and its disturbing element formed by the formidable group of the ‘ten nabaghî-chara’ or ‘the chosen’ and the oldest friends of the Master, he succeeded in neutralising their restless activities, their dire passion for intriguing and in exploiting their greed and mutual jealousies. In the provinces the generals and governors showed an obedience scarcely less intermittent. ‘Omar had frequently to resign himself to approving by sanctio in radice in order not to lose touch with such undisciplined auxiliaries and to remind all of the existence of the vicariate of the Prophet. The day on which he thought of a more effective centralization, of a less ideal systematization, assassination brutally delivered him from his error. The same fate was to overtake ‘Othman, when under pressure from the Umayyads, he took up his predecessor’s programme where it had been interrupted. With Ali the caliphate relapsed into chaos and lost a quarter of a century of progress on the way to reorganization. One province alone formed an exception, Syria, which had been governed since its creation by the Umayyads.

But for the intervention of Mu‘awiya and his able lieutenants, the ‘Amirs, Ziyâds and Marwîns, the Muslim empire would have been transformed — like the ‘Irak and Khursân — into an arena to which the Arabs came to settle their petty quarrels. Once on the throne, the Sufyân worked to extend gradually to the rest of the caliphate the methods of government which had secured the prosperity of Syria. Encouraged by the results obtained in this country, he set himself to discipline the other Beduins who, according to the idea ascribed to ‘Omar, formed the ‘substance of Islam’. From this rude indigetique mole, this rebellious mass, gradually broken in by the influence of Syria, fashioned by teachers trained in his school, the first Syrian caliph recruited soldiers, then formed from them the cadres of a regular army; wonderful troops always ready to play their double part, the jîhâd abroad, and at home the maintenance, against any threat from within, of the ‘imâm, the unity of the empire. Mu‘awiya succeeded in impressing on these descendants of caravan-leaders of Arabia, nomads, all obstinate landsmen, the importance of the mastery of the seas, Arab thalassocracy dates from this period. Forced to use primitive institutions, the umma, sanctified by the Prophet, the Medina caliphs, he endeavoured to turn them to the needs of a great empire. He managed at least to suppress the anarchical working of the ‘îrâd by regulating the dynastic succession. He organised the finances; he began by revising and reducing the enormous pensions granted by preceding governments without regard to services rendered to the state. Down to his time the central treasury of the caliphate had been supplied by intermittent and always unwilling contributions extorted from the provinces. Mu‘awiya endeavoured to settle the amount to be paid by each province and to regularise its collection. Under him the treasury ceased to be a relief fund which the conquerors claimed to use as they pleased. His predecessors had had to empty it periodically to secure assistance or neutrality important for the success of their policy. Hitherto ‘mül al-muslimîn, the collective property of the Muslims’, the treasury, became ‘mül ‘Alih, the treasury of the state, intended to cover general expenses, to secure the representation and the defence of the empire. These reforms made Mu‘awiya the first sovereign, malîk, of Islam, the first ruler to enjoy a definite authority, independent, unlike his predecessors, of the anarchic goodwill of his subjects, and no longer at the mercy of an oligarchy interested in the maintenance of old abuses. The Medinese vicariate which developed from the triumvirate, could not long survive this coup d’état, this drastic solution of the problem of the succession to the Prophet. Before Mu‘awiya, the caliphate had only had a nominal existence. For this fragment, the son of Abu Sufyan substituted a reality; he created the Arab state: a creation seen darkly by ‘Omar without having been brought to realisation.

Bibliography: We refer the reader to our ‘Etudes sur le règne du califte ‘umayyade Mu‘awiya I’, following our Califat de Yazid I (reprint from M.F.O.F., i.—iii.). The references are there given. One may also with advantage consult G. Levi della Vida, Il califato di Ali secondo il Kitâb annâb al-arâf di al-Balâfuri, in R.S.O., vi., 427—507; our ‘Alûb ibn Aîbî, vice-roi de l’hég, lieutenant de Mu‘awiya I (extract from the same periodical, iv.).

(H. LAMMERS)

MU‘AWIYÀ B. ‘UBAID AL-LAHI. [See Abu ‘Ubayd Allah.]
al-Mu'awwidhatani, name of sūras cxiii. and cxiv., taken from the opening words, "Say, I am but a human and not a god." The term al-Mu'awwidi occurs also; it denotes these sūras together with sūra cxiii. — The mu'awwidhatani belong to those parts of the Kurān which are frequently recited (after every salāt: Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Munājat, iv. 155; before going to sleep: Bukhārī, Da'awat, lāb 12; in order to avert the evil eye: Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, Paisley and London 1899, p. 259, chapter Superstitions).

al-Ma'āẓam. [See Tāransah.]

al-Malik al-Ma'āẓam Sharaf al-Dīn ʿIsā b. Malik al-'Adil al-ʿĀlib was born in 576 (1180). In 597 (1200) he became governor for his father al-Malik al-'Adil b. Qarṣ(w. v.) in Damascus and next year was besieged by Saladin's sons ʿAzīz and ʿAṣiḍal in course of the dispute about the succession between them and ʿAdil. ʿAdil came as far as Nablus with his army but could not relieve Damascus so that its fall was imminent. Then a quartet broke out between the brothers as to who was to get Damascus. The majority of the emirs in the army made peace with ʿAdil and the siege was raised in the course of the year. ʿAdil was recognised as the head of the Ayūbids and ʿIsā continued to govern Damascus and the lands going with it as far as the Egyptian frontier for his father. When ʿAdil died in 615 (1216) he had the inhabitants swear fealty to him but recognised his older brother Kāmil as suzerain in the Friday khūba. He was, like his brothers, on fairly good terms with the Crusaders, but at the decisive moment he joined forces with his brothers against them and it is not least due to him, as the moderns have said, that the Crusaders had to withdraw from Damietta in 618 (1221). His desire to seize central Syria (Ḥimṣ and Hamāṭ) was not fulfilled as Kāmil threatened him with war when he attacked these towns. ʿIsā therefore made an alliance in 623 (1226) with the Khuwārizm-Shāh Dīlāl al-Dīn and mentioned him as suzerain in the Friday prayer instead of his brother. He thus felt strong enough to turn away the Emperor Frederick II's ambassador in this year while Kāmil, who did not feel too secure, negotiated with him. It did not however come to fighting between the two brothers as both feared the intervention of Frederick II. But before the latter set out for the Holy Land, ʿIsā died on 1st Dhu l-Hijjah 624 (Nov. 1227) in Damascus of dysentery. Had he lived longer, Frederick II would probably not have taken Jerusalem. It was ʿIsā's son ʿNāṣir al-Dīn Dāwūd who succeeded in regaining Jerusalem for the Muslims. ʿIsā's rule stretched from south of Ḥimṣ beyond Jerusalem to al-'Arish on the Egyptian frontier. In addition to his military ability, he is celebrated as a friend of poetry and letters and he is also said to have been an author himself. Unlike the other Ayābids, he followed the school of Abū Ḥanīfa.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-Aʿyān, No. 526 (transl of Slane, ii. 428 sqq.); Abu l-Fīlī, in Recueil des historiens occidentaux des croisades, l. (s. index); Ibn al-Aṯīr, Kāmil, in Recueil, ii. (s. index); Maḥdī, 'Udb al-Qaymūm, op. cit., and also Rohricht, Geschichte des Krieges Kreuzers Jerusalem (s. index).

Mubāhī. [See Sharī'a.]

Mubāiydā. [See al-Muqāmanāt.]

Mubālligh. [See Masābīḥ, I, D, e and H, 4.]

Mubārak Ghāzī. An Indian saint. In all parts of the domain of the Muḥammads woodcutters invoke certain mythical beings to protect them from tigers and crocodiles. In the 24 Parganas it is Mubārak Ghāzī who, in the Eastern parts of the Delta goes by the name of Zindah Ghāzī, the living warrior. Mubārak Ghāzī is said to have been a faqīr ( mendicant) who reclaimed the jungle tracts along the left bank of the river Hoogly. Every village has an altar dedicated to him and no one enters the forest nor does any of the boat's crew, who might sail through the districts, pass without first making offerings at one of these shrines. The faqīrs in these dangerous forests, who claim to be lineally descended from the Ghāzī, indicate with pieces of wood called sang the precise limits within which the forest has to be felled. Mubārak Ghāzī, so the legend goes, came to Bengal when Rāda Mullāt ruled over the Sundarban. The saint happened to have a dispute with the chief, who thought himself to be in the right, upon which the latter agreed to give his only daughter Shūshila in marriage to the former, should his own opinion be proved wrong. This the Ghāzī succeeded in doing and won his bride in consequence. Since no man saw him die, he is believed to reside in the depths of the forest, to ride about on tigers, and to keep them so obedient to his will that they dare not touch a human being without his express desire. Before entering a jungle or sailing through the narrow channels whose shady banks are infested by tigers, boatmen and woodcutters, both Hindus and Muḥammads, raise little mounds of earth and on them make sacrifice. In the period of full moon, and especially at Mubārak Ghāzī, after which they fearlessly cut the brushwood and linge in the most dangerous spots.

This strange myth, there cannot be any doubt, is borrowed from Hindus to suit the taste of the superstitious boatmen and woodcutters.


Mubārak Shāh, Muẓīz al-Dīn, the second king of the Saiyid dynasty of Dihlī, was the son of Khīr Khān, the first king, and succeeded his father on May 22, 1421. The limits of his kingdom were then restricted to a few districts of Hindūvīan proper and Multān, and he was obliged to desist from an attempt to establish his authority in the Pandārī by the necessity for relieving Gwalior, menaced by Hījāng of Mālwā, who raised the siege and met him, but after an indecisive action came to terms and retired to Mālwā. From 1425 to 1427 he was engaged in attempting to restore order in Mewāt, and received the formal submission of the ruler of Gwalior and Candāwār (Fhūzālād), but Muḥammad Khān Aḥwāshī of Bāyānā, whom he had taken prisoner, escaped and took refuge in Mewāt, and the work there was to do again. Muḥammad Aḥwāshī, on being hard pressed in Bāyānā, fled to Ibrahim Shāh of Dājmūn, but as the latter marched against Kālpi, Mubārak marched to meet him. Ibrahim, who had been plundering Mubārak's dominions, avoided a conflict for some time, but on April 2, 1428, the armies met near Čandāwār and Ibrahim, though not decisively defeated, retired
the next day to Djawnpur. Mubarak then collected revenue in the neighbourhood of Gwalior and retired by way of Bayana, which was evacuated by Muhammad Awadh, who had returned thither. For the rest of the year his officers were engaged in restoring order in the Pandjâb, ravaged by Djasraâf the Khokar, and he in a similar task in Mewât, and in collecting revenue by force. In 1430 Fûlãd Turkalâra successfully defended the royal authority in Bhâtînda, and in 1431 a rebellion broke out in Mûtân and had no sooner been suppressed than Djasraâf renewed his activity in the Pandjâb. The chronicle of the rest of the reign is a record of rebellions in the Pandjâb, Mûtân, Sâmânâ, Mewât, Baýâna, Gwalior, Tûfîra and Ítâwa, and a rebel captured Lâhôr and attacked Dípalpûr. Lâhôr was eventually recovered, the whole country remained in a disturbed condition.

War broke out between İbrâhîm of Djawnpur and Hâshân of Mâlwa in connection with Kâlipâ, the successor over whom belonged neither to Mubârak and Makrân, nor to Dîjkistanl, but which turned aside to inspect Mûbarakshâd which he was building, and then, on February 19, 1434, he was assassinated at the instance of Sarwar al-Mulk, whom he had dismissed from the post of minister in the preceding year.

**Bibliography:** Muhammad Kasim Firuzi, Gultagh-i İbrâhîmî, Bombay 1832; Munîzahâb al-Tawârîxî and translation by L.-Col. G. S. A. Ranking; Taḥâbalâk Akbarî and translation by B. Dâ (both in the Bibl. Ind. Series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal); Yadîy b. Aåmad, Tûrîkî-i Mubârak Şâhi, rare in MS., but reproduced by the authorities cited above.

(T. W. Hаде)

**MUBÂRÂK AL-DÎN.** [Muhammad b. al-Mu'izzî]

AL-MUBÂRÂD, Abu 'L-'Abbas Muhammad b. Yazîd al-Thurîmî al-'Azîz, an Arab philologist, born on the 10th of Dhul-Qa'da 210 (March 25, 826) in Basra, was there taught by Abu 'Umar al-Dârîmî, Abu 'Uthmân al-Mîmî and Abu Hâmîd al-Sîjîstânî, the pupil of Asnâ. In his early works, the Kitâb Mas'ul al-Qulûb, he criticised the Kitâb of Shâwâh, but only a small number of his criticisms were well founded and of these only a minority were original (al-Suyûtî, al-Mushîr, i. 188; 212, 232). Later he went to Baghdâd where he became a very busy teacher, among his pupils were Nhâfizâlî, Ibn Durrustawâlî and Ibn Kâsîm. His rival for favour at court was the Kufan Thâlabâ, to whom he was far superior in ability and style; the rivalry between these two scholars seems to have been the origin of the later tradition of the opposition between the schools of Kufa and Baghdâd. His epitaph al-Mubârâd seems to refer to his skill in disputition, but there are a number of anecdotes explaining it in very different ways (Mushîr, ii. 207; 112 sq.; Baghîya, p. 116—


His chief work al-Kâmî al-'Adab is a typical example of the work of the old philologists as developed from their teaching. Without being tied down to any fixed arrangement or even aiming at cohesion in the separate chapters, it combines traditions of the Prophet, sayings of pious men, proverbs, many poems mostly of the older period, and also historical matters like the important chapter on the Khârijîs (characteristic is the passage on p. 409 in Wright's edition; *In this chapter we shall mention something of everything in order by chance to prevent the reader from being wearied and mix a little jest with the earnest so that heart and soul may be recuperated*); similarly p. 248; exceptions like the chapters on simile p. 447 or on laments for the dead and consolation p. 713 are rare).

The important feature is the full grammatical and lexicographical commentary which he gives to every quotation. The work was given its final form with numerous additions and glosses by Abu 'l-Hasan al-Áshâfî (d. 315 = 927). Al-Bâyalîsî wrote a commentary on it which has not survived (Mushîr, i. 182; 222, 3; 135); there is an anonymous commentary in the possession of Ismâl Efendi in Stambul. It was first printed in Stambul in 1286; editions: *The Kâmî of Al-Mubârâd edited for the German Oriental Society* by W. Wright, part 1–12, Leipzig 1864–1892; reprinted Cairo 1908, 1925, 1924 (with extracts from Dâshî on the margins), 1939; with two modern commentaries: the Kitab al-Shârîh by al-Áshâfî al-Bâyalîsî, Cairo 1341 (1923), 2 vols. and Râghbât al-'Amîn min Kitâb al-Kâmî by Sayyid Ibn 'Ali al-Mas'ûfî (professor at al-Azhar), 8 vols. Cairo 345–346 (1927–1928); *Das Khari- dschitenkaptel aus dem K.*, transl. into German by O. Roscher, Stuttgart 1922. His second collection of material, the Kitab al-Mu'âjâfâb, met with less success, because, it is said, it had been transmitted by the heretic Ibn al-Râwandî; it is preserved with a commentary by Sa'id b. Sa'id al-Fârîkî (d. 391 = 1000; see Yûsûf, Irshad, iv. 240) in the Escurial manuscript p. 111 and in Stambul, Koprulu, No. 1507—1508 (cf. Roscher, *Z. d. M. G.*, iii. 197: photograph in Cairo; Fihrist 2, ii. 123). Of his numerous other works given by his biographers we only have the Kitâb al-Tâ'assûf, Escurial 2, p. 534, n. 1, the Kitâb Nasab Ādâm wa-Ákhfashîn, in Stambul Âfî Efendi. 2003 (M.F.O.B., v. 491) and Al-Dîn, 3178 (M.F.O.B., vii. 108), Escurial, Casiri 1700, fol. 59—68 (s. Levi Della Vida, *Les feux des chevaux*, Leyden 1928, p. xx), his answer to a letter from Ahmad b. Wâlîkî on the question whether poetry is superior to eloquence, in Munich 751 and in a fragment in Berlin, Ahlw. 7177 as well as the Kitâb al-Mu'âjâfâb wa-l-Mu'ânnâsh as transmitted by Abu 'Ali al-Fâisi, in Damascus, Yûsûf, p. 36, No. 113, 2. His other works are only known from quotations, e.g. his Kitâb al-Ikhâyiâr, which he himself quotes (Khâmî, p. 760, 4, the Kitâb Gharî al-Nâdîtî, which Ibn al-Athir mentions among his sources in the preface to the Nihâyâ; the Kitâb ma'atasa Lujûsuh wa'la'adâla Majhûnî (Suyûtî, Sharh al-Mushîr, Cairo 1322, p. 195–200); the Kitâb al-Rîwâq, a collection of poems by contemporary poets beginning with Abu Nuwas, âqâmî, viii. 1, 50, 51; al-Dûrjânî, Kitâb al-Kâmî al-'Amîn, v. 29; Ibn al- Athir, al-Mathal al-sûrî, p. 18, 16; the Kitâb al-Lî'îmân on the causes of the poetical strife between Dijâr and Farâzâlî: 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Baghâdâdi, Khâmînât al-Adab, i. 305, 21; Kitâb al-Shârîh (i.e. Sharh Khâmî al-'Adab). I., e., ii. 193 infra.

Die gramm. Scholen, p. 93; Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtl. d. Arabier, p. 82; C. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 108; Rescher, Abrede, ii. 149.

al-Mubarak, a fortress on the Persian Gulf, about a mile north of al-Hufuf, surrounded by open villages and date palm-groves. The population of the fortress and of the hamlets that belong to it is given, sometimes at 10,000, sometimes at 30,000.


al-Mubdi: [See Allah, ii.]

al-Mudallin, name of sūra xxvi, which is also called al-najâda or al-djina.

Mudar. [See Ka'b.]

Mudārī, the twelfth metre in Arabic prosody, which is very rarely used. Theoretically each of its hemistichs consists of three feet (masūlīm fa'īlatun masūlīm); in practice the third foot is lacking.

It has one ārāf and one fārāf only: masūlīm fa'īlatun; masūlīm fa'īlatun. Masūlīm however must become masūlī. The first masūlīm may lose its ma; in that case the form is fa'īn (= masūlī) and fa'īn. (M. Benchener)

al-Mudawwana. [See Sahnūs,]

al-Mudaththir, title of sūra lxxiv.

al-Mudhill. [See Allah, ii.]

Mudīr, title of the governors of the Egyptian provinces, called madīrūn. The use of the word madīr in this meaning is no doubt of Turkish origin. The office was created by Muhammad 'All, when, shortly after 1813, he reorganised the administrative division of Egypt, instituting seven madīrūn; this number has been changed several times. At the present day there are 14 madīrūn. The chief task of the madīr is the controlling of the agricultural administration and of the irrigation, as executed by his subordinates, viz. the mu'mir, who administers a marak; and the mu'āzir who directs the qism which is again a subdivision of the marak. Under Sa'id Pasha the office of madīr was temporarily abolished with a view to preventing oppression. Until that time they had been without exception Turks, but under Isma'il Pasha, when the function was instituted again, this high administrative position was opened also to native Egyptians.

Bibliography: A. B. C. Bey, Aperçu Général sur l'Egypte, Brussels 1840, ii. 172 sqq.; A. von Kiener, l'Egypte, Leipzig 1863, ii. 8; Illyás al-Ayṣūbī, Ta'rijī Miṣr fī'Abd al-Khādis Ismā'il Pasha, Cairo 1341, i. 62 sqq.; J. Deny, Sommario des archivios turcos del Cairo, Cairo 1930, p. 130. (J. H. Kramers)

al-Muddūlidā, title of sūra lxiii.

al-Muddāhid. [See Rasūlidus,]

Muddassima. [See Taḥṣīb,]

Muddawwāza. [See Turān, v. 890 sq.]

al-Muddīb. [See Allah, i.]

Muddīr al-dīn. [See al-Ólamī.]

Muddīza (A.), part. act. iv. of 〈dh-; lit. "the overwhelming" has become the technical term for miracle. It does not occur in the Kurān, which denies miracles in connection with Muhammad, whereas it emphasizes his 'signs', āyāt, i.e., verses of the Kurān; c. of the Korān. Even in later literature Muhammad's chief miracle is the Kurān (cf. 'Abd Nu'mān, Darāš al-Nubwawān, p. 74). Mu'ḍjīza and āya have become synonyms; they denote the miracles performed by Allāh in order to prove the sincerity of His apostles. The term karāma (q.v.) is used in connection with the saints; it differs from mu'ḍjīza in so far as it denotes nothing but a personal distinction granted by Allāh to a saint.

Miracles of Apostles and Prophets, especially those of Muhammad, occur in the sura and in haddīf. Yet in this literature the term mu'ḍjīza is still lacking, as it is in the oldest forms of the creed. The Fiḥāk Abkar, ii., art. 16, mentions the āyāt of the prophets and the karāmāt of the saints. Mu'ḍjīza occurs in the creed of Abū Ḥāfīẓ 'Umar al-Nasafi (ed. Careton, p. 4; ed. Taftāzānī, p. 165): "And He has fortified them (the apostles) by miracles contradicting the usual course of things".

Taftāzānī explains it in this way: A thing deviating from the usual course of things, appearing at the hands of him who pretends to be a prophet, as a challenge to those who deny this, of such a nature that it makes it impossible for them to produce the like of it. It is Allāh's testimony to the sincerity of His apostles.

A very complete and systematic description occurs in al-Ídji's Mawṣūţ. He gives the following definition of mu'ḍjīza: It is meant to prove the sincerity of him who pretends to be an apostle of Allāh. Further he enumerates the following conditions: 1. It must be an act of Allāh; 2. it must be contrary to the usual course of things; 3. contradiction to it must be impossible; 4. it must happen at the hands of him who pretends to be an apostle, so that it appears as a confirmation of his sincerity; 5. it must be in conformity with the miracle he himself must not be a disavowal of his claim (da'awā); 6. it must follow on his da'wā.

Further, according to al-Ídji, the miracle happens in this way that Allāh produces it at the hands of him whose sincerity He wishes to show, in order to realise His will, viz. the salvation of men through the preaching of His apostle. Finally, as to its effect, it produces, in accordance with Allāh's custom, in those who witness it, the conviction of the apostle's being sincere.


Mudītahid. [See Ḥjjīhād,]

Mudītahthāth, the fourteenth metre in Arabic prosody, has theoretically three feet, consisting of two successive fa'īlatun in every hemistich; in practice there are two feet only.

It has one ārāf, and one fārāf only: muṭṣafūtan fa'īlatun: muṭṣafūtan fa'īlatun. The foot fa'īlatun of the ārāf and also, though seldom, that of the ārāf, may become fa'īlatun, on condition that muṭṣafūtan retains its n; it loses its when muṭṣafūtan loses its s.

Mudītātan loses its s, when the preceding fa'īlatun retains its n; it also loses its n, when fa'īlatun following it, does not become fa'īlatun. (Moh. Benchener)
Al-Mufaddal was a distinguished Twelver scholar of Baghdad. The name of his school was Al-Mufaddal. Al-Mufaddal was a celebrated teacher in the Islamic world. He was born in the city of Kufa, Iraq, and was a pupil of the famous Arab poet, al-Mufaddal. Al-Mufaddal was a prolific writer and is considered to be one of the greatest poets of his time. He was known for his skill in composing poetry and for his ability to express complex ideas in his verses. He was also a renowned scholar and was respected for his knowledge of the Quran and hadith. Al-Mufaddal was a key figure in the development of the Twelver school of thought, and his teachings and writings have greatly influenced the development of this branch of Islam. His works are still studied and celebrated today, and his legacy continues to inspire new generations of scholars and poets. The poems of Al-Mufaddal are considered to be some of the finest examples of Arab poetry, and his works are still studied and admired by scholars and poets alike. 

The Encyclopedia of Islam, III

Ahmed Kamal

AL-MUFADDAL

Al-Mu’azzam b. Muhammad b. Ya’qub b. Amir b. Salim b. al-Kamal b. al-Dabb, an Arabic philologist of the Kufan school. By birth he was a free born Arab; the date of his birth is not known. His father was a recognized authority on the events in the wars of the Arab on the frontiers of Khurasan in 30-60 A.H. (quoted in Tabari, al-Manṣūr). It is possible that his son was born in this war. As a part of the house of ’Ali he took part in the rising against the ’Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr led by Ibrahim b. ’Abd Allah [q.v.], brother of al-Nafs al-Sakhiyya. The rising was put down and Ibrahim killed; al-Mufaddal was taken prisoner but pardoned by the caliph and appointed tutor to his son, the future caliph al-Mahdi, and in his train he visited Khurasan. He then worked in Kufa as a philologist, and teacher; among his pupils was his stepson al-’Arabi. The date of his death is variously given; the Fihrist does not give it at all while others give 164, 168 or 170.

Al-Mufaddal, like his contemporary Hammad [q.v.], bore the epithet and title of honour Al-Mufaddal, and was frequently appointed as an authority on the poetry of the Jāhiliyya. In contrast to Hammad, he is celebrated for the reliability of his transmission. In the Kitāb al-Aghāni there are several stories illustrating this fact. While Hammad was reproached with having inserted verses which he had himself composed into the work of the prominent poets of the Jāhiliyya, al-Mufaddal is praised for handing down the old poetry pure and un falsified. There was, of course, a great rivalry between the two rāwās which also finds expression in the stories of the Aghāni. Al-Mufaddal is reported to have said that the influence of Hammad on Arabic poetry had been most disastrous, to a degree which could never be made good again. To the question how this was and whether Hammad had made mistakes in the attribution of the poems or linguistic errors, he replied: if that were all, it could be made good, but he had done worse than this. Since he was such an authority on the old poets, he was able himself to write verses in their style and he had inserted such verses of his own composition in genuine old kāṭids so that now only very good critics of the old poetry could recognize them (cf. Aghāni, v. 172 and Yākūt, Ḳiyād, vii. 171). It is also recorded that al-Mufaddal once in the presence of the caliph taught Hammad passing off verses of his own as the work of Zuhair b. Abi Sula. The kāṭida which Hammad was reciting began with dād dāh, and on the caliph asking for the missing nasib he added several nasib verses. Al-Mufaddal however said quite rightly that there had probably been a nasib before the surviving verses, but no one any longer knew it. Hammad was thereupon forced to confess his forgery. It is interesting to learn that, as is recorded in this passage of the Aghāni, Hammad was rewarded for his recitation but the sum given to al-Mufaddal was considerably greater. Al-Mufaddal was given his reward, not only for his knowledge, but also for his fidelity and honesty in transmission (cf. Aghāni, loc. cit. and Yākūt, loc. cit.).

Al-Mufaddal worked in different fields of Arabic philology. He was considered an authority on rare Arabic expressions, celebrated as a grammarian and also an authority on genealogy and the history of the Arab battles (Alaʾīm al-ʿArab). He wrote a number of books: a Kitāb al-Anṭāq (on proverb), a Kitāb al-Arād (on metres), a Kitāb Maʿna ʾl-šur (on the meanings of poems) and a dictionary: Kitāb al-Alfāz. His principal work, however, is a collection of old Arabic Ḳāṭidas called the Muṭafḍaliyya, which he compiled for his pupil, the future caliph al-Mahdi. Al-Mufaddal himself is said to have given another story of the origin of this anthology, which is one of the most valuable Arabic collections. When on one occasion Ibrahim b. ’Abd Allah was in hiding in his house, he brought him some books to read at his request. Ibrahim marked a number of poems and these he collected in one volume because Ibrahim was a good critic of the old poetry. This collection was later called the Ḳiyād al-Muṭafḍaliyya (cf. Flugel, Gramm. Schulen, p. 144, note 1).

The Muṭafḍaliyya contains 126 poems, some complete Ḳāṭidas of many verses, some fragments of small size, while in Abu Tammām's collection, the Ḳamāṣa, only little fragments of poems or separate verses are contained. The latter was compiled some fifty years later; at first it was much more popular than the Muṭafḍaliyya and more frequently annotated. But the Muṭafḍaliyya's anthology is of quite outstanding merit. The great bulk of it is the work of pagan poets and muḥārīb, while only six of the 67 poets represented were born Muslims. Two of the poets whose Ḳāṭidas are contained in the Muṭafḍaliyya, were Christians. The poems, the date of composition of which can frequently be deduced from events mentioned in them, are in some cases very old. The earliest are those attributed to Murādī, his son, which probably belong to the first decade of the sixth century A.D. Al-Mufaddal's anthology offers a rich selection of the old Arabic poetry, the value of which is increased by the great age of the poems preserved in it. The name of its collector, who enjoyed a good reputation among his contemporaries for his reliability, also gives us a certain guarantee that we have in the poems of the Muṭafḍaliyya really genuine specimens of old Arab poetry.


AL-MUFĪD

Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Muhammad b. al-Nṣām al-Ḥirveiḥī, also called Ibn al-Muʿāṣim, a distinguished Twelver scholar of Baghdad under the Buyids, was born at the end of 333 or 338 (945 or 950), and came of an old Kuraishi family which, as his second epithet shows, had a reputation for scholarship; he himself became, as his epithet shows, the teacher from whom all later students have derived advantage. While he took little active part in politics, he was a very prolific author. His correspondence, usually replies to queries, came from Mawsil, Djurjān, Dinawar, Bakka, Khwārizm, Egypt and Tabaristan. His literary connection with other leaders of the Twelvers are seen in the fact that the Dogmatics mentioned third below is a critical commentary on Ibn Būbīya's Risālat al-Fīkhādāt (published in a collected volume, Teheran.
1300) and was in turn commented on by the
Baghdaüi na'ib al-Sharí al-Murtada; the life on
law and tradition given second below was also the
basis upon which his pupil Shaikh Tusi [q. v.]
was as a commentary his Tábi'í al-Akham,
one of the "4 (5) books" of the Twelvers. Mufid
wrote pamphlets against Djühâ'í. Dja'far b. Jarb,
Ibn Kullab, Karabín, the Mu'attalis, Zaidis, the
followers of al-Hallaj, Hambalî, Djühâ and the
Shâmínya (for other collected titles see al-Khayat, 
Nûr ad-Din, al-Insâr. p. 156). The number of his writings
runs to nearly 200. In addition to those preserved
in European libraries, there are many other manu-
scripts in Shî'í libraries, e.g. in Najaf. Among
them are the usual handbooks on jûh, on the
nuqûf e.g. on idnâs, as well as the fârid e.g. on the
kholí and the law of inheritance: also treated
on fundamental philosophical conceptions such as
the predicate, the state of being created etc.; but
it is with specifically Shi'í problems that he mainly
deals. Mufid, as the titles of several of his works
and his influence on later writers show, championed
the enhancement of the dogma of Prophets, dealt
with the question, a painful one for the Shi'is,
whether Abû Tâlîb was a believer, with the imâmâte
of 'Ali and the proof that the Imams are higher
than the angels. He naturally dealt also with the
usual special tenets of the Twelvers, like the
concealment of the Imam and the prohibition of mea-
liturged by the "People of the Book". He also
wrote guides for pilgrims to the peculiarly Shi'í holy
places.

Mufid died on Ramadân 28, 413 (Nov. 26, 1023).
The na'ib al-Sharí al-Murtada conducted the funeral
service; he was buried beside Ibn Bâbîye [q. v.]
at the feet of the ninth imâm Muhammad al-Dja'waad
in al-Kâshamîn.

Bibliography: His own works: Al-Iflâmî,
Teheran 1368; al-Mufidâ fi l-Fihâ (ibid.),
The life by al-Bâbîsî is printed at the beginning,
A.t'ti'at al-Bahrain; Ta'bihî l-Yâd al-Ilmîâyî,
ed. with notes by Hîbar al-Din in al-Muruqân,
i. and ii. Baghdaü 1344 sy.; Tüsî, Fihrist,
No. 685; al-Allâmâ al-Hilli Ibn al-Mu'âshhar,
Kâhîyât al-Awâlî fi Marî'ât al-Rîyâb, Teheran
1312, p. 255 sy.; Astarabâdî, Manhâj
al-Muâkî fi Ta'bihî al-Awâlî al-Rîyâb, Teheran
1304, p. 317—318; Khuwairî, Râzâdât al-Djan-
âmî, Teheran 1304—1306, p. 663—670; Fiqâj
Husain al-Kendi, Kâfî al-Mu'âshhar wa l-Astâr,
Calcutta 1330, No. 167, 591, 812—819, 2456—
2459, 2460, 2474—2477 and pass.; C. Brockel-
mann, G. A. L., i. 188; K. Strothmann, Die
Zwelfter-Schû-Schû, Leipzig 1926, index. cf. also
L. Massignon, al-Hallaj, Paris 1922, index; W.
Heffngen, Das Islamische Fremdenrecht, Hanover
1925, index. (R. Strothmann)

MUFTI. [See FATWA.]

MUGHAL, the name given to the dynasty
of Emperors of Hindustân founded by Babâr in 932 (1526), in virtue of the claim made
by Timür, the ancestor of the dynasty, to relationship with the family of the Mongol (Mughal) Çingiz
Khân [q. v.]. For the detailed history of the dynasty see the articles IMAR, HUMAYUN, AKBAR,
SHAIKHUDDIN, SHAH-JAHAN, AWANGANZER, and their successors.

I. THE MUGHAL EMPIRE TO THE DEATH OF
AWANGANZER:
A. Military Organization.
B. Economics and Administration.

II. THE DECLINE OF THE MUGHAL EMPIRE.
III. MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE IN INDIA.

A. Military Organization of the
Mughal Empire.

The army which Babur led into India, and
with which he defeated at Fânipat the army of
Ibrâhîm Lodî, 100,000 strong, consisted of about
10,000 combatants, mainly cavalry, but comprising
a corps of artillery and a small proportion of
infantry, chiefly matchlockmen. Babur's son and
successor, Humâyûn, though hampered by the
virtual independence of his brother Kâmith, governor of Kâbul, who annexed the Pandjâb, and
thus cut him off from the best recruiting
resources of the Muslim army in Northern India.
Afghanistân, and Transoxiana, was nevertheless
able to lead into the field at the battle of the
Ganges, near Kanâwâd, where he was defeated by
Shir Şâh, an army of 100,000 men. On his return
to India in 1555 he left Kâbul with an army of
no more than 15,000 men, and it was his son
and successor, AKBAR, who was the creator of the
army of the empire of which he was, in fact,
the founder.

The empire was a military despotism. The
governor of a province was entitled sipahâdîr,
or "commander-in-chief", the governor of a purjana,
or sub-district, furTî' or "commandant", and
practically all courtiers and officials, even those
holding civil and judicial posts, were graded as
commanders of horse. Thus we find Shaikh Abu
l-Fadîl, Akbar's secretary, graded as a commander
of 1,000; Râdji Dir Bar, court wit and Hindi
poet laureate, as a commander of 1,000; Sulîyîd
Muhammad, Mîrî Sall, a judge, as a commander
of 900; and Shaikh Falîd, the poet, as a commander
of 400 horse. A commander of horse was known
as mutâh ("knight" or "dignity"), and its holder
as mutâhâbîr ("officer"). Each of these nominal
commanding from 500 to 2,500 horse was classed
as unur ("noble"), and each of those nominally
commanding more as unur-i kabir ("great noble").
These commands were nominal, conferred merely
for the purpose of regulating the rank of the
official holding them, and were styled mutâhâbî-
dî ("personal rank"). Each of those actually
exercising military authority had, in addition to
his personal rank, saynîr (horseman) rank. Thus,
a commander of 5,000 might be described as
"commander of 5,000, with 4,000 horsemen", that
is to say, one ranking as a commander of 5,000,
but supposed to maintain only 4,000 horsemen
In AKBAR's reign, apart from the rank held by
the royal princes, commands ranged from 10 to
5,000 horsemen, but at the end of the reign
two or three nobles were promoted to commands
of 6,000 and 7,000. In these two high commands
there was no distinction of grade, but each of
the other commands was divided into three classes,
viz. 1. those whose saynîr rank was equal to their
personal rank, 2. those whose saynîr rank was
half, or more, of their personal rank, and 3. those
whose saynîr rank was less than half of their
personal rank. Thus, a commander of 5,000 with
5,000 horsemen would be in the first class of his
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rank, a commander of 5,000 with 3,000 horsemen in the second, and a commander of 5,000 with 2,000 horsemen in the third. A purely civil official often had no *sawâr* rank, but the distinction between military and civil officials was less clearly marked than it is today, and all officials were, in theory, *soldiers*. The secretary, Abu I-Fadl, said: 'at least on one occasion, in the field, and Akbar once entrusted military commands in the field to his court wit and to a leading physician, with disastrous results.

The lists of "commanders of horse" given in such works as the *Ain-i Akbari*, the *Tabâṣīr-i Akbari*, and the *Pādukhânuma* are not "army lists", but graded lists of the whole establishment of public servants, civil as well as military. Even where, as in the *Pādukhânuma*, *sawâr* rank is given as well as personal rank, the lists are no guide to the effective strength of the imperial army, for commanders with *sawâr* rank did not maintain, and were not even expected to maintain, the number of horse indicated by that rank. Thus, Shâh-Bahlân issued an edict to the effect that commanders with three were not required to maintain more than one-third, and, in some cases, no more than one-fourth of the number of horse indicated by their *sawâr* rank, and in the Balkh campaign they were not required to muster more than one-fifth of their nominal quota.

The yearly salaries of "commanders of horse" ranged from Rs. 350,000 a year for a commander of 7,000 down to Rs. 4,000 a year for a commander of 100, but in the commands in which there were three classes the salary varied with the class. Thus, in the 5,000 command an officer of the first class received Rs. 250,000; an officer of the second Rs. 242,500; and an officer of the third Rs. 235,000. These salaries were attached to the personal rank, and were intended to enable the official to maintain his position at court or in the provinces, his household, his transport, and the horsemen as he might require for his personal service. For the payment of troops actually maintained separate allowances were made.

The horsemen were styled *tāhūnān* ("followers" or "troops"), and the majority of them provided and maintained their own horses and arans, and, in the field, their own transport. They were divided into three classes: three-horsed and two-horsed men, each of whom received nearly Rs. 25 a month, and one-horsed men, each of whom received rather more than Rs. 16½ a month. At a later date higher rates of pay than these were allowed in the Dakhan. Horsemen who could not supply their own horses were styled *kâpâr*, and were the servants or followers of those who supplied them. The proportion of those classes in every ten troopers was usually three three-horsed, four two-horsed, and three one-horsed troopers, or ten men and twenty horses.

The payment of the contingents maintained by the *munâqâbârs* was at first provided for by the grant of *dâjîgir*, or fiefs, so that the army was maintained on a feudal system, which, however, differed from the feudal system of Europe in that the fiefs were not hereditary, and the *dâjîgirdârs*, or fief-holders, had no proprietary rights in them. A fief-holder might be transferred from one fief to another, or a portion of his fief, or even the whole of it, might be resumed. In 1574 an edict was promulgated by Akbar resuming all fiefs and converting them into crown lands, the payment of the troops being provided for by orders on the treasury for payments in cash. This edict caused much discontent, for the *dâjîgir* system was, for many reasons, far more popular than the *naqâl*, or cash-payment, system. Under the *naqâl* system a muster-parade might at any time be made a condition precedent to the issue of a payment order; and a *dâjîgirdâr* might reap much profit by economising in the administration of his fief, by rack-renting the landholders, and by enroaching, but the *naqâl* system furnished him with no such means of enriching himself. The edict was immediately modified, and though the *naqâl* system was introduced in the settled provinces of the empire, the *dâjîgir* system was retained in the more recently conquered provinces of Bengal, Gudjarât, and Sind, and, after Akbar's death, was restored, in many cases, in other provinces.

Another reform introduced at the same time, the *dâjîgir* *umâhâlî* or branding regulation, was resented even more than the substitution of the *naqâl* for the *dâjîgir* system. It was seldom that *munâqâbârs* maintained their full quota of troopers; "false musters were an evil from which the Mughal army suffered, even in its most palmy days. Nobles would lend each other those men to make up their quota, or needy idlers from the bazaars would be mounted on the first baggage pony that came to hand, and counted in with the others as efficient soldiers". It was to check such fraudulent practices that Akbar introduced the *dâjîgir* *umâhâlî* regulation, which required the preparation of descriptive rolls of men and horses, the latter being branded on being passed as fit for service; and at muster-parades only those who produced branded horses were paid. This system originated apparently, with the Saddâqâs in Transoxiana and Persia, and was introduced into India by 'Alî al-Lâ'în Khâldî in 1512, but was not enforced after his death until it was revived by Shâh Shâh in 1541. After his death it was again abandoned, and Akbar had great difficulty in reviving it, owing to the growing opposition to anything designed to prevent public officials from enriching themselves by defrauding the state. Even he was obliged to exempt commanders of 5,000, or a greater number, of horse from its operation, though these were required to parade their contingents for inspection when ordered. In the later days of the empire, the regulation was not enforced, and when Burhân al-Mulk joined Muḥammad Shâh at Karnâl, to meet Nâdir Shâh, a historian considers it worth while to describe his contingent as *munâqâbâr* na ḋâkhal, that is, 'actually present, not merely on paper': and later, in 1750, an officer in Bengal receiving pay for 1,700 men was said not to have been able to muster more than seventy or eighty.

Besides the contingents of the princes and the *munâqâbârs* there were the sovereign's personal troops. His body-guard was a corps known as the *Wâliâbâhâ*, composed chiefly of men who had been attached to him from his youth, and had served under him as a prince. Manucci refers to these as the emperor's slaves, and says that they numbered 4,000 under Awrangzib. Details of their pay are not given, but they probably received more than the troopers serving in the contingents of the *munâqâbârs*. There was also a corps d'élite first formed by Akbar, and styled the *Akhâl* corps. Abu I-Fadl, in a characteristically foolish passage says that they were so called because they were
fit for a "harmonious unity", whatever that may mean; but they seem to have been called *ahad* because they enlisted singly in the personal service of the emperor, and were not brought into the service in bodies by a *mangabālār*. They stood, in rank, between the lower *mangabālār* and the *tārān*, and received nearly double the pay of the latter. They may be compared to "gentlemen of the life-guard", and many were seconded from the corps in order that they might hold civil appointments. The proportion of three-horsed, two-horsed, and one-horsed troopers was the same in the *ahad* corps as in the contingents of the *mangabālār*.

A commander of horse, whether he held a *dājuqir* or whether he drew the pay of his contingent from the treasury, made his own arrangements for its discharge. He was entitled to retain five percent of the pay of his men for himself, and pay was not always allowed for a whole year; often only for six, five, or four months. Manucci, writing of the army in the reign of Awrangzib, says, "in respect of one year's service they receive six or eight months' pay. Even that is not all in coin; they are always foisted off as respect two months' pay with clothes and old raiment from the household. Over and above this, there is almost always due to them the pay for two or three years' service. The soldiers are obliged to borrow money at interest from the *ṣarvās*, or money-changers. These men lend to them, it is true, but it is hardly ever without a command from the general or officer; and these latter have an understanding with them about the profit from interest, which they share between them. Sometimes the soldiers sell their papers to these money-changers, who for a note of hand for one hundred rupees will give them twenty or twenty-five. It is by these and such-like extortions that these generals ruin the wretched soldier, who, unable to find other means of gaining his bread, is forced to remain on in his service. Speaking generally, it is impossible for them to escape such extortions, for these disorders reign throughout all the princes' establishments. If any one resigns service at his own request, they deduct two months' pay. Nevertheless service in the cavalry was socially an honourable profession; a common trooper was looked upon as being, to some extent, a gentleman, and such were, even when illiterate, often used to the highest positions".

The infantry was, in every respect, an inferior arm. With it were classed doorkeepers, watchmen, runners and spies, gladiators, wrestlers, and palm-leaf bearers, but the combatant branch consisted of musketeers or matchlockmen (hārkanīs), archers, and spearmen. Akbar maintained a corps of 12,000 matchlockmen, the officer in command of which was styled *dājuqir*. A secretary and a treasurer kept the accounts and disbursed the pay of these troops. The non-commissioned officers of the corps were graded in four classes, the first of which received *7 1/4* rupees a month, the second *6 3/4*, and the fourth *6 1/2* rupees a month. The privates were divided into five classes, the pay of which ranged from *4 3/4* down to *2 1/4* rupees a month.

Besides this corps was a number of troops styled *dāhuqār*, of which one-fourth were matchlockmen and three-fourths archers. These were the troops allowed to the *fārmās* in the *parganas* or sub-districts, to assist them in maintaining order and collecting the revenue. The non-commissioned officers of the matchlockmen received *Rs 4* a month, and the privates *Rs 3 1/2* each. The archers were considered more efficient than the matchlockmen, for the matchlock was not an arm of rapid fire or precision, and an archer could shoot many arrows while a matchlockman was loading his matchlock. Neither matchlockmen nor archers could, as a rule, face cavalry in the field, and it was not until the emperors and their vassals were brought face to face with troops armed and drilled after the European fashion that they discovered that infantry was the queen of battles; but belief in the superior efficiency of cavalry died hard.

The artillery was divided into two classes, the heavy and the light. Bābur had an efficient corps of artillery, and used it with great effect, but the Muslims of India were not skilled artillersists, and the heavy artillery was usually officered and partly manned by "ʿUmānī Türk, Portuguese renegades of pure or mixed blood, and occasionally by other Europeans. The light artillery consisted of field-pieces carried on bullock-carts, wall-pieces on animals' backs, and *zambīrāks*, or still lighter service-guns, carried on and fired from the backs of camels. The heavy artillery was drawn by strings of oxen, or, occasionally, by elephants, and, as the army gradually declined in efficiency the heavy guns increased in length and calibre until they became so heavy as hardly to be mobile, so that often they could not be dragged to their destination but were left stranded by their road.

A defeated army could seldom save its heavy and field artillery. All that it could do was to spike the guns and burn them. The ammunition was solid shot, sometimes of stone, sometimes of iron, and field guns and heavy guns in the field were sometimes loaded to the muzzle with the rough copper coin of the time, which took the place of case-shot, and did great execution at close quarters. The artillery also comprised a corps of rocketeers. The whole of the artillery was commanded by an officer entitled *mir-ai Ḿīrūd*, or "lord of fire". The officers were entitled *gūṭās* ("commander of 100") corresponding to a battery commander, and *mūrūdāk* (commander of 10), who had charge of a subdivision, or one gun. The wall-pieces and *zambīrāks*, which were numerous, account for the enormous numbers of "guns" mentioned in accounts of armies in the field.

Akbar used elephants freely in battle, and brought them into the field in great numbers. They usually carried archers or musketeers on their backs. Their use as a fighting force was, however, soon abandoned, and would have been a handicap had it not been for their imposing appearance, for it had long been established that they were more dangerous to their own side than to the enemy. "To the last some elephants protected by armour were brought into the battle-field, but their use was confined almost entirely to carrying the generals or great nobles, and displaying their standards. The baggage elephants were assembled in rear with those bearing the harem, the women remaining mounted on the latter during the battle, and protected by a strong force posted round them".

Under Akbar the elephants ridden by the emperor were called *khāṣā* ("special"), and all others were arranged in groups of ten, twenty, or thirty, called *halāt* ("ring", or "circle"). In later reigns the same classification was employed, but with
a more extended meaning, khasha then including all riding, and kalsa all baggage elephants. Mannabdars from 7,000 down to 500 were required to maintain each one riding elephant, and, in addition, five baggage elephants for each Rs 2,500 of pay. It appears that these elephants belonged to the emperor, and were not even made over to the mansabdars for use, except in the field. In the Ain-i-Akbari, for instance, Agha says that "Akbir put several khalas under the charge of every grandee, and required him to look after them."

The commander-in-chief of the army was the emperor himself, but at the head of the military administration was an officer entitled Bakhshah al-Manzil, whose position may be described as that of adjutant-general and mustem-master-general. He was assisted by three bakhshahs and a number of kithkis, or clerks, and the duties of this department included enlistment, mustering, and passing the pay of both mansabdars and cabiltins, for which purpose they were obliged to see that the branding regulations, so long as they were enforced, were observed by those to whom they applied. Manucci says, "twice a year the bakhshah holds a review of all the cavalry present at court, examines all the horses, and sees whether any of them are old and unfit for service. In the latter case he makes the owners get rid of them and buy others". These officers remained at headquarters, and from some authorities it appears that one of them had charge of the WaliNaqib, or body-guard, but the Ahadi corps, which was commanded by one of the great nobles, had its own diqan, or paymaster and quartermaster, and its own bakhshah, both officers being assisted by kithkis. Certificates granted by the bakhshah were recorded by the waliNaqib, or writer of the official diary, and were by him submitted to the wazir, or minister, who, after passing them, sent them to the office of revision and record, but pay was issued on the minister's order. "In addition to the bakhshah at headquarters there were officers with similar functions attached to the governor of every province", their office being generally combined with that of waliNaqib, or provincial diary-writer; and in imitation of the imperial establishments each great noble had his own bakhshah, who performed for him the same duties as those performed for the emperor by the imperial bakhshah.

It is impossible to estimate accurately the strength of the army in Akbar's reign, for the sowar rank of the mansabdars is not given, either in the Ain-i-Akbari or in the Tabakat-i Akbari. He maintained 12,000 matchlockmen, and Blochmann estimates the whole strength of his army at 25,000, of which 12,000 were cavalry and the rest matchlockmen and artillery, but this seems to be much too low an estimate. Humayun could put 100,000 cavalry into the field, and it is not likely that Akbar, with far wider dominions, would have been content, or could have ruled and extended his empire with a smaller army. It seems probable that Blochmann's estimate included only the emperor's personal, or household, troops, in the latter half of Shah-Dahshin's reign the contingents of the princes and nobles would have numbered 425,000 if each mansabdar had maintained the full quota of his sowar rank, but this they were not even expected to do. Fortunately a fairly exact return of the strength of the army is given in the Padshahnama. There were 8,000 mansabdars of all ranks, 7,000 mounted Akhis and barakandaz, 200,000 cavalry, exclusive of the troops allowed to farsdydars for the maintenance of order and the collection of the revenue, and 40,000 foot matchlockmen, artillery, and rocketeers, of whom 10,000 were at headquarters and 10,000 in the provinces and the forts. It is not quite clear what is meant by the mounted barakandaz classed with the Akhis, for barakandaz is the word used for a matchlockman, and horsemen certainly did not carry the cumbersome matchlock, and carbines and pistols had not been introduced, but it may be that a few men carrying a lighter musket than the ordinary matchlock were attached to the Akhis corps. Of the army in the reign of Awrangzib Manucci writes, "ordinarily the king keeps fifty thousand horse in garrison besides those in movement every day, an almost equal number. He has twenty thousand infantry, all Radjpitits; out of them twelve thousand are in charge of the artillery; the rest are for guarding the royal palace, mounting sentry, and cetera".

The army of the Mughal emperors was not drilled. Muster parades consisted merely in the troopers passing in single file before the bakhshah, and the nearest approach to any manoeuvres was the participation of the army, or part of it, in a royal hunt, when the troops, aided by the people of the country side, acted as beaters, surrounded a large tract of country, and, day by day, closed inwards until in a small area was enclosed an enormous quantity of game, which was then slaughtered wholesale by the emperor and those who were permitted a share in the "sport". Apart from this species of hunting styled shah-i-kamargha, the army was never exercised in any combined movements, or drill; but the individual trooper paid great attention to the training of his body, exercising himself with all his weapons, sabre, spear, mace, battle-axe, buckler, dagger, and bow and arrows. The bow was considered a most effective weapon, as a hor-eman could shoot six times before a musketeer could fire twice. The trooper also went through various exercises for strengthening his limbs and his body, both with and without apparatus, the latter consisting of dumb-bells, magdar, or Indian clubs, and the lizam, a strong bow with a steel chain instead of string, most effective in training these muscles employed by an archer. The horses were also trained in a sort of manege.


T. W. Haig

B. Economics and Administration

The Mughal Empire lived mainly by agriculture. The only metals available in quantity were iron and copper; both were relatively expensive, and local supplies of the latter were falling in the xvith century. The existence of coal was unknown, and of other minerals only lime, salt, saltpetre, and, locally, building stone were largely produced. The agricultural land was divided into areas known as
During the xvith century all the sea routes were dominated by the Portuguese, who were concerned rather to exploit than to develop; the chief extension of trade due to their efforts was the supply of cloth to Brazil and West Africa, but most of this was drawn from the Comonwealth Coast, which was outside the empire until almost the end of the xvith century. After “factories” (i.e. agencies) had been established at Surat by the English (1611) and the Dutch (1617), an important trade with western Europe grew up in indigo and calico. In the middle of the century the indigo-trade yielded to competition from the West Indies, while the depopulation of Gujrat by the famine of 1630 transferred the bulk of the calico trade to the East Coast; Surat remained, however, an important centre until its suppression by Bombay. In the second quarter of the xvith century the Dutch, followed by the English, established factories on the Hāglī in Bengal, and trade developed in silk, saltpetre, fine calico, and muslin. Towards the close of the century a change of fashions in Europe produced a great demand for muslin and prints. The Dutch were met partly by Bengal, and partly by Madras, by this time technically within the limits of the empire.

The outstanding feature of all trade with India was the need for importing gold and silver. India bought little beyond the industrial metals and luxury goods, but was eager to sell produce for cash; and, since Western Europe could not supply what was most in demand, the operations of the trading Companies were necessarily so organised as to direct streams of gold and silver to India from those countries which would part with them, notably, at this period, gold from China, and silver, and later gold, from Japan. The seaports serving the empire were thus brought into a complex but efficient organisation, which took whatever they had to sell, supplied whatever they wanted to buy, and, so far as was possible, satisfied the demand for gold and silver.

Inland transport was necessarily less efficient. The Indus, the Ganges, the Djamna, and the waterways of Bengal were largely used, but the bulk of the empire depended on what were then called roads, unmetalled tracks, sometimes defined by lines of trees, with halting-places which were generally walled or otherwise defended against robbers, and usually furnished with supplies. Transport was effected by carts and pack-animals, generally ozen but in some places camels. Passengers travelled on horseback, in palanquins, or in carts drawn by fast ozen. There were excellent arrangements for the rapid transit of letters, but these were for official use, and were not ordinarily available for private persons, who hired messengers when required, or in a few cases, clubbed together to send messengers periodically.

Standards of life presented sharp contrasts. The mass of the population, peasants, artisans and labourers, lived in such extreme poverty as to excite the commiseration of European visitors. An almost equally low standard prevailed among the numerically important class of servants in the towns, whether freemen or slaves, who, however, enjoyed a more secure life than the rural population. The middle classes, comparatively smaller in number than now, were thrifty and frugal; and, even when wealthy, were careful to avoid any display which might lead to exactations by officials. The superior
grades of officers employed by the State were exceedingly well paid when allowance is made for the high purchasing power of money, and spent their incomes freely in extravagance and display, increased by the fact that on their death their property reverted to the treasury.

The prosperity of the empire depended mainly on three factors: the character of the rainfall, the degree of internal tranquillity, and the working of the revenue administration. The seasonal rainfall was, as it still is, uncertain, and any serious defect resulted in insufficient food. The difficulty of transport made it impossible to afford adequate relief on the spot, the people abandoned their homes to wander in search of food, and in contemporary narratives we read again and again of the then familiar features of deaths from starvation, cannibalism, and the sale of children into slavery. Recovery from such a calamity was a slow process, and the famine which desolated Gujarán and the Dakhan in 1630–1631 left its mark for at least a generation. Exceptionally favourable harvests might also prove calamitous, though not to the same extent. There was no local market for the surplus produce, prices fell to a ruinous level, and official regulations low prices were treated as a calamity requiring relief on the same footing as drought or hail.

The dominance of the weather was irresistible; the other influences on prosperity were matters of administration. Here a clear distinction must be drawn between the general and the revenue administration, a distinction denoted by the current phrase multi waz-mali. The emperor was of course supreme in both branches, and was assisted at his headquarters by four principal officers, the Wazír or Prime Minister, the Waqil or Revenue Minister, the Badshá (see eel. 639), and the Sa'dr, who was in charge of Islamic law and also administered the department dealing with charitable grants and endowments. The post of Waqil was not always filled, and when it was in abeyance the duties attaching to it devolved on the Wazír. In practice the powers of these Ministers depended on the personality of the Emperor; under Akbar or Sáhá-Dinásh they were definitely subordinate, while Džahángír's Prime Minister was at times practically the ruler of the country.

The system of general administration to which the Mughals succeeded in Northern India was not highly developed. The great bulk of the country was held by officers in assignment (a term explained below); the assignee was responsible for keeping the peace, and in practice had a free hand in the methods employed. Under Akbar a more effective system was established, which was maintained throughout the period. The empire was divided into provinces (siyás), each of which was in charge of a Viceroy (Sipán-dár, Sáháb-dár), who at first was responsible to the Emperor for all branches of administration, but after 1595 was relieved of revenue work. Apart from the Viceroy, officers who may be described as Governors were stationed at selected places, with the duty of keeping the peace and putting down rebellion, a term which covered failure to pay the revenue due. The ordinary designation of these Governors was Fauj-Dár, but in outlying regions which were controlled by fortresses the Governor was the fortress-commander (Khál-dár), while in a few large assignments the assignee exercised the powers of a Governor. Cities were governed by officers designated Kétvál, who combined the functions of magistrate, police-commandant, municipality, and censor of morals. There was no regular police force at the disposal of these officers, who were expected to employ the troops they maintained as a condition of their rank, obtaining help when their own forces were insufficient. The efficiency of this organisation varied with that of the central administration, which depended mainly on the personality of the Emperor; by the close of the xvi^th century it was definitely breaking down, and conditions of anarchy were spreading over the empire.

It is difficult to state in precise terms the relation of this organisation to the extensive portions of the empire where internal jurisdiction remained in the hands of Hindu Chiefs; but apparently the Chief was regarded officially as assignee of his territories, and was expected to maintain order within them. If he failed to do so, the Viceroy or Governor concerned might intervene, but his action would ordinarily be directed against the Chief rather than against the people.

The revenue administration was controlled by the Wazír, sitting in the Revenue Ministry, which was known as Džián, as opposed to faríd, or the Court, whence orders were issued by, or in the name of, the Emperor. Revenue at this period meant practically Land Revenue; the Imperial Treasury had receipts from other sources—Customs, Salt, Mint, Presents, Inheritance, and, under Awaržéh, the Capitation Tax (qizya)—but, taken collectively, they were of little importance compared with the income obtained from the peasants. Under the system traditional in India, and embodied in Hindu law, every person cultivating land was required to pay a share of the produce to the King, who determined, within somewhat elastic limits, the amount of the share, and who also prescribed the methods of assessment and collection. The first Muslim conquerors accepted this "King's share" as the kibrí which to which they were entitled under Islamic law; the question of property in land was not raised, but occupants were ordinarily allowed to retain possession subject to due payment of the revenue.

In the Mughal period agricultural land fell into three classes: Chiefs', Reserved and Assigned. The areas governed by the more important Chiefs were not assessed to revenue (kibrí) by the Wazír; that was the privilege of the Chief, and any payments which he made to the treasury were in the nature of a tribute, determined by negotiation. The treatment of the numerous smaller Chiefs is not on record; but the few facts which have survived are consistent with the view that assessment was made through them, and that they were allowed to retain a portion of the revenue in return for their services. In the regions which were directly administered, certain areas of land, described as kibrí, were reserved to furnish the treasury with cash, and were managed by the staff employed by the Revenue Ministry; at first the local staff was under the provincial Viceroy, but in 1596 a Džián was posted to each province, to manage all revenue business directly under the Minister, and in this way emerged the dichotomy into džiání (revenue business) and faují (general business) which hencsfoward characterised the local administration.

The land not reserved for the treasury was
available for assignment. Every officer appointed to the Emperor's service was entitled to an income defined in cash, which represented both his personal salary and the cost of the troops he was required to maintain. For a short period in Akbar's reign, this income was paid, as well as defined, in cash, but the ordinary practice in the empire was to assign to each officer an area (qādīr, ṭalī, or ḡādī) estimated to yield as revenue the amount of his stated income; and the officer thereupon took charge of the area assigned to him, and assessed and collected the revenue in accordance, at least theoretically, with the general orders in force. If the yield proved insufficient, he could claim the balance from the treasury, while he could be required to account for any excess receipts; but in practice these matters seem usually to have been adjusted by bribery, for which there was also extensive scope in securing profitable assignments, and in getting rid of those which had been squeezed dry. Charges of assignment were ordinarily so frequent that an officer would have been unwise to spend money on fostering agricultural development or do anything by way of improving the income which his assignment could be made to yield. The great bulk of the land was ordinarily assigned, the reserved area being one-sixth or one-seventh of the whole.

The share of the peasants' produce claimed by Akbar was one-third; later, at some uncertain time in the first half of the xvith century, this figure became the minimum, with a maximum of one-half, which inevitably tended to become the standard. Three principal methods of assessment were in vogue: Shāring (qolla baždr), Measurement (paunāṭ bi), and Group-Assessment (naʿād). In Shāring, the produce of each peasant was ordinarily estimated (or occasionally ascertained at harvest), and the prescribed share valued to determine the cash-revenue due for that season. In Measurement, a fixed charge, varying with the crop, was made on each unit of area sown; it might be fixed in either cash or produce and in the latter case it was valued at current prices. Under both these systems payment in cash was the general rule, but payments in kind were permitted in some backward regions where currency was scarce. In Group-Assessment, the official concerned came to terms with the headmen of the village to pay a sum fixed in cash for the year, thus avoiding the necessity of detailed assessments on individuals; this system tended to pass into Farming, when terms were made, not with the headmen, but with an outsider.

Each ruler determined at his pleasure which of these methods should be employed, and in what regions. Group-Assessment was the prevailing system at the time of Babur's conquest, and apparently was accepted by him. After the expulsion of Humāyūn from India, Sher Shah introduced Measurement throughout his kingdom, and his methods were at first adopted by Akbar; the revenue claimed from each unit of area was at this time a stated quantity of produce, calculated to be one-third of the average yield, and, except in the tracts where payment in kind was practised, this amount of produce was commuted to cash at prices fixed officially for each season. Practical difficulties arose however, in regard to commutation; and in 1579-1580 the revenue was put definitely on a cash basis, the charge on each unit of area sown being a fixed number of dām (reckoned at 40 to the rupee) instead of a fixed weight of produce. Schedules of cash-rates adapted to the varying productivity of different regions were now drawn up, which remained in operation during the rest of Akbar's reign. At some uncertain period, probably under Dālamānī, these schedules were discarded, and a return was made to Group-Assessment, which was the standard system in the middle of the xvith century, and survived into the British period; Sharing was now practised only in backward tracts, or in some cases where the headmen refused to pay what the assessor thought a reasonable revenue, in which case he proceeded to detailed assessment on individuals, by Sharing or by Measurement according to circumstances.

Such was the history of assessment in the heart of the empire, but the outlying provinces were not brought into rigid uniformity, local conditions determining the system applied in each; while in the Dakhān provinces a distinct and elaborate system was introduced in the middle of the xvith century in order to promote recovery from the effects of wanting farming.

It would be futile to criticise these varying institutions, for the value of all alike depended on the spirit in which they were worked. In administrative circles there was throughout the Muslim period a definite ideal of agricultural prosperity as the foundation of the State, its elements being extension of cultivation, improvement in the class of crops, and development of irrigation. Against this ideal operated the urgent need for the largest immediate revenue that could be wrung from the peasants. The course of the struggle cannot be traced in detail but the central fact is that by the middle of the xvith century agriculture had ceased to be an attractive career, and the peasants were deserting the land for other occupations; the resulting decline in agricultural production was the chief economic factor in the eventual collapse of the empire.

The remaining branches of the administration require little description. Customs duties were formally low, but their incidence was increased by arbitrary over-valuation and unauthorised payments required to secure prompt clearance of goods. In the towns, civil justice was administered mainly by the khādir; in the country, disputes were apparently decided summarily by the executive officials. Punishments for crime were summary and drastic, and were not always in accordance with Islamic law. By Indian tradition, local officials raised a large revenue for local purposes by a multitude of taxes and exactations of a most oppressive nature; these were prohibited en masse by Akbar, and again by Aurangzēb, but the system survived. Its worst feature was the levy of transit dues on internal trade, which were a cause of constant complaint by Indians as well as foreigners.

Special attention was given to the coinage, as being a recognised appanage of sovereignty. Gold, silver and copper were coined, all the coins circulating at their metallic value, so that the exchange rate between different denominations fluctuated; but gold was not in general circulation. The chief coin of the empire was the silver rupee, containing nearly 180 grains of almost pure silver; the principal copper coin was the dīm, of nearly 324 grains; and there were various smaller coins of both metals.

The unit of weight used in wholesale commerce
was the maund or man, which varied in different parts of the country. In the south of India it ranged round about 25 lb; in Gujrat it was 33 lb, but in 1635 this was raised to 37 lb; in North India, it was 52 lb at Akbar's accession, was raised by Hum to 55 lb, by Dhâhângir to 60 lb, and by Shâh-Jhâhan to 74 lb. In Bengal, it was 64 lb in 1669 the weight of the maund; and these figures are given to the nearest lb. The unit for retail trade varied from place to place, but was ordinarily smaller than those which have been named. Measures of capacity were not used in wholesale commerce. The measure of length in the North was the gaj or yard, which was standardised by Akbar at about 33 inches, and by his successor at about 40 inches, but the smaller unit survived; in the South the hâsta, or cubit, of about 18 inches was used: in Gudjârat the unit was about 24 inches; and in Bengal about 27 inches.


(W. H. Moreland)

**II. The Decline of the Mughal Empire.**

The decline of Mughal authority, already manifest during the reign of Awaŋzâb, rapidly developed under his immediate successors. Bahâdur Shâh [q. v.] (1707—1712) was too amiable, Qâbhândîr Shâh [q. v.] (1712—1713) was too vicious, Farrukh- siyâr [q. v.] (1713—1720) was too feeble, to revive the empire. In seven bloody battles of succession, fought within six years of Awaŋzâb's death, the imperial family attested its inherent lawlessness and declining power. Then it became the sport of rival factions. For a while the two famous Saiyid brothers, 'Abd Allâh and 'Hasân 'Uli of Bâhâra, became the joint mayors of the palace. But they were unable to consolidate the support of the Mughal nobles. In 1720 Aṣ̣ṣaf Shâh Nîzân al-Mulk rose in arms. 'Hasân 'Ali marched against him, but was murdered with the connivance of Muhammad Shâh, the emperor whom he and his brother had set up in 1719. Shortly afterwards, his brother 'Abd Allâh was defeated, and, after lying in prison at Dilli for two years, was poisoned. When they fell, Nirâm al-Mulk strove hard to restore something like the old order of administration. But he was unwilling to force himself upon Muhammad Shâh as the Saiyids had forced themselves upon Farrukh- siyâr. When the emperor whom he had delivered refused his advice, and the favourites of the court made fun of his antiquated dress and ceremonious manners, he preferred to retire and rule the Dakhân in virtual independence. Ironically enough, Mu-
Hamid Shah believed that Niẓām-al-Mulk had been plotting his overthrow. With Niẓām-al-Mulk’s departure from Dihlī the last chances of a revival of the empire vanished. Never did a falling state betray greater incapacity for reform. No phoenix could arise from those shaven-headed ashes. Even while Niẓām-al-Mulk still retained the nominal control of affairs, extraordinary incidents could occur. At Dihlī itself, for example, a Hindu clerk in one of the imperial offices turned Muslim, and, when his wife and daughter refused to follow his change of faith, he laid a complaint against them, alleging that, as his daughter had not attained puberty, she was therefore of her father’s religion. The case offered certain technical difficulties, was at least referred to the qādhī of Dihlī. His treatment of the case displeased the Dihlī mob. Riots arose, the recital of the kḥyāta at the Dihānī-nāmā Masjdī was interrupted, two or three Hindus were seized and circumcised. To pacify the rioters, the girl was imprisoned, and, a few days later, buried with Muslim ceremonial. “To cut a long story,” says Kāmrān Khān who relates the incident, “she was killed; otherwise there would have been many headaches and much vexation”.

Niẓām-al-Mulk’s successors were worthy of the frivolous emperor whom they professed to serve. For twelve years the imperial councils were directed by a man called Shāh ʿAbd al-Qādir. By origin a cotton-weaver of Tatha, he had lived both as ʿṣārī and faṭīr. Claiming magical powers and popularly believed to consort with jinns and devils, he was summoned to interpret the dreams of the emperor’s mother. This led him into the imperial service, and he contrived to accumulate in his own hand a great number of offices, producing a revenue of 5,000 rupees a day, apart from the bribes which he received, paid to amount to as much more. This man was pithily described as never having spent money on a good work, never having conferred a favour, and never having done a kindness. He was a miser, and at his downfall (for even at Dihlī under Muhammad Shāh such qualities at last produced their natural reaction) more than a crore of rupees was found in his private hoards. But the unpopularity which his character and habits naturally bore was enlisted without the detriment with which his son and daughter were regarded. No one in Dihlī was safe who displeased them or denied them anything that they desired.

Amid such confusion and under such rulers the empire rapidly lost its cohesion. The Marāḏāsīs (q. v.), whom even Awrangzēb sought in vain to subdue, soon became the most formidable power in India. On Awrangzēb’s death, his successor, Bahādur Shāh, had released the Marāḏā prince, Shāhī Rāḍā, in the desperate hope of re-establishing him through his form, if not the substance of imperial control. Shāhī Rāḍā met with influential and talented support. In 1708 he took possession of Satara and by the year next was generally recognised as ruler. A Chitpavan Brahman, Bāḷḍī Wishnawāṇī, became his faḵawī or first minister, and began to develop the characteristic Marāḏā policy, which was to play a part in the culmination of the empire. This was to put forward claims to a share (under the title of ʾrāṭ or a quarter part) in the imperial revenues in as many provinces as possible. In 1709 the Mughal governor in the Dakhān admitted this claim, and, although later governors contested it, it was again recognised by the Bāṛha Saḥīyids in 1719. In the next year Bāḷḍī Wishnawāṇī was succeeded by his son, Bāḍī Rāo I, and the process was extended farther afield. Particular provinces were assigned to particular officers, who were to realise the ʾrāṭ either by collecting the amount from the provincial governor, or by plundering the country. Bāḍī Rāo employed Pāḷḍī Gāekwār as his chief leader in raids in Gudjarat; Raghunāṭī Bhōṇḍāl established himself at Nāgpūr; these and other leaders spread the terror of Marāḏā devastations in all directions, and it was no longer possible for the provincial governors to make political arrangements outside the capital. At the same time, seeing that their tenure of office was coming to depend more and more upon their own power and resources, the governors tended to become virtually independent rulers. Aṣaf Dāḫī Niẓām-al-Mulk in the Dakhān continued to profess himself a humble servant of the emperor, but he repelled by force of arms the persons who came with imperial farmanās ordering his supersession, and when he died in 1748 he was succeeded by his son. In Bengal too the succession had become a matter of heredity or war. But the respect which the name of the empire still enjoyed and the degradation into which the empire itself had fallen were exemplified by the large gifts sent by a new ruler for farmanās of investiture and the unhesitating compliance with which they were issued.

The troubles bred by this internal dissolution were enhanced by those of foreign invasion. In 1722 the Ṣafāwīs were overthrown in Persia, and, after a short period of great confusion, the Turkmān Nādir Kullīn established himself as ruler under the title of Nādir Shāh (q. v.). With him difficulties arose over the Kandāhār frontier. He was engaged in reducing the Ghilzais there to submission. Thrice he sent envoys to the court of Dihlī requesting that his enemies should not receive shelter in the Mughal territory. But by this time the Kābul province was falling into a like disorder with the rest. The governor spent his time in prayer and hunting. The money which had been regularly sent from Dihlī to bribe the hill-tribes into quietude and pay the troops ceased to be sent, partly because of the growing imperial penury, partly because it was believed that it never reached the governor but was embezzled by his patron at court. Large bodies of Ghilzais therefore were able without the least difficulty to take shelter from Nādir Shāh’s troops in the Mughal province, while the Mughal court foolishly supposed it was evading its difficulties by neglecting to answer Nādir Shāh’s repeated demands. The ineptitude of the court, therefore, rather than (as used to be supposed) any elaborate intrigue of party against party, made Nādir Shāh resolve to invade India. No effective opposition could be offered in either the Kābul province or the Pāṇḍījāh. In 1738 Kābul was occupied. In the next year Nādir Shāh’s army appeared before Dihlī. The emperor went out, not to strike a blow in his own defence, but to make his humble submission. Conqueror and captive then entered the city. The Dihlī mob, grievously mistaking its strength, attempted to massacre the foreigners. As a punishment Nādir Shāh deliberately let loose his troops for five long hours—from 9 o’clock in the morning till 2 in the afternoon—during which some 20,000 of the inhabitants are believed to
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to have perished; and beyond this toll of life a
great ransom was exacted, including 50 stores' worth of those wonderful jewels which earlier Mughal sovereigns had heaped up for their delight. From this time onwards the annals of the Mughal empire contain nothing but dishonour. Nādir Shāh fell; but Akhmed Shāh Durrānī established on the borders of India another empire and repeatedly invaded India between 1748, the year of the ignominious Muhammad Shāh's death, and 1761, the year in which he inflicted the severest defeat in all their history upon the Marāthās at Pānpāt. Until the decay of the Durrānī empire in the early years of the nineteenth century, the provinces of Oudh, the Pūndārīk, and Kashmir, were dependencies of the Afghan kingdom.

Europeans in India—Dutch, French, and English—had observed these events with great concern. Early in the eighteenth century the Dutch had sent a great embassy to Bahādur Shāh, and a little later the English had sent one to Fārūj-şīyar. Both had secured far-reaching fārmāns by profuse expenditure; both had found that their fārmāns were waste paper wherever they ran counter to the interests of local governors. But it was the Frenchman Dupleix who first sought to put into practice the conclusions to be drawn from this situation. Others were convinced that European force could easily establish itself in India; but he began experiments, and, in the hope of keeping the English motionless while he acted, he professed to be acting on behalf and in the name of the Mughal emperor. This fiction became the traditional basis of French policy, and down to the end of the century Frenchmen were elaborating plans (which their failure to control the sea brought to nothing) for establishing themselves in India and expelling their rivals under cover of imperial grants. With equal consistency, the English adopted a political realism which squared far better with the circumstances of the time. They fought and overcame Dupleix in the name of their national interests. When they acquired Bengal, they carefully avoided all obligation to reestablish the imperial authority; and it appears that their acceptance of the disnān of Bengal was dictated, not by any desire to mask the reality of their power (which no one in India doubted), but by the desire to take on behalf of the East India Company something which could not be taken over by the English crown as a territorial sovereignty certainly would have been. Thus it was that Prince 'Ali Gāwār, who proclaimed himself as Shāh 'Alam II, so as to be able to recover his disnān of the province of 'Ālamgīr's murder by his wazir, Ghāzī al-Dīn, first came under the protection of the English. He had for some years been attacking the province of Bihār with the aid of the Nāwāb Wazīr of Oudh. But after the battle of Bākār in 1764 he had given up the struggle, joined the English camp, and in the following year Clive's demand bestowed on the East India Company the disnān of the provinces it held in return for an annual allowance of 26 lakhs of rupees. At the same time the districts of Kora and Allahābād were assigned to him and he proceeded to reside in the latter city. Soon however, he wearied of his position of dependence, and departed to join the Marāthās, who, having recovered from their defeat at Pānpāt, were once more invading northern India. On this, Warren Hastings decided to hand Kora and Allahābād over to the Nāwāb Wazīr and refused to continue the payment of the 26 lakhs. From this time until the close of the century he remained under the control of the Marāthās, except at such times as their internal dissensions led to the recall of their forces from the north. One of their chief leaders at this time, Mahādāyī Sīndhī, gradually built up a strong principality for himself, conquering the provinces of Agra and Dīlī, and becoming the emperor's real custodian. So matters remained till Sīndhī's defeat by the English in 1803 transferred the guardianship of Shāh 'Ālam into the hands of the latter. They carefully refrained from entering into engagements with him, but when they assigned revenues from the imperial family, they permitted all orders issued in the city of Dīlī to run in the emperor's name, though the actual administration was conducted by an English agent, and they attempted no interference within the precincts of the palace. Gradually the traditional observances broke down. The Mughal emperor and the British governor-general met with the ceremonial of equals. The emperor's name was removed from the coinage, and it had been resolved no longer to recognise the imperial title after the death of his holder, Bahādur Shāh II, when the Indian Mutiny, in which several of the imperial princes took an active part although they seem to have had little share in bringing it about, led to the formal trial and deposition of the emperor and the disappearance of the shadow court which for a century had lingered on under the toleration of the real powers of India.


III. MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE IN INDIA.

The Mughal dynasty brought to India strong Central Asian predilections and a keen feeling for natural beauty. But each in succession obeyed his own instincts, education and caprices. Hence they patronised no "schools" of art, but came to employ an almost cosmopolitan body of artists, Persian, Indian, Turk and even European, who one and all had to adapt their own canons to the aesthetic moods of their employers. In general the Mughals forbade any sculpture of the human form, but like the Orthodox Greek Church, were usually less rigid towards paintings of it and even fostered portraiture till it reached a high level. Yet, with relatively few exceptions, the Mughal buildings were all religious, comprising mosques and tombs or shrines. Hence their scope was limited, though within their limits they express the religious feelings and policies of the dynasty. Even the conqueror Bābur found leisure in his brief reign of five years, 1526—1531, to build at Pānpāt the Kābul Shāh mosque, whose name commemorates at once his love of Kabul and his victory at Pānpāt in 1526. His mosque at Sāmsār in Rohilkhand is marked by an ovoid dome. When he required constructive work Bābur summoned persons from the main Albanian, from Constantinople, and avoided Indian, Hindu or indigenous standards, though he must have employed Indian workmen in spite of his dis-
parangement of Indian skill and knowledge in design or architecture.

Humayun's longer but still more chequered reign produced many buildings, of which few remain. His mosque at Fatehabad near Dihl is massive and well-proportioned, recalling the Tughlak or Turkish period, with domes rather than hemispherical. It is decorated with enamelled tiles in the Persian manner, apparently the earliest example of that style now extant. His tomb at Dihl, doubtless begun, as is customary among pious Easterns, during his lifetime, is of red sandstone and also Persian in style, but in it coloured tiles are replaced by white marble, of which the dome is wholly composed, the rest of the masonry being also inlaid with that material. The main dome has a narrow neck, the first of its type to appear in India, the four corner cupolas, also a new feature, support domes of an earlier style.

Akbar (1556–1605) was versatile in his architectures as he was in his religion. In the Fort at Agra he built the palace—a few of the secular buildings of the Mughal period which survive—called the Dajangiri Mahall. His other buildings at Agra were demolished by Shah-Djahân. This palace, built of red sandstone which has weathered badly, bears the impress of Akbar's vigour and originality. Throughout arches are used sparingly, the horizontal style of construction being the rule. Its forms also are as Hindu as its construction, but the ornamentation, carved on all flat surfaces, is of a type used by Akbar but not found in other buildings. During the early part of his reign was erected at Gwalior the tomb of Muhammad Ghuwâl, who died in 1558. Closest resembling that of Sher Shah at Sahsâram, it marks a considerable advance in tomb-building during the brief period that had elapsed between the erection of the two, an advance ascertained by Ferguson to the invigorating touch of Akbar's genius, but doubtless due in great measure to the skill of the Gwalior school of architects and masons who were probably Hindus.

The tomb is a square, 100 ft. each way, exclusive of the hexagonal towers, and its chamber forms a hall, 43 ft. square, with the angles cut off by pointed arches so as to form an octagon on which the dome rests. Around this square building is a wide gallery, enclosed on all sides by a screen of exquisite tracery in pierced stonework with a projecting porch on each face.

At Fatehpur-Sikri, the new capital founded by Akbar where the court resided from 1560 to 1584, the emperor's eclectic phase found its fullest expression. Its architecture is admirably illustrated in W. F. Smith's works 1), but all its significance has not yet been explained. The site was chosen because Akbar's patron saint, the Sufi Salim Chisti, lived in a cave on its summit 2). Akbar's own residence was the "House of Dreams", the Khwâb-gâh, an unpretentious structure standing on the roof of the Mahâll-i Kâhsâ, which contains paintings attributed by Smith to Chinese artists and apparently depicting Buddha as Yamântaka 1). However this may be, the design of his throne in the Divân-i Kâhsâ massive pillar symbolizes that he sat there as a Çakravartin or ruler of the four quarters, as Havell suggests, though it is conceivable that it signified his claim to the supreme headship of his new religion, the Din-Ilahi. But it is rash to dogmatize on the symbolism of a builder who seems to have had no settled design for the plan of his new city. The Mahâll-i Kâhsâ regarded by Ferguson as the original block of building at Fatehpur-Sikri, has two spacious courtyards and is larger than the Red Palace at Agra, but its surrounding structures are inferior in richness of design and ornamentation. From time to time Akbar added courts and pavilions as if to compensate for this inferiority. While the Divân-i Kâhsâ is square, as befits a Hall of Audience, the Darfar-Khâna or Record Office is peristyle like the one erected by Akbar at Allâhabâd. The Panâ' Mahâll, a five-storied open pavilion with richly carved pillars, and long colonnades and walls connecting these buildings one with another, complete this group of structures. The most characteristic and beautiful of his designs here are the three small buildings, the Mahâll or apartment of Bibâl's daughter, the house of Mariam Zamâni, mother of Dajangîr, and the palace of the Râmt Sulâmâ, Ruḵâyra Begam, a cousin of Akbar and his first consort. Akbar's greatness however demanded more grandiose monuments. The Dâmî Masjdâl or cathedral mosque, erected in 1571 (the year in which he proclaimed himself the neginbâd of his age and openly claimed the spiritual headship of Islam) commemorated his victories in the Dakhan (Southern India). It ranks amongst the finest ecclesiastical buildings of India. According to its inscription, it was designed by Shaikh Salim Chisti himself and modelled on the Ka'bâ. Though highly ornate it betrays few or no traces of Indian influence 2). The tomb of the Shaikh, in its courtyard, is built wholly of white marble, with windows of pierced tracery of the most exquisite geometrical patterns, and a deep cornice of marble supported by brackets of a design so elaborate as to be almost fantastic. The other tomb in the courtyard, that of Salim's grandson, Shaikh Islam Khan, is of sober and excellent design but eclipsed by its surroundings. The Buland Darwrâzâ or "lofty gateway", built in 1602, commemorates Akbar's conquest of Khândesh and dwarfs even the Dâmî Masjdâl. It is the grandest gateway in India and one of the loftiest in the world, its height being enhanced by its position on the brow of the hill on which Fatehpur-Sikri stands. Its architect placed its portals at the back of a semi-dome, which thus became its porch or portico, and its dimensions impress themselves as those of the actual portal. It must be added that Akbar intended his new capital to be a school of all the arts and that he allied architecture to painting.

From the fragments of interior mural paintings which survive, it is clear that he employed Persian and Indian artists, who worked independently, and some idea of their technique is doubtless to be gathered from the miniatures of this period, as mural artists were also required to illustrate manuscripts.

1) J. Indian Art, No. 47 (vol. vi., p. 66), 1894.
2) For its wall-paintings see J. Indian Art, No. 66 (vol. viii., p. 55), 1899.
At Allhâhâbâd, the city where Akbar was compelled by administrative duties to reside more than at his new but isolated capital, he built the pavilion of the Ĉâls Sûtan or “Forty Pillars”, of which only the hall survives. Its plan is square, supported by eight rows of columns, eight in each row, making sixty-four in all; and it is surrounded by a deep verandah of double columns, with groups of four at the angles, all surmounted by bracket capitals of the richest design.

But perhaps the most characteristic of Akbar’s buildings, observes Fergusson, is his tomb at Sikandra, begun in his lifetime but completed by his successor. Unfortunately Djiâhângîr, in his Tâzkbî (transl. 1584), asserts that he demolished Akbar’s work and reconstructed the tomb. But, seeing that the plan of the building is unique in India and has no Persian or Saracen parallel, it is more likely that only its exterior is the work of the fastidious orthodox Djiâhângîr. Its original plan was modelled on the Panâ Mahâl, being composed of five square terraces diminishing in size as they ascend. Thus the outline of the structure is pyramidal, not domical. Standing in an extensive garden it is approached by a single gateway and stands on a raised platform. Excluding the angle towers the lowest storey measures 320 ft. each way, and on this terrace stand three more, similar in design but more ornate, each about half the height of the lowest storey or terrace. Within and above the highest storey is a white marble enclosure, 157 ft. square, contrasting with the red sandstone of which the rest of the structure is built. The outer wall of this enclosure is entirely composed of beautiful trellis-work; and inside it is a colonnade or cloister, also of white marble, in the centre of which is placed the tomb of Akbar, resting on a platform of exquisite arabo-Perisan tracery. This doubtless typifies Akbar’s celestial resting-place, for below it lie his remains under a far plainer tombstone in the basement. That Djiâhângîr here departed from the original plan is certain. According to W. Finch, the tomb was to be have been covered with a canopy of “curious white and speckled gold richly inwrought”. What Akbar planned and what he meant to express by his design must remain a matter of conjecture. Fergusson postulates a Buddhist model, and even sees in the pavilions which adorn the upper storeys reminiscences of the cells which stand on the edge of the great rock-cut rath at Mâmalappuram; but these may have been intended for use as a theological college like the rooms and pavilions in the upper storey of Humâyûn’s tomb. He also thought that a domical chamber over the tombstone formed part of the original design, since no such royal tomb remains exposed to the air in any Indian mausoleum — a dangerous generalization. Havell sees in the building an Indian five-storeyed Assembly-Hall, apparently a meeting-house for the royal order, the Din Iliâhî, the four lower pavilions (or terraces) corresponding to the four grades of the order. Even Cambodian influences have been conjectured 1). Yet it is not impossible that a Zoroastrian model was kept in view, as Akbar borrowed from that faith among others.

As compared with Akbar Djiâhângîr contributed little to the architectural magnificence of Mughal India. At Lahore, which he made his capital, he added the Bârâ Khwâb-gâh or greater sleeping apartment to the Fort; and the tomb of Añâr-kâlî was also erected in that city. Near Srinagar in Kashmir he made the Shâhîmâr gardens with their summer-houses; and the fine gateway to the Sarî at Nûr-malâh near Djiân-dhâr is also ascribed to his reign. The quadrangle at Lahore was doubtless executed by Hindu artisans, as the conjoined, which surrounds three sides of its area, is supported by pillars of red sandstone with bracket capitals and carved figures of elephants, peacocks and conventional animals like those found in the Red Palace at Agra. Djiâhângîr’s greatest buildings were however erected at Dâkka, in Eastern Bengal, where he made a new provincial capital in succession of Gâvar; but his structures there were principally built of brick, covered with stucco, only the pillars and brackets being of stone, and they have been almost destroyed by the jungle. In one respect only did Djiâhângîr innovate. In 1600 he built the Mott Makâdîl or “Pearl Mosque” at Lahore, the first of its kind in India. Between Akbar’s style and that of Djiâhângîr little difference exists. The former had used colour ornamentation at Fathpur-Sikri; its later buildings were richly decorated with wall-paintings, and marble mosaic was used in the Dânîr Makâdîl. Djiâhângîr relied still more on masonic decoration, e.g. in Akbar’s tomb at Sikandra, but soon after its completion we find variegated marble mosaic supplemented by ðiţra durâ a. as in I’tîmâd al-Dawlâ’s tomb, and in the Tâdî we still find inlay almost exclusively used. Akbar had continued the use of enamelled tiles at Fathpur-Sikri for roofing and more sparingly for ornamentation; and they were employed by Djiâhângîr at Sikandra and by Wâzîr Khân, his vezîr, on his mosque at Lahore. Indeed this mosque is only noteworthy on account of this decoration. Akbar had also introduced painting on interior walls. Djiâhângîr’s wife Nûr Makâl or Nûr Djiân erected at Agra the tomb of her father, I’tîmâd al-Dawlâ, completed in 1628. Built almost entirely of white marble, enriched with semi-precious ðiţra durâ patterns, it foreshadowed the finest work of Shâh-Djiânâ’s reign. Djiâhângîr’s tomb, at Shâh-darâ near Lahore, has little architectural merit, consisting of a vast platform 209 ft. square, with a minaret at each corner. The façades are decorated with white marble let into the red sandstone and the flat roof with geometrical mosaics. The emperor’s remains are probably buried beneath an opening in the roof so that the rain and dew of heaven might fall on his tomb, as his earliest chronicler says 2). In brief the actual grave was hypaethral 3),

1) This view is contested in Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1903—1904, p. 19, but it was certainly the usual custom for a Mughal emperor, like any other good Musulman of his time, to build his tomb during his lifetime. The problem is fully discussed in The Tomb of Akbar, by E. W. Smith and W. H. Nicholls, published by the Arch. Survey of India, Allahâbâd 1908.

2) Muhammad Salîh Kâmbî, in his Shâh-Djiânâ-Name (also called the Amâl-i Sâîîk in Elliot and Dowson’s Hist. of India, vii., p. 123) cited in Arch. Survey of India, Annual Rep., 1906—1907, p. 13.

3) A contrary view, that the tomb had a closed
al-MUGHIRA

now afford certain 20, 4 sqql). extract in Medina. said is e brotherhood those Mecca. Muhammad's possible (Fr. derived title which the suppose make dies "they Allah, the Sura a.shu'ba Mecca. fighting left sufferings which the 13, their 4, Ansar made for that reason the Ansar, the emigrants, a name often applied in the Kur'an to those followers of Muhammad who had migrated from Mecca to Medina with him. The word is derived from hijra, which does not mean "flight" but breach, dissolution of an association based on origin, in the place of which a new connection is formed. The term mukhađîr is not applied to the Prophet himself but only to those who migrated with him and later made up a considerable portion of the population of Medina. The followers of the Prophet who were natives of Mecca were given the name Anṣâr [q. v.] to distinguish them from the Muhâjdîrûn, because the immigrants were mainly dependent on their help and active support after they had given up their homes and livelihoods in Mecca. It now became one of Muhammad's main objects to arouse sympathy for them, because in the early days after their migration they were for the most part in very needy circumstances. With the greatest eloquence he describes them as the particular favourites of Allah who will receive a splendid reward for their sacrifices "when those who have adopted the faith, who have migrated and fought for Allah's cause may hope for his grace" (Sûra ii. 215); "the sins of the emigrants and of those driven from home are forgiven" (iii. 191). Those who remained in Mecca and feared to migrate although the earth was large enough to afford them shelter are severely censured. He who emigrates finds a home on the earth and if he lilies Allah will reward him (lit. 107). It was however at first only an indication of a future which had not yet materialised, and in addition to these rosy utterances (cf. xvi. 43; vii. 75; xxii. 57) the Prophet made more practical efforts to help those who were living in difficult circumstances. A portion of the plunder taken in fighting was given to the poor emigrants who had been driven from their possessions in order to aid Allah: "they are the trustworthy" (lix. 8). In order to make the bond between them and the Medine to as tight as possible it is announced in Sûra vii. 73 that the emigrants who had left their homes to fight for the true religion and those who gave them shelter (cf. Ibn Hishâm, p. 321 sqq.) and assistance (the Anṣâr) should enjoy rights of kinship with one another while on the other hand, those, who while adopting Islam had not migrated, should not have any rights of kinship. According to the usual interpretation, this passage refers to the peculiar bond of brotherhood which Muhammad instituted between each emigrant and a Medinese believer, an explanation which is however not quite certain as the passage perhaps only expresses a general principle (cf. Fr. Buhl, Lehren Muhammed, p. 209). Besides, the usual exegesis sees in the regulations for inheritance (Sûra iv. 13, 15) a proof that this special bond was very early abolished again.

The high esteem in which the emigrants were held finds expression in Sûra ix. 20, where we read "those who believed and migrated and expended blood and treasure in fighting for the cause of Allah, occupy a higher position (than other believers); they are a fortunate ones". Muhâjdîr in this way became a title of honour (cf. Sûra xxix. 25 where Lot is so called). Individuals who had migrated not to Medina but to Abyssinia also proudly called themselves mukhađîr (see Fr. Buhl, op. cit., p. 172). But the real "migration" was that to Medina in which the Prophet himself took part. The number of the Muhâjdîrûn gradually grew as the increasing power of Muhammad from time to time induced Meccans to leave their heathen city and go to Medina. It is to them that Sûra viii. 76 refers, where those who adopted Islam later than the first emigrants who migrated and afterwards fought alongside of the older Muhâjdîrûn are acknowledged as belonging to the community ("they are of you"). After the treaty of Hûdâibîya [3. v.] in particular, we hear of Meccan women who left their pagan husbands and went to Medina where in accordance with Muhammad's interpretation of the treaty they were not surrendered if they were otherwise the stock of Meccan women (see Sûra ix. 11 sqq.). Thus the Muhâjdîrûn, later and earlier, formed an increasing element in the population of Medina, whom Muhammad often mentions along with other sections of the community as possessing equal rights with them (e.g. Sûra xxxiii. 6, 49) in which connection it should be noted that Muhâjdîrûn is never, as was the case among the Anṣâr, used in genealogies.

That these emigrants were specially dear to Muhammad is easily intelligible, for they had shared his sufferings in Mecca and made the greatest sacrifices for him and included in their number men who had adopted his teaching out of pure conviction. With the occupation of Mecca, the migration ceased while the Muhâjdîrûn remained as a separate highly honoured body. It is natural to suppose that a certain amount of rivalry might easily arise between them and the other elements of the community, and that there was actually a certain amount of friction between the emigrants and the Medine is evident from the fact that in the troubles after the Prophet's death the Medine endeavoured to set up one of their number, Sa'd b. U'ba'da, as successor to the Prophet. The attempt failed through the energetic action of 'Umar, Abû Bakr and Abû U'ba'da, and the leadership of the community remained in the hands of the Muhâjdîrûn until the descendants of Muhammad's old opponents in Mecca seized power for themselves.

Bibliography: The biography of Muhammad, especially Ibn Hishâm, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 541 sqq. (FR. BUHL)

MUIHÂL [see MÂâTIRK]

AL-MUHALLAB b. ÂSHI:"SUFA, ABU Sa'îd AL-ÂZDI, an ARAb geNerAl. Al-Muhalab is said to have been born two years before the death of Muhammad. In the reign of Mu'awiya he undertook a campaign against India and occupied the country between Kâhil and Mulfân (44 = 664-665). He next distinguished himself in the expeditions of the governors of Khurâsân against Samarkand. Then however, he left the Umâyядs and joined the anti-Caliph 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair who gave him the governorship of Khurâsân. When he was just about to start for there, he was appointed commander-in-chief in the war against the Azrâkis.
following the precedent set by Bābur. The sarcophagus is of white marble, inlaid with *pιστρα δουρα*, and it stands in an octagonal chamber 21 ft. high and 20½ ft. in diameter. This chamber is enclosed in nearly solid walls of masonry. 56 ft. thick on all sides, and access to it is afforded by two oblong apartments, one on each side, but it does not open into any of the forty other rooms behind the arches which surround the structure, each façade having a central arch with five smaller arches on each side.

Under Shāh-Djāhān (1627—1658) Mughal architecture attained its zenith. One of his earliest buildings was the incomparable Tādž Mahāll [q. v.], begun the year after the death of the empress, Anuḍjān, and finished by Mumtāz Mahāll, or the “Chosen One of the Palace”. For himself Shāh Džahān planned a corresponding tomb of equal magnificence on the opposite bank of the river Džamnā, but avarice did not carry out the scheme, probably because it savoured of paganism. Considerable controversy has raged over the question of its architect. Shāh-Djāhān’s style was essentially Persian, with an indefinable difference of expression, and it was sharply distinguished from those of Iṣpahan and Constantinople. With the constant use of white marble, sumptuously decorated with *pιστρα δουρα*. Coloured tiles had by now become rare. Spacious grandeur was combined with feminine elegance, to which inimitable open-work tracery contributed. In the mosques colour was eschewed, and the finest art is found in the Pearl Mosques at Asgra and Dihlī. The former was built in 1646—1653. Meanwhile Shāh-Djāhān had founded Shāh-Djāhān’s, the great palace near modern Dihlī, recently restored to something like its pristine beauty. A Persian engineer, All Mandal Khān, had tapped the Džamnā 6 miles above Dihlī, and his canal fed the new capital with many streams. The most favoured of them was the Nahr-i Bihisht of “Stream of Paradise”, which was so named by Shāh-Djāhān himself. It fell in a cascade down a marble chute in a pavilion—the Shāh Burj—a kind of terraced garden which bordered the Hayāt-i-Bahāsh (“life-giving”) garden, it traversed the chain of stately edifices that lined the eastern wall of the Palace—the Ḥammām, Divwān-i Khāss and Khwāh-gāh—silently gliding beneath the Mian-i Inṣāf (“Balance of Justice”) across a sun-bathed court into the cool of the Intiyyāz Mahāll or “Palace of Distinction”, styled later the Rang Mahāll Kālān or “Greater Colour Palace”, from its elaborate painted decoration and gliding. Set on a marble terrace which formerly swept from end to end of the court, it overlooks the Džamnā whose course then flowed along the base of the red sandstone walls. On the West an orchard separated it from the Divwān-i-ʿAmm. Thence, still southward, it passed through the Lesser Rang Mahāll, the Mumtāz Mahāll and other buildings of the imperial zanāna. Thus Dihlī combined the Mughal love of open gardens, walled by running channels, with their passion for architectural beauty. It preserved Bābur’s love of nature, and perhaps added to it a sense of landscape which also found expression in the Mughal gardens of Kashmir.

With Awrangzēb (1659—1707) set the period of decline, due to doubt largely to that emperor’s orthodox prejudice against art, but partly also to his conscientious parsimony. He declined to complete Shāh-Djāhān’s tomb, ostensibly on the ground of expense, but also perhaps because he regarded the scheme as savouring of paganism. Yet he constructed at Benares the great mosque with its lofty graceful minarets, built a copy of the Dihlī mosque at Lahore, and at Awrangzēb’s imitation, though on a small scale, of the Tādž in the tomb of his favourite wife. Awrangzēb’s own tomb, at Khuldābād, a hamlet just above the caves of Elīn, is mean and insignificant. But some of his buildings, in spite of their incipient decadence, are the last great examples of the Mughal style. His Džāmī or Bāzāshīhi mosque at Lahore is pleasing in form, though the marble ornamentation of its great central and front façade is very inferior in detail to its prototype at Dihlī. Its three domes of white marble and the imposing gateway of red sandstone and marble leading to it from the Hazāri Bāgh are its finest features.

Near Dihlī the tomb (1756) of Nawwāb Saqīdar Djang, Ważīr of Oudh, is a passable copy of a Hamāyūn’s mausoleum, but its interior is marred by indifferent plaster decoration.

At Lucknow, the capital of the Nawwāb Ważīr of Oudh, the buildings erected by that dynasty and its nobles hardly deserve to be classed as Mughal. The one exception is the vast Imāmābār, built by the fourth Nawwāb, Asāf al-Dawla, in 1784. Conceived on a grand scale for the celebration of the Muharram according to the Shi’ite rite, its details will not bear close examination, though its solidarity is impressive. The buildings of the Muhāmmedān dynasty of Mysore (1760—1777) have still less claim to be regarded as Mughal.

To conclude, the architecture of the Mughals was, like all their arts, a resultant of many forces.
But its essential distinction over Hindu art lay in its balanced use of purely Indian and imported technique: while it recognised the value of symbolism in its structures, it never made its arts merely a vehicle for symbols, as Hindu sculpture tended to do.


A comprehensive and critical bibliography of the Muhammadan Architecture of India by K. A. C. Creswell appeared in *The Indian Antiquary*, vol. XI. (1922).

**MUGHAMAS**. It is usually supposed that the Karuqu, a valley near Mecca on the borders of the sacred area. According to tradition, Abrah a[q.v.] ordered his army to encamp here when he was going to attack Mecca, but was prevented from doing so as birds slew his soldiers by dropping stones on them. In Mughamas is shown the tomb of the Ta'if Abú Righal who died here after acting as guide to Abra hae. He was so hated by the Meccans for this that the custom grew up of casting stones on his grave [cf. *AL-DJAMARA*]. Whether this explanation is true or not is unknown, but in any case a verse of Hassan b. Thabiti (ed. Hirschfeld, *LXII.*) shows that in the time of the Prophet the mention of his name was sufficient to insult the Ta'ifs. The antiquity of the custom of stoning his tomb is shown by a verse of Džarir: "When al-Farazdak dies, stone him as you stone the grave of Abú Righal!"


**AL-MUGHIRA B. SHUBA**, of the sept of the Abâf, a subdivision of the Thâf, further a member of the clan of the Banû Mu'attib — guardsian of the sanctuary of al-Lát — and nephew of 'Urwa b. Mas'mid [q.v.], companion and martyr. For having attacked and plundered some travelling companions during their sleep, he was forced to leave Ta'if, his native town, and came to Medina to offer his services to Muhammad. The latter used him to attract the Thâkif to Islam and after the submission of Ta'if, sent him to this town to superintend the destruction of the national sanctuary and the liquidation of the treasure of al-Lát. As the caliphate of Abd Bakr, although he never succeeded in attaining to one of the great posts which were reserved for the Karâsh, Mughira was able to keep a position in governing circles.

Omar, while under no illusions about his morals, appointed him governor of Basra. A scandalous incident temporarily interrupted his administrative career. He was accused of adultery. The evidence was overwhelming: instead of having him stoned, 'Omar only dismissed him. Mughira holds in tradition the record for marriages and divorces: the figures of 300, 700 and 1,000 are given. In the year 21 (642), recalled to public life, he was appointed to the important governorship of Kufa. His slave Abû Lulu'â, who lived in Medina, assassinated the Caliph 'Omar. Under 'Othmân, Mughira retired to private life. In the reign of 'Ali, he withdrew to Ta'if to watch the course of events. He went without having been invited to the conference of Adhrûṣ [q.v.]. In 40 (660), taking advantage of the general confusion that followed the assassination of 'Ali, he produced an alleged certificate of appointment from Mu'âwiya and took over the control of the annual pilgrimage.

The great Sufyân was able to appreciate at their true value auxiliaries of the stamp of Mughira, one of the chief dikîya of his time, the man "who could get himself out of the most hopeless difficulty": "It (was said) he were shut behind seven doors, his cunning would have found a way to burst all the locks". Of shocking morals, free from any attachment to the 'A'id party, equally free from any claims to the caliphate, free from enmity to his neighbours as well as the narrow-mindedness of the An'sî clans, a member of the intelligent and enterprising tribe of Thâkif, everything attracted Mu'âwiya's attention to him. In the year 41 (661), this Caliph appointed him governor of Kufa, a region disturbed by the intrigues of the Shâ'a and the continual risings of the Khâridj. Mughira succeeded in non-compromising himself with the former: he was content to advise them to avoid any too striking outburst. Now nearly sixty, the able Thâkif felt the unusual ambition of remaining where he was and of finishing his troubled career in peace and honour.

This opportunist, who had come over to the Sufyâns after cool calculation, felt little desire to sacrifice his own peace and leisure for the consolidation of the Omayyad dynasty; he was solely concerned with keeping on the right side of the sanguine Mu'âwiya. The sudden rising of the Khâridj leader Mustawrid failed to disturb his tranquillity. With remarkable cleverness he was able to let loose against these rebels their born enemies, "the fine flower of the Shâ'a". Whichever was victorious, it could not fail to lighten his responsibilities. By setting them against one another he rendered harmless the most dangerous elements of disorder in his province. The crushing of the Khâridj enabled him to breathe freely.

Thanks to this combination of mildness and astuteness, and by knowing when to shut his eyes, Mughira succeeded in avoiding desperate measures against the people of the Irâk, who were a continual source of trouble, and succeeded in retaining his position. He was even regretted by his former subjects after he was gone. Not quite satisfied, Mu'âwiya thought of breaking this lieutenant of his, who was playing a double game. Mughira was always able at the opportune moment to provoke troubles which required the continuation of his services. In this way he prepared the return to favour of Ziyâd b. Abihî [q.v.], destined to be his successor. He is also said to have disarmed the Caliph's suspicions by suggesting the plan of proclaiming Yazid heir-apparent. As the general situation had considerably improved in the Irâk and order prevailed, on the surface at least, the Caliph left him in office till his death, the date of which is uncertain but which must be placed between 48 and 51 (665—671). Mughira died of the plague at the age of about 70.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation (in German)</th>
<th>Abbreviation (in English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abb. G. W. Gött.</td>
<td>Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr. Fr. B.</td>
<td>Bulletin du Comité de l'Afrique française</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr. Fr. HOC</td>
<td>Bulletin du Comité de l'Afr. franz., Ren-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>einsen des Coloniaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Archives marocaines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMZ</td>
<td>Allgemeine Missionsschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anth.</td>
<td>Anthropos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Acta Orientalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQR</td>
<td>Asian Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARW</td>
<td>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Fr. B.</td>
<td>Bulletin du Comité de l'Asie française</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAH</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Araba-Hispanico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGA</td>
<td>Bibliotheca geographorum araborum ed. de Geog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIE</td>
<td>Bulletin de l'Institut Egyptien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIFAO</td>
<td>Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale au Caire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOS</td>
<td>Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTLV</td>
<td>Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned.-Indie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Corpus inscriptionum arabicarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>L'Égypte Contemporaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>Geographical Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>Gibb Memorial Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOR</td>
<td>Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOW</td>
<td>Babinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. I Ph.</td>
<td>Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAI</td>
<td>Giornale della Soc. Asiatica Italiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOP</td>
<td>Gibb, History of ottoman poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>Indische Gids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRM</td>
<td>International Review of Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isl.</td>
<td>Der Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal Asiatique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Authr. i.</td>
<td>Journal of the Anthropological Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASI</td>
<td>Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Soc. of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Jewish Encyclopedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPHS</td>
<td>Journal of the Punjab-Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Geographical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSF. Ot.</td>
<td>Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCA</td>
<td>Körösi Csoma Archivum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>Koloniale Rundschau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Kaleti Sztet (Revue orientale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>Al-Mahriq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDPV</td>
<td>Mitteilungen und Nachr. des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFOB (eryouth)</td>
<td>Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGG</td>
<td>Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Wien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGXM</td>
<td>Mitt. zu Geschichte der Medicin und Natur-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wissenschaften</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGWJ</td>
<td>Monatschrift f. d. Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judentums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI</td>
<td>Mir Islauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Mémoires de l'Institut Égyptien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIPAO</td>
<td>Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Inst. Frang. d'Archéologie Orientale au Caire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitt. DOG</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Orient-Gesell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schaft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitt. VAG</td>
<td>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesellschaft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMAP</td>
<td>Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOGS</td>
<td>Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSFO</td>
<td>Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSL</td>
<td>Mémoires de la Société Linguistique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSOS Afr.</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Sem. für oriental. Spra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chen, Afr. Studien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSOS As.</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Sem. für oriental Spra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chen, Westasien, Studien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTM</td>
<td>Millit telebbl'tier medjimū'asṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>The Modern World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du Roi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Der Neue Orient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Orientalistisches Archiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Orient Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLZ</td>
<td>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Oriente Moderno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFAQ</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Fund. Quarterly Statemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet. Mitt.</td>
<td>Petermill.: Mitteilungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDC</td>
<td>Questions diplomatiques et coloniales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAAD</td>
<td>Revue de l'Académie Arabe de Damas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAfr.</td>
<td>Revue Africaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJ</td>
<td>Revue des Études Juives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Is.</td>
<td>Revue des études islamiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
<td>Revue de l'histoire des Religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Revue Indigène</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMM</td>
<td>Revue de Monde Musulman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Koszalik Orientalistyczny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROC</td>
<td>Revue de l'Orient Chrétien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROJ</td>
<td>Revue de l'Orient latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRAH</td>
<td>Rev. del. R. Academia de la Historia, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRAL</td>
<td>Rendiconti della Real Accademia di Lucca, Classe di sci. mor., stor., e filol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSO</td>
<td>Rivista degli studi orientali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Revue Tunisienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Ak.</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wiss. Heidelberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Ak. Wien</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wiss. in Wien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Bayr. Ak.</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBPMs, Erlg.</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte d. Phys.-medizin. So-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zietat in, Erlangen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Pr. Ak. W.</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBBGK</td>
<td>Tijdschrift van het Batavisch Genoot-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TOEM                   | Tārīkh-i 'Olāmāt (Türk.) Eadjımiyê ve Māˈasṣ, Revue Historique publiée par l’Ins-
| titution, Ottomane     | tum d’Histoire Ottomane |
| TTEM s. TOEM           | Tijdschrift van de Vereniging der Nederlandse Wetenschappers te Amsterdam |
| TTLV                   | Tijdschrift v. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde |
| Verh. Ak. Amst.        | Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam |
| WI                     | Die Welt des Islams |
| Wiss. Veröff. DOG      | Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichun-
| gen. der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft |
| WZKM                   | Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes |
| ZA                     | Zeitschrift für Assyriologie |
| Zär.                   | Zāpski |
| ZATW                   | Zeitschrift f. ältestenwissenschaftlichen Wissenschaften |
| ZDMG                   | Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandisch Gesellschaft |
| ZDPV                   | Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinaverins |
| ZGerd. Berl.           | Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erd-|
| kunde in Berlin        | |
| ZI                     | Zeitschrift für Indologie u. Iranistik |
| ZK                     | Zeitschrift für Kolonialgespräche |
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Al-Muhallab, the vizier of Mu'izz al-Dawla. He belonged to Basra and was born in Muhamrām 291 (= Dec. 953). In 334 (945) when Mu'izz al-Dawla was marching to pollen, he sent him in advance to negotiate with the Caliph and on Ilmād I, 27, 339 (= Nov. 950) al-Muhallab was appointed vizier. He was given the supreme command in the war with Irān b. Shāhīn (= Mu'izz al-Dawla) and had brought him into a very precarious position when he himself fell into an ambush and could only save himself with difficulty, whereupon Mu'izz al-Dawla had to conclude peace with Irān in 341 (952–953) the ruler of Ommān, Yusuf b. Wadīhī undertook a campaign against Basra; al-Muhallab, however, anticipated him, occupied the town and defeated Yusuf. In the same year, he fell into disgrace but was able to retain his office and the good relations between Mu'izz al-Dawla and his vizier were restored. A few years later, Mu'izz al-Dawla equipped an expedition against Ommān and put al-Muhallab in command. The latter set out in Ilmād II, 352 (= June/July 955), but soon fell ill and decided to return to Baghdād. He died on the way on 26th Shabān of the same year (= 19th Sept. 955) and was buried in Baghdād. On his death Mu'izz al-Dawla conferred all his property, a measure which aroused general indignation.

The Encyclopedia of Islam, III.
Muslim historians make him usually 40, sometimes 43 years old at the time of his call, which, taken with the already mentioned data, would put the date of his birth at about 570 A.D. When however tradition puts the date of his birth in the "year of the Elephant" (see Qur'an and Sūra cxxv.), this is a result of an unhistorical combination, for Abrahah's attack on Mecca must have taken place considerably before 570. But Lammer has cast various, not unfounded doubts on the whole chronological calculation itself; in particular the fact that Muhammad's migration to Medina and his resultant activities there do not give the impression that he was then a man already in the fifties. In reality 580 or one of the years immediately following would suit very well as the date of the Prophet's birth, so that the Qur'ānic expression *ummar* would mean about 30 years.

The name "Muhammad" occurred previously among the Arabs (e.g. Ibn Daud, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 6 sq.; Ibn Sa'd, ii. 111 sq.) and therefore need not be regarded as an epithet only adopted later in life by the Prophet. As to Muhammad's descent, several old poems (e.g. Hassān b. Ḥālitī, ed. Hirschfeld, Nos. 23, 77; Abū in Ibn Ḥishām, p. 256, 1; cf. also on Ibn Kathīr, H. i. 21, Al-wāli b. Mūlik in Ibn Ḥisham, p. 500; on Ḥanābī: Ibn Ibrahīm, p. 130; on Abū Lahab: Hassān b. Ḥālitī, No. 217, 3) confirm the statement of tradition that he belonged to the family of Ḥāshim; and that he was recognised by them as one of themselves is evident from the fact that only the protection of a fairly powerful family could have made it possible for him to stay so long in Mecca in face of the hostility of his fellow-citizens (cf. the words put in the mouth of the enemies of Shu'āiba [Sūra xi. 93]: "Had we not had consideration for thy family, we would have stoned thee"). The Ḥāshim family related to the Banū Muttalib (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 536, 4) was apparently one of the better class families of Mecca (cf. Ibn Ḥishām, p. 821 and the words of the poetess, Sima, p. 81, 9, which however might be interpreted merely as a polite formula; cf. Song of Solomon, viii. 2; Dalman, Palästinische Divan, p. 190, 255 sq.; E. Littmann, Neurahritische Volkspoesie, p. 141). On the other hand, the Meccan enemies of the Prophet say in Sūra aab. 30 that they would believe in him more readily if he had been one of the prominent men of the two cities (Mecca and Taif). The Ḥāshim family in any case could not compare with the most prominent families like the Makhzūm and Cmāya: and what is recorded of the needy circumstances of Muhammad and some of his relatives suggests that the Ḥāshim family must have been exceedingly poverty-stricken at this time. On his mother's side he had connections, which are not clear to us, with Medina (cf. Sima and Ḥāshim); according to Māsā b. 'Ukṭa the Medinaite called Al Ḥāsib their "father's son" (cf. Ibn Sa'd, i. 18, Sid. 12). We know nothing more that is definite about his once-try, for most of what is related is legend. His father, who is said to have died before his birth, is quite a colourless figure, whose name 'Abd Allah is perhaps only a later improvement on a heathen name. His grandfather is called Sa'dib or 'Abd al-Muttalib; the connection between these two names is however as obscure as that between 'Abd al-Muttalib and the oft mentioned family of Mutallib (Hassān b. Ḥālitī, No. 184, 4; Ibn Ḥishām, p. 230, 13; 536, 14) or the Banū Shaibā (Ibn Sa'd, i. 94, 6; ii. 124, 92).

The only thing certain from the Qur'ān is that Muhammad grew up as an orphan in very miserable circumstances (Sūra, xcxvii. 6 sq.). The first tangible historical figures among his relatives are his uncles: 'AbdṬalib, with whom tradition records that he found a kindly reception, 'Abdā bn Ḥamza [q. v.] and 'Abd al-Uzza [cf. Abū Lahab]. On theidylic little story of the boy's stay with the latter, see the article AL-'UZZA. The story of the cleansing of his breast (a similar story is related of Umāya b. Abī 'l-Sālih; cf. Goldziher, Abk. i. Arab. Phil., i. 213) is a materialisation of Sūra xcxv. 1.

In Sūra xxiii. already quoted, we are told that Allāh made the poor orphan prosperous. Corresponding to this in tradition is the marriage of Muḥammad with a rich merchant's widow, in whose service he had been [cf. Khadija]. She bore him four daughters, who play a part in later history, and several sons all of whom died in infancy: one of them at least must be historical as his pagan name 'Abd Manāf (Sprenger, i. 199 sq.; Caetani, i. 173) could not be invented by later writers; such a fiction in any case, as posthumous comfort to alleviate the disgrace of the lack of male heirs (Lammens), would be very inadequate, if it had to make the sons die against the will of their father. The interest in business matters apparent in the Qur'ān (Sūra lii. 194; liii. 9 sq.) as well as his fondness for business expressions (cf. however similar expressions in the Wisdom of Solomon, iv. 20; Pirke Abot, iii. 16; iv. 22; Horn, Gesch. d. Pers. Lit., p. 10) are very natural if Muhammad took part in business transactions as Khadija's assistant and husband. On the other hand, it would be wiser to set aside the alleged trading journeys into neighbouring lands, which he is said to have made even as a child with Abū Ṭalib and later in Khadija's service: in the form in which they are given, they have distinctly apologetic tendencies [cf. Bahira] and are quite unnecessary to explain his later religious development. Sūra xxxvii. 137 sq. in any case is the noblest piece of the history passed by Liri's dwellings on a journey. Nor did Khadija equip trading caravans independently. Equally little confidence is to be placed in the story, which is given in the usual mārāch style, of the part played by Muhammad in rebuilding the Ka'ba.

While the questions already raised are really of no great importance, the problems which concern Muhammad's début as a religious reformer are of the utmost importance but offer the greatest difficulties to the student in view of the insufficient material available in the sources. The main question is: whence did Muhammad, who everywhere betrays a great receptivity for foreign matter, get his ideas? That he originally shared the religious conceptions of his milieu is in every way the most natural supposition — his uncle Abū Lahab was an ardent defender of paganism and Abū Ṭalib, who was like a father to him, died without adopting Islam and is confirmed not only by the name of his son already mentioned but also by Sūra xxii. 3. "God said to him, "Write what thou hast and guide thee" (cf. also lxxii. 52: "Thou didst not know what book or belief was") and the statement of Ibn al-Kalbi that he once brought a sheep as a sacrifice to al-'Uzza.

Distinct traces of his early beliefs survived in his later life. He shared the belief of his fellow-countrymen in ḥijāma and ḥawāf, in evil omens etc. Mecca with its sanctuary was a sanctified place in his eyes (Sūra xxvii. 93; xxviii. 57; xix.
07: ev. i sqq.; evii. i sqq.), he admitted the disciples offered them into the true worship (evii. 2) and allowed his followers to take part in the pilgrimage (vii. 29 sq.) so that it was all the easier for him later to accept it as one of the main features of his religion (see below). We shall later discuss a relapse into paganism, which however was speedily brought back by the fact that he was only gradually led to attack on principle the gods of Mecca. He was also influenced by the manes of the old Arab inspired soothsayers (cf. on the modern Khaled: Musli, Die Kultur, 1910. p. 10) to the extent that he adopted their peculiar form of speech with mysterious oaths and rhymed prose (zafid); cf. Gollner, Abhandlungen i. arab. Philol., i. 59 sqq.; Mas'udi, Mafid, iii. 381 sqq.) when he began to announce his revelations. All his earlier conceptions were however driven out except for such trifling residua as these, when a new world of ideas began to fill him to an ever increasing extent, until he was finally compelled with irresistible force to come forth and proclaim them. These new ideas were the conditions in these passing away "of a scripture"— Judaism and Christianity—and he was conscious of this, in as much as he repeatedly emphasises the agreement between his teaching and these older religions of revelation as irrefutable evidence of its truth (cf. the significant passage: "If thou art in doubt about what We have revealed, ask them who read the scripture before thee", Sura x. 94). The only question is, in what way did he become possessed of these new ideas. This much only is certain that he did not get them from his own reading of the holy scriptures of the Jews and Christians. The word ummati (q.v.) applied to him (Sura vii. 156) signifies, without committing us to anything about his ability in reading or writing—as a merchant he must have had a certain knowledge of these arts—that he was an illiterate layman, who was not able to read the Hebrew or Greek Bible, and that this was actually the case, the Kur'an shows on every page. For this explanation of the term Wensinck, Acta orient., ii. 191 and (citing the Hebrew ummat ha-'elüm) Horovitz, Keramische Untersuchungen, p. 52 would put "pagan", Hanân, but, although this might fit some passages, it could hardly suit Sura ii. 73 where there is a reference to a difference between the "possessors of a scripture" and the ummiyyûn, among the Jews. The usual explanation suits well enough, as it is certain and it is confirmed by the Kur'an everywhere that, while Muhammad had some notion of the books of the Bible, the Hebrew and Greek Bibles were closed books to him. Utterances like the saying that Jesus "received" the Gospels (iii. 44; v. 50; livi. 27) and that it should be "observed" like the law (v. 70, 72) clearly show that he did not know its real contents. Sura xvi. 105 contains a quotation from the Psalms, but this is quite an isolated instance and he knew nothing of the Psalms as a part of the Old Testament (vii. 57). The parable of the camel and the eye of a needle (vii. 38) proves of course no literary dependence and the alleged description of Muhammed and his followers in the Gospels (xvi. 29) shows what he could build up on a vague and collection of something he had heard. On the other hand the story of Joseph (Sura xii.), show that he was indirectly dependent on the Bible and not only on the Old but also on the New Testament (cf. what he relates of Mary, Joseph, Zacharia and John); the story of the Seven Sleepers (cf. Asâb Al-Kahf and M. Huber, Die Wanderungen von den Siebenschlafenden, 1910) also presupposes Christian authorities. One therefore cannot blame his enemies when they said that he had foreign teachers (xvi. 105; xxv. 5 sq.; xlv. 13), which is certainly not refuted by the reply in xvi. 105. Further it is clear from the Kur'an that he endeavored to get hold in this indirect way with the books of the Bible in their simple form, but that his authorities had drawn on Midrashic and Apocryphal works, which is easily explained by the varied and luxuriant character of the religious tendencies in Arabia. In particular what he tells of the birth and childhood of Jesus (xxii. 22 sqq.; iii. 41; v. 109 sqq.) comes from Apocryphal sources, and his account of the death of Jesus (v. 156) has parallels among the Manichaean and Buddhists.

To state exactly what religion exercised particular influence on Muhammad's ideas is hardly possible in view of the scanty information available about these new ideas; in particular the original sources which indicate that he was influenced from various sides, primarily by Christian sects, but later also by the Jews. There was ample opportunity to become acquainted with both these religions from caravans passing through to Syria or the lands of the Euphrates, from communication by sea with Abyssinia, and from foreign merchants visiting the great markets: and not only in the more advanced districts of South Arabia, but also among several Bedouin tribes (e.g. Bakr, Taghilib, Hamâa, Ta'yî), Christianity had established itself, while Jewish colonies had settled in Medina and the oases north of it. But a citizen of Mecca in particular had repeated opportunities of coming in contact with Christians and Jews. The great festivals attracted people from all districts and it is expressly recorded that Christians also took part in the pilgrimage (Sinoek Hurgronje, III Meckanische Feest, p. 28, 128, 159); in addition there were Christians captured in war and immigrants (ghassâlûn living in Mecca (Asâkî, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 97; 458; 456; cf. the Christian slave in Tâ'fî: Ibn Ilišâm, p. 250 sqq.). In the Kur'an alongside of expressions coming from the Aramaic, several Ethiopic loanwords are evidence of religious influence from Abyssinia (cf. Noldeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, p. 47). Recently scholars have been found of seeking a main source of Muhammad's ideas and their formulation in the religious development which is alleged to have taken place in South Arabia. This is certainly a possibility to be reckoned with, but so long as we know so little of South Arabian religious history and in particular so long as no intermediate South Arabian forms are found for the Abyssinian loanwords in the Kur'an we are better to set it aside. It should also be noted that Muhammad in his stories of the prophets frequently mentions the Arab tribes of 'Ad and Qimâniyy (q.v.) but only rarely touches on the older history of South Arabia (Sura xxvii. 29 sqq.; xxxvii. 21 sqq.; xlvii. 26; xlviii. 13 on the other hand hardly lxxvii. 1 sqq.; cf. M. Hartmann, Die arabischen Früge, p. 474); in the utterance ascribed to the Prophet (Bukhari, ed. Kcherl, iii. 56): "Belief and wisdom are Yemeni", Yemeni, as the context shows, only means "of Yemeni fashion", i.e. cultivated, human, in contrast to Bedouin uncoarseness. The main objection however, is that the hypothesis would only mean
an unnecessarily circuitous route, for Muhammad always appeals directly to his agreement with Christianity, without suggesting any remodelling of these religions through a South Arabian medium. And the stronger one endeavours to make Yemenite influence in religious matter in M.-cc., the more unhistorical is the supposed opposition of the Meccans to Muhammad. Much greater weight should be given to Tor Andre's treatment of the question of Muhammad's dependence on Christianity. After calling attention to the wide dissemination and dominating position of Ne’torianism in the Persian province, which is of importance as it must have been much more accessible to Muhammad than Monophysitism, he points out the close relationship between Muhammad's ideas and the ecclesiastical writings of the Syrians, the contempt for worldly possessions, the strong condemnation of the arrogance and sinfulness of the unbelievers, the warnings, against laughing, joking and careless speech, the emphasis on the significance of abstaining as an atonement for sin, the descriptions of Paradise (we even find the hours in Ephraim), and the like. Alongside of these very intricate similarities, there is however one point to be remembered in which the relationship is somewhat modified, namely, Muhammad's Christology. It is, in any case, remarkable in several respects; for it is distinguished from his other accounts of prophets and approximates to the teaching of the Church in its orthodox fashion, e.g. in the account of the birth of Jesus and his miraculous gifts and in the undeniable echoes of the doctrine of the Logos (Surah iii. 34; iv. 169). But already in the Meccan period (e.g. Alii. 57 sqq.) Muhammad vigorously rejects the idea of Christ being the son of God and definitely denies that he had ever aspired to anything of the kind for himself. Here it is not sufficient to point to the Ne’torian since they did not deny that Christ was the son of God. When Muhammad from the first insists on the complete agreement of his teaching with the old revealed religions, i.e. with Christianity also, he seems to have been influenced by a form of Christianity where this dogma occupied a very unimportant position.

What one can deduce in this way from the Koran about Muhammad's development is supplemented in an important way by tradition, according to which he was not alone in his search for a purer religion. Various individuals are named who, dissatisfied with old Arab religion, were seeking for a more intellectual faith, in particular a cousin of Khadija, Wajshu b. Nafis. Even if these traditions cannot be wholly in the form in which we have them, as they have been influenced by later Muslim ideas, yet they certainly have a historical basis, because they are not taken from the Koran and are not intended to show Muhammad in a more favourable light. In addition there are the Imanfi. [q. v.] of whom the traditions of the Arabs have preserved only a very hazy picture, and Unayzah b. Abi Ta’talk [q. v.] whose poems often have points of contact with the Koran, which would be of great importance if they could even in part be regarded as genuine [cf. also the talk of Zachari].

While Muhammad was in a state of great spiritual excitement as a result of contact with the religious ideas that had penetrated into Arabia, something happened which suddenly transformed his whole consciousness and filled him with a spiritual strength which decided the whole course of his life; he felt himself called to proclaim to his countrymen as a prophet the revelations which were communicated to him in a mysterious way. When Caclani wishes to see in this the result of a long development and common reflection, this is certainly not incorrect. We have much rather every reason to treat the tradition which tell of a sudden outburst of conviction that he was called to proclaim the word of God. For this view we have the analogy of prophets in general, from the Old Testament prophets down to Joseph Smith; and no long drawn reflections but only an overwhelming spiritual happening could give him the unshakable conviction of his call. This is also confirmed by several passages in the Koran, which point to a deciding moment, definite in time (xlv. 2 sq.; xvii. i; ii. 181), in which connection it is of minor importance whether it is possible to identify the revelation of the call itself among the Suras of the Koran (according to a common opinion. xvi. 1 sqq.; according to some, on the other hand, lxiv. 1 sqq.), especially if one must the Koran. The very earliest revelations were not written down. If this was really the case, however, the reason certainly was not that they were deliberately suppressed, since a revolution by change of his world of ideas into its diametrical opposite while retaining the earlier apparatus of inspiration would be quite an untenable hypothesis.

The Koran gives only a few hints about the manner of these inspirations; a veil lay over them which the Prophet either could not or would not raise completely. Perhaps the wrapping up (lxiv. 1; lxiv. 1) refers to a preparation for the reception of the revelations in the manner of the old Arab deities; but we are taken farther in an indirect way by the oft recurring accusation of his enemies that Muhammad was possessed (madrân), a soul-seeker (kâhu), a magician (âfarî), for they show that in his moments of inspiration he made an impression similar to those figures well known in ancient Arabia. In addition there are several traditions which describe his condition in such moments more fully and may undoubtedly be regarded as genuine, since they are the last thing later Muhammadanism might be expected to invent, while these mysterious seizures afforded to those around him the most valid evidence for the superhuman origin of his inspirations. In Byzantine authors we find it stated that the Prophet was an epileptic (e.g. Theophanes, Chronographia, ed. de Boor, i. 354); and modern psychol., recognise the correctness of these descriptions of his attacks and we must of course have it to them to define the exact nature of his condition. From the scientific point of view the fact is that the voice heard by him only uttered what he had from time to time heard from others and which now cropped up out of his subconscious. The scientific student therefore does not see in Muhammad a discoverer but fully agrees with the impression of sincerity and truthfulness which his utterances in the older revelations make [e.g. Sura x. 16, 20, 113; xviii. 85 sq.; lxiv. 44: lxav. 16 sq.; cf. vii. 202; xvi. 100; the cognate imperatives lxav. 2; xvi. 1; the self-denunciation lxav. 1 sqq. etc.] along with the fact that he unconditionally endured years of hostility and humiliation in Mecca in the unshakable conviction of his lofty task. It is more difficult with the later Medine revelations, in which it is often too easy to
detect the human associations, to avoid the supposition that his paroxysms (e. g. at the battle of Tabuk: Ibn Hishâm, p. 444: in the slandering of Nâ'imah, p. 375, 2) could not be artificially brought on, and there is even a tradition which makes 'Abd Allah say to the Prophet: "Thy Lord seems to have been very quick in fulfilling thy prayers". It must not be forgotten however that nature like this, without actually being conscious of it, are able to provoke the same states of excitation, which earlier arose without their assistance; and so probably not only were his followers in Medina (cf. Ka'b b. Malik in Ibn Hishâm, p. 614, 9) but even he himself convinced, that the spirit was continually hoversing about him to communicate the revelations to him. By this we do not of course mean that in his ecstatic condition he received the divine communication as extases, as we now have them in the Qur'an: only the foundations were given him, which he afterwards developed into discourses of greater length. Since in doing this he used the external forms of the old Arab soothsayers it is natural that the Meccans took him for one, but it does not follow that he was spiritually akin from the first to those soothsayers who were inspired by djinn. The indignation with which he objects to being associated with them is not a proof of such a relationship of which he wished to rid himself. Simply because he was conscious of the similarity, but a natural result of the fact that the enlightened Meccans saw in persons of this kind ludicrous fanatics of the lowest kind, while he was firmly convinced that he was filled with quite a different spirit, one quite unfamiliar to his enemies.

While it is in this way possible with the help of the Qur'an and Tradition, to get an on the whole anti-factory picture of Muhammad's development and his condition when prophesying, he himself gives in the Qur'an quite a different interpretation of the revelations that came to him, which is based on a peculiar theory which he apparently did not invent himself but adopted from others. The fundamental idea in it is the conception of a divine book existing in heaven, al-Kitâb, a well guarded book, which only the pure may touch (xii. 56 sqq.), a well guarded tablet (lxxv. 21 sq.), the mother of the book (xlii. 2 sq.), on in audible leaves, exalted and pure, by the hands of noble and pious seraphs (lxxv. 13 sqq.). He himself did not read this book, as E. Meyer erroneously thinks, but it was communicated to him orally piece by piece, not in its original form but in an Arabic version intelligible to him and his countrymen (cf. xlii. 1; xiii. 37; xii. 112; xvi. 192 sq.; xlii. 2; xlv. 58 and especially xlii. 44: "if we had made it a Qur'an in a foreign tongue, they would say: Why are its aylâh ("signs", from the small sections of the text) not expounded intelligibly, a foreign text and an Arab reader "). In addition there is the fact that Muhammad was aware that the complete contents of the book were not communicated to him, as he expressly states e. g. in the stories of the prophets, not all of which were related to him (cf. 178 sq. iv. 162) he received the communications orally, Allah reassuring him to the substance of the separate sections (lxxv. 16 sqq. etc.), while in several passages it is stated more precisely that the revelations were communicated through the Spirit (xvi. 192 sq.; xvi. 104; xlii. 52) or the Angel (xvi. 2; xv. 8; cf. iii. 5 sqq.; lxxxi. 23 sqq.); a late passage of the Medina period (lvi. 91) is even more precise in saying that they were communicated by Gabriel. References to visions are rare (e. g. the encouraging apparitions in Sûn viii. 45; xliii. 27: the night journey must also have been a vision) and even in such cases the main thing is not what he heard (lxxi. 10; lxxxi. 16). These communications were the great miracle that was granted him, while he expressly and repeatedly says that the ability to perform miracles in the usual sense was denied to him (unlike Jesus).

From this book in heaven, the all-comprising contents of which are not by any means exhausted in the extracts forming the Qur'an, also came the older religions of revelation of the possessors of a scripture, whose religions, therefore in his view coincide with his, and as he often says, were confirmed by it (cf. Hâsan b. Thabit, No. 134, 9). This again is connected with a theory expounded by him of a line of prophets which began with Adam and of which he was the last and representative. His source for this idea was not Judaism, for he does not know of the great prophets who wrote books of the Old Testament; instead of them he mentions individuals, whom the Jews do not count as prophets, e. g. Lot, Joseph, Solomon, Job, etc.: on the other hand the fact that Jesus and John the Baptist are the last links in the chain of prophets clearly suggests a Christian origin, and certain parallels in more or less haphazardly gathered early Christian literature can be demonstrated. Of the prophets Muhammad relates a number of stories, which do not begin to appear in any number until the middle Meccan period when the Meccans were beginning sharply to reject his mission.

The ideas in the oldest, passionately excited inspiration, developed under a byzantine power of imagination rarely reached later, are very simple. They are based not on the dogmatic conception of monotheism but on the strong general religions and moral impressions which contact with older religions had made upon him, which was bound finally to lead to a breach with polytheism. In particular he was filled with the idea of the moral responsibility of man created by Allah and with the idea of the judgment to take place on the day of resurrection, which again points undeniably more to Christian than Jewish influence (cf. especially the introductory sounding of trumpets, not found among the Jews). To this are added vivid descriptions of the tortures of the damned and seductive pictures of the joys of Paradise, which are further of interest because they reveal Muhammad's strongly sensual temperament. Gradually monotheism was emphasized as an overruling basic idea and at the same time he attained a somewhat wider conception of the Deity. With all the vigour of an essential religious nature, he points to the wonders of everyday life, especially to the marvellous phenomena of man (in this connection cf. the poem of the Jew Samawal, cf. Jâmi' al-Tâhâ, ed. Ahlwardt, No. 20, 5). The religious duties which he imposes on him and others are simple and few in number, one should believe in God, appeal to Him for forgiveness of sins (xviii. 11), offer prayers frequently on the model of the Jews and Christians, in the night also (xii. 116; lxxix. 20: cf. lxxv. 25 sq.). He is also to observe the annual fast of the Jews (cf. x. 187 sq.), to give alms especially to those who are in need, free oneself from the love of delusive wealth and - what
is significant for the commercial life of Mecca — from all forms of cheating (xxvi. 182 sq.; lv. 8 sq.), lead a chaste life and not expose newborn girls, as the barbarous custom of the time was (according to Ṣūrah vi. 152, xvii. 53 from poverty; cf. al-Mubarrad, Ḳūfī, ed. Wright, p. 277: original passage perhaps a list of magic songs, when only girls had been born. Cf. Musil, Ḳūfī, loc. cit.). This is the ideal of the truly pious man who is called by the name of muṣūd (lxviii. 45; xxi. 108 etc.) or Ḳūfī (x. 105; xxx. 29; xviii. 4; cf. vi. 79 and the article). Cf. in this connection the list of Muhammad's precepts in Ḳūfī's poem (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 255: Ḳur'ānische Forschungen, p. 25 sq.).

From all this, it is quite evident that Muhammad had at this time no thought of founding a new religion. His task was only to be a "warner" (li. 59; xlv. 2; lxix. 45; lxxi. 11; lxix. 21 sqq.), in view of the approach of the ṯawras, to fulfill the divine judgment, to his countrymen, to whom his prophet had yet been sent (xi. 157; lxviii. 46; xxii. 3; xxxvii. 45; xxxvi. 51; no notice is taken here of Ḥūd and Sāliḥ) and as a result of the revelations granted him to give them, in the form of a lucid Arabic Qur'ān (see above), what the "possessors of a scripture" had in their scriptures, which were not accessible to the Arabs and thereby to save them from the divine wrath. The Jews and Christians also must therefore testify to the truth of his preaching (x. 94; lxvi. 45; xxvi. 197; xxvii. 52 etc.).

On account of the insufficiency of the sources, it is very difficult to ascertain in detail how Muhammad's relations with the Meccans developed. The Qur'ān contains only vague hints, which permit no chronological arrangement, while the traditions are very full but little reliable. Only one report, which Ṭawrā composed for the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (Ṭabarî, i. 1150 sq., 1224 sq.), the value of which has already been indicated by Spenger, gives a brief but apparently trustworthy glimpse of the main events (cf. also al-Zuhîr in Ibl Sidî, i/1, 133). At first Muhammad met with no serious opposition and in not a few cases his preaching fell on fruitful soil; indeed in the words addressed to Sāliḥl (xi. 64) we may find a hint that he had at first aroused considerable expectations among the Meccans. All traditions agree that Khadija was the first believer, while they differ as to who was his first male adherent. In any case ʿAbî Bakr, the manumitted slave Zu'd b. Ḥârans, Zubair b. al-ʿAwwâm, Ṭalah b. ʿUbayd Allâh, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf, Saʿd b. ʿAbî Waḳqâs, and Muhammad's cousin 'Ali [q. v.] were among his earliest followers. The majority of those who were won over by his preaching were however young and of no great social standing, while the well-to-do and influential held back (xix. 74; xxxiv. 30 sqq.; xxviii. 62 sq.; lxxi. 11; lxx. 1 sqq.; cf. the veiled references in vii 73; xi. 29; xvii. 17; xxvi. 111). This became still more the case when the full consequences of his ideas became clear to him and he openly attacked the religion of his native town; for the Meccans, to the majority of whom such devotional meetings had been a matter of complete indifference, now discovered that a religious revolution might be dangerous to their fairs and their trade. That this was the salient feature of their resistance to Muhammad is evident from the fact that he frequently endeavours to calm the fears of the Kūraish on this point: the Meccan sanctuary, he said, belonged to his god Allâh, whom the Meccans also recognised as the highest god (xxvi. 24; xxxix. 39; cf. Kâis b. al-Khaṣîm, ed. Kowalski, v. 14; xi. 12 where Allâh is the lord of the Ka'bah) and he will protect and bless his sanctuary, if they submit to him (xxviii. 93; xxviii. 57; xxix. 67; cvi. 1 sqq.). In addition there was the conservative attitude of these merchants in the field of religion and their animosity to new and fantastic ideas, particularly to that of the resurrection of the dead.

Traditions record at great length the persecution and ill treatment which Muhammad and his followers suffered at the hands of the Meccans. These descriptions are undoubtedly much exaggerated, for the object was to glorify the self-sacrifice of the believers and no doubt also to put the old patrician families of Mecca in an unfavourable light. But it is equally certain that there is some foundation for these stories, and most of the persecutions (jâhiz) which twice forced the believers to migrate, and in the Kūrān there is mention of "trials" which their opponents inflicted upon the believers, men and women (lxxxi. 10), and it is expressly mentioned that the influential wished to prevent Muhammad from praying (xxvi. 9 sq.; cf. the veiled account vii. 84), while on the other hand, the complaints about what they would have liked to do should not be taken at their face value without more ado (viii. 26; xxxvi. 17; xvii. 78; cf. xi. 93). The peculiar feature, repeatedly found in stories of the prophets, that their opponents threaten them and their followers with stoning (Ṣūrah xi. 93 and frequently) might suggest the hypothesis that Muhammad was actually threatened in this way by the Meccans, but this would probably only have been in a momentary outburst of passion and in any case the quarrel was mainly conducted in endless wordy disputation in which the spiritual advantage lay with Muhammad. His strength lay in the consciousness that he lived in a higher intellectual world which was closed to the Meccans and that he proclaimed ideas, "the equal of which neither men nor djinn with combined efforts could produce" (xvii. 90). Very pertinently he often points to the lack of logic in his enemies, when they recognise Allâh as the real true God but will not draw the logical deductions from this. But even his most crushing arguments rebounded from the impregnable wall of their prejudices which were based on their material interests. This circumstance now began to influence the matter of his preaching in a very special way. When his opponents mocked him because the divine judgment threatened by them did not come (xxxviii. 15; lxx. 5) he began to describe in an increasing degree in his stories how the contemporaries of earlier prophets had met them with incredulity and had therefore brought on their heads dreadful punishments. That he did not use such means at the very beginning of his mission is evident from the fact that his preaching, according to the already mentioned credible tradition, at first gave no offence, and indeed this feature is lacking in the sūras which are certainly the oldest. It was the harshness of heart of his countrymen which made him take to this weapon in order to stir them. At first it proved by no means ineffective, as the Arabs knew of old trading peoples like the
Several episodes stand out in the Meccan period which are unfortunately more or less obscure and may be interpreted in various equally uncertain ways. It is certain, in spite of the silence maintained about it in the Qur'an (even xvi. 43 sq. does not refer to it), that Muhammad's community was at one time in so great distress that a considerable section of them migrated to Abyssinia. The later view was that participation in this flight became a patent of nobility similar to that conferred by the great Hijra to Medina, which was actually granted as a titular distinction (Wellhausen, S.S.-Z. iv. 113); but the Prophet gave the advice to seek protection among the Abyssian Christian only to those of his followers, of whom he was told that they had not sufficient strength to maintain their faith under the difficult conditions in Mecca (cf. the significant story of the cool reception which some of the exiles later received on their return to Medina; Bukhari, ed. Kreidl, ii. 128). M. Hartmann's view that the emigrants were to conduct political propaganda in Abyssinia is not capable of proof. According to 'Uway, these emigrants (i.e. probably the greater number of them) returned to their native town, when Islam had become strengthened by the accession to its ranks of a number of individuals of position. At the same time there is a different story of their return, which is more difficult to reconcile with the story of 'Uway's story if we assume that they gradually drifted back. We are told that Muhammad proclaimed in one of his sermons that the favourite deities of the Meccans, al-Lāţ, al-'Uzza and Manat [see these articles], might be regarded as divine beings whose intercession was effectual with Allāh. This led to a general reconciliation, news of which reached Abyssinia and induced a number of the Muslims there to return home. Here however they learned to their horror that the agreement had been of short duration, as the Prophet had very soon recognised these words as interpolations of Sādiq and had substituted for them the words which we now have in Sura lii. 19–23. The credibility of this story has been doubted, certainly wrongly; for in view of the absolute impossibility of such a story being a later invention, any possible objections to the reliability of the authorities cited (Tahari, i. 1102, 1105; Ibn Sa'd, i., 1 i. 137 sq.) hardly deserve consideration and passages like vi. 56, 57: xxvi. 75 sq. (cf. iv. 113) amply show that the incident was quite possible from the psychological point of view.

It is much more difficult to elucidate another episode of the Meccan period, the story of the boycott of the Hashimids. That Muhammad's whole position during his struggle with the Meccans was only made possible by the support given him by his own family has already been indicated. All members of the family of Hashim on Muhammad's side were not only not denounced in the Qur'an along with his wife, chivalrously fulfilled their duty in this respect, although only a few of them believed in his call. It would therefore be not unnatural in itself for the Meccans in the end to attempt to make the whole family innocent without making on themselves the guilt of bloodshed by an open attack. The story, however, which tells how they forced the Hashimids to withdraw into their own part of the town and pledged themselves to refrain from intermarriage or commerce with them, is confirmed neither by the Qur'an nor by 'Uway, but sounds in itself somewhat suspicious and is probably much exaggerated. That the effort finally failed is conceded by the story itself. On the other hand, it is quite possible that Khaḍīja's fortune may have suffered considerably from Muhammad's obligations to his necessary followers and from the enmity of the influential merchant princes.

To the last portion of the Meccan period most probably belongs Muhammad's nocturnal journey, later so celebrated, to the "remote place of prayer", to which vii. 1 (perhaps also verse 62) briefly refers, no doubt a vision, which however was an impression of reality. According to the prevailing opinion, the terminus of this journey was the temple in Jerusalem, and conclusions are drawn from this about the great significance which this city had for him. Schrieke (Ib., vi 1 sqq.) and H-ravicz (Ibis. ix. 159 sqq.) have however shown that μεταφετησαλλη στη ορθή refers to the place of prayer of the angels in heaven (cf. vii. 205: xxxiv. 75); for which view several cogent arguments can be produced, notably that the nocturnal journey is associated with the journey to heaven as early as in the tradition given by Ibn I-hāk and that it in the Qur'an there is several times a reference to an ascent to heaven (vi. 35: xxvii. 92 sqq.; xxv. 14 sq.)

Of other details we may further recall that Muhammad, who, as already remarked, was firmly convinced that his preaching agreed with the religion of the "parasites of a scripture", nevertheless had already begun in Mecca to select the christological dogmas of the church. This is certain from the conversation with his pagan opponents (XIII. 57 sqq.) which can only have taken place in Mecca. This however does not affect his idea of the fundamental identity of his with the older revelations but only the false doctrine later adopted in the church, for he makes Jesus vigorously reject the doctrine of his divinity; but this limitation of his theory was not without importance and was able to serve him as a model in his later criticism of Judaism.

The sources are somewhat fuller for the close of the Meccan period, although late tendentious historiography has coloured everything in the traditions. According to 'Uway's account, Muhammad did, it is true, succeed in winning a few notables in Mecca (including probably 'Umar) for his teaching, after the emigration of a number of his followers to Abyssinia. But on the whole his attempt at a religious reformation could be regarded as having failed; and when Khaḍīja and Abī
Talh died, his position gradually became more and more hopeless. An attempt to establish himself in Taif brought him into considerable danger, according to the narrative, although the approval of his preaching expressed by some djinn (cf. xlii. 1) certainly raised his drooping spirits. It was probably at this period that Mu'ayjim b. 'Adi took him under his protection, which is corroborated by Hāsan b. Thalāt (No. 1xviii. 89.). He could now have consolated himself with the reflection that he had done his duty as a "warner" and could regard it as the will of Allah that his opponents were not to be saved (cf. x. 99: xłów. 89.). But the consciousness of being a chosen instrument of Allah had gradually become so powerful within him that he was no longer able to sink back into an ignominious existence with his object unachieved. His astonishing gift of being able to exert a powerful religious suggestion even on men who were intellectually superior to him insensibly demanded a wider sphere of activity than a small number of adherents, mostly without influence. In addition, there was a factor of which he himself was certainly unconscious but which is apparent on every page of the Meccan sōras, namely his mental exhaustion. All this brought him to the idea of looking for a new sphere of activity outside Mecca, however difficult it must have been for an Arab to break the links that bound him to his tribe and family. The congress of people from all parts of the pilgrimage gave him good opportunities to attempt to find one. After several unsuccessful negotiations, he found a favourable soil for his scheme with some men from Medina. Unfortunately we know very little about conditions at this time in this town (q.v.) but we may safely assume that the large number of Jews in it had contributed to make the peasant population of Medina somewhat familiar with religious ideas (cf. Ibn Hīṣām, p. 178.).

There is however no question that the Medinees did not so much want to attract an inspired preacher to themselves as to get a political leader, who would readjust their political relations, which had been shattered in the tribal conflicts culminating in the battle of Bu'aith [q. v.]. With this we are faced with one of the most difficult problems in the biography of Muhammad, namely how he presented himself to us. The inspired religious enthusiast, who, in spirit, mainly centred around the coming last judgment, who had borne all insults and attacks, who only timidly touched on the possibility of active resistance (xvi. 127) and preferred to leave everything to Allah's intervention, with the migration to Medina enties upon a secular stage and at one stroke shows himself a brilliant political genius. That Muhammad's eye in Mecca took in the wider political situation is evident from the prophecy in Sūra xxx. 1 sq.; but the passage is quite isolated there and in any case M. Hartmann's efforts (Die arabischen Jezidi, p. 53.), to make him play the part of a fathering diplomat in international politics is based on fanciful arguments with no basis in the sources. Nevertheless in the despatch of a section of his followers to Abyssinia and in the attempt to reach a compromise with the polytheists in Mecca, we have hints which to some extent bridge over the gulf between the two figures. The decisive point however is that the Medinees would certainly not have thought of seeking in him a saviour from their social and political difficulties, if they had not been much impressed by his abilities in this direction.

After Muhammad had entered into relations with some Medinees who had come as pilgrims to Mecca, the latter began to spread Islam in their native town along with men whom he had sent there and thus he was able after a preliminary conference in al-Akaba (q.v.) to conclude at the pilgrimage next year (622) at the same place a formal agreement with a considerable number of Medinees, in which they pledged themselves in the name of their fellow-citizens, to take him into their community and to protect him as one of their own citizens, which, as the further history shows, was also to hold for his Meccan followers if they moved to Medina. Tradition, and no doubt rightly, here mentions only the promise of the Medinees to take Muhammad under their protection and not any further obligations. On the other hand according to Ibn Hīṣām, p. 287., at the first conference at 'Akaba Muhammad is said to have imposed a series of commands upon them; but this so-called "women's homage" is, as the very same shows, taken from the later Sūra lx. 12 and is clearly adapted to Meccan conditions (cf. especially the vow not to kill children). These negotiations, which could not remain unknown to the Meccans, produced great bitterness, and a second jīna, as Urwā says, began for the believers, which must have still more confirmed them in their resolution to migrate to Medina. They slipped away in larger or smaller bodies, so that finally only Muhammad with Abī Bakr and, according to the story, 'Ali, was left. That the Prophet did not go with the others was certainly due to the fact that the Meccans otherwise would have prevented the whole emigration. They knew him well enough to see the danger if he were to ally himself with another tribe and there is therefore no reason to doubt Tradition when it relates, although with much legendary embellishment (cf. on David's flight: Tabari, i. 556.), how he had to be the last to flee from the town. Tradition is also confirmed by Sūra ix. 49 where there is mention of Muhammad and his companion (Abī Bakr) stopping in the cave.

The migration of the Prophet, the Hijra (q.v.), had been, with justice taken by the Muslims as the starting-point of their chronology, for it forms the first stage in a movement which in a short time became of significance in the history of the world. According to the usual calculation, he arrived in Kūfah, a suburb of Medina, on the 12th Rabī' i of the first year, i.e. Sept. 24. 622 and shortly after went into his new home. The tasks which awaited him placed the greatest strain on his diplomatic and organizing abilities. He could only rely with absolute certainty on those who had migrated with him (the Muhájirūn, q.v.) for their whole future existence depended entirely on him and of course only those who had migrated who were to go with the others was certainly due to his mission. In addition, there were those Medinees who had already adopted Islam or did so soon after his arrival, the so-called Ansār (q.v.) or "helpers", who however formed only a portion of the inhabitants of Medina. He only found direct opposition in a few families, like the 'Awṣ Allāh; but at the same time there were a number who while they did not exactly oppose him only reluctantly accepted the new relations, the so-called mūnaṣṣifīn (q.v.), who were to cause
him much anxiety. Fortunately for him, they were led by a man, the Khazrajī 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy, who possessed the munāziq quality of misresolution to such an extent that he regularly let slip every occasion on which he might have offered successful opposition. A further danger lay in the fact that the old and bitter feud between the two chief parties, the Jews and the Khazrajī, had by no means died down, but might easily break out again on any occasion. Finally there were the Jews (in the first place al-Kāmilīn, i.e. the Nadrī and the Khazrajī, as Kāsāsī b. al-Khaṭīb, ed. Kowalski, xxi. Hāsan b. Thābit, N, 216, l.; Ibn Hishām, p. 660 and Ibn Sa'd, viii. 86, 91) and the jādīdīst tribes in Medina, who played an important part because of their wealth and the support they had in the Jewish colonies in Khizar etc. For Muḥammad they were on the whole a plus factor in his calculations for, according to his theory already mentioned, he ought to expect that they would champion the truth of his preaching. His relations with the Christians in Medina (cf. Hāsan b. Thābit, N, 133, l.) were no longer absolutely estranged, since he had begun in Mecca to reject the orthodox ecclesiastical Christology; but they were unimportant and could be ignored. He also had a much greater sympathy with them than with the Jews (v. 85; vii. 27).

Muḥammad had to form a united community out of these heterogeneous elements. The first problem to be tackled was how to procure the necessary means of subsistence for the emigrants, who were for the most part without means or work, which could for the time being only be done through the self-sacrifice of the Ansār and certainly very inadequately. To strengthen their claims for protection, he ordered the relationship of brotherhood to be created between each emigrant and a man of Medina. This arrangement, to which was added brotherhood between every two emigrants, was abolished after the battle of Badr by Sāra x-xvi. 6 (the only few traces (see Ibn Sa'd, iii. xxxvi.). On the other hand, as was seen for a somewhat later period, when relations between Muḥammad and the Jews had begun to be strained, a very valuable document in Muḥammad's constitution of the community which was preserved by Ibn Isḥāq. It reveals his great diplomatic gifts, for it allows the ideal which he cherished of an umma definitely religious in outlook to sink temporarily into the background and is shaped essentially by practical considerations. It is true that the highest authority is with Allah and Muḥammad, before whom all matters of importance are to be laid; but the umma included also Jews and pagans, so that the legal forms of the old Arab tribes were still substantially preserved. This scheme had however no considerable practical importance: it is nowhere mentioned in the Kurān (hardly even in vii. 58), because it was soon rendered obsolete by the rapidly changing conditions.

It is a proof of the Prophet's political wisdom that he endeavoured to attach the Jews to himself by taking over several features of their worship. Thus he made the 10th Muḥarram a fast-day, obviously in imitation of the Jewish fast on the 10th Tisri, the day of atonement, which is particularly obvious in its name, taken from the Aramaic 'šālāt' (N. 239). On Jewish practice are probably also based the introduction of the midday salāt, which was now (N. 239) added to the morning and evening salāts and the easier rule about purification before the salāt (iv. 46: v. 97). On the other hand, Friday as the day of the common salāt, which probably goes back to the Jewish day of preparation (cf. Becker's correction to Ibn Sa'd, iii. 83, in Id., iii. 519), is said to have been already introduced before the Hilārī by the Muʾāwīya b. Umar (according to others, Asād b. Zūrā') Whether the choice of Jerusalem as the kibla [q. v.] was one of the concessions made to the Meṣhrīn Jews is uncertain as the statements about his attitude in Mecca on this point differ. But it is improbable that he should have turned towards the Ka'bah there, otherwise it is difficult to understand how the different stories could have arisen. But whether he then used Jerusalem as the kibla, which need not necessarily mean a borrowing from the Jews, as this direction of prayer was elsewhere found in the east, e.g. among the Ebanites and Elkanites, whether he turned to the east like many Christians, or whether he had a kibla at all (the Kurān is silent on the point) is uncertain, but in any case the balance of probability is in favour of the Jerusalem kibla having been one of the alterations made to gratify the Meṣhrīn Jews. If some writers have seen in the immediate erection of a place of prayer (Ibn Hishām, p. 356) a copying of the Jewish synagogues, Crezini has with weighty reason argued that this was not a building definitely assigned to the worship of God, since the alleged masjid was also used for all kinds of secular purposes, because in reality it was simply the court-yard (sā'ūn) occupied by Muḥammad and his family, while the assemblies for regular worship were held on the masjid (cf. Maxim.). But nevertheless the "mosque of opposition" so called by the Prophet with horror (Sūrah ix. 108; see below) seems to have been an actual building recalling the Jewish synagogues. In spite of these concessions to the Jews, it soon became obvious that he had seriously misjudged with regard to them. Although they undoubtedly felt the weighty expectations of the coming of the Messiaš (Ibn Hishām, p. 286, 373 etc.) they could not possibly recognise an Arab as the expected Messiaš and he had soon reason to lament that only a few among them believed in him (iii. 106). In particular, the misunderstandings in his reproduction of the Old Testament stories and laws aroused the notorious Jewish hate of ridicule and thus brought him into an unfortunate position. His conviction of the divine origin of his mission and his position among the believers would not allow him to confer that he had made a mistake and on the other hand he had too often himself appealed to the re-translation of the older religions of revelation to be able to ignore this criticism. He rescued himself from this dilemma by asserting that the Jews had only received a portion of the revelation (iv. 47; cf. iii. 115) and even this included a number of special laws adapted to a particular age (i. 158; vi. 147; vii. 119) but they had also cancelled all sorts of things in their holy scriptures (ii. 30. 141. 154. 169; iii. 64 etc.) and indeed had even falsified their scriptures (i. 56: iv, 48: v. 16. 45: vii. 162; cf. Hāsan b. Thābit, N, 96, 2; and the article 'alāmah, in short they obtained hardly more benefit from their scriptures than an ass from the books which he is carrying on his back (v. 25). The Jews were not able to refute these assertions, for although he challenged them to produce these scriptures
(iii. 87) neither he nor his followers could read a word of them. He therefore now poured forth the rails of his wrath upon the Jews in many speeches and awaited the time when he would be able to refute their criticism and malicious witicism and tergiversation, in convincing fashion (e.g. iii. 177 sq.; iv. 48). As he had now already begun to regard the church doctrine of the Christians as a corruption of the true teaching of Jesus, he felt himself called upon to reform the degenerate religious of revelation, each of which asserted it was the only true one (ii. 107) As a result he now claimed a special place among the prophets: he is seal of the prophets (xxxvii. 40; a metaphorical expression which Mani among others applied to himself and which indicates the conclusion of the series), he is the last prophet, to whom Jesus himself had pointed under the name Ahmad (lx. 6; cf. iii. 75). Still he is not thinking any more than before of introducing a new religion but only of restoring the religion proclaimed by the prophets from the beginning; But nevertheless the early years after the migration were the period when Muhammadanism was born as an independent religion and parallel with his criticism of the religions of revelation and in particular opposition to Judaism ran a positive shaping of Islam, through which he was emancipating himself in important points from his previous models. He gave his religion a pronounced national character by taking over various elements from the worship of the old Arabs and associating them with his religious ideas. In the second year of the Hijra (July 622—June 624) after hesitation, he ordered that Jerusalem should no longer he the kibla at prayer but the ancient sanctuary of the Black Stone at Mecca (ii. 136—145) for it is a gathering-place and a safe retreat for men” (ii. 119). His native town was thus made the centre of the true religion. As a substitute for the pilgrimage which he now adopted into his religion as one of the main rites, but from which he and his followers were temporarily cut off, he had an animal sacrificed in this year on the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijja on the musalla in Medina (Tabari, i. 1362; according to Ibn Sa'd, t.vii. 9 he continued this after the occupation of Mecca) and in the following year he calls the hadj one of the obligations of believers towards Allah (ii. 90 sq.). Friday retained its significance but was not to be a day of rest like the Jewish Sabbath (lixiii. 9 sq.) which is connected with his rejection of the Old Testament idea of God resting after the creation (i. 37). In place of the fasting on ‘Ashura’, he substituted quite a new particular rite, according to which his followers were to fast throughout Ramadan, the month, in which he had received the fundamental revelation (ii. 281), as long as the sun was visible in the heavens. The Manichaean had a similar custom; but whether he took the new revelation from them or from another sect cannot be ascertained. [cf. KAMALAN.]

This nationalization of Islam, which was to have so many results, gave Muhammad a final legitimation, which brought it into harmony with his earlier appeal to the religions of revelation, as he came forward as the restorer of the religion of Abraham (sulhren Hashim) which had been corrupted by the Jews and Christians. Abraham, whom Jews and Christians alike regarded as the great type of faith and whom he had himself emphatically indicated as the true hujjat (e.g. vi. 79), now becomes the great hujjat, not only in contrast to the heathen but also to the possessors of a scripture (whether polytheist, nor Jew nor Christian [ii. 129; iii. 60, 89] wherefore, as Snouck Hurgronje has shown, vi. 162 and xvi. 123 must also be Medinese). He and his son Ishmael, the ancestor of the Arabs, founded the Meccan sanctuary and the rescelasticated here, now corrupted by the heathen, which Muhammad is to restore (ii. 118 sq.; xii. 27 sq.). Whether this bold idea, which according to Sura iii. 58 met with opposition from the possessors of a scripture, was an original one and in this case a really brilliant invention of Muhammad’s or whether it was already in existence, for example among arabesiced Jews, cannot be decided. The only thing certain is that he cannot have been acquainted with it in Mecca for we meet it nowhere in connection with mentions of the Ka'ba and it is actually excluded by the passages mentioned above (p. 726a).

While his religion was being transformed in this way, Muhammad’s personal position was being gradually changed by the altered conditions. Among the dominant religion of the community, all important matters were to be laid before Allah and himself. It now became a fundamental duty of the believers to be obedient to Allah and to himself (iii. 3, 29, 126, 166; iv. 17 sq. 62 [where it is added: “and to those among you who have to exercise authority”]; v. 93; xxiv. 51. 62; cf. also lx. 12, the “women’s hommage” which is inserted in the account of the second conference at ‘Aksa, Ibn Hisham, p. 289) and those who are disobedient are threatened with the tortures of hell (lx. 64). Alongside of the belief in Allah now appears belief in the Prophet (xlviii. 9; xiv. 8 etc.). Allah is his protector, as is Gabriel, and the angels are at his disposal (lxvii. 4). He claims certain privileges, which suggest a worldly mortal rather than a spiritual leader (xxiv. 62; xlix. 2 sqg.; xxiv. 63; liii. 13 sq.; xxxvii. 53) but which however must be described as quite moderate demands.

The elevation of Mecca to be the centre of his religion imposed on Muhammad new tasks, which were soon to lead to unexpected results. If visiting the holy places in and around Mecca was a duty of the Muslims, who were excluded from the town (xvii. 25 sq.), the result was the inevitable necessity of forcing admission to them. In addition the Prophet had an account to settle with the Meccans, for by his expulsion they had triumphed over him in the eyes of the world and the punishment repeatedly threatened them had not materialized, unlike the stereotyped punishments of the godless in the stories of the prophets. This led to a new command, that of the holy war (“war on the path of Allah”, al-djihadi, q. v.) and to set such a war in motion now became the object of his endeavour, which he tenaciously pursued. There were however considerable difficulties in the way of achieving this object. The Medine-e had only pledged themselves to defend him like one of their number if he were attacked, and the anything but warlike merchants of Mecca were not inclined to oblige him by beginning. The emigrants were, it is true, not bound in this way, but it went nevertheless very much against their feelings as Arabs openly to fight members of their tribe and blood relations. How much their resistance vexed him is shown by the vigorous reproaches which he makes to his
fellers in this connection (ii. 212; xxii. 39 sqq.) He succeeded however in finding a way out of the difficulty, which might be able to pave the way for military enterprises without injuring these feelings too much. After he had sent different men with small armed forces who did not succeed in encountering the enemy, in Radjād, one of the sacred meadows in which allighting was forbidden, he sent some of his followers to Nakhlā, where a caravan was expected and gave their leader sealed orders in which he left it to their judgment what they should do. They did not disappoint him for they fell upon the caravan which felt secure until the end of the month and one of the Meccans was killed. The rich plunder was sent to Medina, where in the meanwhile a storm of indignation had broken out. Muhammad however gave the people time to recover and finally calmed them by the revelation ii. 214. The success of the coup had had such an effect in Medina that not only enmigrants but also a number of Ansār offered their services, when he appealed for followers in Ramādān 2 A.H. in a new raid, which, however, he would lead. On this occasion chance came to light an unexpected favorite. He had learned that a rich caravan was on its way from Syria and he decided to ambush it at Badr [q.v.]. The very cautious Abī Sufyān [q.v.] who was leading the caravan got wind of his plan however and sent messengers express to Mecca for help. But when by a diversion to the coast he had reached safety, he soon afterwards sent other messengers to Mecca to cancel the first message. The enraged Meccans had however already collected an army which was three times the size of Muhammad's little handful of men and were unwilling to let the opportunity escape of properly chastising their troublesome enemy. They went to Badr where soon afterwards Muhammad arrived with his men, expecting to meet Abī Sufyān's helpless caravan. When they discovered their mistake they were filled with terror (viii. 5 sqq.; cf. the continuation of Īrāwa's story: Tabārī, i. 128 sqq.) but the Prophet saw in the encounter the wonderful dispensation of Allah, who wished to force them to a battle and his remarkable power of suggestion was able so to inspire his men that they completely routed the far superior enemy. A number of the Meccans, including the leader of the aristocrats Abī Dāhī, were slain and several, including Muhammad's uncle 'Abdāb, were brought prisoners to Medina, where Muhammad had two of them, al-Naṣr and 'Ukhā b. Abī Mu'āṣir, put to death, while the others were held to ransom. This in our case a very insignificant fracas, which however must be judged in light of the observation by Doughty who knew the country (Travels, ii. 38), because it was the utmost significance for the history of Islam, for Muhammad saw in the victory a powerful confirmation of his belief in the superiority of Allah (vii. 17; 66; iii. 119; cf. Kahā b. Malik, in Ibn Hīshām, p. 520 sqq.) and in his own call, and besides the commercial city of Mecca enjoyed such great prestige in Arabia that its conqueror was bound to attract all eyes to himself. He therefore displayed even greater energy and was able to utilise the advantages he had won. After he had drawn up the programme given in Sūra vii. 57 sqq., he began to besiege the Jewish tribe of Khurāsān in their forts. The Mundhirākā did not dare to oppose him seriously and the other Jews left their co-religionists in the lurch in shameless fashion (cf. lxx. 14) so that the latter were forced to migrate to Transjordania.

In order to protect himself while fighting from attacks from another foe, Muhammad at this time adopted a plan which is a further proof of his outstanding political ability. He concluded, as a number of letters that have been preserved show (cf. J. Sperer, Medizinische dichtung im Semiar fur Orient, Spalton, 1916), as lord of Medina, alliances with a number of Beduin tribes in which the two parties pledged themselves to assist one another.

In the year 3 A.H. (June 624—June 625) Muhammed continued his attacks on the Meccan caravans so that the Kurāsh finally saw the necessity of taking more vigorous measures and revenging themselves for Badr. An army of 3,000 men was equipped and set out with much display for Medina under the leadership of Abī Sufyān, who was little suited for the task. Although several of his followers advised Muhammad to make his defence within the town, he decided to go out with his forces, which, had been much reduced by the departure of the Anasārā, and took up a position at the foot of the hill of Uhud [q.v.]. In spite of the numerical superiority of the Meccans, the fighting at first went in favour of the Muslims, until a number of archers who had been placed to defend his flank joined against Muhammad's express orders in the battle, which promised to yield rich booty and this at once enabled Kahā b. al-Walīd to fall upon Muhammad's flank. The tables were now turned and many of the Muslims began to flee, especially when the rumour spread that the Prophet had fallen (cf. iii. 158). In reality he was only wounded and escaped with a few faithful followers through a ravine on to the south side of the hill. Fortunately for him, the Meccans were quite incompetent to follow up their victory and as they thought that Muhammad had been punished and as their honour saved, they turned quietly back to Mecca. The Prophet was thus saved from the worst, but he had to lament many fallen friends including Ḥamza [q.v.] and his newly acquired prestige naturally also suffered. With all the eloquence in his power he endeavoured to raise the morale of his followers by exhortation and censure alike (ii. 114 sqq., 133—154, 159—200) but the consequences of his reverse did not fail to materialise. The Jews who had taken no part in the fighting (according to Ibn Hīshām, they were observing the Sabbāth), made no secret of their delight at his misfortune and several Beduin tribes next year (4 A.H. = June 625—beginning of June 626; the eclipse of the moon which took place in Djamāl II of this year was that visible in Medina in the night of Nov. 19—20, 625; cf. Rahdonakists, in H. Z. K. c. v. 105; Caetani, i. 598 sqq.) showed how much his prestige with them had sunk (cf. n. 185 moux) It was therefore all the more necessary to make an example and another Jewish tribe in Medina, the Naṣrī, seemed a suitable object after Kahā b. Ashāt's (q.v. and cf. Ḥassān b. Thābit's, N°. 67 murder had served as a prelude. It was made a charge against them in Sūra iv. 4 that they defied Allah and his messenger, on which account Tradition imputes all sorts of crimes to them. After a siege of several weeks (Tabārī, i. 1850; cf. Fattah, Taʾṣī, ii. 111) they were forced to emigrate to Khathāb or Syria. They left behind them their weapons and their gold and silver as a rich booty, the distribution
of which on this occasion Muhammad reserved for himself (lxix. 6 sq.)

To this period most probably belongs the prohibition of the drinking of wine which is characteristic of Islam (v. 92 sq.); of the inductive gradation in xxxiii. 25: xvi. 69; iv. 46: ii. 216, where the word "great" is to be deleted as Schwell proposes. It has been connected with a number of features of life in the old Semitic east but the main reason should rather be sought in the connection with the masic games [6, v.]. Drinking-bouts with feasting on a specially slain camel and games of chance, which were in the eyes of the old Arabs the bright spots in their hard struggle for existence, and in which they endeavoured to display their nobility and hospitality, brought the Muslims into suspicious relations with pagans and with Christian and Jewish wine-sellers, which might easily lead to their faltering in their new religion (cf. Wākidī transl. Wellhausen, p. 100; Baūhi, ed. Kreil, ii. 270 sq.); and this might explain why he forbade both at the same time, which of course does not exclude the possibility that forms of abstention for other reasons may have been known to him (Musailima’s prohibition of wine was obviously intended as a section of the Mu‘ahhidīs). While Muhammad was endeavouring to restore his weakened authority, a new and threatening storm came upon him and Medina from Mecca. The Kurāish, whose caravans were being continually harassed by him (cf. Ḥassān b. Thabit, N°. 16, 1 sq.) and who were urged on by the Jews of Ḥālib, recognised that the victory at Ḥudh had only been a blow in the air and realised the necessity of occupying Medina, which they had then neglected to do. Conscious of their slight military skill, they negotiated vigorously with various Beduin tribes and thus raised a large army — said to have been 10,000 men — with which they set out against Medina in the year 5 (June 626—May 627). The various accounts of the season of the year (sometimes a month after the bailey harvest, sometimes cold winter storms, the latter in agreement with Sūra xxxviii. 9; cf. Ḥassān b. Thabit, N°. 14, 2) may be reconciled by the possibility that the siege lasted a considerable time (cf. Doughty’s description, Travels, ii. 429 sqq. of the siege of Ḥanīza, which in general illustrates this war excellently). The advance of this imposing army produced great consternation in Medina, which was still further increased by the vacillating attitude of the Mūnāfīn and by the discovery or perhaps only the suspicion that the Jews were conspireing with the enemy (xxxii. 10 sqq., 26) Muhammad in order to strengthen the defence had a ditch (kāfūrūm, a Persian word) dug in front of the unprotected part of the town. According to several stories, he did this on the advice of a Persian named Salmān but J. Horovitz (cf. Isf. xii. 178—183) would reject this as a later accretion. Modest as the defence were — about 150 years later Ṯāb b. Mūsā bridged the ditch which had been restored by Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh, by throwing a few doors across it — they seem to have imposed upon the enemy who had little experience in the art of war and the siege gradually dragged on. The able lord of Medina used the time for secret negotiations with the Ghāfit and cleverly stirred up distrust of one another among his opponents and when at the same time the weather conditions became unfavourable the besiegers lost heart and gradually began to retire so that the last effort of the Kurāish to destroy their sinister foe came to nothing. For one section of the participants however, the comedy of the “War of the Ditch” was to become a bloody tragedy. Hardly had the besiegers retired than the Prophet declared war on the last Jewish tribe of any size, the Kūrājin, and began to besiege their quarter of the town. The Jews no doubt hoped to escape in the same easy fashion as the Nadrī had, especially as their allies, the Sāwī, were very actively trying to induce Muhammad to eleumency; but this time he was inexorable and carried out seriously a threat that he had previously made (lix. 3). Tradition has however endeavoured to put the responsibility for the massacre of the Kūrājinn on Sa‘d b. Mu‘ād (cf. Ḥassān b. Thabit, N°. 183, cloxii., who asserts Sa‘d’s innocence). But there are various indications that it was the Prophet himself who made the decision and perhaps induced the Jews to surrender. On this occasion the Jews showed a strength of character and nobility of spirit which throws a redeeming light on their otherwise so ignoble history.

By these amputations, which however did not remove all the Jews from Medina (cf. Ibn Ḥishām, vi. 85; cf. M. Weidner, S. 264, 300, 393: Ḥassān b. Thabit, N°. 133, 17), the Prophet had come nearer his goal, the organisation of an umma on a purely religious basis, which hitherto had to keep somewhat in the background for political reasons. For the present he continued his attacks on the Meccan caravans far into the year 6 (May 627—May 628) and his raids, usually punitive expeditions, on Beduin tribes; of these expeditions, which have no particular interest, mention may be made of that against the Banū Muṣṭalīt which must have taken place about this time, as it gave rise to a serious conflict between the Mu‘ahhidīn and the Aṣṣir and involved Ḥā‘ib b. Ḥa‘ib [g. v.] in the celebrated adventure which nearly cost her position as the wife of the Prophet, until finally a revelation saved her (xxiv. 4 sq., 10—20).

Towards the end of the year 6 Muhammad thought that his position in Medina was so firmly established that he could risk a step, which would bring him nearer the desired goal. He and the emigrants were still excluded from Mecca and its holy places, but through secret confidential agents, among whom we may certainly include his carefully calculating uncle ‘Aḥībān, he knew that feeling in the town had been gradually coming round (cf. xlvii. 15; Is. 7). An increasing number had become tired of the hopeless wars and thought it would be much more advantageous for the commerce of Mecca to make peace with their independent anyad, which had adopted into his programme the pilgrimages to their fairs, the source of the city’s wealth. Trusting to this revulsion of feeling he gave his followers in Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da of the year 6, i.e. March 628 (the news of the death of the Persian king Khusrav Parwēz on the 29 of this year reached him on the way) orders to provide themselves with sacrificial victims and undertake an ʿumra [g. v.] with him to Mecca, as Allah in a vision had promised him a successful fulfilment of the visit (xlvii. 27). He probably chose an ʿumra deliberately (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 740: Waqīlī-Wellhausen, p. 240 sq., 2531: cf. Sīra, xx. 39, 34) instead of the great pilgrimage which was soon due, as the consequences of an encounter with all manner of tribes, with whom he might
possibly have been waging war, were too inextricable for him: but perhaps he cherished also the hope that, if all went well, he might remain there in the following month also (cf. ii. 192 which perhaps belongs to this connection). The step was nevertheless a risky one, so that he asked several Beduin tribes to accompany him in case they met with resistance. To his disappointment however, they refused (xxvii. 11 sq.) so that he decided to abandon the military character of the march and make his followers go as harmless pilgrims. In Meccan many were inclined to meet his wishes but the belligerent party was still strong enough to get a body of armed men sent to meet him to prevent him entering the town. He therefore encamped at al-Hudaybiya (q.v.) where he began to negotiate with the Meccans, and when this led to no result he sent to Yilman, who was protected by his family connection, into the town as his representative. But when the latter showed no signs of returning and finally a rumour got about that he had been murdered, the situation became critical and Muhammad dropped all negotiations, collected his followers under a tree, probably one long held sacred, and made them swear to fight for him to the last, which they did with enthusiasm (xxvi. 10, 13). But soon afterwards a number of Meccans arrived and offered a compromise, which is very characteristic of the aimless Meccan policy, by which he was to retire this time but to be allowed to perform an 'umra next year. He agreed to the proposal, concluded a ten years' truce with the Quraysh and further promised to surrender all Meccans of dependent status who came to him. His followers, whom he had worked up into a state of great excitement by his promises and the taking of the oath, heard these conditions with scarcely concealed anger; but Muhammad calmly ordered the sacrificial animals brought with them to be slain, which was to have been done at an 'umra in the town (see Lane, Lexicon, s.v. muzzil). and had his hair cut and by his authority forced his gloomful followers to do the same. Only later did they discover that he had made a brilliant stroke of policy for he had induced the Meccans to recognise the despoiled fugitive as an opponent of equal rank and had concluded a peace with them which promised well for the future.

He and the participants received ample compensation for the apparently frustrated 'umra at the beginning of the year 7 (May 628-April 629) by the capture of the fertile oasis of Khaybar (q.v.) which was inhabited by Jews. It was the first actual conquest by the Prophet and he instituted on this occasion a practice which became regular afterwards, when Jews or Christians capitulated: he did not put the people to death or banish them but let them remain as tenants, as it were, who had to pay dues every year. This expedition which also brought the Jewish colonies of Wadi 'Il-Kufr into power, made the Muslims rich (xxvii. 18-21).

In this period, although the exact date is variously given, tradition puts the dispatch of letters from the Prophet to Mu'awiyah, governor of Alexandria, the ruler of Byzantium, the Byzantine emperor, the Persian king etc., in which he demanded that they should adopt Islam. The alleged original manuscript of the first of these has however proved not to be genuine (see T. M., 1854, p. 482 sqq.; Sandall, in Hibah, 1904, p. 103 sqq.; Becker, Papias; Smith-Rhindt, i. 3). But even what is related about these epistles hardly deserves the faith most people have put in it. Even if we disregard the many apocryphal details, we must surely consider it very unlikely that so sober a politician as Muhammad, who had at this time a very definite object, the conquest of Mecca, before his eyes, should have thought of indulging so fantastic an idea as the conversion of Heraclius or the Persian king, to whom the "Inad Arabic Kur'an" was no less unintelligible than the Bible to the Prophet and his countrymen, and whom he could neither compel by force nor entice with promised advantages. It is very doubtful if Muhammad even thought at all of his religion as a universal religion of the world, as for example Noldeke, in W. Z. K. M., xxi. 307, Goldziher, Vorlesungen über den Islam, p. 25, and T. W. Arnold, The Preaching of Islam, p. 23 sqq. hold (against them, see Snouck Hurgronje, Mohammedanism, p. 48 sqq.; H. Lammens, Enquéte sur le vœu du calife Mohamet, i. 422). The passage in the Meccan sūras which can be quoted in favour of this theory (vi. 90; xii. 104; xxi. 157; xxiv. 3; xxxiv. 27; xxxvii. 70; xxxviii. 87; lixiv. 52; lixiv. 27: cf. from the later period: li. 90; xii. 25) are limited by their context or by unanimous parallels (cf. xii. 92; xxxiv. 7 [the mother of the city, i.e. Mecca]; cf. xxvi. 214). Besides, in the Medina period, the place of persuasion and proof ("no compulsion in religion"); li. 257; cf. xvi. 126), was taken by the spread of Islam by force of arms, which, although based on the supremacy of Islam over other religions (lii. 79: cf. lxi. 4), was confined to the lands inhabited by Arabs.

If after the conquest of Mecca he also declared war on the possessors of a scripture (see below) the campaign undertaken by him prove that he was only thinking of Arabs under Byzantine or Persian rule, and it cannot be proved that he ever went beyond this in his schemes (the gift of Hebron, Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 129 may be confidently asserted to be a forgery: cf. the article in T. M.). The decisive consideration however is that Muhammad at the height of his power never demanded from Jews or Christians that they should adopt Islam but was content with a political subjection and the payment of tribute. The correct conclusion is therefore to reject those stories and to look for the real historical basis in negotiations of a purely political nature, e.g. with the friendly Muqakwik (q.v. and cf. Butler, The Arab Conquest of Egypt, 1902) and to assume that the idea of a great missionary enterprise arose later under the influence of Christian traditions, notably the miracle of Pentecost.

On the other hand, the character of the genuine letters of the Prophet to the Arab tribes changes at this time, for he was no longer content with a purely political agreement but, relying on his now consolidated power, also demanded that they should adhere to his religion, which involved performing the 'salat and paying 'alms'; he even gave the Dhu'lahim on the Syrian coast a re-prise (jum'ah) of two months after which they were to declare (see Speeher, cf. cit., p. 14 sqq.).

In March 629, Muhammad performed the 'umra stipulated for him by the peace of Hudaybiya (the 'umra of the "contract" or "recovery"). For him who had been driven out of his native city it was undoubtedly a great satisfaction to be able to visit Mecca as the acknowledged lord of Medina;
but otherwise the significance of the occasion was more symbolic and the efforts of the practised diplomat to prolong his stay by his marriage with a sister-in-law of his secret ally 'Abbâs [see Mâmu'â] were politely but firmly resisted by the Meccans. On the other hand, it was of great significance that some of the most important Meccans, like 'Amr b. al-'Asi and the military genius Khalid b. al-Walid, who saw he was the coming man, openly joined him, while his uncle 'Abbâs and the very patriotic (Ibn Hähâm, p. 275) but cautious Abu Sufîyan endeavoured in secret negotiations to prepare in the most favourable way for the inevitable result. In the meanwhile he continued his military expeditions. His forces suffered a serious reverse in the first considerable effort to extend his authority over the Arabs on Byzantine soil, at Mu'ta (q.v.) in Transjordania; this is also recorded by Theophanes (Chronographia, ed. de Boor, i. 335). But several Beduin tribes now began to see what advantages they would procure not only for the next but also for this world by joining him, and large groups like the Sûlâm voluntarily adopted Islam and placed themselves under his flag.

That it was Muhammad's intention to break the truce with the Kurâsh at the first opportunity may be taken as certain; for it must have been intolerable for him that the heathen should still have Allâh's sanctuary in their control (ix. 17 sq.); cf. ii. 3). The tacitness of the Meccans now gave him his opportunity. Very much against the advice of Abu Sufîyan, the belligerent party in Mecca had supported the Bâqer against the Kurâsh, who were Muhammad's allies, and thus given a plausible casus belli (cf. perhaps ix. 12 sq.). In Ramdân of the year 8 (May 629—April 630) he set out at the head of an army of Muhâjîrîn, Ansâr, and Beduins. The news produced considerable anxiety in Mecca where the number of those who wanted to fight shrank daily so that the more prudent now could take control. Abu Sufîyan, who was sent out with several others (including the Kurâsh Bâdâl b. Warqâ who was a friend of the Prophet's) met Muhammad not far from the town, paid homage to him and obtained an amnesty for all the Kurâsh who abandoned armed resistance (cf. 'Uwâ', Tabârî, i. 1654 sq.). Except for a few irreconcilables (cf. Divan der Hudâlît, N. 183; Muhârîd, al-Kâmîl, ed. Wright, p. 365) they acquiesced and thus the Prophet was able to enter his native city practically without a struggle and almost all its inhabitants adopted Islam. He acted with great generosity and endeavoured to win all hearts by rich gifts (tâlîf al-kâfûbî, a new use of the alms—cf. iv. 60). Only he demanded ruthless destruction of the adib of in and around Mecca. Only Sûra ex. seems to preserve an echo of the exaltation with which this victory filled him; here as in the unusually touching passage xviii. 1 sq., he sees in the success of his plans a sign that Allâh has forgiven him all his sins.

Muhammad did not rest long upon his laurels for not only was Tâ'if, which was closely associated with Mecca, still unsubdued but the Hâwazîn tribes in Central Arabia were preparing for a decisive fight. A battle was fought with these Beduins at Hunain on the road to Tâ'if (q.v.) which at first threatened to be a fatal disaster to the Prophet, mainly because of the unreliability of a number of the new converts, until some of his followers succeeded in recalling the fugitives and routing the enemy (ix. 25 sq.). On the other hand, his inexperienced troops were unable to take Tâ'if with its defences (cf. the description of impregnable fortresses in Diez der Hudâlît, N. 66, to sq.). The people of Tâ'if however afterwards fell in with the spirit of the time and adopted Islam. When Muhammad, after raising the siege, was distributing the booty of Hunain, the Ansâr who as soon as he entered Mecca had expressed the fear that he would take up his residence again in his native town, became very indignant about the rich gifts that he made to his former opponents in order "to win their hearts", while they themselves went empty-handed (cf. 'Ishân b. Thabit, N. xxxi.) but he spoke so kindly to them that they burst into tears and declared themselves satisfied. His conduct on this occasion reminds us to some extent of that of David towards the Jews and Ephraîmites after Absalom's rebellion.

The characteristic feature of the year 9 (April 630—April 631) in the memory of the Muslims was the many embassies which came from different parts of Arabia to Medina, to submit on behalf of their tribes to the conqueror of Mecca (cf. ex. 3) and the letters which he sent to the tribes, to lay down the conditions of their adoption of Islam. In the autumn of this year, he made up his mind to conduct a campaign against Northern Arabia on a considerable scale, probably because the defeat in Transjordania required to be avenged and because the Ghassânîd king was adopting a hostile attitude (cf. Ibn Hähâm, p. 911; Bukhârî, Magâzî b. 78, 79). But his appeal for followers met with little support. Munâfiqûn as well as Beduins had hardly understood the promise, and there were some who put forward all sorts of objections, out of fear of a campaign so far away in the glowing heat (cf. iv. 45; lxi. 84—91, 98 sqq.). In particular he seems to have had to face at this time a considerable opposition in Medina (ix. 58—73, 125) so that he had to have recourse to his old instrument of intimidation and his words recall in a remarkable way the period of passion in Mecca (ix. 71, 129 sqq.). Matters came to such a pitch that some of the opposition, behind whom is said by one tradition to have been his old inexorable opponent, the ascetic Abu 'Amr, the child of a house of prayer of their own "for division among the faithful and a support for those who had formerly fought against God and his Prophet" (ix. 108 sqq.). Unfortunately the expression in the Kurân and in the tradition are quite insufficient to enable us to get a clear picture of this very remarkable affair. In spite of all opposition however, he carried through his plan; but when after great hardships he had reached Tabîk on the frontier (in the land of the Byzantines: cf. Ibn Idrîs, p. 956), he stayed there some time and then returned to Medina. The campaign was however not without success. His prestige had now become so great that the petty Christian and Jewish states in the north of Arabia submitted to him during his stay in Tabîk, for example the Christian king Yuhannâ in Aila (q.v.), the people of A'diru (q.v.) and the Jews in the port of Makâa Khâlîd also occupied the important centre of Dama al-Djandâl (cf. for a criticism of the account Caetani, i. 261—268; Sperber, cf. ib. p. 44 sqq.; on the alleged letter from Muhammad to the Jews in Makâa, see also Wensmek, in ib. ii. 290).
Unfortunately we do not know how the matters which were rapidly coming to a head in Medina actually developed; but we may safely assume that the death of 'Abd Allah b. Umay, which took place not long after the expedition to Tabuk, must have contributed to slacken the tension. These years showed a marked increase in the prestige of the lord of Medina abroad. Mecca was in his hands, and among the Beduins an inclination was noticeable in several places to submit to the will of the conqueror of this town, to be safe against his attacks and to have a share in his rich booty. This was for example the case with the group of tribes of Ṣamī b. Sa'da, with portions of the great tribe of Tamim and the neighboring Asad and farther north with the Bakr and Taghlib. Even in regions so remote as Balqais and Ḍumān within the Persian sphere of influence and among the chiefs of South Arabia, the new teaching and order of things penetrated and found ardent followers in some places. But we must not allow ourselves to be deceived by the representations of the historians, from which it appears as if all the people in these lands adopted Islam. Caætani and Sperber in particular have shown that these accounts are not in keeping with reality and that it was only little groups that submitted, while there was a not inconsiderable number who rejected the Prophet's demands. As regards open opposition the question was quite simple; when they were heathen, adhered to their paganism and would not abandon their polytheism, they were to be threatened by Muhammad with the "holy war". He had not only to deal with such as those in Arabia, but there were also in addition to the Jews who had already felt his strength, a considerable number of Christians, and some Pārsis in the eastern and southern districts. Muhammad was thus faced with a problem which he had to solve. From his words in Sūra ii. 29 sqq. where he includes the Christians and even the Jews, the people of such strict monotheism, among the polytheists, who give Allah a son and honour men as lords beside him, one would expect that he would have fought them like the heathen, if they did not adopt Islam (cf. also the attack on the Christians, verse 76 sqq.). But in contrast to such utterances we have another (Sūra ii. 85) where he mentions the Christians very sympathetically because they, unlike the Jews, show themselves kindly towards true believers and are not arrogant, which he ascribes to the fact that they have priests and monks (cf. his judgment on monasticism: Sūra liv. 21). These remarkable contradictions may be explained, as pointed out by Tor Andræe, by the difference between the Monotheists and the Nestorians. The former answered his unqualified displeasure by their Christology, while the latter, who were then predominant in the Persian empire, attracted him much more, and this attitude was shared by his followers after his death, as the letter of the Catholocos Išo'yah, quoted by Tor Andræe, shows. On the other hand, his remarks about the Jews are always very severe. It is, therefore, all the more remarkable that the distinction between Jews and Christians completely disappears when their position is finally settled. They were included together as "peoples of a scripture" and they were allowed to retain their religion if they recognized the political sovereignty of the Prophet by paying a tax (jizya, q.v.); if they did not they were to be fought without mercy.

The memory of the agreement between Muhammad's teaching and that of the "peoples of a scripture", earlier so much emphasised, must have contributed to this rather illogical settlement and in addition there was the fact that treating the Jews as tax-paying tenants, and allowing them to practise their religion, had been already done at Khaibar, was much more practical for the Muslims than fighting them till they gave in. A further compromise with the "peoples of a scripture" was that believers were allowed to marry the daughters of the "peoples of a scripture" and to eat food prepared by them (v. 7). It is noteworthy that the Pārsis (Māqūi, A.M. 17) were included among the "peoples of a scripture" which made a difficulty for later better informed generations (Tabari, t. 1995, 19; Badūh, p. 79); probably Muḥammad did not dare for political reasons to demand that they should give up their religion. This extended application of the term "peoples of a scripture" is found not in the Kurān but in a letter of Muhammad's to the Pārsis in Hijjār (Ibn Sa'd, l. 19) but with the limitation that the Muslims are forbidden to marry their women and to eat meat killed by them.

With these exceptions, the Prophet had approached nearer the object which was always before him, although it hitherto eluded him, the formation of an umma on a definitely religious basis, for the inhabitants of a number of parts of Arabia were now actually bound together by religion. The old differences between the tribes with their endless feuds, their blood-vengeance and their lampions which continually stirred up new quarrels, were to disappear at the will of Muhammad and all believers were to feel themselves brethren (lxii. 11; xlix. 10 sq.). There was to be no distinction among believers except in their degree of pious (lxii. 13).

The Prophet certainly had an ideal before him, but it was realised only in a very incomplete way. The very rapid extension of Islam had been accompanied by a considerable diminution in its religious content. Alongside of the older adherents, who were really carried away by his preaching, and whose faith had been tried by privations and dangers, there were now the many new converts who had been gained mainly by fear (cf. the well-known poem of Ka'b b. Zuhair; the poem of the Hidutha Laid a b Ahi Iyas in Kosegarten, Geminna Hidutha, NO. 127) or by the prospect of material advantages.

In spite of the teachers sent out to them there could be no question of any deep-seated conversion among these Arabs and how the old Arab spirit continued to flourish among them, weakened as shown for example by the boasting and abuse in the poems in Ibn Ithiṣām, p. 934 sqq., which are in no way inferior to the old poems. The Prophet himself in Sūra xlix. 14 has recorded very definitely how far the Beduins were from the true faith; they cannot say that they believe but only that they have adopted Islam, Commandments relating to religion and worship, which had considerably occupied Muhammad in the early Medinese period, gave way in striking fashion to social and political regulations, a natural result of the fact that the few members were not ripe for the former. Uncertainty on these matters was still great and even the headquarters much seems still to have been in an embryonic state. This is true even of so fundamental a law as the rule for the times of daily prayer, as the five prayers later obligatory are
nowhere laid down in the Kur'an (see above; cf. also the expression "morning and evening" in A'sh'a's poem: *HerzoglLand Festschr., p. 259*). That they were introduced by Muhammad himself at the end of his life is possible, but not very probable in view of the silence on the point in the Kur'an, and in any case it is not certainly proved by the mention of the five times of prayer in a letter of the Prophet. (Ibn Hishâm, p. 902) as we are not justified in expecting absolutely literal accuracy in the transmission of such documents. Only one or two religious institutions are dealt with at all fully in the Kur'an, the great pilgrimage to the sanctuaries at Mecca and the 'umra in the town itself, but the hadj was indeed the crown of his endeavours begun in Mecca and carried through with tenacity. The Prophet, although he was now lord of Mecca, did not yet take part in the pilgrimage in the year 8, which was so inexplicable to later generations that they invented an 'umra unknown to many of his followers (Ibn Hishâm, p. 885; Tâbarî, i. 1670 ["Uwa", 1655]; Wāṣīlī, p. 310; Ibn Sā'd, ii. 1, 123 sq.; iii. 105, 152; cf. ii. 123 sq.; Snouck Hurgrone, *Het Med.
Apart from the revelation with which he was favoured, he is a man like any other and social views refer to the fact that he will die. The episode in Ibn Hishäm, p. 1612 sq.; is not historical but a tendency story directed against the tendency becoming apparent to apostathise the Prophet. This is exactly the field in which later ages have felt dissatisfied, so that they quite early, driven mainly by their disputations with the Christians (see M. Schreiner, in Z. D. M. G., xli. 594), wove around the person and life of the Prophet a network of supernatural features (see for Andrac's work quoted below). Apart from the traditions which are clearly confirmed by the Qur'an, we can only have certainty in the strictest sense of the word in case where the stories place the Prophet in an unfavourable light, not only from our point of view but also from that of the Muslims, e.g. in the story of his temporary recognition of the three Meccan goddesses or of his being cenured by 'Umar for setting off the ihram between the umra and hajj. On the Farewell Pilgrimage, for it is an incredible fact that such features should be later inventions and as a rule in such cases the compromising stories are confirmed by the existence of variant traditions which endeavour to dispose of the offensive features by glossing them over or altering them.

If the biographers of Muhammad must for these reasons impose a very considerable restraint upon themselves, there is nevertheless one essential aspect of his activity, which ought to be very strongly emphasised, particularly as justice is not always done to it in modern treatments of his life. There is a tendency in some recent writers not only to emphasise all that is unfavourable but also to neglect his real religious importance. If he had really only been an oversexed man, anxious for worldly profit and quite unscrupulous in the choice of his means, Islam, which had been created by him and developed after his death, would have been an effect without a cause. It is impossible for the unbiased historian to deny that he aroused the religious instinct of his countrymen, and gave expression to a body of religious and moral conceptions which not only satisfied his fellow-countrymen but supplied the needs of the people of lands which had old civilizations conquered by the Muslims and served them as foundations for a vigorous and far-reaching intellectual activity. Although as a result of his singular theory of inspiration, his direct dependence on the older religious of revelation remained concealed, he was able in his own way to communicate to his countrymen a part of the spiritual wealth of the "peoples of a scripture" and how he touched the soul of the Arabs is best seen by the efforts of the Wahhabis at a reformation. In lands of ancient culture, Islam, it is true, was only able to carry out its task by a sometimes radical remoulding and the intellectual activity already mentioned developed also under the influence of Christianity and mysticism, but yet it was Muhammad who set the whole process in motion and he could not have gained this influence if he had only been what the writers mentioned professed to have found in him.
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MUHAMMAD I-III. [See Ummays I]
Muhammad II, with the surname Ali Fatih, or, more popularly, Fatih, was both ruler of the Ottoman Empire in his own right and a key player in its expansion. His reign, from 1451 until his death in 1481, was characterized by his successful campaigns against the Byzantine Empire, the capture of Constantinople, and the establishment of the Ottoman Empire as a major power in the Mediterranean region.

Muhammad II was born in 1432 and was the son of Bayezid II, who had been the last sultan in the line of Bayezid I. Muhammad was elevated to the throne after his father's death, and he immediately set about expanding the Ottoman Empire.

One of his most notable achievements was the capture of Constantinople in 1453, which marked the end of the Byzantine Empire and the beginning of the Ottoman Empire's domination of the Mediterranean. This victory was followed by a series of successful campaigns that brought much of the Balkan Peninsula under Ottoman control.

Muhammad II was known for his military prowess and his ability to negotiate with the Crusaders and other European powers. He was also known for his interest in art and architecture, and he is credited with the construction of many important buildings in Istanbul, including the Sultanahmet Mosque.

His reign ended in 1481, when he died suddenly. However, his legacy lived on, and the Ottoman Empire continued to expand under his successors.
year, the sultan obtained successes against Serbia, while Turkhan [q. v.] intervened in Morea, where the last Palaeologus despots were at war with the Albanian. Immediately after the taking of Constantinople the grand vizier Kajtil Pasha had been deposed and executed by order of the sultan, who had personal and political causes of complaint against him (cf. Taedelmen and Witten, in C.F. with 156 sqq.); he was replaced after nearly a year by Mahmud Pasha [q. v.], who for the next twelve years was to be a less energetic supporter of Muhammad in the achievement of the programme of conquest. The year 1455 saw both of them in Serbia and on the Aegean coast, where the principal conquests were Amoss and the island of Lemnos [q. v.]. In 1456 they were unsuccessful in the siege of Belgrad. During the years 1458 and 1459 Serbia was made a direct Ottoman province (Semendra taken in 1459 by Muhammad), and in the same year and in 1460 the sultan took part in several campaigns in the Morea, the northern part of which was conquered from the Palaeologus. About the same time a temporary understanding was reached with Skanderbeg [q. v.] in Albania. Then came the famous Asiatic campaign of 1461. Amara (Amastria) was taken from the Genoese and Serbs [q. v.], which was the last island on the coast of the western part of the Black Sea. The fall of Trebizond immediately followed (cf. PARABEN), after the beginning of a conflict with Zan Hasan of the Ask-Oyunkul. In the next year the sultan's army drove the famous Wallachian voivod Vlad Dracul from his principality, which was given to his brother Radul, and at the end of the year Muhammad and Mahmud made a secret to the rule of the Genoese dynasty of Lesbos. The years 1463 and 1464 were mainly occupied by the annexation of the kingdom of Bosnia. In 1465 a war with Venice, which was to last seventeen years; the main theatre of hostilities was the Morea, but also in the islands of the Aegean there were continual encounters with Venetian fleets. The death of the Karaman Oghlu [q. v.] Ibrahim in 1454 had first provoked the sultan's intervention and soon nearly all the towns of this once powerful principality were conquered during Muhammad's campaign of 1466 (battle of Larenis). In that same year Muhammad was successful in Albania, where he fortified the town of Illyria (cf. SKANDERBES). Mahmud Pasha had been deposed as grand vizier after the Karaman campaign and replaced by Rüm Mahmud Pasha. But it was Mahmud who as governor of Gallipoli and Kapudan Pasha, helped Muhammad in the conquest from Venice of the Islands of Negroponte (Euboea) in 1470. In the same year began again a series of campaigns under Rüm Mahmud and Gedik Ahmad Pasha against the last towns held by descendants of the Karaman Oghlu, who were supported by Zan Hasan [q. v.] and by Christian fleets on the sea side. When Zan Hasan had even taken the offensive in conquering the town of Tokat, great preparations were made for a new Asiatic campaign of the sultan, and Mahmud was again made grand vizier. The sultan's army went in 1473 the last victory of Ernudjian, which put an end to danger from that side. In this campaign a part was played by prince Mus-tafa, the heir to the throne, who completed in 1474 the conquest of Fë Ilt (Galicja) but died soon afterwards. Mahmud Pasha had been deposed again from the grand vizierate and executed in August 1474; Gedik Ahmad Pasha took his place.

In the following years, until 1480, the sultan's chief attention was given to conquests in Europe. He built in 1471 the fortress of Sabac (Bugardelen) in Srbija, near Belgrad, while his troops in these and the following years made incursions into Hungary and far into Austrian territory; the war with Venice continued and in 1474 the Albanian Skutar (Skukand) was in vain besieged. The year 1475 brought the great success of the conquest of Kutja from the Genoese and, as a result of the establishing of the Ottoman power in the Crimea, the submission of the Tatar Khânate of the Crimeans to Ottoman suzerainty. In 1476 the sultan himself was successful in Moldavia, but in the next years the Turkish armies had less success against the Venetians in Albania and southern Morea; finally in 1478 Muhammad himself went to Albania and took Corfu; Skutar was besieged a long time, but surrendered only on account of the peace negotiations with Venice, which led to a peace treaty (confirmed January 26, 1479) leaving a certain number of towns in Albania and Morea to Venice. The Ionian islands, however, were conquered in 1479 by a fleet under Gedik Ahmad, who at the same time, went so far as to take Otranto in southern Italy. An endeavour to conquer the island of Rhodes in the same year was not successful.

Muhammad's last campaign took place in 1480, when he intervened in the dynastic disputes of the dynasty of Dhi Tekkdr [q. v.], which intervention gave rise to the first difficulties with Egypt. In the next year, 1481, he had already set out for a new military enterprise in Asia, the aim of which was yet unknown, but may have been connected with the same difficulties, when he died, rather suddenly, in the place called Tekfur Ciyri or Khiyuk Ciyri between Skutar and Gebze (May 3, 1481). His body was transported to Constantinople and buried in the vault of the Faithful Mosque. Besides being a great conqueror, Muhammad II was the builder of many important edifices. In the first place of the Faith Mosque in Constantinople and the mosque of Eyyub (Elieieyub at-Dawr), r. 8 sqq.: 243 sqq.) and further the castles on the Dardanelles and other works of naval and military importance. In the army administration he succeeded in restoring discipline among the Janissaries by incorporating in them the corps of the Seghans; further his name is connected with the first Ottoman Kâmil-i-Müslîm (printed as an appendix to T.O.E.M., ii.). He encouraged scientific studies and showed an interest in literature and poetry: he pensioned thirteen Turkish poets, and even for the Renaissance arts in Italy (he summoned Gentile Bellini to Constantinople, who made his portrait, et. alia Thach. Tom allen otzebothen Reich, Tur- bingen 1938, p. 18*).

Bibliography: Among the early sources, the Byzantine historians (Phlanes, Ducaas, Chaconylambos) are by far the more important. The Greek description of Muhammad's life by Cito- bulos was translated into Turkish (appendix to T.O.E.M., i. and ii.). The old Ottoman chronicles (Nezhi and others) often treat the beginning of Muhammad's reign in their last part; the later historical sources (Sad al-Din, Ali Ferdinân) are far from being reliable in this time. Further von Hammer, G. O., K. I., ii. Zinkens (i.) and
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MUHAMMAD III, thirteenth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born on May 16, 1567, the son of Murad III and the Venetian lady Baffa, and reigned from January 27, 1593 until his death, December 22, 1603. He was the last sultan who, as crown prince, had reigned as governor in Magna-

...
against the Polish king; the Polish war, ending in a peace treaty of 1676, strengthened still further the Empire's position in the north. Köprülu Ahmad Pasha died on Oct. 30, 1676. Though the sultan, who had developed in the meantime a morose and capricious character, never showed him the same deference as to his father, Ahmad had been easily able to maintain himself against enemies in the interior, not least by forming new troops (the "light" and the "gōnluhal"), who were far more reliable than the Janissaries and Sipahis. He had not been able, however, to put an end to the extravagant luxury of the court, which wasted enormous sums. The sultan had an abnormal liking for fox hunts, that were organized at enormous cost in the environment of Adrianople, which town he preferred as a residence to Constantinople.

After Ahmad's death the sultan did not himself like the affairs of state in hand; he appointed Kara Muştafa Pasha [v. v.] as grand vizier. The latter continued in an unnecessary war, the tradition of warfare; in 1677 and 1678 he obtained several victories against the Cossacks, behind whom the Moscovites now began to gain in importance in Turkish affairs. In 1682 war broke out again with the Austrian monarchy and led to the second Turkish siege of Vienna (July 13—Sept. 12, 1683), ending in a Turkish defeat, thanks to the intervention of the Polish king Sobiesky. This disaster cost Kara Muştafa his office and his life and at the same time the influence of the Sıddil became again predominant. The grand viziers following proved unequal to their task and in the years 1685—1687 nearly the whole of Hungary was lost to the Austrian armies (Turkish defeat at Mohács on June 22, 1687). At the same time the hostilities with Venice had been reopened in the Morea and in the Archipelago.

All these disasters caused a revolt of the troops in the field; they marched on the capital in September 1687 under Slaywush Pasha of Aleppo. This time the sultan himself fell a victim to the rebels; he was murdered on November 8, 1687 by the big Köprülu Köprülu Muştafa Pasha and lived in seclusion in Adrianople until his death on December 17, 1692. He was buried next to his mother in the Yeni Džami.

**Bibliography:** Na'ima (iv.) and Hâddî Kâlifa, and until 1660 the Taşıl of Raşid are the most important Turkish historical sources. The Sıddil-name of Ebulîbî Celebi describes many of the military expeditions of this period and is also otherwise a valuable source of information. Among the European sources this period is covered by P. Ricaut, *Histoire des derniers emperors des Turcs depuis 1624 jusqu'à 1677*, Paris 1683. Further, von Hammer, *G. O.R., v., vi. and the works of Zinkeser (iv. and v.) and Jorga (iv.). See also the monographs of Ahmad Refik, *Köprüluahmet*, Constantinople 1831 (1913), *Kadınlar Sultanât*, Constantinople 1914—1924, and *Felaket Sefileri* (1904—1110), Constantinople 1832 (1914).

**MUHAMMAD V RESHÂD, THIRTY-FOURTH OTTOMAN SULTAN, was born on November 2, 1834 as a son of Sultan Abd al-Madjid. During the reign of his brother 'Abd al-Hamid II he lived in seclusion; his very existence inspired 'Abd al-Hamid with such terror that even the mentioning of persons with the name Reshâd had to be avoided in his presence (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *Verspreide Geschriften*, iii. 329). He was a man of mild character, who owed his accession to the throne (April 27, 1909) only to the victory of the Young Turks; moreover he was the first constitutional ruler of Turkey, but he was unable to give direction to the very disparate political tendencies that manifested themselves within and without the Parliament during the years after the Revolution, and, after the final victory of the Unionist party in January 1913, Muhammad V had to submit, much against his will, to their government.

At the very beginning of his reign, Turkey lost her last vestige of authority over Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary's annexation, and over Bulgaria by the declaration of its independence (Oct. 5, 1909). The cabinets under Hüsein Hilmi Pasha (until January 18, 1910) and 'Isâ'iî Hakki Pasha (q.v., until Sept. 29, 1911) were not able to bring about a peaceful situation in the interior (revolts in Albania). Hakki Pasha had to resign on account of the declaration of war by Italy. Under the grand vizierate of Said Pasha (q.v.) the Italian war led to the loss of Tripoli, confirmed by the peace treaty of Ouchy (Oct. 15, 1912). The peace was signed under the anti-unionist cabinet of Ahmad Muktâr Pasha, but in the same month began the so-called Balkan War against the confederated Balkan States. The reactionary cabinet of Kâmil Pasha soon showed an inclination to conclude a disastrous peace through the intermediation of the European powers (Conference of London); then on January 23, 1913 the Unionist coup d'état brought again a Unionist government under Mahmud Shewket Pasha. The result was a reopening of the hostilities and, after the failure of Bulgaria, the recapture of Adrianople (July 22, 1913). In the meantime Mahmud Shewket had been murdered (June 28) by adherents of the liberal opposition, but this did not bring about a change in the political course; his place was taken by Said Hâlim Pasha, whose government signed the peace-treaties with Bulgaria (Sept. 29, 1913). Greece (Nov. 14) and Serbia (March 14, 1914). From this time, the Committee of Union and Progress, which from the beginning of Muhammad Reşhad's reign had not ceased to work behind the scenes, became all-powerful and its leaders Tafrat Bey and Enver Bey came more and more to the front. Afterwards, when at the beginning of the Great War, the Ottoman Government had decided to remain neutral, it was the unionist sympathies with Germany that brought about a gradual entanglement between Turkey and the Allies (the "Ioehmen" and "Bieslau" incident), culminating in the entrance of Turkey into the war on the side of the Central Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black sea on October 29 and 30, 1914). Tafrat Pasha himself became grand vizier in February 1917. The Allied manoeuvre to force a way through the Dardanelles was definitely abandoned in January 1916 and in the meantime Turkish troops fought on the Egyptian front, in Iraq and on the Russian and Persian frontiers. Before the end of the war Muhammad V died unexpectedly on July 2, 1918.

**Bibliography:** de la Jonquière, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, 1914, i. 'Alâeddín Eman, *Turkey in the World War*, New Haven 1930; besides many other publications on the war and on the general politics of Turkey.

(J. H. KRAMERS)
MUHAMMAD VI WAHID AL-DIN, last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was born on January 14, 1561, as son of Sultan Abd al-Majid. He was elected to the throne on July 3, 1568, after the death of his brother Muhammad V Rëşad, the former heir to the throne Yusuf Izz al-Din, son of Abd al-Âziz, having died in 1566. When on October 30, 1568, nearly four months after his accession, the amirshah of Mudros was signed, he was the ruler of an empire that seemed to be at the mercy of its former enemies, whose military forces occupied the capital and other hitherto unconquered parts of Turkey. On the other hand, the power of the Committee of Union and Progress was broken, but, since in the beginning of 1569 there began in Anatolia an increasing opposition against the foreign occupation, joined with an aversion to obey the Constantinople government, Muhammad VI seemed to have no other choice than to throw in his lot with the Allies and, together with his grand vizier Dâmid Ferid Pasha, he collaborated with the Allies in the efforts to suppress the nationalist forces (beginning of 1570): this anti-nationalist action was even sanctioned by a fa'âlâh of the Shaikh al-Islam.

As the nationalist movement grew ever stronger, the Sultan's authority could only be upheld in Constantinople by the support of the Allies. His government had to sign the Treaty of Sèves (August 10, 1570) and the Tewfik Pasha cabinet (since October 21, 1570) tried to summon the Parliament for its ratification. But in 1571 things had already gone so far that Tewfik Pasha recognized the powerlessness of his government to represent Turkey. The final success of the nationalists against the Greeks (destruction of Smyrna, September 6, 1571) brought about the armistice of Mudânas (October 11, 1572), to which the Sultan's government was not a party. It was still invited to represent Turkey in Lausanne, together with the Angora government. This was not accepted by the Great National Assembly, which, on November 1, 1572, declared the Ottoman sultanate abolished from March 16, 1570 (occupation of Constantinople); Tewfik Pasha's cabinet resigned accordingly (November 4) and Muhammad VI remained as Khalif in Constantinople, where, on November 10, he appeared at his last Âlâmâ. When, however, the National Assembly decided some days afterwards to try Wahid al-Din on a charge of high treason, this last Sultan left Constantinople as a fugitive on a British ship (November 17, 1572) and the very next day the Angora government declared him dethroned and expelled. Having gone first to Malta, the ex-sultan proceeded to Mecca as the guest of king Husain. From here he launched his proclamation to the Islamic world, in which he maintained that the separation of the caliphate from the sultanate was contrary to the shura (text in Ouverte Modernes, t. 702-705). This appeal found hardly any response in the Islamic world. The last Ottoman Sultan left Mecca again and went to live in San Remo, where he died on May 10, 1576. In 1574 he had even recognized king Husain's claim to the caliphate.

Bibliography: Jaschké and Pritsch, Die Türken seit dem Weltkriege, in W. J., vol. x., 1977-1929, and vol. xi., Ieft 1—2, 1939, where in the introduction all available Turkish and Western sources are indicated.

(J. H. Kramers)

MUHAMMAD, Mu'izz al-Din B. Isk, was the fourth of the Shamsâhî princes of Ghur to rule the empire of Ghurri. His name was originally Shamsâh âIâ, but he assumed that of Mu'izz al-Din. His elder brother Ghîyâth al-Din succeeded his cousin Saif al-Din in 1173 and made Muhammad governor of Herât, entitling him also the duty of extending the dominions of the house in India.

Muhammad led his first expedition into India in 1175, expelled the Ismâ'îlî heretics we rukd Multân, placed an orthodox governor in that province, and captured Uch. In 1178 he rashly led an army into Gujûrajâ, was defeated by the rajâs, Bhima the Vâghâra, and returned to Ghirât with no more than the remnant of his army, but in the following year he took Peshâvar, and in 1181 Lâlior, taking prisoner Khusrâv Malik, the lot of the Ghazâwids, and adding the Fândijâ to his brother's dominions. In the winter of 1190-1191 he invaded the Cawhân kingdom of Diîhî and captured Rustâm, but the rajâs, Fâridî Râgâ, marched against him and defeated him at Tarâvîr near Karnál. He was wounded, but escaped, and in 1192 returned to India, defeated and slew Fâridî Râgâ at Tarâvîr. He captured Fânsî, Sâmînâ, Guhîm, and other fortresses, and plundered Adjmer. On returning to Ghirât he left Kûth al-Dîn Abâgh [q. v.] in India as vicere, and at the end of 1192 Abâgh took Dîlhi and made it his capital. In 1197 Abâgh was beheaded in Adjmer and Muhammad sent a relieving force which enabled him to defeat Bhima of Gujarât and to plunder his capital, Anhilvâra.

Muhammad was now employed with his brother in recovering Kharâsân. On the death of Taâkâsh Khân Khâirimshâh [q. v.] in Marw, on July 3, 1200, Muhammad Curbak was sent to Marw, which he captured and occupied for Ghîyâth al-Din, and Ghîyâth al-Din and his brother besieged and took Nâjîpur. Muhammad was then sent in command of an expedition to Kâil but the misbehaviour of his troops earned a rebuke which led to the only quarrel between the brothers.

On the death of Ghîyâth al-Din in 1202 Muhammad succeeded to the great empire which he had helped his brother to build up, but Muhammad Khâirimshâh [q. v.] took Marw from Muhammad Curbak, recovered Nâjîpur, but failed to capture Herât. Mu'izz al-Din Muhammad marched against him but suffered a crushing defeat near Anhilvâra and fled to Tâlağân. He was besieged by the army of Gûr Khân of Kâsh-khârî and purchased a safe retreat only by the surrender of the whole of his baggage and material of war. On his arrival before Ghirât in this plight his younger brother refused to admit him, and he passed over to Multân where the governor likewise refused him admission, but he attacked and defeated him and appointed Nâjîr al-Dîn Khabâ [q. v.] to the government of the province. He returned to Ghirât and established himself there, sparing the life of Isma'îl. By the treaty which he concluded with Muhammad Khârimshâh he was permitted to retain Bâlîr and Herât, but not Nâjîpur and Marw.

On Oct. 20, 1205, he marched from Ghirât for India and, with the help of Kûth al-Dîn Abâgh, defeated the Khokars, but on returning towards Ghirât was assassinated, on March 15, 1206, on the bank of the Indus, either by Ismâ'îlî heretics or by some Khokars. He was succeeded in Ghur
by his nephew Mahmūd, son of Ghiyāṣ al-Dīn, but the viceroy of the provinces, Shīgh in Dihlī, Kubīlī in Multān, Tādī al-Dīn Yūduq in Kānnār, and Dīligīn in Ghaznī, became independent.

Bibliography: Tahākāt-i Nāṣir, and translation by Major H. G. Raverty (Bibl. Ind.); Tahākāt-i Guðrā, by Šāhīn Allāh Muḥtāfī and translation by Professor F. G. Browne (G. M. S.), The Cambridge History of India, vol. iii.

T. W. HARK

MUHAMMAD, TUGHĀL, the second king of the Tughāl dynasty of Dihlī, was the eldest son of Ghiyāṣ al-Dīn Tughālī, its founder. During the short reign of the usurper, Šāh al-Dīn Khurāsān, he was in some peril, but escaped and joined his father, who was marching on Dihlī. He was known at first as Ḥa máxima, but received the title of Ulugh Khān and was sent in 1321 to Warangal, to reduce obedience to the Ḥāṣ, Pratāpa Rādrāleva II. In this distant region he attempted to rebel, but his army refused to believe his story of his father's death at Dihlī and refused to accept him as their king, and he was obliged to return in haste to the capital, where he either persuaded his father of his innocence or gained a pardon, for, though his accomplices suffered cruel deaths, he was again sent in 1323, into Telengānā, and on this occasion compelled the Ḥāṣ to surrender and sent him to Dihlī. In the following year he acted as regent during his father's absence on an expedition into Bengal, but his conduct aroused suspicion, and his father rebuked him in letters sent from Bengal. He received the king, on his return, in a temporary house of wood, so constructed that the dislocation of a beam would bring the whole structure down, and by this device crushed the old man to death, and ascended the throne in February 1328.

The delineation of a character so complex and contradictory as that of Muḥammad Tughālī is no easy task. He was one of the most extraordinary monarchs who ever sat upon a throne. To the most lavish generosity he united revolting and indiscriminate cruelty; to scrupulous observance of the ritual and ceremonial prescribed by the Islamic law an utter disregard of that law in public affairs; to a dehiscing and superstition-veneration for all whose descent or whose pious command respect a feculity which when ruled repected neither the blood of the Prophet nor personal sanctity. Some of his administrative and军事 measures give evidence of abilities of the highest order; others are the acts of a madman.

The chronicle of his reign is largely a record of rebellions punished with gross barbarity. In the second year his cousin Ghunṣār rebelled in the Dakan and was slayed alive. In 1327 he rebuilt Dāwlatābād, made it his capital, and two years later drove the whole population of Dihlī thither. In 1328 Kishlā Khān rebelled in Multān and was defeated and slain, and in 1329 India was invaded by the Khuṭbāl. Ali al-Dīn Tārmābīr, who, however, was driven from the country. In the same year the enhancement of the land-tax on the Gangetic Doāb drove the inhabitants into rebellion, and the measures taken to suppress the rising depopulated the country. At about the same time Muḥammad resided in his famous fictitious currency, decreeing that his brass tokens should be accepted as equivalent to silver tangas. No precautions were taken against counterfeiting, and when the experiment failed and the tokens were recalled the treasury was obliged to purchase mountains of brass at the price of silver.

In 1331 a rebellion in Bengal was crushed by Bahārām Khān, but in 1338 he died, and a second rebellion separated the province from the kingdom of Dihlī, and in 1334 Saiyid Dādāl al-Dīn Aḥsan established his independence in Madūnī. Muḥammād marched to purs-h him, but a pestilence in his army compelled him to retreat, and on his return he established in the Dākāu the piers system of farming out the revenue for extravagant sums, the result of which was to drive both the impoverished cultivator and the defaulting farmer into rebellion. Ḥāṣ-γang of Dāwlatābād, believing a report of the king's death, rebelled, but was captured and pardoned, a rare instance of leniency, but a rebellion in the Pandjāb was crushed with great severity.

An enormous army raised for the conquest of Persiā melted away for want of funds to maintain it. In 1337 a heavy calamity fell on northern India, a famine of unusual severity which lasted for seven years. The king's measures to combat the famine were, on the whole, well-conceived and well-executed. Grain was plentiful in Awadh, which proved that the famine was largely due to artificial causes, and he built a temporary city, Suitā-i-Īlm (Sīntā-i Dowšān, Sans. "the Gate of Paradise"), on the western bank of the Ganges, transferred thither the revenues of Dihlī, and with the assistance of Šāh al-Mulk, governor of Awadh, fed them from the granaries of that province. In the following year he committed one of the greatest of his follies in assembling an army of 100,000 horse for the invasion of Tibet and sending it into the Himalayas, where it perished.

In 1339 a rebellion in the Dakan was crushed and even the faithful Šāh al-Mulk was/goaded into rebellion, but, in consideration of his services, was imprisoned instead of being put to death. Almost immediately afterwards, 1340, the Afghan rebelled in Multān, but fell before the king's wrath into Afghanistan. The famine was now at its height, and the people were eating human flesh. Muḥammad aimed to set him at the head of rebellions which should improve and extend agriculture and oblige future famines. By these means, says the contemporary historian, with conscious or unconscious irony, agriculture would have been so promoted that plenty would have reigned throughout the earth, had they been practicable. They included the extension of the system of farming the revenues, and bred confusion and rebellion, which reacted on the king until he regarded his subjects as his natural enemies and waged war against them with all the weapons of despotic power. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution is recorded, with sickening details, by execution was recorded, with sickening details, by execution. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution was recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by executioner, with sickening details, by execution.
and proclaimed an Afghan, Isma'îl Muhk, as their king. The king marched to Daulatbad, captured the city, and besieged the rebels in the citadel, but was recalled to Gujrat by a serious rebellion headed by a man named Taghi. He pursued the rebel in Gujrat and Kãthiawâr for three years, drove him into Sind, and followed him thither, and on March 20, 1551, died within a few miles of Thatha, where the rebel had taken refuge. "The king," as a historian says, "was freed from his people, and they from their king."

His empire, at its greatest extent, included the whole of Indus except the small kingdoms of the Cola and the Pandya, in the neighbourhood of Cape Comorin and the principality of Ghurâr in Kãthiawâr. Before his death he lost Bengal, the Dakan, the Peninsula, and Sind, and left the remnant of his dominions seething with discontent.


MUHAMMAD III, the sixth king of the Tughluk dynasty of Dihlî, was the son of Firûz, at whose death the son of Fath Khân, his eldest son, was raised to the throne on Sept. 20, 1358, as Qâhîyâ-’dîn Tughluk II, but was slain on Feb. 19, 1359, and was succeeded by his cousin Abu Bakr, son of Zafar Khân, the second son of Firûz. Muhammâd, the third son, contested the succession, and, after suffering more than one defeat, occupied Dihlî and ascended the throne on Aug. 31, 1390. Abu Bakr took refuge with Bahâdur Nâhir in M-wât but was pursued and defeated, and imprisoned in Mirâh, where he shortly afterwards died. The old servants of Firûz, men of Eastern Hindûstân, who had been the principal factors in all the troubles of the kingdom, were put to the sword, after being tested by a shibboleth which distinguished them from the natives of Dihlî.

A rebellion in Gujârât was suppressed in the same year by Zafar Khân, who in 1396 became independent in that province, and in 1392 Muhammad launched a serious rebellion in the Dübâb, captured Ispâhân, ravaged the districts of Kanâvâl and Dâlman, and built near Dâlaârs a fort, which he named Muhammadâbâd. In the same year, he put to death his minister, Gilân Khân, who was meditating rebellion, and appointed in his place Khwânda Dîkâân. Another rebellion was crushed in the southern Dübâb, and in August 1393, Muhammâd invaded and plundered Mewât and returned to Dâlaârs, where he fell sick. Bahâdur Nâhir took advantage of his illness to plunder some villages in the neighbourhood of Dihlî and Muhammad marched into Mewât, defeated him, and put him to flight, but on his return to Muhammadâbâd his disorder increased, and on Jan. 26, 1394, just as he had ordered his son Humâyûn Khân to march against the Khârasâns, who had captured Lahor and were ravaging the Pathânis, he died.


MUHAMMAD II, the fifth king of the Bahâni dynasty of the Dâkan, was the eldest son of Hasan, "Allâ”-Dîn Bahman Shah, usually, but incorrectly, styled Hasan Gangi. On succeeding his father, on Feb. 11, 1538, he carefully organized the government of the four provinces of the kingdom and the administration of the army. The pertinacity of the Hindâ bankers and money-changers in melting down the gold coinage which he introduced led to a general massacre of the community and the measure involved him in hostilities with the Hindu states of Wargânâl and Vidiyâmangar. He invaded the dominions of Kânâhâiyâ of Wargânâl three times, but his son Venââyê Deva to death, and compelled him to pay heavy indemnities and to surrender the town and district of Gulkânda. After this success he grossly insulted Bukkâ I of Vidiyâmangar by paying some dancing girls with a draft drawn on him. On Bukka's treasury Bukkâ invaded the Khâr Gâb, captured Mudigal, and massacred its garrison. Muhammad marched against him, attacked him with great impetuosity, defeated him, and recovered Mudigal, where he rested during the rainy season. In 1367 he met Bukkâ at Kasthâl, again defeated him, and carried out an indiscriminate massacre of his subjects. The Hindis were cowed by the slaughter of 400,000 of their race. and Bukkâ was compelled to sue for peace. He honoured the draft and paid an indemnity, and received in return a guarantee that non-combatants should be spared in future wars, and the agreement, though sometimes violated, mitigated to some extent the horrors of the long period of intermittent warfare between the two states. On returning from Vidiyâmangar he completed, in 1367, the great mosque at Gulkânda, and then turned against his cousin Bahârân Khân Mûzâdiarân, who, had for some years been in rebellion at Daulatbâd, defeated his army, and drove its leaders into Gujrat. He died in 1377 and was succeeded by his elder son, Mudiâhid.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kasim Firdusi, Gul酣âm-i Firâkîmî (Bombay 1832); Muntahâb al-Lubâb, vol. ii. (Bibl. Ind. Series of A. S. B.); Burhân-i Mâdâ’ûr (MSS) and translation by Major J. S. King (The History of the Bahâni Dynasty); An Arabic History of Gujratâr, edited by Sir E. Denison Ross (Indian Text Series); The Cambridge History of India, vol. iv.

MUHAMMAD I, the second king of the Bahâni dynasty of the Dâkan, was the son of Mâhmûd Khân, the youngest son of "Allâ”-Dîn Bahman Shah, the founder of the dynasty, and was raised to the throne on May 20, 1378, after the assassination of his uncle, Dâwûd Shah. Firdusi's statement that this king's name was Mahamad has misled all European historians, but is refuted by inscriptions, legends on coins, and other historians.

Muhammad II was a man of peace, devoted to literature and poetry, and his reign was undisturbed by foreign wars. He invited Hâjî to visit his court, and the great poet set out from Shirâz in response to the invitation, but was so struck by a storm in the Persian Gulf that he disembarked and returned to Shirâz, whence he sent to Muhammad his excuses in a well known ode.

Between 1387 and 1395 the Dâkan was visited by a severe famine, and the king's measures of relief included the free importation of grain, the establishment of schools at which children were taught, fed, and lodged at the public expense,
and special allowances to readers of the Qur'an and the blind, but only those of his own faith profited by his benefactions. He died of a fever on April 20, 1397, and was succeeded by his elder brother, Cibyra al-Din.

Biography: See art. MUHAMMAD I; also A. S. B., vol. lxxiii., part i, 1904.

T. W. HAGE

MUHAMMAD III, LASHKARI, the thirteenth king of the Bahmani dynasty of the Deccan, was the younger son of Humayun Shih, and succeeded his elder brother, Nizam Shih, on July 30, 1465, at the age of nine. His minister was the famous Mahmud Gawan, Malik al-Tudjjar, Khadda Djiplan. A campaign against Malwa in 1457 was unsuccessful, but between 1469 and 1471 Mahmud Gawan conquered the southern Konkan. In 1472 Malik Hasan Bahri, Nizam al-Mulk, a Brahman who had been captured in Vellayanagar and educated as a Muslim, led a successful expedition into southern Calisa and was rewarded with the government of Telengana. Fath al-Mulk, another Brahman with a similar history, was made governor of Barar, and Yusuf Adil Khan, a Turk, was appointed to Dawatlahabad. In the same year Muhammad captured the fortresses of Bankapur and Balgaug, and his conduct at the siege of the latter earned him the title of Lashkari, the Soldier. In 1474 the Deccan suffered severely from a famine which lasted for two years, and in 1476 a rebellion in Kondawir led the king into Telengana. He relieved Malik Hasan, who had been besieged in Rajdahmahendri, invaded Calisa and punished the rajah, who had supported the rebels, and on his return, in 1478, captured Kondawir and assumed the title of Gawan. He then set out to invade the eastern Karnatak, but first divided the great province of Telengana into two governments, mortally offending Malik Hasan, the governor. The partition was part of a scheme devised by Mahmud Gawan, to be applied to all the provinces of the kingdom.

Muhammad made Kondapalli, in the Karnatak, his headquarters, and returned thither after carrying out a daring raid to Kandheveram. From Kondapalli he issued an edict dividing the other three provinces of his kingdom, Barar, Dawlatabad, and Gullaqua, each into two governments. The measure was intensely unpopular, but it was only the vindictive Malik Hasan that actively resented it. He regarded Mahmud Gawan as the author of all the unpopular reforms, and by means of a forged letter persuaded the young king that his minister was league with the foreign enemies of the state. Muhammad, when under the influence of drink, summarily and his faithful minister, and on April 5, 1481, without any inquiry into the circumstances of the case, caused his head to be struck off. Mahmud's innocence was established immediately after his death, and from the day of his unjust execution may be dated the collapse of the authority of the Bahmani kings. Of the two parties in the state all the foreigners, led by Yusuf Adil Khan, who established himself in Bidjaipur, and the respectable portion of the Deccan, led by Fath al-Mulk of Barar, avoided intercourse with the king, who was thrown into the arms of the assassins, led by Malik Hasan. The army accompanied Muhammad to Bidar and subsequently on an expedition to Balgawi, but encamped apart from the royal troops, and always saluted the king from a distance, refusing to enter his presence. Muhammad attempted to drown his grief and humiliation in drink, from the effects of which he died at Bidar on March 22, 1482, crying out in his last moments that Mahmud Gawan was slaying him. He was succeeded by his son Mahmud, who was never a king but in name.

Biography: See art. MUHAMMAD I.

T. W. HAGE

MUHAMMAD b. `ABBAS [See KAMBAR.]

MUHAMMAD b. `Abd Allâh, greatest grandson of Hasan, the eldest son of Ali and Fatima, was one of the Alids, who did not spend their time passively awaiting the fulfilment of their aspirations, but endeavoured to realise them by personal effort. He and his brother Ibrahim had, according to Wâlidi, been brought up as future rulers and Muhammad was called al-Mahdi by his father. As early as the reign of the Umayyad caliph Hishâm, the two sectarian al-Mughrîs [q.v.] and Bayân [q.v.] who did not recognise Muhammad b. `Abd Allâh as Caliph, was anxious to make propaganda for him. When signs of the imminent collapse of the Umayyad rule became apparent after `Abd Allâh's death, `Abd Allâh's family by his command paid homage to Muhammad with the exception of al-Mughrî's son Djaflar. Wafer circles also recognised him as the legitimate heir, including the Mu'tazilis, who in those days had a distinctly ascetic character. Alî Djaflar, later the Aflâmîs caliph, was at this time attached to this cloud and it is several times recorded that he was among those who paid homage to Muhammad. This is in itself by no means improbable and well explains his hostile attitude to him, although it remains remarkable that Muhammad later nowhere, even in his polemical letters to him, refers to this important fact. The Umayyad governor Ibn Hubeira also thought of joining him when he was besieged in Wast in 132 (750) but dropped the matter when he received no answer to his letter.

When finally the Aflâmîs Abu l'-Aflâmîs in the same year won the caliphate and ousted the Alids, the two brothers disappeared and showed thereby that they would not recognise him. There now began for them a period full of adventure and danger, especially after Alî Djaflar became caliph in 136 (754). They went secretly from place to place to gain adherents: nowhere could they feel safe from the caliph but the people were on the whole favourably disposed to them and at least would not betray them. In this way they reached not only Bayâra and Kûfa but even went as far as al-Sind via 'Aden; as a rule however, they stayed in Arabia, most securely among the Djihaâna, in whose territory lay the hill of Bajwâ, which so often appears in the history of the Alids. The caliph was very uneasy at the continued lack of success of his search for them; more and more angrily he demanded of his governors in Medina that they should be produced and he dismissed several in rapid succession, when they appeared, perhaps without reason, ineffective and lukewarm in their efforts. He himself took very active steps but with as little result. On his pilgrimage in 140 (758) he had Muhammad and Ibrahim's father thrown into prison because they would not betray their place of concealment, and on a later pilgrimage (144 = 763) the same fate met the sons and grandson of Hasan, 'Abd Allâh's brother. They and 'Abd Allâh were taken to Kûfa, treated most
brutally and thrown into prison, where most of them died. The same thing happened to Habib-ud-Dawla Muhammad b. Abd Allah, a deponent of 'Uthman, whose head the caliph sent to Khurasan with a certificate on oath that it was the head of the 'Abd Allah Muhammad in order to intimidate his followers there. Shortly before (Dec. 701), he finally found a governor after his own heart. 'Uthman b. 'Abd Allah, who conducted the search with the necessary vigour. But he was soon able to save himself the trouble for in Radjab 145 (Nov. 763) Muhammad appeared in Medina and began the revolution while his brother Ibrahim went to Basra to do the same. It is not clear whether they did this because in Muhammad's opinion the time was ripe or whether they were forced by circumstances to hasten their plans. In any case, the enterprise was not sufficiently prepared, for although they had a large number of followers in Kufa, Bagha, Egypt, where however Muhammad's son 'Ali was arrested by the 'Abbasid governor in Khurasan and even in Sindh, to which another son Abd Allah al-Ashtar was sent, there was no question of any organisation, and, as so frequently, the enthusiasm for the 'Ali was like a fire of straw which blazes up quickly but dies down as soon. In Medina where 'Uthman was completely taken by surprise, Muhammad in keeping with his character acted with great mildness, he opened the prison, forbade all bloodshed and was content to arrest 'Uthman. The best elements in the town came over to him after the jurist Mafik b Ama declared invalid his oath taken to the 'Abbasid. Mecca also surrendered to the new ruler. The outbreak of the revolt was really a relief to Abd al-Dafar for he had now, as he said, entered the fox out of his hole. He hurriedly left Baghdad, with the building of which he was busy, and went to Kufa, the point of danger. With keen instinct he saw that the weak point of the rebellion lay in Medina which must be attacked first, for if in this remote spot there was a lack of materials of war and the roads thither could easily be barred. But he first of all offered a complete amnesty to Muhammad, which however only led to a characteristic exchange of letters, in which one reproached the other with the weaknesses of his family. He then sent his relative 'Isa b. Misr against him with 4,000 men, with instructions however to settle the matter peacefully if possible. His arrival had a sobering effect upon the Medinees, of whom a number seized the opportunity to get out of their difficult position. Muhammad however remained undismayed. He rejected the well meant advice of several men to abandon Medina as an insult to the town but left his people free to stay with him or not. He trusted in Allah "from whom victory comes and in whose hand the matter lies", and imitated all that the Prophet had done in his time in romantic fashion. For example he restored the ditch which the Prophet had dug round Medina when it was besieged by the Khurais; he used Muhammad's sword and his battle-cry was the same as that in the battle of Hunain; even the odd single combat before the battle proper was revived. The result in these circumstances was easily foreseen 'Isa, after offering a free pardon in vain for a few days, had a few doors over the ditch, entered the town and began a battle in which Muhammad's supporters became less and less in numbers until their leader finally fell (Monday, 14th Ramadhan 145 = Dec. 6, 762). Muhammad's head was cut off and sent to the caliph. For the further course of the rebellion see the article Ibrahim b. 'Abd Allah.

Muhammad is described as tall and strong with a very dark skin, on which account the caliph sobriqued him al-Mahmud, the Blacksmith. He was rightly called "the pure soul" (Tabari, iii. 260) for he was an ideal character, gentle in spite of his personal bravery, but he lacked those qualities which are required of a pretender in times like his.


MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD ALLAH, a Tahirid, governor of Baghdad. Born in 209 (824—825) Muhammad in 237 (851) was summoned by the Caliph to Baghdad and appointed military governor in order to restore order in the chaos then prevailing. In spite of the great power of the Tahirids, who ruled Khurasan as independent sovereigns in practice, although they nominally recognised the suzerainty of the Caliph, his task was by no means a light one. After al-Mustanir had ascended the throne (248 = 862), he confirmed Muhammad in his office and also gave him the governorship of the 'Iraq along with the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina. In the following year troubles broke out in Baghdad and Samarra. The Arabs were defeated by the Byzantines and the rage of the people was turned against the Caliph. The vizier 'Utmanis however finally succeeded in restoring order with the help of the two Turkish generals Wasif and Bogha the Younger. The 'Alids also gave the government trouble on several occasions. A descendant of 'Ali named Vahya b. 'Omar rebelled in Kufa and drove out the governor of the town. When he had routed an army sent against him by Muhammad, he was attacked by the 'Abbasid general b. Hasain b. Isma'il and was killed when he tried to defend himself. He was finally killed in the battle (Radjab 250 = Aug. 864). Another 'Ali, al-Hasan, b. Zaid, had more success. Two prominent men in Tahiristan, who were dissatisfied with the rule of the Tahirids, appealed to him in 250 and very soon he was acknowledged as lord of the whole of Tahiristan. The Tahirid governors of al-Ray and Kazvin were driven out and replaced by 'Alids; Muhammad b. Tahir, governor of Khurasan, a nephew of the governor of Baghdad, then sent an army against al-Ray. The 'Alid governor was defeated and captured and the town had to surrender, but again fell into the hand of the 'Alids. When the former governor of Tahiristan, Sulaiman b. 'Abd Allah, invaded this province and conquered it completely, al-Hasan b. Zaid had to flee to Bulain where he was defeated by 'Abd Allah b. Tahir (351 = 865-866); after some years (257 = 870—871) however, he inflicted a defeat on the latter's troops in Djordjan and in 259 (872—873) he again became lord of Khurasan, where he founded an 'Alid dynasty which lasted about sixty years. Arabia
also did not escape the 'Ahd plot. A descendant of 'Ali named Isma'il b. Yuhäf raised trouble there in 1902 (895), plundered Mecca and Medina and killed or wounded many pilgrims that he received the epithet of Al-Mutā'ab, "the Blood-Botherer". There was also continual trouble in the capital. In Mecca of the same year (1902, Fed. 265), al-Mutā'ab left Simārak and went to Baghdad. Al-Mutā'ab [q.v.] was then taken by force from his prison in Simārak and proclaimed Caliph; he then appointed his brother Ali Ahmad, later co-regent with the Caliph al-Muhammad, commander-in-chief in the war against al-Mutā'ab and his governor. When all negotiations failed, the latter had to take arms but was several times defeated. Fighting took place in and around Baghdad with varying success during almost the whole year, while anarchy in the provinces increased and when Muhammad finally began negotiations with Abū Ahmad, he was accused of treason, so that the Caliph had to protect him again against the troops who were furious with him. But when Muhammad's friends told him that al-Mustā'ab intended to sacrifice himself, he made peace with Abū Ahmad. The Caliph had reluctantly to confirm the treaty and jabhata in favour of his rival al-Mustā'ab. (Dhu'Al-Hijjah 1251 = Fajr 596) and the latter the same day ascended the throne. Muhammad died in Dhu 'Al-Ka'd: 253 Nov. 867.


MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD ALLĀH ḤASSĀN AL-MUḤDI, the well known Somali Mahdi who became the British "the Mad Mahdi". He was a Somali belonging to the Ogaden tribes and Arabian, his return to Somaliland he first settled in the Dhiibahantah tribe's territory and began a vigorous propaganda on behalf of the Shari'ah and to call Somali Muslims to a more strict rule of life. As he was a learned man and a skilful impromptu composer of poems (the ancient and best way to propagate one's ideas among the Somali Beduins), he was easily able to attain a great popularity among the Dhiibahantah in British Somaliland and his Ogaden countrymen in Abyssinia. His influence brought him to the knowledge of the government of Berbera and British officials had sometimes recourse to him to settle through his mediation disputes among the Beduin groups. In March 1899 however the Mahdi suddenly changed his former attitude and openly hostile and towards the British Government. In August 1899 he assembled his followers in Baren and declared himself to be the Mahdi and proclaimed the holy war against the infidels. A first expedition was sent against him by the Abyssinians to prevent a further exten-

-ion of the rebellion in Ogaden; but Gräich Bānta, the leader of this force, returned to Harar after a violent jollifying razzia led by him against the Kīr ʿAqīb. The Ogaden tribe. In 1901 Colonel Swayne drove back the Mahdi as far as the boundaries of Italian Northern Somaliland and defeated him at Fartūla on July 16, 1901. A second British expedition in 1902 won another victory in the fight at Eregi on October 6, 1902. In 1903 it was decided to send against the Mahdi a Christian expedition in three columns: a British one departing from Hoby according to a British-Italian agreement concluded in the same year that effect, another British column departing from Berbera; and a third, an Abyssinian force departing from Harar. The British forces were placed under the command of General Manning, but the first column fell into an ambush and was defeated by the Mahdi at Guandari on April 17, 1903: the second column suffered heavy losses in a fierce fight at Fartūla on April 22, 1903; the Abyssinian column made only, as usual, a razzia against Ogaden groups in the valley of the Shebelia. In 1904 a fourth British expedition defeated the Mahdi at Dhabla on January 9, 1904 and again, after the landing of a naval force on the shore of the Indian Ocean, at Ilīg in Italian territory on April 21, 1904. In the meantime, Siyyid Muhammad Šīkhī on the invitation of the British and Italian Government had directed a letter to the most influential Muslim learned men in Somaliland, which contained a declaration against the Mahdi, who was said to have violated the rules of the Shari'ah and thus to have become worthy of the curses of the true followers of the Shari'ah. The victories of the British, however, they could not be followed up by a permanent occupation of the interior, had not been sufficient to subdue the rebellion. It was therefore attempted to conclude an Anglo-Italian agreement at with the Mahdi and this was carried through by offering to the Mahdi the concession of the Italian portion of the Nūgal valley with Ilīg as his seat. The Mahdi subjugated to these conditions in Ilīg on March 5, 1905; but added to his signature the clause "'Abd Allāh Šīkhī Šīkhī" (and the Consul knew my condition), which was explained in Europe as meaning a close trust in the Consul, but otherwise in Somaliland, as he (the Mahdi) was a Šīkhī, and therefore by no means obliged to execute any arrangement he might have concluded with infidels on account of temporary political conditions. In January 1906 the Mahdi actually began again to lead raids against British and Italian subjects. No great expedition was however sent against him by the British, who only sent a column from the interior of their colony; a Camel Constabulary Corps was raised as a mobile force to be employed in raids and swift operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties. But after many successful operations against the Mahdi's parties.
Government, and further they organised the Sultan's forces to employ against them the Mullah, thus releasing the defence of the northern frontier of their colony. Thereon began a series of raids led by Somali auxiliaries especially against the Mullah's followers in the northern valley of the Shabelle and towards Nyagal, where Djibouti and Garad were occupied by the Sultan of Hobyo.

These energetic actions which took place even during the Great European war, besides wearing down the Mullah's army, caused him to lose political control of a very large zone where the population concluded peaceful agreements with Italy and forced him to be continually ready to defend his territory from the south also. However, after the end of the Great War, the British Government decided to attack the Mullah from Berbera and to finally overthrow him. In January-March 1920 after violent bombardments of the Mullah's defences by the British airmen, a British force advanced to Talash, the Mullah's last camp: he, rapidly pursued by the Camel Corps and Somali auxiliaries, fled to Ogaden and then into the Karaniah territory, where he died on November 23, 1920.

The Mullah's career is a very typical one for the study of the Somali mind. He had begun his movement as an agent of the Sihiyya far'a, then his increasing popularity tempted him to a more ambitious sphere and, accordingly, after placing his propaganda on a severely religious basis, he tried to become the leader of all the Somali by making the ties of the common faith prevail over the tribal bonds. This is really the only way to lead such a movement in Somaliland where Islam may be regarded as a tie of brotherhood among tribes otherwise deeply divided by their secular history of wars and revenge. Therefore Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah Husain said in a famous poem: "Have I not put my prayer-mat on this sea to join together the Muslims who were not brothers," alluding also to his relations with the Sihiyya in Arabia. He desired for the same reason that his followers should call themselves "Dara-wish," forgetting even the name of their original tribe. Therefore he appeared to become angry when he was referred to in official correspondence as "Muhammad 'Abd Allah, the Ogaden Bah Gen" while he used to add to his signature only the nisba: al-Hadhi'im (alluding to the origin of the Somali from 'Aqil b. Abi Talib) [see the art. SOMALILAND].

Further, instead of the tribal forces he raised special armed corps, often with a new name, like the Haggattu ("the scratchers") recruited among the Habar Gidir, the Dugad recruited among the Miskahil ("Dugad" means "shooter"); the Kaliqay recruited among the Jillahanta. But he did not pursue this policy to the end of the Somali tribe, the greater part of the Isaj tribes, which was a strong appeal to the old rivalry between Isaj and Darasii, Muhammad Sihi's letter, which was undoubtedly a severe blow to him, since he had already provoked the hostility of the Kadiyira and so had to rely entirely on Sihiyya support; the necessity of getting booty for his soldiers who otherwise would have hardly remained with him: all these things and his very nature caused the religious prestige of the Mullah as the Mahdi of Somaliland to decline and he gradually became merely the chief of a tribe; a powerful chief indeed of a large tribe as the Darasii were, formed from various elements and therefore very similar to the federations well known in the Somali customary law. It was obvious that, when he began to regard himself in this light (that is regarding himself as a chief of a Somali tribe rather than the brother born from the same father and the same mother of all the Muslims); it was very difficult for him to restrain himself and his followers from exaggerating those tendencies so familiar to their own national character: and therefore they came back gradually to the ancient Somali custom of guerrilla warfare conducted in the traditional way, even to defying the tribes of the enemy in insulting or scornful poems or designating them with typical ironical nicknames or giving to every razzia a special name ("the razzia smashing the bones") was the name given to the fight at Dalmadoba; cf. the Ahyam al-'Arab.

It may therefore be concluded that the Mullah's attempt to avail himself of Islam to conquer the old rivalries between the tribes and combine the Somalis to drive the Europeans out of the country, failed both on account of the strength of the European and the Arab tribe the forces once, often unconscious, opposed by the Somali on behalf of their ancient tribal organisation and customary law.


(Exerco Cerulli)

MUHAMMAD R. 'ABD ALLAH [See Ibn Al-Dirak, Ibn Al-Khatib, Ibn Malik.]

MUHAMMAD R. 'ABD AL-MALIK, ARC DIAS, called Ibn al-Zaïyât, vizier to several Abbasids. Ibn al-Zaïyât began his career as secretary in the chancery in Bagdad and when the caliph al-Mu'tamin noticed his ability and learning he appointed him his vizier (219-220 = 834-835) He also filled this office in the reign of al-Wathib: but as he treated the latter's brother Dja'al, the future caliph al-Mutawakkil, with a lack of respect he earned his hatred. After the death of al-Wathib in Dhu 'l-Hijja 232 (Aug. 847), Ibn al-Zaïyat wished homage to be paid to his son Muhammad; the latter, however, was thought to be too young by the Turkish general Wazif and in his stead Dja'al was proclaimed caliph under the name al-Mutawakkil. The vizier was at first allowed to remain in office but in Safar of the following year (Sept. 847), he was arrested, deprived of his possessions and subjected to a cruel form of torture which he himself had invented. After enduring the most horrible cruelty he died in Rabi' I 233 (Nov. 847).


MUHAMMAD R. 'ABD AL-MALIK [See Ibn Tufail, Ibn Zahir.]

(K. V. Zietekstein)
MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD AL-RAJHIM [See Ibn al-Fikri.]

MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD AL-WAHHAB [See Wustenfeld.]

MUHAMMAD b. ABI TAMIL [See Al-Mansur.]

MUHAMMAD, a son of Abu Bakr and one of his wives, Amma of the tribe of Khath'am. He was born in the last year of Muhammad's life so that his father could not have exercised any influence on him, while the memories of Abu Bakr's great friend which were kept alive in his family must have had all the more influence on the passionate nature of the boy, which receives important confirmation from the fact that Ibn Khutbah decries him as one of the "pious" (muhaddith) among the Khurashi. When in the reign of Uthman the bitterness at the preference of the Umayyads in combination with a reaction against the strong secularisation of Umar provoked a movement which grew in strength, he took part in it with great vigour and began along with "Chalghim" and foster-son Muhammad b. Abu Hujaj to stir up events for the portion of Egypt against the Caliph. He later went with other revolutionaries to Medina where his equally ardent but much wiser half-brother Alig in vain advised him to go with him to Mecca and leave others to carry through the crime; but he was one of those who bade into the Caliph's room where he ill-treated the helpless old man although it was Kinana b. Bishir who dealt the death-blow. He was one of the few Khurashi who joined Alig and the latter apparently cherished a real affection for the young man, which his enemies of course interpreted as further evidence of his friendship with the murderers of Uthman. Muhammad took part in the battle of the Camel, at the decision of which the chivalrous Alig commissioned him to escort his half-brother to Basra. The sources give somewhat different accounts of the last phase of his life in Egypt. According to Tabari, Abu Muthanna (Tabari, i. 3592 sq.) and Ya'qubi, 'Ali at one time appointed him governor of Egypt. He was unsparingly recalled by Kais b. Sulayd; but as he so soon discovered how foolish it was to appoint a youth inexperienced in war to this difficult post, he sent for his eldest follower al-Ashtar (q.v.) and gave him command in Egypt while he appeased Muhammad's rightly injured feelings by a kind letter. The attempt to make good his failed, however, for al-Ashtar was poisoned on the way in al-Kul'am at the instigation of Mu'awiyah. Al-Zubair's account (Tabari, i. 3342) shows Alig in a somewhat more favourable light. After the recall of Kais he sent al-Ashtar as governor to Egypt and only after he was poisoned did he send Muhammad. Finally there is a third story (Ibn al-Kalbi and Mas'udi) according to which al-Ashtar was sent to Egypt only after the death of Muhammad, but this must be due to some misunderstanding of the first version. In any case, the choice of Muhammad was an unfortunate one. For the inexperienced youth, who had no authority and was besides insufficiently supported by Alig, was not fit to meet experienced opponents like Mu'awiyah and 'Amr b. al-Asyri, as anyone but Alig would have seen. 'Amr b. al-'Asyri came with an army and a battle was fought at al-Muusunah (the dam). When the actual murder of Uthman, Kinana b. Bishir, had fallen after a brave resistance, the Egyptians lost heart and Muhammad, abandoned by all, was captured and killed while trying to escape (38 = 658).

Bibliography: Baladuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 228; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 2869—3414 (ed. index); ii. 3634; Khudaib, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 87, 98; Mas'udi, Muruj, ed. Barbier de Meynard, iv. 277, 279—281, 421 sq.; Ya'qubi, ed. Houtsma, ii. 203 sq., 226 sq.; Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich, p. 59—62. 
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MUHAMMAD b. ABI BAKR [See Ibn Qayyim al-Majdil-yah, Ibn Suyuti al-Nasir.]

MUHAMMAD b. ABI 'L-KASIM [See Ibn 'Ali Dinar.]

MUHAMMAD b. ABI MUHAMMAD [See Ibn Zatar.]

MUHAMMAD b. ABI 'L-SADJ. Abu 'Ubaid, son of Abu 'l-Sadji, Dhwali, an Eastern Iranian (not Turkish) noble from Ushasana in Marwah al-Nahar (see Alrabad, Zeus, ed. G. S. S. I., p. 169). For his early career see the article Aghlab. After his return to Baghli (276 = 886) and appears to have remained there (cf. Tabari, ii. 2122) until his appointment as governor of Adhharisjan in 279 (882). Though on his arrival he had entertained friendly relations with the Bagrati king of Armenia, Sembat (see 891), after seizing Matghia in 280 (893) he made a first incursion into Armenia, but without success. At the same time he had strengthened his position at Baghli by giving his daughter in marriage to al-Mu'tadid's confidant, the general Balq al-Mu'tadid. Having been rejoined by his 'Abdullah, the general Wasi, who had defeated the Dulad 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Aziz in al-Lihab in 281 (894—895) but did not succeed in annexing his territory, he made a second expedition into Armenia in 282—283 (895—896) and captured Kars, Dwii and Wasparkan. Subsequently he came to terms with Sembat, but his son Dhwali remained a governor of Dwin until Muhammad's death in 284 (897—898) Muhammad declared his independence, but finding himself unable to withstand al-Mu'tadid made prompt submission, was pardoned, and, in the following year officially recognized as governor of Armenia in addition to Adhharisjan. About the same time he appears to have adopted the title of al-Ashir, which appears on his coinage, and which was evidently intended as a claim to descent from the old princely family of Ushasana (see the article Aghlab and Juan, Iran. Nomenclat.. s. v. Fisaha). In 287 (906) he made a further indirect attempt to extend his rule over the territories which were slipping from the grasp of the T'umans by encouraging Wasi to seize Matghia and to apply to the caliph for investiture with the government of Cilicia. Al-Mu'tadid, however, learning that this was only a preliminary step towards the seizure of Dyar Muhar by Wasi and al-Ashir, put an end to their design by a swift and unexpected campaign against Wasi, who was himself captured. Al-Ashir died a few months later (Rabi'i 1, 288 = March 901) at Barjarha. 

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited above and under the article Aghlab see Mas'udi, Muruj al-Dhabab, vii. 144—145, 196—200; Abu 'l-Kindu, Wiladat Mijr (ed. Guide), p. 238; Ibn Khallikan, transl. de Siane, i. 500; History de l'Arménie par le patriarche Jean VI, trad.
MUHAMMAD B. ABI'Y-SADIJ — MUHAMMAD B. AMMAR

MUHAMMAD B. ABIFI ZAINAB [See Abu-
I-KHAIIR].

MUHAMMAD B. AGHLAB [See AHGLABIDES].

MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD [See IBN AL-TAKAMI].

MUHAMMAD B. 'ALI, a grandson of Husain the son of 'Ali: his kunya was Abu Qa'far. On account of his learning he was given the Honorable name of al-Bakhir (the investigator, who goes deeply into things). He was a recognised authority on Tradition and a number of pious utterances are also recorded of him; he had at the same time the characteristic fondness of his family for embroidered silk garments and colours. That he did not escape the usual fate of his family of being celebrated by a section of his descendants, is shown by a poem of the 'Ijli Abu Huiala; but he lived contentedly in Medina and apparently played no part in politics although he was treated, for example by 'Umar II, with respect. He was expressly disowned by extreme Shi'is like al-Mughira and Bayzîn. When the party which had hitherto paid homage to his brother Zaid, abandoned the latter, they transferred his privileges to him, or rather, since he was dead, to his son Qa'far [cf. Qa'far b. MUHAMMAD]. The reason of the breach is said to have been that Zaid would not insult the memory of the two first Caliphs as his followers demanded but this does not agree very well with the fact that Muhammad in Ibn Sa'd's obviously much retouched account emphatically declares his fondness for Abu Bakr and 'Umar. The date of his death is variously given as 114, 117 or 118 A.H.


MUHAMMAD B. 'ALI [See IBN AL-DOWAD AL-ISAHANI].

MUHAMMAD B. 'ALI AL-RIDJ, ninth Imam of the Twelver Shi'is, was born in Kâmajan 195 (June 811) in Medina. As, according to Abu 'l-Faradj al-Ishâhani, al-Kâtîf al-Tâlibiyyin (Teheran 1307), p. 193, he was of negroid appearance, it may be true that his mother, a slave-woman of her name, a slave-girl of Dura and Khat-uz-Zam, was a Naha:; to give her an honourable pedigree it was added: "of the family of Mari'a the Capt". When al-Ma'mûn attacked 'Ali al-Ridj to his court, he married the boy to one of his daughters, Cmm al-Fadlî, who was taken to him in 215 (830). Al-Mu'tamîn on his accession summoned him to Bagdad. He arrived there at the beginning of 220, but was dead already by Dhu 'l-Ka'da (Nov. 835). According to the Shi'is and in keeping with their scheme of martydom, he was poisoned at the instigation of al-Mu'tamîn by Cmm al-Fadlî who remained childless; but even the already mentioned Maljâfîn, which record every murder of an 'Ali, know nothing of this. This Muhammad is, generally speaking, only occasionally mentioned outside the Shi'a, along with his father, e.g. in Ibn Wâdi'h al-Ya'qubî, Ziyâ'd, ed. Hormuz (Leiden 1883), ii. 552 and in Tabari, Annals, iii. 1029, 1102; according to al-Ma'mûn: Hârân al-Hasht (Paris 1885), v. iii. 117, Muhammad died in 210 according to vi. 1271 not till the reign of al-Wâdi'hî, i.e. after 227. Even within the Shi'a, his role is quite a passive one. After his father's tragic end, those with Zaidi views who had hoped some day with him as Caliph to put into force their activist 'Ali political programme, went their own ways again, while others who held Imami views, one group, as usual in such a case, became "standfast" Wâdi'hîya and another chose Ahmad, a brother of al-Katdâ, as Imam; for Muhammad was only seven at the time. For those who remained faithful to him, there arose in the Shii' al-Imâmâ the question of the child Imam's knowledge. The case was repeated with the following three Imams. But the authority to teach was in the hands of men whose activity extended through several Imâmîs; with Mâjîsî (s. Bibl.) the third Imam, 125 Imâmî, and Mâljâfîn, al-Mallak al-Mâjilî (Teheran 1306), p. 217; Abi' Amir al-Kašqî, Mârîfât al-Kââfîr al-Râli (Bombay 1317), p. 353 sq., 374 sq.: Tâsi', Fihrist Kitâb al-Shi'â (Bud. Ind., No. 60), No. 124, 150, p. 289, note 1. The gradual development of the dogma in question, which is associated with the child Jesus teaching in Sûra xix. 30 sqq., is not quite clear, as regards its assimilation to the various Imâmîs. Heresiographers including al-Nawâbâñ, Firaq al-Shi'â (Bibl. Ind., No. 4), p. 74 sqq., quote the doctrines anonymously. Besides, there is the confusion of names (which has also entered European indices); for Muhammad b. 'Ali was also the name of one of his grandchild, who died before his father, the 10th Imâm 'Ali al-Nâbi, but left issue; his adherents continued the imamate further than the Twelver through these children, while they deny the existence of the twelfth Imâm Muhammad al-Malî in son of his brother, the eleventh Imâm Ijâsan al-Akbarî. Shi'a works avoid confusion by giving the ninth Imâm the kunya Abî Qa'far al-Tâni: his official title is al-Tâni, "the Gold-bearing"; a common epithet is al-Tâni wâdî, "the liberal"; he is said to have paid his father's debts. As 'Abî 'l-Kâtîf b. Abî al-Ridj before him, Ummânîh b. Sa'id al-Amir, called Sannmûn or Zay'în. Among the usual miracles of the Imâmîs, Abî Qa‘far al-Tâlîfî (290) in Fihrist al-Darâghî (in Mâljîsî, iii. 188) relates that the ninth Imâm carried a vassipasser at night from Syria to the holy sites of Kerbêlia, Kûfa and Medina as well as to Mecca. The fact that his memory has been kept so green to the present day is due to the fact that he was buried beside the tomb of his grandfather, the seventh Imâm, Mâlarına al-Kâmûn (v. v.): this arose the double Meshed al-Kâmûn.

Bibliography: A full account with exact references to the sources is given in Muhammad Bâkî b. Muhammad Ta'jî al-Mâjîsî, Bâkî al-Isârî (Beirut, xii. (Teheran 1302), p. 99—126: of earlier works we may specially mention al-Muflî (v. v.), al-Itrâdî (Teheran n. d. without pagination), arranged in the order of the Imâmîs.

(R. STRÖHLMANN)

MUHAMMAD B. 'AMMAR [See IBN 'AMMAR].
body of cavalry at once to Mecca and released Muhammad and the other prisoners in the nick of time but by the latter's express orders avoided conflict with Ibn Zubair's troops; the town was not to be desecrated by bloodshed. Muhammad then sought shelter with his family at Mina (cf. Kāmil, p. 554; 597; Kitāb al-ʿĀdām, viii. 33; Kumayt, ed. Hotovitz, i. 78) and later went to Fāṭif. He made no further use of Mukhtar and was therefore not compromised when the revolution failed and his champion fell in 67 (686–687).

In spite of the threats of Ibn Zubair and the demand couched in more friendly language of Abū al-Malik and although a safe place of residence was granted him neither in Ḥijāz nor in Syria, he defined his attitude by paying homage to neither of the two pretenders and adhered to the principle that he would only recognize a ruler around whom the Muslim community were united. He therefore appeared in the noteworthy pilgrimage of the year 688 along with the Zanadis, Umayyah and Khāṭiṣ, as an independent head of a party, although only under an armed neutrality. Only when, after the fall of Ibn Zubair (73 = 692), the unanimatorous qā'īyār which he had demanded, became a reality, did he finally recognise the Marāṣīd as the legitimate rulers and visited him in 78 (697–698) at Dama-scus. He returned however to Medina, where he died in St (700–701). His strict passivity in the political field is always attributed to purely religious motives in the traditions: not human force but Allah's help alone should assist Allah's family to their rights; but there is no doubt that a further reason was his lack of enterprise and self-confidence, a trait common to a number of 'Alids. That, like his whole family, he at the same time liked the good things of this world is evident from the heavy demands which he sent to Abū al-Malik for the payment of his debts and annual pensions for his children, relatives and clients; there is also evidence that he had the family fondness for fine clothes and costumes. It is all the more remarkable then that the more fanciful and extravagant school of Shi'is seized upon him at once after his death and spread the belief that he was not dead but lived in a kind of fairy kingdom on the hill of Khawāf west of Medina, whence he would return as the victorious leader of an army (cf. Kitāb al-ʿĀdām, vii. 4 sq.; 9 sq.; viii. 52). This was the idea of radīya which 'Abd Allah b. Salāh [q. v.] had associated with 'Alī (cf. Friedlander, in Z.A., xxiii. 390 sq.) and which was now transferred to him: and in fact it was now easier to bring him into the forefront than it had been while he maintained an attitude of stubborn passive resistance in his lifetime.

MUHAMMAD B. AL-ḤANAFĪYA — MUHAMMAD B. MAHMUD


**MUHAMMAD B. HĀNI** [See Ibn Hāni'.]

**MUHAMMAD B. AL-ḤASAN** [See Ibn Duraid-

**MUHAMMAD B. AL-HUDHAIL** [See Abu ‘l-Hudhail.]

**MUHAMMAD B. HUSAIN, an Ottoman dignitary and historian**, who at the request of the first Wali of Bagdad, Derwish Mehmed Pasha (Thurzay, *Safīl-i-Būludnī*, i. 33), translated into Turkish the history of ‘Alīb Shihāb Hamadānī, written in 10 bīb in Persia; he added two bīb to it and gave it the title *Turāf al-Madīnān*. The work only exists in manuscript.

*Bibliography*: Brusali Mehmed Tahir, *‘Abd al-Maleqef*, lii. 142; cf. also Ḥādi Ḥafīz, *Kittī al-Dawār*, Bilāl 1747. 4, 401, where Ḥafīz Shihāb is named as the Turkish translator.

The *MUHAMMAD HAFIZ* (*Muhammad Hafiz*), who was a dignitary of the court and flourished under three sultans (*Mutasī IV*, 1032–1049 = 1623–1640, Ibrahim, 1049–1058 = 1640–1648, and Mehmed IV, 1058–1099 = 1648–1687), was not identical with him. He wrote a chronicle of his time entitled *Ta‘rīkh Gilāmān* which covered the years 1060–1075 = 1650–1665. The work which consists of 3 bāb and a *Kātibīn* (of which the second bāb contains two and the third 13 faʿīl) was published by Ḥādir Afraf as supplement II to *To O.E.M.*, parts 78–83, Istanbul 1340 (1924).

A certain Muhammad Khalīfa b. Ḥusain is perhaps the same person; he also was a dignitary of the court of the same three sultans and wrote a history of his time which covered the years 1043–1070 (1635–1659). The only known manuscript is in Vienna.


(TH. MENZEL)

**MUHAMMAD B. AL-ḤUSAIN** [See Abu ‘l-Ḥasain, Abū Sa‘īd, Ibn Muklā, Al-Shirīf al-Rafī‘.]

**MUHAMMAD B. IBRĀHĪM** [See Abu ‘l-Ḥasain.]

**MUHAMMAD B. IBRĀHĪM ‘ĀDIL SHĀH** (1053–1070 = 1636–1660) succeeded to the throne of Būlāpur after the death of his father. In the years 1044 (1634), the armies of the emperor Shihīb Ḥasīn invaded the Dakān and laid waste the country of Būlāpur. After the subjugation of Dawlatābād and other forts, Muhammad b. Ibrahim ‘Ādīl Shāh agreed to pay a considerable tribute to the emperor of Dehlī. He was the last king of Būlāpur who struck coins in his own name. In the latter part of his reign, his vassal Siwādī, son of Sāhīb Bhusān, by stratagem and treachery obtained great power, and the foundation of the Būlāpur monarchy became weakened. He died in 1070 (1660) and was buried in Būlāpur where his tomb is called *Sat Gumbār* (circular dome).

*Bibliography*: Fuzairi Astarvandī, Fustatīh *‘Ādīl Shāh*, fol. 314v; *Imārat Gazetter of India*, viii. 189.

(See Ibn Ṣa‘īd, Al-Nadim.)

**MUHAMMAD B. AL-KĀSIM** [See Abu ‘l-Ārīwī, Anauke].

**MUHAMMAD B. KĀSIM, a cousin of Walid I (86–96 = 705–715) and son-in-law of al-Hādijādji b. Yūsuf, was the governor of Ra’sā, in 92 (711), he was sent to conquer Sind. Having defeated and killed the Kāדā of the place called Dāhir, he took possession of that country in 93 (712) and finally penetrated as far as Multān about 500 miles from the sea and even reached the foot of the Himālāya. Various accounts are given of the death of this general. The common story is that Muhammad b. Kāsim was falsely accused by the two daughters of the Kādā of Dāhir, whom he had sent to the harem of Sulaimān (96–99 = 715–717), the brother and successor of Walid, of having violated their chastity, and that he was therefore sewn up alive in a raw cow-hide, by order of the enraged caliph. Others say that he quarrelled with other members of his family, was tortured and put to death by Shāh b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, governor of ‘Īrān, in revenge for the murder of his brother by Kādijādji.


**MUHAMMAD B. MAHMŪD** [See Abu Shurq, Ghiyath al-Din, b. Sahl b. Sulaiman al-Dīn, a Saljuq Sultan 547–554 (1151–1159), born 522 (1128), like his brother Malikshāh, was educated with the atabeg Buzāba, who set them up as claimants to the throne against their uncle Maṣūd. When Buzāba in 542 (1147–1148) was taken prisoner in a fierce battle and executed, Maṣūd adopted his nephew and married Muhammad to his daughter. He probably intended him to succeed him and not Malikshāh, as Ibn al-Athīr and others say, because after his death (547 = 1158) the latter was actually raised to the throne. Muhammad was away at the time but within three months he was recognized as sultan by the powerful Khaybūg, after he had come to Hamadān, because Malikshāh proved quite incompetent. The new sultan showed his gratitude by treacherously putting Khaybūg to death and sent his head to the emirs of Marāgha and Ardabrādīdīā̄ in the hope that he would win them over. But Khaybūg was disappointed, for although they hated Khaybūg, their horror at the cruel deed made them prefer to pay homage to Muhammad’s uncle Sulaimān, who had escaped from years of imprisonment on Maṣūd’s death. Muhammad therefore fled to Ifshān, but because Sulaimān was an inveterate drunkard, he could not hold out in Hamadān and when he had gone away Muhammad returned and was henceforth recognised as sultan by the emirs. In the meanwhile Sulaimān succeeded in escaping to ‘Ishf and entered into relations with the Caliph al-Muṣṭaṣrīf b-Amar Allāh. The latter was endeavouring not without success to make himself independent of the Saljuqs and let Sulaimān come to Bagdad (550 = 1155) to use
him against Muhammad. He was also able to win Malikshah over and to collect an army, which was however scattered in the following year by the help of Mawdud, lord of al-Mawṣil, and Sulaiman was again made prisoner. Muhammad now thought himself strong enough to attack the Caliph himself and to besiege him in Bagdad. Imād al-Din, who was in the town, gives a full account of the siege (Ruc. Hist. Crois., ii. 246 sqq.). Muhammad hurriedly raised the siege when news reached him that Rūkhīs had occupied the heights with Malikshah and Ardān (552 = 1157). By the time the sultan there arrived, he had retired, but he was at war with them till his death in 554 (1159).

Bibliography: see the article selīḥ ʿīsī.

(M. TH. HOUTSMA)

MUHAMMAD b. MALIKSHĀH

Abū Shuʿībā Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa-l-Din Kāsīm Amīr al-Muʾminīn, a Sālīḥūk sultan (498 = 1105—1118), was born on the 18th Shabān 474 (Jan. 20, 1082) of a slave, who was also the mother of Sandjar, and was given the Turkish name of Tapar. After his father's death, he stayed at first with Turkan Khaṭṭūn but then joined his brother Barbaryūk who granted him the town of Gandja. Arrived there, he also seized Ardān and allowed himself to be seduced by Muʿāyjad al-Mulk b. Niẓām al-Mulk into dropping his brother's name out of the kāfīfa. The two brothers fought another one with varying success in the following years until finally in 497 (1104) Barbaryūk withdrew from the western provinces of the empire to Isfahān and left Muhammad to enforce recognition as sultan from the governors in these lands. Barbaryūk died soon after, at the end of 1104, Muhammad turned first to Bagdad because he was sure of the homage of the Caliph, who had already received him and his brother a few years before in ceremonial audience (cf. the account in Ibn Khalil, Bālūḳ 1299, ii. 444, had the emir Ayyār, who had at first had the kāfīfa read for Malikshah b. Barbaryūk, treacherously put to death and sent the king of the Arabs Šadāka back to his capital al-Hilla with orders to restore peace in Bāyra and among the Arab tribes of the neighbourhood. He then hurried to Isfahān, where the Bāṭlīnaya had achieved great successes in the troubled reign of Barbaryūk and had established themselves in several hill-fortresses in the neighbourhood. One of their leaders, Ibn Aṭṭāsh, had by a ruse secured possession of the fortress of Du-Kūh or Šāh-Diz built by Malikshah. The Sultan regarded as his first duty to subdue and root out if possible these unbelievers; he sent his troops to besiege the fortress and, when it was taken, razed it to the ground and had the captured Bāṭlīnaya executed in cruel fashion (500 = 1107; cf. the text of the report sent by him to the Caliph's vizier in Ibn al-Kalānīsī, ed. Amedroz, p. 152 ff.). Nor did he hesitate to use his own vizier, Sa'd al-Mulk Abū l-Mahāsin al-Attī, executed at the gate of Isfahān; he was suspected, according to Anusharwaṟān wrongly, (cf. Rec. Hist. Crois., ii. 91) of having had dealings with the Bāṭlīnaya.

While Muhammad was still in Isfahān, the emir Ĉawa b. Ṣaḵawaw, who ruled between Fārs and Kūrūstān, made his submission to him; the sultan had frequently tried in vain to bring him to obedience through the emir Mawdūd. The sultan was so pleased that he granted him the town of al-Mawṣil where Djekermīsh, who had only paid homage to him under compulsion, was in command. The latter was not inclined to submit to the arrangement, but was taken prisoner in an encounter with Čawallā. The latter however was not yet lord of al-Mawṣil, for the followers of Djiķermīsh now supported his son Zangi and appealed for help to Aḵšonḵor al-Būruḵi, the governor of Bagdad, to Šadāka and to Khiẖūd Ārdān, the Bāṭlīnaya of al-Rūm. The last-named alone answered the appeal and came with his troops to al-Mawṣil where he had homage paid to himself as sultan, but soon afterwards, after an unsuccessful encounter, he was drowned in the Khabūr on his retreat. Čawallā now had little difficulty in taking the town and going on to his further task, the war against the Crusaders. It would take us too far here to sketch the course of this war, and the reader may therefore be referred to Weil, Gesch. der Chal., iii. 191 sqq. During his absence he again fell into disgrace with the Caliph, who had in the meanwhile returned to Bagdad and sent his troops to attack Šadāka, with whom he was also dissatisfied. Šadāka fell in battle in 501 (beg. of 1101). The sultan sent Mawdūd to al-Mawṣil and granted him the same dignity as he had previously given Čawallā. The latter after some time made peace with the sultan and was appointed as atabeg to Fārs, where he fought the unruly elements in the population with great energy (cf. Ibn al-Aḏīr, ed. Tornberg, p. 561 sqq.). The Bāṭlīnaya however gave Muhammad no peace, so long as they were able to hold their strong mountain citadel of Alamūt; Abū Naṣr Aḥmād, a son of Niẓām al-Mulk, who after Sa'd al-Mulk acted as the sultan's vizier, was therefore given orders to take this fortress and when he did not succeed, was dismissed in 504 (1109—10). In the meanwhile the sultan was being urged more and more from different sides to prosecute the war with the Crusaders seriously, and he succeeded in persuading the various governors of the western provinces to combine and attack the Christians under the leadership of Mawdūd accompanied by the young prince Mawdūd. After Mawdūd's assassination (507 = 1113) Aḵšonḵor al-Būruḵi took command and, after Būruḵi assumed the supreme command but on account of the strife among the Turkish emirs, the value of the Crusaders and the complicated situation in Syria, decisive successes could not be attained. For the course of the campaign we again refer the reader to Weil, op. cit., p. 194 sqq. and the historians of the Crusaders. In the last years of his life, the sultan sent the emir Anushteḵin Shāfīr against the Bāṭlīnaya in Alamūt, but he died on the 24th Dhu 'l-Ĥidżđa 511 (Apr. 18, 1118) before the fortress was taken. He was only 36 years old and this is why Weil suggests that the Bāṭlīnaya had a hand in his death, but there is nothing to support this hypothesis in the original chronicles. On the contrary, individuals in his immediate entourage, notably the Great Ĥidijī 'Abī Bār, seem to have been not quite innocent, because they, apparently to avert suspicion from themselves, accused the sultāna Ghaus Khaṭṭūn and the famous poet al-Tuğhurī of having caused the sultan's illness by magic arts. The former was blinded and strangled on the day Muhammad died. The reason given by Matthias of Edessa for this (Docum. Arm., i. 120) is wrong. The sultān deserves credit for having, with the assistance of his brother Sandjar who ruled in Kūrūstān and the adjoining lands, restored the fortunes of the Saldiḵān kingdom, which had declined since the death of Malikshah
and for having vigorously fought infidels and sectarians in his zeal for Sunni Islam and the 'Abbāsid caliphate. He was, as Ren. Hist. Cr., ii. 118 has it, the perfect man of the Seldjūqs and their strong he-camal.

Bibliography: given in the article SELJUK.

(M. Th. HOUTSA)

MUHAMMAD, ABB AYHM, DJALA AL-DAYWLA WA-DIJN AL-MILLA, ABB AYHM MUHAMMAD, second son of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna, was born about 537 (997). He was married to a daughter of Abd Nasr Muḥammad b. Abu T-Ḥanīf Ahmad b. Muhammad, the Farighūnī ruler of Džun-ḍāna. After the death of Abd Nasr Muḥammad in 491 (1050-1051), Sultan Mahmūd assigned his son Muhammad the government of the province of Džundžanda. In 497, at the instance of Sultan Mahmūd, the 'Abbāsid Caliph al-Kāfir bi-‘līth conferred on him the titles of Djalal al-Dawla wa-Dījma al-Milla. Towards the close of his life, Sultan Mahmūd divided his empire between his sons, giving Ghazna, Khorasan and India to Muḥammad and Rayy, Liǧbit and Isfahan to Maṣ’ūd, and took solemn vows from both to respect this division. When Mahmūd died in Rabi’ II, 421 (April 1030), Muhammad ascended the throne at Ghazna, but Maṣ’ūd, disregarding his vows, marched from Isfahan to take possession of Ghazna. In the meantime, the nobles at Ghazna deposed Muhammad on 3rd Shawwal 421 (October 2, 1050) and read the Īṣa or in the name of Maṣ'ūd. Muhammad was then deprived of his sight by orders of Maṣ’ūd and imprisoned in a fort. His reign had lasted only 6 months.

In 431 Shāhī Muhammad suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Seldjūqs and, resolved to settle in India. In the beginning of 432 (September 1030), leaving Ghazna in the hands of his son Maṣ’ūd and his wazar, he marched to India with all his treasures, but on 13th Rabi’ I, 432 (December 24, 1040) his slaves deposed him and raised Muḥammad to the throne. Shortly after this, Maṣ’ūd was put to death. Hearing this, Maṣ’ūd advanced with a large army to avenge his death of his father, defeated Muhammad near Dūmār on 3rd Sha’bān 432 (April 1041), and put him to death. The second reign of Muhammad lasted only 4 months. Muhammad was obedient to his father and was a man of amiable temperament. He resembled his father in appearance.


(MUHAMMAD NĀZĪM)

MUHAMMAD B. MARWAN, an Umayyad governor. In 65 (684–685) he was sent by his father, the caliph Marwan I, to Mesopotamia, and in the battle of ‘Aṭām al-Dārī ‘Abbād b. al-Zahār, he commanded the advanced guard of the Syrian army. In the following year ‘Abbâd al-Mālik gave him the governorship of Mesopotamia and Armenia which carried with it the command in the war with the Byzantines. On account of climatic conditions the Arab expeditions always took place in summer. In 73 (692), the emperor Justinian II was defeated at Sebastopolis in Cilicia. In 75 (694) Muḥammad again took the field against the Byzantines and was successful against them at Marāsh, and in the following year he invaded Armenia. Along with his nephew ‘Abbād Allāh b. ‘Abbâd al-Mālik he was sent to al-Hafidjād in the year 82 (701), to support him against the rebel ‘Abbâd al-Ḵayrān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḵayrān and, in the negotiations with the ‘Ifrīqī, before the battle at Daur al-Djamādun the caliph was represented by Muḥammad and ‘Abbâd Allāh. In the same year, Muḥammad led an expedition against Armenia, and again in 84 (705) and 85 (704). After the accession of al-Walī (Shawwāl 86 = Oct. 705) Muḥammad fell gradually into the background while Maṣlama, the caliph’s brother, was the actual commander; but the former retained his governorship for some time until in 91 (709–710) he was replaced by Maṣlama here also. Muḥammad died in 101 (710–720).


MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD [See Abb. ‘Alī, ‘Abb ‘UWAṣ, AL-DIJAL, IBN AṢIM, IBN BAṬṬŪṬA, IBN DAIḤIR, IBN AL-HABRĪYĀ, IBN NEṢĪṬA, IMĀD AL-DIN.

MUHAMMAD B. MUKARRAM [See Ibn MANZUR.

MUHAMMAD B. MUSA B. SHĀĶIR [See MUSA BANDU]

MUHAMMAD B. AL-MUSTANIR [See KUTRUB]

MUHAMMAD B. AL-MUẒAFFAR [See MUIŻAFARĪ]

MUHAMMAD B. ‘OMAR [See Ibn AL-KUṬĪYA]

MUHAMMAD B. ‘OTHMAN [See Abb. ZAḤĪN]

MUHAMMAD B. RĀʾĪK [See Ibn KAYRĀ]

MUHAMMAD B. RAZĪN [See Abb. ‘UṢRAṢ]

MUHAMMAD B. SA‘D [See Ibn MARDABESH, IBN SA’D]

MUHAMMAD B. SĀLĪM [See Ibn WAYSĪL]

MUHAMMAD B. SA‘ŪD [See ŠAIKH DYNASTY]

MUHAMMAD B. SA‘ŪD (properly Sa‘ūd) e. Muḥammad of the Muṣīrīn clan of Abī Anas, the founder of the Wāhhabī dynasty of the Al-Sa‘ūd in Najd [see the article ‘SA‘ĒD], succeeded his father as amir of al-Dafyah in 1137 (1724) or 1140 (1727). His association with the reformer Muḥammad b. ‘Abbâd al-Wahlāb [cf. WAHHLAIB] began in 1157 (1744). Thereafter until his death (end of Rabi’ I, 1179 = Sept. 1765) the history of his reign consists of an unceasing and on the whole indecisive struggle against the neighbouring settlements and tribes and his former neighbors, the Damūl Khalīd b. al-Jasār. He took little active part in these operations, and his personality was overshadowed by the figures of the reformer in front of himself and of his own son ‘Abbâd al-Ḵazā. Nevertheless his talents as a diplomatist more than
once saved the Wāḥḥābī state from being crushed by a coalition of its enemies, notably after the disastrous defeat by the forces of Naṣrān at Ḥājirah in 764.


**MUḤAMMAD b. SIRI** [See Ibn Sirin.]

**MUḤAMMAD b. TĀHIR, governor of Kūḥārān.** After the death of his father, Muḥammad received the governorship of Kūḥārān (Rājdāb 245 = Sept. 856). In 250 (864—5) the Abī Ḥasan b. Zaid rebelled, which led to a long and serious struggle [see Muḥammad b. ṬĀḤĪ AL-ṢĀ‘Ī]. When Abū ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ṣadīq rebelled against Ya‘qūb b. al-Mu‘āwiyah, the caliph and Muḥammad, who appointed him governor of al-Ṭabasain and Kūhārān, Ya‘qūb b. al-Mu‘āwiyah sent an embassy to him; but as Ya‘qūb b. al-Mu‘āwiyah had already found a following among discontented Kūḥārānīs, all negotiations were in vain. In Ṣawā‘ilā (Aug. 873), or according to another statement in 258, he entered Nisbin without striking a blow, put an end to the Ẓahīrī dynasty and took Muḥammad prisoner. When he rebelled against the Caliph al-Mu‘ātimid, he was defeated in Rājdāb 262 (April 876) by the latter's brother al-Mu’awāfik and Muḥammad, whom he had with him in chains, escaped. The Caliph restored the latter to his former office in Kūḥārān; the exiled Ẓahīrī however never found an opportunity to exercise his functions. He was further appointed — probably not till 270 (885—6) — by the vizier ʿAbd Allāh b. Makhān as his deputy as military governor of Baghdu. He held this office until the accession of al-Mu‘ātimid (279 = 892). He died in 296 (908—9).


**MUḤAMMAD b. TĀHIR** [See Ibn al-Kādān-Rāḥī.]

**MUḤAMMAD b. TAKASH** [See Khāzīrī al-Maḥārī.]

**MUḤAMMAD b. TUGHḌĪ** [See Duff (of Duff)].

**VAṬIKAN b.FORĀN b. FERĪ b. KHĀN, Abu Bakr, known as al-Muḥammadī, from the title granted to him by the Caliph al-Rādi in 327 (939), was the founder of the Egyptian dynasty of the 1khshidīs (q. v.).**

He was born in 268 (882) at Baghdu and must have spent his youth in Syria, as his father, who joined the service of the Ẓalūnids at about the same date, was appointed governor of Damascus and Tabariya c. 276, a post which he held for some fifteen years, and he himself acted for a time as his father's deputy for Tabariya. In consequence of the overthrow of the Ẓalūnids dynasty in 292 (904), he was imprisoned at Baghdu. He was released in 294 (907), attached to the wāṣir al-ʿAbbās b. al-Hādī, and being implicated in murder, had to fly when the conspiracy of Ibn al-Mu‘taṣṣāz (q. v.) failed in 296 (910). He escaped to Syria and found himself reduced to a humble station. Next year he passed on to Egypt, where Tākin, his governor, took him into favour, so that he kept him with himself, both in Egypt and in Syria when he was transferred thither to act as governor at intervals (302—307 and 309—311), and promoted him to appointments of importance.

At this period Muḥammad came into contact with the powerful Ẓalūnī family, and also attended Mu‘nis (q. v.) when he was brought to Egypt by the Fāqūd invasion. He had already attracted some attention at Baghdu by an exploit in 306. In 316 (928), through influence at the capital, he became governor of Ramla, quitting Tākin abruptly. In 319 he obtained a transfer to Damascus where he became powerful, and in consequence of his defeat of Bahṣrā in 321 extended his rule over the whole of Syria. In the same year (March 933) Tākin died, and Muḥammad b. Tughḍī succeeded in obtaining the appointment as governor of Egypt in his place, but only nominally and for one month (Sept. 933). Two years later, by means of a large army and fleet, he entered Fustāt and took possession of the country, overcoming the resistance of al-Mudarrī (Muḥammad b. Ṭāḥī), who by appointment from Baghdu was then in control of Egypt, the governor being under his direction (ṣādīr ad-dābārī). Superior to al-Mudarrī, however, was al-Fadl b. Ḥāfīz b. al-Fārābī (for whom see the article INN AL-FARDĪ), the inspector minister (ṣāzīr kāfi), of Egypt and Syria, who had been specially granted full executive powers. Muḥammad b. Tughḍī had acted with the authorization of al-Fadl and later (324) obtained the confirmation of al-Rādi to the addition of Egypt to the province of Syria already held by him. Probably at the same time he was granted the sovereignty over al-Yaman and the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina, for in his letter of the following year to the Emperor Romanus he boasts of these places as part of his kingdom. Until the death of al-Fadl in 327 (March 939), he seems to have been subject, at least in theory, to some control by him.

In 324 a decisive victory by the troops of Muḥammad b. Tughḍī near Alexandria (battle of Abuqūk, March 31, 936) crushed the third Fāqūd invasion of Egypt and led to overtures from the Fāqūd, Caliph al-Kāfīr, which in the end came to nothing. Muhammad did indeed decide three years later to recognize the Fāqūd, and had given the order that al-Kāfīr should be proclaimed in Egypt, out of indignation at the ʿAbhābī government at Baghdu, but was induced to reckon with his decision.

Only a month after he had received his title al-Hāshid from al-Rādi (Ramadan 327 = June—July 939), he found himself threatened from Rakka by Ibn Rāʾik (q. v.) and learnt that his provinces had been granted to this rival. Badjkam (q. v.), as amīr al-awārād at Baghdu, gave no answer to his appeal but that the question must be decided by the sword; the powerless Caliph could say nothing. Ibn Rāʾik rapidly possessed himself of Syria, driving back the forces sent to oppose him,
and had soon captured Ramla (Oct. 939). Muhammad b. Tughdjid himself confronted him with an army at Faramah, and with no fighting beyond some skirmishing entered into negotiations, ending in an agreement to cede Syria from Tabariya to the north on condition that Ramla and the rest were restored to him. Ibn Rā'īk soon broke this treaty and again advanced. This time Muhammad b. Tughdjid encountered him at al-‘Arish and routed him (15th Ramadān 542 = June 24, 940), but as he followed him into Syria, met with a reverse to his turn, one of his detachments being surprised and badly defeated at Lajdjin (15th August). Peace was then renewed on the same terms as before, and Muhammad b. Tughdjid undertook to pay an annual subsidy of 140,000 dinārs. He was back in Egypt in October.

The death of Badjkm in 329 (April 941) drew Ibn Rā’īk back to Baghda, and Muhammed b. Tughdjid was soon relieved of him completely, for he was murdered a year later by the Hadmānis. Muhammad lost no time in recovering Syria, marching thither himself (June 942) and remaining in the country about six months before coming back to Egypt. It must have been at about this period that he succeeded in dispensing some minor encroachments for Syria from the direction of Raqqah (which were allowed to without detail), those of Adl (al-Badījami) and Badr al-Kharsani. He had to meet more serious attacks from the Hadmānis. One of them, al-Husain b. Sa’d, took Halab from him in 332 (March 944), and in May he set out to recover it. The Caliph al-Muttaqi, moreover, insecure under the protection of the Hadmānis from Tūrūn, the amir al-unārā, had appealed to him for help. His enemy retired at his approach and having regained the town he proceeded to Raqqah, where he met the Caliph (Sept. 7, 944). At this time he had thoughts of becoming amir al-unārā himself. He urged al-Muttaqi to come with him to Syria and Egypt, and even offered to go with him to Baghda. He succeeded in this, and not to trust himself to Tūrūn, but could not dissuade him. After receiving flattering marks of honour he departed. Before he reached Fustāt he returned the Hadmān Saif al-Dawla [q.v.] had retaken Halab (Oct. 944). The Egyptian army sent to meet this new aggression was severely defeated at Rastān near Hims, and Saif al-Dawla advanced to Damascus and entered it (April-May 945). Muhammad b. Tughdjid, coming from Egypt with his army, obliged him to retreat, pursued him, brought him to battle at Kinnar (May—June 945), and defeated him. Again Muhammad made easy terms when victorious. Saif al-Dawla retained Syria north of Damascus and was also given a subsidy. The treaty was concluded in Rabi’ I. 334 (Oct.-Nov. 945), and Muhammad then went back to Damascus, remaining there until he died a few months later (21st Dhu’l-Hijjah 334 = June 24, 946), just after the arrival of a Byzantine envoy concerning an exchange of prisoners for which he had opened negotiations.

Next to nothing is recorded of the internal events of Egypt during his reign; the country was doubtless quiet. Its revenue, said to have amounted to two million dinārs annually, was no longer accounted for to Baghda, and no regular payments were made from it to the central treasury. But he sent large occasional gifts to the Caliphs, so that al-Kāfi considered him an exemplary vassal.

He left seven million dinārs at his death besides considerable other property. No constructional works of much importance are credited to him. At Fustāt he rebuilt the shipyard on the mainland, and on its site on the island of Rawda made a garden called al-Mukhtar; he enlarged the government house in which he resided, a Fāṭimid building that was situated near the still existing tomb of al-Kāfi Bakkar, and added a madrasa; he also made another garden known later as al-Kāfari, afterwards the site of the western Fāṭimid palace of Cairo. His armies at times seem to have been large. At the battle of Abūlq the Egyptians are said to have had 15,000 horsemen, at that of Kinnarsin 50,000 men. Such numbers should have been reached by means of levies for particular emergencies, which he is known to have raised more than once. On one occasion his personal retainers (al-Mutlu), on whom he more especially depended, numbered 500. The constantly repeated and universally accepted figures of 400,000 for his army, and 8,000 for his bodyguard can be dismissed as ridiculous, notwithstanding that they rest on the early authority of al-Tanūkhī (d. 384), and with them the accompanying myth as to his habit of concealing his sleeping places when on campaign.

The most renowned of his followers was Kāfīr [q.v.], without doubt, the ablest, and his colleagues al-Mutlu, Fālīs, rose to some eminence. Alī b. Muhammad b. Kāfīr was his secretary both at Damascus and in Egypt. Muhammad b. Alī al-Mutlu was his wazir for a few months (328—329), Muhammad b. Alī b. Mukātīl, previously secretary to Ibn Rā’īk, was his wazir at his death. His four brothers were all younger than himself; al-Hasan was in command at the battle of Abūlq, and represented him in Egypt during all his absences. al-Husain was in command at Lajdjin and killed there, ‘Ubayd Allāh acted for him in Syria, Alī disappears early.

Notable Egyptian authors who flourished during his reign were the historians Ibn al-Dīya (d. 334), al-Kindī (d. 350), and ‘Abd Allāh al-Farghānī (d. 362), who came to Egypt in 329 and remained in his confidence at Raqqah in 333. Al-Mas‘ūdī moreover visited Egypt in 330. Al-Mutanabbi, just rising to fame, recited once in his presence in Syria and addressed a verse to him and to his brother ‘Ubayd Allāh (d. 333 at Ramla).

Muhammad b. Tughdjid was strong physically, but subject to occasional fits of melancholia. His character is illustrated by a number of incidents that have every appearance of being authentic. He was strict, but in no way vindictive or cruel. He often brought his officers to account, and then after punishing them by arrest or fine would restore them to favour. Hardly any executions are heard of in his reign. He would not allow torture and the maltreatment of accused persons, so common in his time. His tact and sagacity were conspicuous. He was decent in his life and liked by his men and the people. On the other hand, he was certainly oppressive and unfair in some of his money exactions, and though at times not ungenerous was inclined to be mean and miserly in minor matters. The two great faults attributed to him, even to his face in his lifetime, parsimony and timidity, are not altogether without foundation. As to the latter, his own defence in a particular instance looks valid.

His career was closely parallel to that of Ahmad b. al-Tūlūn [q.v.], even as regards several fortuitous
occurrences. It leaves no doubt of his capacity, and if admitting of occasional overcharge, will not allow of anything like cowardice. He did not make the same mark as his predecessor, but was a mild and perhaps a better ruler.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa'id, *Muṣḥib* (ed. Tallqvist, Leyden 1899) contains the text of the principal authorities but including subsidiary authorities, and a full biography in German carefully worked out from both sources. By far the most important authority is the long and detailed biography of Muhammad b. TughdUL which forms part of Ibn Sa'id's work, and appears to consist of the life compiled by Ibn Zālīk between 350 and 355, reproduced almost but not quite verbatim. The other principal authority is the *Kitāb al-Wilāyat* of al-Kindī, ed. Guest, Little, if anything, can be added from books published after *Muṣḥib*.

(R. Guest)

---

**MUḤAMMAD B. TUGHULŪK** [See MUḤAMMAD TUGHULŪK.]

**MUḤAMMAD B. TŪMART** [See IBN TŪMART.]

**MUḤAMMAD B. 'UBĀD AL-LĀH** [See ABU 'UBĀD AL-LĀH.]

**MUḤAMMAD B. AL-WALĪD** [See IBN ABĪ RANDAKA.]

**MUḤAMMAD B. YAHYĀ** [See IBN YAHYĀ.]

**MUḤAMMAD B. YĀKIṬ, ABū BAKE**, a chief of police in Baghdaḍ. In 321 (930) Muhammad, whose father was chief chamberlain to the Caliph al-Muktaḍar was appointed chief of police. The maintenance of order in the capital at this time was much neglected and the praetorians conducted a regular reign of terror. In a fracas between infantry and cavalry Muhammad intervened on behalf of the latter; their opponents were cut down, some driven from the city and only a small contingent of negroes, who at once surrendered, remained unscathed (Muḥarrām 318 = Feb. 930). Some months later these mutinied and demanded more pay; but they were driven from the town by Muhammad and then routed by the chief emir Muḥammad b. Ṭawālīsh. Their confusion was increased by the breach between Muḥammad and Muhammad. At the instigation of Muḥammad, Muhammad was dismissed in Dhuʾl-Qaʿa 310 (June—July 931). Muḥammad was nevertheless not satisfied but demanded that his hated rival should be banished. The Caliph at first refused to grant his request; but when Muḥammad threatened with force, he had to yield, whereupon Muhammad went to Siḏjistān (Radjab 319 = July 931). Soon afterwards the Caliph quarrelled with Muḥammad and recalled Muḥammad. In Muḥarrām 320 (Jan. 932) the latter returned to Baghdaḍ; the Caliph then sent him with an army to al-Maṣṭūk in the region of Ṭakrit. But when Muḥammad advanced from Mauṣul, the Caliph's troops under Muḥammad and Saʿd b. Ḥarīmīn returned to Baghdaḍ without striking a blow. After the victory of Muḥammad and the murder of al-Muṣṭūk in Mauṣul in the beginning of the year (Oct. 932) the latter's son Abd al-Walīḥid led with Muḥammad and his other supporters to al-Mada'in and then to Wāṣit where a number of his generals abandoned him. When the forces of the new Caliph al-Kāhir approached under the command of Yalbāq, Abd al-Walīḥid and Muḥammad fled to Tustar. Muḥammad was not popular on account of his arrogance and selfishness, so that one after the other laid down his arms and finally Abd al-Walīḥid surrendered. Muhammad entered into negotiations with Yalbāq and the Caliph pardoned him. He then returned to Baghdaḍ where he gained a great influence over al-Kāhir. On the accession of al-Rāḥil in Dhuʾl-Qaʿa 3 (April 934), Muhammad became the real ruler in a short time; the Caliph appointed him chief chamberlain and also made him his commander-in-chief while the viceroy Ibn Maḥlīk played a more subordinate part. When al-Muṣṭūk's cousin ʿAbd al-Qādir b. Qādirī, whom al-Kāhir had appointed governor of Māḥ al-Kūfah, al-Dinawar and Māḥabbaḏān rebelled, Muhammad was sent with an army against him. In the resulting battle, Muhammad suffered a defeat (Dhuʾl-Qaʿa 322 = May 934); soon afterwards however, ʿAbd al-Qādir fell from his horse and was killed by one of Muhammad's slaves. With the death of their commander the resistance of Ṭabātī's followers collapsed; Muhammad was nevertheless unable long to retain his position of power. On the advice of Ibn Maḥlīk who feared his ever increasing power, al-Rāḥil had him arrested along with his brother al-Muṣaffar and the secretary ʿAbd al-Malik al-Karāẓī on the 5th Dhuʾl-Qaʿa 3, 323 (April 12, 935); Muhammad died in prison in the same year.


**MUḤAMMAD B. YAZĪD** [See IBN MŪṢIJĀ, MUḤARRAD.]

**MUḤAMMAD B. YŪSUF** [See ABU YŪSUF.]

**MUḤAMMAD ʿABD AL-KARĪM ʿALAWT**, better known as ʿAbd al-Karīm Mūṣijā, a Persian historian of the middle of the ninth century. His best known work is the *Taʿrīḥ-i ʿAbd al-Rāḥamīn b. Hādīḍī Muhammad Rasūl al-Funūn*, a history of the founder of the Durrānī dynasty in Afghānīstān, Ahmad Shāh. After ʿAbd al-Karīm had finished a history of Shudjaʿ al-Mulk Durānī and the conquest of Khūsāṣ in 1235 (1820), he decided to write a complete history of the Durrānīs and began his *Taʿrīḥ-i ʿAbd al-Rāḥamīn b. Hādīḍī Muhammad Rasūl al-Funūn*. The work is based on the *Taʿrīḥ-i Ḥusainīyāt* of Firdawṣī al-Din Husainī (Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS. Brit. Mus., ii. 904) and is really only a paraphrase of it. It begins with the story of Ahmad Shāh which he continued to the year 1212. Then follows a description of the Pandjaḥ and the roads between Kābul, Hārāt, Paghāvar and Kandahār and a chapter on Turkestān under Nāṣir al-Dīn Bāy. The work concludes with the accession of Shudjaʿ al-Mulk. In addition to this book, ʿAbd al-Karīm in 1263 (1847) wrote the *Mūsākāt-i Kūfi ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Tusi*, describing the war with the English down to General Pollock's expedition (Sept.—Oct. 1842). It again is not original but based on the poem Abūrūmāma of Kāsim Ẓāfīn. According to Beate, *Oriental Biographical Dictionary* (London 1894, p. 5), he also wrote a history of the Sikh war entitled *Taʿrīḥ-i Pandjaḥ Tusafān ʿAbd al-Rāḥamīn b. ʿAbd al-Rāḥamīn* but there is no mention of a manuscript or lithograph of any such work in any of the European catalogues. It is possible that there is some confusion with the Pandjaḥ section of the *Taʿrīḥ-i ʿAbd al-Rāḥamīn*. In the Catalogue of the Persian printed Books in the British Museum (London 1922, p. 19), E. Edwards ascribes to the author a dictionary of English and Persian homonyms.
entitled *A Dictionary of Anglo-Persian homogenous words being a... Collection of... Words having nearly the same Sound and the same Meaning*, Bombay 1859; it is however unfortunately not possible to be certain that the author of the book is the same ʻAbd al-Karim Munhū.

**Bibliography**


MUHAMMAD ʻABDUH, a Muslim theologian, founder of the Egyptian modernist school.

Muhammad ʻAbduh belonged to an Egyptian peasant family and was born in 1849 in Lower Egypt. He spent his childhood in the little village of Mahjīlāt Naṣr in the mudirya of Bahāra. When Muhammad ʻAbduh had learned the Korān by heart, he was sent in 1862 to the theological school of Tanṭa but he left this after a year and a half discouraged and was only induced to resume his studies through the influence of a grand uncle who aroused in him an interest in mysticism. In 1865 he returned to Tanṭa but the next year proceeded to Cairo to the Azhar mosque. There at this moment the first movements of a new spirit were becoming apparent in the beginning of a return to the classics and an awakening interest in natural science and history, which agreed with mysticism in a lower estimation of the old traditional studies. In this milieu Muhammad ʻAbduh at once devoted himself entirely to mysticism, practised asceticism and retired from the world. It was again his grand uncle who persuaded him to give this up. About the same time, 1872, Muhammad ʻAbduh came into contact with Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn al-Afghānī [q.v.] who had just arrived in Egypt and was detined to exercise a profound influence upon him. It was he who revealed traditional learning to Muhammad ʻAbduh in a new light, called his attention to European works accessible in translations and attracted his interest finally to Egyptian and Muslim problems of the day. Muhammad ʻAbduh soon became himself the most ardent disciple and in his very first work of a mystic nature (Risāla al-Wardi‘ah, 1290 = 1874) enthusiastically described Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn as his spiritual guide. The influence of Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn is still more marked on the matter of Muhammad ʻAbduh's second work, notes on dogmatics entitled Ḥīfiya al-Dīn al-Dawānu ʻl-ʻĀˈmīr al-Dīn ʻAbduh (1292 = 1876). The influence of Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn and the development of affairs in Egypt towards the end of the reign of the Khedive ʻAmīr caused Muhammad ʻAbduh in 1876 to take to journalism, which he practised henceforth. After concluding his studies at the Azhar mosque and acquiring the certificate of an ʻalim (scholar), he first of all gave private tuition; in 1879 he was appointed as teacher in the Dar al-ʻUmm, which had been founded a few years before to modernise instruction in religious learning. In the same year, shortly after the accession of the Khedive Tawfīk, Muhammad ʻAbduh was dismissed for reasons that have not been clearly explained and sent to his native village. During the reign of Djamal al-Dīn was banished from Egypt; but a liberal ministry very soon recalled Muhammad ʻAbduh (1880) and appointed him chief editor of the official gazette al-Waḥīf al-Miyrājī, which not only contained official announcements but also endeavoured to influence public opinion; under Muhammad ʻAbduh's control it became the mouthpiece of the liberal party. In spite of a common ultimate goal: the liberation of the Muslim peoples and a renaissance of Islam by its own strength, there was an essential difference between Muhammad ʻAbduh's programme and that of Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn: the latter was a revolutionary who aimed at a complete upheaval; Muhammad ʻAbduh, on the other hand, held that only gradual reform could be successful, thought that no political revolution could take the place of an internal transformation of mentality and regarded a reform of education, especially moral and religious, as the first preliminary to progress. His interest gradually became concentrated on Islam and its position in the modern world. ʻArīf Pāṣgārī's rebellion put an end to Muhammad ʻAbduh's activity on these lines. His part in this movement has not yet been sufficiently elucidated; although it is certain that he neither shared the optimism of military circles nor approved their use of force, he put himself on the side of the nationalist opponents of absolutism and endeavoured to exert a moderating influence on its leaders. After the suppression of the rebellion he was condemned to banishment from Egypt at the end of 1882. He first went to Bārsīt and then to Paris, where in the beginning of 1884 he met Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn. The two founded a society called al-ʻIzza al-dāwarīya and published a paper with the same name, which became publication after eight months but exercised a very profound influence on the development of nationalism in the Muslim east. In Tunis Muhammad ʻAbduh continued propaganda for the society, but then cut himself off from it and settled in Bārsīt at the beginning of 1885. The al-ʻIzza expressed the views of Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn entirely. In Bārsīt he taught at a theological school and engaged in Muslim and Arabic studies. In this period he produced his translation from the Persian of the Risāla al-Radd ʻala l-Dhahīrīn, the only considerable work of Saiyid Djamal al-Dīn (1302 = 1886), and two valuable philological treatises (Sāḥib al-Athār al-Muqarrab, 1302 = 1885) and Sharh Maḥfīz ʻAlī al-Zawān al-Hamadhānī (1306 = 1889). When in 1889 he was allowed to return he at once went to Cairo. His wish to resume teaching again was not at once granted; instead he entered the judiciary and was immediately appointed a judge on the Tribunaux Indigènes, two years later Consul at the Cour d'Appel. In 1899 he attained the highest clerical post in Egypt, that of state mafi, an office he held till his death. One result of his work in the courts was the publication of his verdicts in Taḥsīr fi Ḥijāţ al-Muhābīm al-Sa‘īdī (1318 = 1900) which gave the stimulus to important reforms in the admin-
stratation of the 'shari'a, and the foundation of the College for Kādīs goes back primarily to his efforts. In the same year, 1896, he became a member of the Consul Législatif, which marked the first stage in the representation of the Egyptian people. Finally, he was allowed to resume his interest in education: in 1894 he became a member of the governing body of the Azhar which had been constituted at his suggestion, and in this capacity he not only acquired great renown by his reforms in the university but himself took an active part in the teaching. In addition to this many-sided activity in the fifteen years after his return he found time to publish a number of works, including his most important: the Riādāt al-Taswīqī (1315 = 1897), his principal theological work based on his lectures in Bairūt; the publication of a work on logic (Sharḥ Kītāb al-Bayṣūr al-Nāṣīriyya, Taṣnīf 'Alī Zālī al-Dīn [1316 = 1898]): a defence of Islam against Christianity in the field of knowledge and civilization entitled al-Islām wa al-Nāṣīriyya maṣūma (L'Islam et l'Inquisition, 1901: first published in al-Manṣūr). Muhammad 'Abdūh was not to finish his career as a member of the Kurān on which he had great importance and of which he had published portions in al-Manṣūr; it was revised by his disciple and friend 'Abd al-Rahīm Rāshīd Riḍā and published first of all in al-Manṣūr. Of Muhammad 'Abdūh's numerous articles by which, along with his lectures, he most influenced the public opinion, two (of 1900) were published in a French translation entitled L'Église et l'Islam by Muhammad Ta'ālat Harb Bey (1902). The advanced ideas put forward by Muhammad 'Abdūh provoked the most vigorous hostility in orthodox and conservative circles which manifested itself not only in serious refutations but also in attacks on and intrigues against him, as we see from a whole literature of pamphlets. But his teaching met with remarkable support among all seriously minded Muslims. The principal organ of his views was the bi-monthly al-Manṣūr, which had appeared since 1887 under the editorship of Sheikh Muhammad Rashīd Riḍā, who had also produced an extensive literary monument to his master (but his views and the tendencies of his periodical must not be identified offhand with those of Muhammad 'Abdūh). Muhammad 'Abdūh died in 1905: but his teaching has retained its influence steadily to the present day.

Muhammad 'Abdūh's programme according to his own statement was: 1. the reform of the Muslim religion by bringing it back to its original condition, 2. the renovation of the Arabic language, 3. the recognition of the rights of the people in relation to the government. His political activity was dominated by the idea of patriotism, which was the first to champion enthusiastically in Egypt. As an opponent equally of the political control by Europe and of Oriental despotism in Muslim lands he favoured an inner assimilation of western civilization, without abandoning the fundamental Muslim ideas and a synthesis of the two factors. From this programme, which assures Muhammad 'Abdūh an important place among the founders of modern Egypt, must be distinguished his effort to carry it through in the field of theology. Muhammad 'Abdūh is in the first place a theologian; his life was devoted to the attempt to establish and maintain Islam, at least as a religion, against the onslaught of the west, while he abandoned without a struggle those aspects of Muslim-Oriental life in which religion was of less moment. However great a stimulus he may have received from progressive western thought, the actual foundations of his teaching came primarily from the school of Ibn Taimiyā and Ibrāhīm al-Dhawīyā, who favoured reform on conservative lines, and from Mūsā ibn Shāhīnā's ethical conception of religion. Deeply convinced of the superiority of true Islam, unaffected by the vicissitudes of time, Muhammad 'Abdūh wished to get rid of the abuses which falsified the Muslim religion and made it out of keeping with the times, and to adapt Islam to every real advance by going back to its true principles. Muhammad 'Abdūh was thus brought to attack the ma'ālima and khalīfah, to demand freedom for iṣlāfīqah and to new uṣūm, in keeping with modern conditions, based on the Kurān and the true sunna, for the establishment of which he laid down strict criteria; he was also brought to reject the hair-splitting of the 'ufāqīrs, the worship of saints and all kāf, as, and to the endeavour to establish a new religion instead of a mechanical formalism. The antiquated system of Fīqīk, against which Muhammad 'Abdūh claimed full freedom, was to be replaced by new laws capable of development, in which consideration for the common good (maslahah) and the times should, in keeping with the true spirit of Islam, have all necessary preference to the literal text (maṭbah) and the times should, in keeping with the true spirit of Islam, have all necessary preference to the literal text (maṭbah) of revelation, just as in any conflict between reason and tradition in settling what is laid down by religion, the verdict of reason should be followed. Alongside of the belief in the sublimity of revelation there was in Muhammad 'Abdūh the conviction that knowledge and religion, properly understood, could not come into conflict at all, so that reason need not recognize a logical impossibility as a religious truth; religion was given to man as a thread to guide him against the aberrations of reason: reason must therefore, after it has tested the proofs of the truth of religion, which it is qualified to do, accept its dogmas: Muhammad 'Abdūh's object was a cooperation between religion and science. In dogmatism he adopts essentially the most rational conception that could still be reconciled with orthodoxy. At the same time he interiorizes the conception of revelation (to him it is intuitive knowledge caused by God and provided with the consciousness of this origin, but this kind of religious experience is limited to the prophets) and deflects that of religion (to him it is an intuitive feeling for the paths of happiness in this and the next world, which cannot be clearly grasped by the reason). The task of prophecy for him is the moral education of the masses. Religious teaching and commandments are therefore intended for the masses and not for the élite. Muhammad 'Abdūh regards the Kurān as created and endeavours to weaken the rigidly opposed point of view of orthodoxy. The saints he does take into his system but is sceptical regarding belief in miracles. In spite of the denial of causality and laws of nature by orthodoxy, he finds a basis for explaining nature by causal laws but by quite scholastically formal reasoning. As regards the duties of religion, Muhammad 'Abdūh adheres to the four main duties: ritual prayer, the alms-tax, fasting and pilgrimage; only he shifts them as usual in mysticism, from the sphere of worship to that of religion and morals. On the old question of free will Muhammad 'Abdūh
decides for indeterminism; he thereby opens the way to build a moral system for society, which, excluding all fatalism, preaches vigorous activity by every one and, following the ethics of the mystics, mutual support. His view of the substance of Muslim teaching Muhammad 'Abduh defends not only against traditional orthodoxy but against Christianity also by a kind of philosophy of history of religion: the sending of prophets was a gradual process of education of step by step: the last and highest stage, that of absolute religion, is the sending of Muhammad: if the Muslim peoples of the present do not correspond to the Muslim ideal, this is only the result of the fact that they have lost the old purity of the teaching; an improvement is possible by return to it. This primitive Islam of Muhammad 'Abduh is however not the historical Islam but a very much idealised one. The superiority of Islam over Christianity in substance lies, according to Muhammad 'Abduh, in its rationalism and its closeness to reality and its avoidance of unattainable ideals of life.

In this theology, the religious content consists of humility before God, reverence for the Prophet, enthusiasm for the Korân. The basis of this Islam is the recognition of a not too retrogressive system of dogmatics, its object is the observance of an ethical system which is favourable to progress, and both are influenced by a strongly marked rationalism, which is genuinely old Muslim but for Muhammad 'Abduh is no indifferent inheritance but the main weapon of defence of Islam and actually takes the place of a deepening of religion so that his theology has the character of an apologetic compromise.


J. Schacht

MUHAMMAD AHMAD R. 'ABD ALLAH, the Mahdi of the Sudan, was born about 1258 (1843) on the island of Darâr in Dongola among the Argû islands north of el-Orde. A member of the Kunûz family of the Nubian Arab Berâbera, in later life when Mahdi to prove his kinship and mystical relationship with 'Ali and the Prophet, he traced his genealogy on his father's side to Hasan and on the mother's to Hasan and 'Abbas. He was the second son of a ship's carpenter and had an older sister and three brothers. Mystic tendencies early revealed themselves in him; after the usual early education he therefore in 1277 (1861) entered the order of the Sammâniya with Shâïkh Muhammad Sharif; after a seven years' noviciate Muhammad Sharif appointed him a Shâïkh of the order. After a short stay in Kharjum where he married, he went to the island of Abba (in the White Nile, north of Kosti), built a djami and collected pupils around him.

His master Muhammad Sharif, with whom he maintained a close connection, settled near him in 1288 (1872), which seems to have been unwelcome to Muhammad. Shortly after this event there awoke in Muhammad the consciousness that he was the Mahdi al-muttaqar, under the influence of the traditional ideas of the Mahdi, which brought about a breach between him and his master. He now joined the enemy of his former leader, the Shâïkh al-Kurashi, and in 1297 (1880) became his successor. In his wanderings (iyyâda) from Dongola to Sennâr, from the Blue Nile to Kordufân, he convinced himself of the discontent of the people, who were oppressed by the Egyptian government: the turbulent, mixed population of the Sudan, the religious fanaticism, the dissension between Turks and Arabs, the old opposition of the Shà'a to the Turkish ruling official classes, all formed a fruitful soil for his claims to be the Mahdi; the movement begun by Muhammad Ahmad which, as his letters and proclamations show, was based on a religious experience in which he earnestly believed, came from the first mixed up with political and social ideas, which in the east cannot be separated from religion, and in which finally deception and cunning played an evil part. According to the traditional formula, Muhammad Ahmad felt himself called "to purify the world from wantoness and corruption". For this purpose he summoned the people to fight in the first place against the infidel Turks'. He had previously bound a number of chiefs in Kordufân and Dâffûr to him by bâd'a (oaths of fealty, after the model of the Prophet: for the text see Dietrich, in Islam, 1925, p. 39) and had been cleverly able to attach men of action like the unscrupulous 'Abd Allâh al-Tâ'sîshî, later his Khalfî, to him; at the same time he practised a shameless nepotism. He further incited the people by numerous pamphlets and edicts, which contained his visions of the Prophet, who had appointed him Mahdi, of al-Khidr, Gabriel, the afshâ, summons "to purify religion", to "emigrate", to swear fealty, to imitate the Mahdi, to the dînhad etc. The hill of Gadir in Dâr Ñuba became the centre of this secret propaganda; in Sha'bân 1295 (July 1881) he made his first public appearance as Mahdi. Negotiations begun by the government in Kharjum with Muhammad Ahmad proved fruitless. Two companies sent against him under Abu l-Sa'îd were destroyed; this secured further victories for him. The Egyptian government was moreover prevented by the rebellion of Abd al-Fâdhî from taking vigorous action. The expeditions of the governor of Fashûda, Rashîd Pâsha, Yûsuf Pâsha al-Shallûli (at Gadîr, May 1882) and of Hîches Pâsha (at Sha'kân or Kasgîl), all ended unsuccessfully. The Mahdiya thus spread unhindered from Kordufân via Bahr al-Ghazal to the eastern Sudan; there in Sawâkin, 'Othmân Digna, a former slave dealer, soon to be the ablest Mahdist general, entered Muhammad Ahmad's service. Attempts by the Mahdi to extend his power to the west and with this object to conclude alliances with Muhammad al-Sanûsî in Daghëbû and with Morocco came to nothing. At the height of his power the campaign of 1301 (1884) took him to Kharjum, after which a heroic defence by Gordon fell into the Mahdi's hands on Jan. 30, 1895. Gordon was killed. Muhammad Ahmad did not have to survive his victory; he died, probably of typhus, on 9th Ramadân 1302 (June 22, 1885) at Omdurman near Kharjum,
where a khalifa was erected to him by his successor, the Khalifa 'Abd Allâh; it was henceforth the Mahdist capital until Kitchener put an end to 'Abd Allâh's rule and to the Mahdiya in 1898.

The organisation of the Mahdiya under Muhammad Ahmad, which was primarily to follow the sunna of the Prophet, was early developed; it was quite military in character, for the dhikr was considered more important than the hajj. He had four khalfas beside him, of whom al-Tâ'âyyishî was the most intimate and undoubtedly had the most pernicious influence on him. Particular attention was devoted to the distribution of booty to and the administration of the treasury (hadi al-mal).

Muhammad Ahmad's teaching shows some of the features of the extreme popular Sûfism and some of those of an idealised primitive Islam. His asceticism was hostile to progress; the contempt for learning in the Mahdiya and the order to burn all books on sunna and tafseer alienated the educated classes from him. The only things that had validity in addition to the Kur'an were the proclamations of the Mahdi, the Kûtîb (a collection of dhikr exercises) and the Madjîf, a work that contained Muhammad Ahmad's views on sunna as a substitute for the previous one but remained incomplete. In the abolition of the four madhâbbîn we see the shaykhî tendencies frequent among the Sûfîs. Wahhabî influences are very probable in a number of regulations, for example in the prohibition of adornment, music, extravagance at weddings, tobacco and wine; particularly however in the zeal against the worship of saints and sorcery; as a matter of fact Muhammad Ahmad himself became an object of worship among his followers even before his death.

The only really new thing in Muhammad Ahmad is the addition to the shahâda: 1. ...wa-una Ma-"hmadan Ahmad 'bi-n 'Abd Allâh huwa Madhîyya 'Wlîkhu wa-khâfîyatu rasûlîhî. Where the traditions of the Mahdi did not suit him, he did not hesitate to alter them. He laid down the following 6 articles instead of the 5 of the sunna: 1. qülî, on the congregational prayer, the face of which greatest stress was laid; 2. dhikr, in express opposition to the sunna practice and in place of the hajj; 3. obedience to God's commandments; 4. the extended shahâda; 5. recitation of the Kur'an and 6. of the Kûtîb.

A few extremist ideas, like that of equality between rich and poor, come partly from the revolutionary character of the old Shi’a, partly from the political and social conditions of the time; the social ideas were however not their central ones but only incidentally used cunningly to attract the masses. In practice the Mahdiya had an exceedingly unifying and equalising effect: slaves and slave-dealers fought under one banner, the humblest often rose in a short time to the highest offices.

Muhammad Ahmad's eschatology centres round the world domination of the Mahdi. The conquest of the Sudân was to be followed by that of Egypt, Mecca, Syria and Constantinople.

The formation of legends around Muhammad Ahmad's personality began very early, sometimes deliberately encouraged by him and his immediate followers and sometimes actually believed by them. Under pressure from him his court chronicler Ismâ'il 'Abd al-Kâdir composed a highly coloured sirâ entitled Kitâb al-Mustahshâ'î illâ Sirat al-'Imâm al-Mahdi. It covered the years 1298 to 1302 A.H. but was burned in the time of the Khalifa 'Abd Allâh. The Egyptian writer Shukair (see below) claims to have had in his hands a copy that was said to have survived.

Bibliography: Na’âm Shukair Bey, Turîkh al-Sudân, Cairo 1903 (in the third part Shukair, utilizing the edicts of Muhammad Ahmad and the Khalifa 'Abd Allâh, which were collected and printed under the Khalifa, as well as the above mentioned Sirâ and his own experiences in the Anglo-Egyptian army, gives a very full account of the Mahdiya under Muhammad Ahmad and 'Abd Allâh); Dâjîdî Zâdân, Kur'ânîyât al-Muhâmmadîyâ (Cairo 1892).—On two fatawa’s of the Egyptian government against the Mahdiya s. Dietrich, in Ist., 1925, p. 83.—F. R. Win- gate, Mahdism in the Egyptian Sudan, London 1891; do., The Rise and Wane of the Mahdi Religion, London 1893; J. M. Ohlwald, Aufstand u. Rîch des Mahdî, Innsbruck 1892; Satîn Pashâ, Fire and Sword in the Sudan, London 1896; Hasenclever, Geschichte Egiptens im 19. Jahrhundert, Leipzig 1901; L. Dietrich, Der Mahdti, Mohammed Ahmad nach arabischen Quellen, in Ist., 1925, p. 1–90 (with further literature); J. Darmesteter, The Mahdi, London 1885.

(Dietrich)

MUHAMMAD 'ALI PASHA (In European sources often Mehemet Ali or Mehemet Ali) was the well-known powerful viceroy of Egypt during the years 1805–1849 (which period comprises the entire reign of Sulûn Mahdî II q. v.) and the founder of the khedivial, later royal dynasty of Egypt. Seen in the light of history his life-work fully entitles him to the epithet of 'the Founder of Modern Egypt'.

Muhammad 'Ali was born in 1769, possibly of Albanian extraction, in the town of Kâwîla [q. v.] in Macedonia; he was engaged in the tobacco trade until he joined, as hitâbi in a corps of Albanian troops, a Turkish army that landed in Egypt in 1799 and was beaten by Bonaparte at the Battle of Al Jir (July 25). In 1800 he was one of the two chiefs of the Albanian troops in Turkish service who were left behind in Egypt; this secured him an influential military position when, after the final defeat of the French in 1801, Turkey began to try to recover her authority over Egypt. At the end of 1801 he fought as a general against the Mamlûks, but in the troubled years that followed he was alternatively on the side of the Mamlûk Beys (headed by al-Bardîsî) and of the Turkish governors sent from Constantinople. He intrigued against Khushraw Pasha [q. v.], who had to leave Egypt in May 1803, and was already in the same year, appointed titular governor of Jâlîdah. Under the following governorship of Khurshîd Pasha, Muhammad 'Ali succeeded in winning the favour of the inhabitants of Cairo and their spiritual leaders, and used them with success in his intrigues against Khurshîd, whose Turkish troops — composed of delâs — were a scourge to the population, while his own Albanians were ordered to behave well. The result was that Khurshîd had to withdraw in August 1803, leaving the citadel of Cairo to Muhammad 'Ali. The Turkish government, though sending several emissaries and trying to remove the Albanian troops, failed to keep Egyptian affairs under control and ended by recognizing Muhammad 'Ali's self-assumed
position (November 2, 1803); he was solemnly installed in April 1805.

The internal and external difficulties of the Sublime Porte did not allow her to interfere any further on the moment and the new governor had soon occasion to show himself a loyal vassal when England — Turkey (cf. Selim III) — landed in Alexandria in March 1807. At that time Muhammad 'Ali had already undertaken the struggle against the Mamlûk Bey-
al-Bardisî and al-Ali, the latter of whom was strongly supported by the English. He came back hastily from Upper Egypt, fortified Cairo, and gained a victory over the English army at Rashid (Rosetta) in April. Soon after the departure of the British fleet in September the victor began the execution of his far-reaching administrative and economic measures, which were to restore Egypt's economic strength and consequently to assure for himself a more powerful position than any Turkish governor had had for the last two centuries (cf. Malek). In the meantime the Boys (whose two leaders had died in 1807) continued their opposition (no doubt increased by the viceroy's land policy), which was finally broken by the massacre of about 100 Mamlûks at the citadel of Cairo on March 1, 1811, on the occasion of a festival. The persecution of the Mamlûks was at the same time extended to the other parts of the country. Mu-
hammad 'Ali now could send, without danger to his own position, his Albanian troops in the cam-
paign against the Wahhabis in Arabia, to comply with a request of the Porte. The Wahhabí war began in September 1811 and was conducted, until 1816, by Muhammad 'Ali's son Tusun; after the latter's death the command was taken over by his elder brother Ismâ'il Pasha (q.v.). Muhammad 'Ali himself took part in an expedition to Yaman, but had to return before the end of the war, because his position as governor seemed to be in danger.

The military successes of the Egyptian troops against the Wahhabí power immensely increased Muhammad 'Ali's authority all over Arabia and in a larger sense in the entire Near East; European policy began to look for the first time on Egypt as a factor of political importance. This importance was further increased by the expeditions to the south that followed immediately on the Arabi campaign: Egyptian power was established for the first time in the Sûdän (q.v.), where Muhammad 'Ali's third son Ismâ'il found his death in 1822, the year in which the town of Khaṭîm (q.v.) was founded. At this time Egyptian power was also extended in the direction of the Red Sea, which made an end to the hitherto continuous plague of the incursions of nomadic Arabs into the Nile valley; the ports of Sawàkìm and Massawa (Mayâq) came under the Egyptian sphere of in-
fluence, although the direct authority of the Porte was maintained.

A new phase in the development of Muhammad 'Ali's power began by his participation in the military repression of the Greek revolt by the Turks. Only through Egyptian aid was the submission of the whole of Greece with the exception of Nauplia obtained; first by the conquest of Crete by Ibrahim Pasha (1823) and then by the Egyptian army that landed in 1825 in Morea. When in 1827 England, Russia and France intervened in the Greek question, the combined Turkish-Egyptian fleet was destroyed in the bay of Navarino (October 20, 1827); in the following year the Egyptian troops evacuated the peninsula, after a convention had been concluded between Muhammad 'Ali and the British admiral Codrington (August 6, 1828). Crete remained under Egyptian administration until 1841.

Muhammad 'Ali's power was now such that he could conclude international agreements without the sultan's cognizance; at the same time the two Mediterranean naval powers, France and England, were endeavouring to win him over as an independent political factor. In 1829 France had almost induced Muhammad 'Ali to undertake the conquest of the Barbarese states of Algiers and Tunis; the viceroy, however, was more inclined to seek territorial expansion in the east, the more so as the four governorships of Syria had been promised him by the Porte as reward for his participation in the Greek war, a promise that had never been fulfilled. At the end of 1831 there arose difficulties between Muhammad 'Ali and the Porte on account of the government of 'Akka, which he claimed for himself. The conflict soon brought about the sending of an Egyptian army under Ibrahim Pasha into Syria. On May 27, 1832 'Akka was taken. In the following month the army that was sent by the sultan was repeatedly defeated and finally beaten near Konya (December 21, 1832). The Egyptian army, continuing in the direction of Constantiopole, reached Kutahia. Here at last an armistice was concluded between the Porte and Ibrahim as representative of his father, thanks again to the intervention of the European powers, of whom Russia had already sent military aid to Constantiopole. Muhammad 'Ali was granted the governorship of Syria and Adana by the definite peace of April 6, 1833.

During the following six years the viceroy's power was at its height. While Ibrahim administered Syria, severely but on the whole to the prosperity of the country, Muhammad 'Ali continued his administrative programme in Egypt and in his pan-Arabian policy, the aim of which was to be the union of all Arab-speaking peoples under his leadership. In Arabia his influence was still considerable since the Wahhabí war; he now tried to extend Egyptian influence as far as the 'Irak. This policy, while at the same time constituting a threat to the ambitions of the European powers in the Near East, was to bring him again into conflict with the sultan, who, having succeeded at last in subduing too independent vassals in other parts of his empire, was waiting for an opportunity to crush his most powerful vassal in Egypt. The latter, in 1838, had even made known his intention of declaring himself independent of the Turkish government.

Not long after the outbreak of hostilities the Turkíh army under Hâthi Pasha was completely defeated at Naṣib in North Syria (June 24, 1839); while the Turkish fleet under the Kapudân Pasha sailed to Alexandria and went over to Muhammad 'Ali's side. In this desperate situation the authority of the Porte was saved by the inter-
vention of the five European powers, in defence of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The Egyptian question had thus produced an inter-
national political crisis, which was aggravated by the opposition of France, which had long been the best intentioned towards Muhammad 'Ali among the European governments. By the convention of
London (July 5, 1840) England, Russia, Austria and Prussia agreed with the Porte upon the terms to be imposed upon Muhammad `Ali. When the latter did not accept, there followed military demonstrations against the coastal towns in Syria (`Akkî taken on November 4, 1840). Soon afterwards a British fleet appeared in Alexandria, where Admiral Napier on November 27 concluded an agreement with Muhammad `Ali. The viceroy consented to the return of the Turkish fleet and renounced his governorship of Syria, Adana and Crete, while on the other hand he was to keep the hereditary governorship of Egypt as a part of the Turkish Empire. These terms were confirmed by an imperial firman of February 13, 1841, completed by another of May 23, in which the mutual relations of Sulṭan and viceroy were definitely regulated. The chief points were the right of succession according to seniority in Muhammad `Ali’s family, the payment of a tribute and the permission to maintain an Egyptian army of 18,000 men, the higher officers of which were to be appointed by the sulṭan.

Muhammad `Ali’s last years were passed in peace. In 1846 he visited Constantinople and Kâdîa; in 1848 he lost his son İbrahim to whom so many of his military successes were due. On August 21, 1849 he himself died in the citadel of Damascus, to be succeeded by his son Abū Bakr Pasha [q.v.]. He was buried in the new mosque which he had erected in the citadel of Cairo.

Still more amazing than the career of this once obscure Turkish officer are the enormous changes brought about by his work in the condition and the international position of Egypt; they have made him a hero in the history of the Near East. His reign is an era by itself in Egyptian history. Muhammad `Ali’s latest biographer says: “He began by seeking only to raise money. He ended by seeking, however mistakenly, to develop and civilise the country” (Dodwell, p. 220). His work indeed did not at all mean a break with the government traditions prevailing in the Turkish Empire, but the political aim that Muhammad `Ali had set himself, seconded by his persevering energy and the continuous supervision of his autocratic individuality, led at last to a result which, in similar conditions, would otherwise have been difficult to attain, as is shown by the state of things prevailing at the same time in other provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

As the measures taken by Muhammad `Ali in the field of administration, land policy and the industrial and commercial mobilisation of the country have been briefly sketched in the art. Khedive, it is unnecessary to enter here into the same details. It is sufficient to point to the fact that all these measures had as their first object to make the pasha himself the sole proprietor and administrator of the riches of Egypt. He certainly listened to the advice of European and other councillors and valued European institutions as examples to follow to a certain extent. But he followed oriental methods and made as good as no use of Europeans as officials in the home administration.

This was not the case in Muhammad `Ali’s newly erected army. The pasha himself had not been entirely able to keep his mercenary troops under control (mutiny in Cairo in 1816). So he decided to form a new army, moved by the same motives that had led Sulṭan Selim III to create new regular troops (millet-i meşale). From 1819 this enterprise was confined to and brought to a successful end by the French captain Sève, who, after having embraced Islam, served Muhammad `Ali as Sulţanım Pasha. A first attempt to use negro slaves from the Sudan as soldiers having failed, the officers of Egyptian birth were recruited; the officers were mainly taken from among the young Mamluks, besides whom there were not a few Europeans. With this army he won the military successes in Morea and Syria. The recruitment met with exceedingly strong opposition among the people of Egypt and later in Syria, and the methods used to get the required number were sometimes cruel, but the pasha’s energy prevailed. At length this military organisation proved to be a means of education for the people and prepared the growth of national feeling among the generations to come. As has been said already, the final Imperial firman of 1841 limited the Egyptian army to 18,000 men in time of peace.

Muhammad `Ali’s attempts to create an Egyptian fleet go back as far as 1815. At first he had ships built in France and Italy and in Bombay, but soon Alexandria itself got its yards. After the destruction of the Egyptian fleet at Navarino ship-building began again and quite a number of French and Italian officers were employed in the Egyptian navy after 1831. The Egyptian fleet, however, did not long survive its founder.

On the whole, Muhammad `Ali’s rule wore a Turkish character. Most of the responsible posts in the administration and in the army were held by Turks and by de-cendants of the Mamluks. Thus the Ottoman ruling system, with some modifications applied after the European model, was imposed on Egypt most completely at the time when the country itself was politically loosened from the empire. It may be called an exception that the Armenian Boghos Bey, who was for a long time Muhammad `Ali’s minister of finance and of foreign affairs, came to this exalted position, although the use of Christians (Armenians and Copts) in more subordinate offices had always been a government practice in Turkey as well as in Egypt. The viceroy himself is said never to have spoken well any language other than Turkish.

Muhammad `Ali was not a great builder of magnificent architectural monuments. He erected a mosque after the Turkish fashion in the citadel of Cairo, but he never built costly palaces for himself. Most of his works were of public utility, such as the improvement and the enlargement of the irrigation system in the Delta, including the Nile Barrage below Cairo. This last work was undertaken in 1847, but failed.

The judgments on Muhammad `Ali’s personality were very divergent even during his lifetime. Most of his admirers were found amongst the French; in view of the other the whole friendly attitude of the French government this is of course not strange. British opinion was less favourable, but all those who came into contact with the viceroy were impressed by his personal charm. Now that his era belongs to the past, the impression remains of a great man in many respects, possessed of considerable personal courage and trustworthy and loyal in a high degree. His methods were sometimes cruel and in the begi-
ning of his career he often had recourse to intrigues, but in the circumstances it is hard to understand how it could have been otherwise. At years passed by and the prosperity of the country increased, his methods of government grew more lenient, so that, at the end of his reign, he had become decidedly popular with his subjects. An equestrian statue of Muhammad 'Ali now commands the chief square of Alexandria and one of the largest thoroughfares in Cairo is called after him.


ancestor Bairam, at the head of a body of soldiers, took part in the capture of Tunis by Sînîd Fâshî on 25th Dîmâdâ 981 (Sept. 24, 1572) and of which several members had held the office of grand mufti of Tunis, Muhammad Bairam studied at the Dîmini al-Zâitûna and had as teachers al-Fâhir b. Ûd-dîr, al-Shâhîlî b. Sâlih, Aymad Bairam, Muṣṭafâ Bairam, the Shâhîk al-Īslâm Muhammad b. Muṭawwîya and others. At the age of 17, he compiled a Kannûddîn in which he recorded the ordinances, decrees and administrative regulations which the emir Muḥammad Fâshî ordered the authorities to enforce.

On the death of his paternal uncle Bairam IV, he was given charge of the Madrasat al-Qânûkiyâ on 12th Dîmâdâ 981 (Oct. 1, 1285), and on the 9th of the following month (Dec. 13) of that of the Dîmini al-Zâitûna. Soon after this, troubles provoked by the despotic régime began to disturb Tunisia and resulted in the closing of the representative assemblies in which Bairam was interested. He published in the Rûdâd, the official gazette, the two first political articles that ever appeared in Tunisia and in them he condemned the tyranny of the authorities, preached the love of liberty and began the government to be liberal and to grant its subjects representative assemblies.

On Safar 17, 1291 (April 6, 1574) he was appointed to administer the waqfât, which he hastened to reorganise. The hard work ruined his health and forced him to take a journey in Europe to recuperate, this caused him to begin his Sifwat al-Fâhib. He left in Shawwâl 1292 (Oct. 31—Nov. 28, 1875) and visited Paris. In the same year the Shâādîkî College was founded; Bairam shared in the preparation of the regulations and programme of studies, modelled on those of European institutions, and was one of the first of the students to enrol his son so as to encourage his compatriots to take advantage of such innovations.

On 1st Dîmâdâ 11, 1292 (May 7, 1575) he was put in charge of the government printing works which he at once reorganised, and securing eminent assistants like Muhammad al-Sanûsî of Tunis and Ḥamd al-ʿAlîh of Cairo he produced the Rûdâd regularly. It was at this time also that he reorganised the Muktabat al-Shâādîkîya alongside of the Dîmini al-Zâitûna.

In 1293 (1876) he assisted Turkey in the war with Serbia and Montenegro by sending money, horses and camels, political considerations preventing the despatch of help in men.

In the summer of 1295 (1878) he went a second time to Paris, visited the Exhibition and was received with great attention by President MacMahon. He took the opportunity to visit London and England and, on his way back, Algiers. He took a very prominent part in the reorganisation of rather the creation of the Shâādîk Hospital which was opened on Safar 18, 1296 (Feb. 1879). At the same time he was one of the two arbitrators appointed by the Tunisian government in the case of Hensch Siâyîdî Thâbit and the French government. In the middle of the same year, he was appointed by the vizier to go to Paris, to receive medical attention, it was said, but in reality to ask Gambetta to remove the French consul, who was interfering in the domestic affairs of the country even managing them. The consul thwarted the plans of Bairam and the vizier. On his return he told the vizier that France intended to annex Tunisia. Tired of the vexatious pestering of the vizier Muṣṭafâ b. Ismâ'îl he obtained, after many attempts, permission to make the pilgrimage to Mecca and left Tunis under the protectorate on Shawwâl 16, 1296 (Oct. 4, 1879). He went via Malta, Alexandria and Cairo, where he was received by the Khedive Tewfîk Pâshâ, and thence to the Hijaz, visiting Mecca and Medina. He then went via Yambu and the Suez Canal to Bâirût, where he was much honoured by the people and by Midhat Pâshâ, the governor of Syria, and on to Constantinople. He wrote a haddâdî in honour of Sulîn ʿAbî al-Ḥamîd. The Tunisian government at the instigation of the French consul, who feared the establishment of closer relations between Turkey and Tunisia, demanded his return but the Sublime Porte diplomatically did not receive the request.

It was in Constantinople that he began to prepare the Sifwat for publication and finished the first two volumes. The penetration of France into Tunisia was a rude shock to Bairam, who in collaboration with the former vizier of Tunisia, Khair al-Dîn, was appointed by the Sublime Porte to prepare a report on the situation created by France. Despairing of returning to his native town he went to Leghorn and was joined by his family; he then went to Geneva, where he left his son to finish his education, and to Vienna and Bucharest and then settled in Constantinople. The Sulûn, wishing to send some horses as a present to the Emperor Frederick III of Germany, Bairam was appointed to write the letter conveying the gift. During the eighteen months which he spent in the Turkish capital, Bairam drew a pension of £25 per month. It was during this stay that he prepared the third volume of the Sifwat.

His health being undermined by an illness which grew worse daily and being unable to meet his expenses and fear the machinations of his detractors, who saw in him a man to be removed, he left Constantinople on 1st Muḥarram 1302 (Oct. 21, 1884) to go to Egypt, where his letters of recommendation secured him the esteem of the Khedive Tewfîk Pâshâ, who gave him a pension.

On the 25th Rabi I of the same year (Jan. 13, 1885) he produced al-Īlam, a political and scientific journal.

Two years later, he went to London to attend the Jubilee celebrations of Queen Victoria, had medical attention in Paris and returned to Egypt via Berlin and Vienna. He then completed a work which he had begun in Constantinople entitled Taqṣîrd al-Sanîd c. ʾRadd d. al-Khâshi b. Kâbir (Renen), in which he refuted the arguments which Renan had advanced at a conference in the Sorbonne on March 29, 1853 on Islâmîme et la Science (Paris 1853), in which he alleged that religion was an obstacle to the diffusion of science among Muslims. He also published a Rûdâd in which he declared that it was permitted to purchase bonds or shares in a Muslim government loan so that Muslim money should not leave the country, and this had no character of usury. He wrote a report on the compulsory use of the Arabic language in the teaching even of modern sciences. He finished the fourth volume of the Sifwat and had begun the fifth which death prevented him from finishing.

On 12th Dîmâdâ 1. 1306 (Jan. 14, 1889) Bairam was appointed a judge in the Tribunal de 1er Instance in Cairo. Going to Hulwân for a change of air, he took pleurisy and died after 25 days' illness.
He had a vast knowledge of Hadith, law, history, ancient and modern, and historical and political geography.

In addition to the works already mentioned and numerous nizālas which it would take too long to enumerate, we may mention the following: 1. Tadhkirat al-Khāniqā fi Hilāl Sāl Bundūs al-Kāțiṣ, printed at Cairo in 1303 in which he claims that the law regards as permitted the flesh of game killed with fire-arms; 2. a treatise on provoody; 3. a riṣālah in which he says that it is permissible for men to let their hair hang down and that in the air, contrary to the opinion of several fāqīhs; 4. al-Tadhkirat fi Mus'ālat al-Kāțiṣ, a study in which he shows what slavery among Muslims is according to the law, points out the motives of slavery and the rules regulating it, and concludes by saying that slaves who are sold at the present day are free men and that Muslim governments which forbid the sale of slaves are acting in accordance with the law; 5. Subkāt al-A'īdā bi-Mustawadā' al-Amār, published in 6 vols. in 1302—1303, 1303, 1304, 1301, the sixth volume being devoted to the biography of Muhammad Baṭr and edited by his son of the same name; it is perhaps the best treatise yet written in Arabic on political geography.


MUḤAMMAD BAṬR, son of Shaikh Ghulām Muhammad, born in 1307 (1829), was first taught by his father and then by Shaikh 'Abd Allāh, called Mīyān Ḥadīr, and Shaikh Nūr al-Ḥaḍīr b. 'Abd al-Ḥaḍīr Dīhlāwī. After a few years he himself began teaching in his native country. He first became a mu'amīl or disciple of his father, and after the latter's death attached himself to the famous saint, Muḥammad Muṣʿūm Sarhānī. He was pursued by Itīlāhān Khān, Mir Khānsāmān, to come to the court of Awrangzēb and accepted the duties of Baḥshī (pay master) and Wādīhāni (writer of the official diary), but by special favour he enjoyed much leisure, which he devoted to literary work. He died in 1094 (1682) at Sahāranpūr. He is the author of 1. Mirāt al-Dīnān Namā (a general history compiled under Awrangzēb), 2. Rayāl al-Aṣwāfiyya (life of saints), 3. Taḥkīrat al-Shu'ārā' (biographies of the poets).

Bibliography: Bakhītārān Khān, Muṣʿūt al-Ālam, fol. 478b; Eliot-Dowson, History of India, viii. 145—165; Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS. Br. Mus., iii. 890; Ethe, Cat. of Persian MSS., India Office, p. 49. (M. Hidāyat Ḥosain)

MUḤAMMAD BAKHTĪYĀR KHALIQ was an inhabitant of Ghūr [q. v.]. He was of a very mean appearance and amongst other deformities of his person it is said that when he stood upright the end of his fingers extended considerably below his knees. When he reached the age of manhood he went to Ghazna [q. v.] and offered himself as a volunteer to the officer of Muhammad Ghōrī, but they refused to enrol him. He, therefore, repaired to Dīhlāwī and was appointed by Kaṭb al-Dīn Abīg [q. v.] to command an army destined for the conquest of Buhār about 596 (1199). Here he was very successful. He was next ordered to invade Bengal. In 600—601 (1203—1204) he proceeded to Nadyā, the capital of Bengal, and captured it without any blood-loss. His last attempt was directed towards the invasion of Bihār and Tibet, but he met with reverses which compelled him to retreat. He succeeded in reaching Dīvānī in Bengal where he died, but his body was carried to Buhār and buried there in 602 (1206).


MUḤAMMAD BEY ABŪ DHAḤAHAB. [See 'Abb. Bey.]

MUḤAMMAD BEY 'OTHMĀN AḤDJAL was born in Egypt in 1829, the son of a judge in the Court of Appeal, named Yūsuf al-Hasani. When a boy he learned English, French and Turkish at the school of languages (Madrasa al-Aslu), and when only 16 was given an appointment in the government translation bureau. His patron, the late Old Bey, had him appointed to the Conseil de Médecine. In 1853 he entered the War Ministry and five years later the Ministry of the Interior. In 1879 the Khedive Tewfik Pasha appointed him to his civil cabinet and several times took him to accompany him on journeys. After the death of the Khedive he was appointed a judge in Cairo. In 1895 he was pensioned and he devoted himself to literary work till his death at the end of 1898.

In collaboration with Clot Bey, he published a sketch of the history of Muḥammad 'Ali and an elementary grammar of the Arabic and French languages and also a description in rhyme of his journey with the Khedive Tewfik. He then devoted himself to the translation of poetry: first of the fables of La Fontaine, the novel Paul et Virginie, and of Racine's tragedies Alexandre le Grand, Esther and Phèdre. All these he translated into classical Arabic. But his real importance lies in his endeavours to translate Molière's comedies into the modern Arabic vernacular of Egypt, freely adapting them to Arabic conditions: a. Tangoir under the title al-Bikār Matlash, which Vollers edited under the title Il sikh Matlash (cf. D. M. M., xl. 71 sqq. and thereon Socin, Ibid., xl. 131 sqq.); b. Madrasat al-Aṣwāfi (L'École des Maires), transcribed and translated by M. Sobernheim, Berlin 1896; c. al-Niṣā wa al-Manvāt (Les Femmes Savantes), transcribed and translated by Fr. Krein, Berlin 1898; d. Madrasat al-Nīsā (L'École des Femmes); e. Risiyyat al-Thakrīl (Les Fâchons), 1897. His collections of popular poems were also lithographed: Ḥimāl Zaydūl.

The Egyptians were not much attracted by these comedies translated into the vernacular. The language did not appear cultured enough to the Egyptian public. They were hardly ever produced and the rich vocabulary which the comedies contain has not been noticed or utilized by students of modern Arabic.

Bibliography: On metre and language see Socin, Sobernheim and Kern, loc. cit.; and see also Brockelmann G. A. L., ii. 176 ff.; the poet's autobiography in al-Mustāf al-Jadida of 'Ali Pasha Mālārak, xvii. 62; al-Abād al-Hashā'īn ibi-Karn al-aṭšār, ii. 91 sqq.; J. E. Sarks, Dictionnaire encyclopédique de bibliographie arabe, ii., col. 1306. (M. Sobernheim)
MUHAMMAD ČELEBI. [See GHAZALI.]

MUHAMMAD DAMAD PASHA, grand vizier, also called ORUZ MUHAMMAD PASHA, was the son of a footman of Constantinople and was educated (rather unusual at that time for a boy from Constantinople) in the imperial palace for a military career. He left the palace as sadık, but we do not know his career until he was appointed, in 1616 (1607–1608), governor of Egypt. Here he was successful in the energetic suppression of a Mamluk revolt and when he returned in 1610 to the capital with two years' tribute, he was appointed Kapudan Pasha, being at the same time married to sultan Ahmadi's seven-year-old daughter Gawhar Khan (married afterwards to Kapudan Pasha). He added to the title of sultan Pasha that of Şüfîli, əımıd, i. 147), which assured him the qualification damad. As Kapudan Pasha he was made responsible for a defeat inflicted in 1613 on a part of his fleet, off the island of Chios, by a small Spanish-Sicilian fleet: this blow prevented the landing of Turkish ships in Syria on an expedition against the Druses. Damad Muhammed was dismissed from the post of Kapudan, became, however, second vizier and, after Nasuh Pasha's execution (October 17, 1614) he was appointed grand vizier. In this office he commanded in 1615 as serasker in a new campaign against Persia, the peace negotiations having ended unsuccessfully a short time before. Nothing was undertaken, however, that year, partly owing to astrological calculations. The grand vizier remained that winter in Aleppo. The next year the Persians were attacked in Armenia, where they had made some progress; Erivan was beleaguered and capitulated beginning of July 1616 after a 25 days' siege. The Turkish fleet had to return home, without having suffered losses occasioned by the rude climate and the insufficient food supplies. Damad Muhammed was dismissed in January 1617 to be succeeded by Khalil Pasha [q.v.]; in the Venetian Relationi Khalil Pasha and Muhammed Pasha are described as the only members of the Imperial Divan that really count. The next year, after the accession of Əthman II, he became Khalil's şef-lene, during that year's Persian campaign and, after Khalil's disgrace, was appointed a second time grand vizier (January 18, 1618). This dignity he held only a year, in which peace was concluded with Persia; the reason of his dismissal was a dispute with the Kapudan Gudzdegli Ali Pasha [q.v.], a favourite of the sultan (January 1620). Damad Muhammed went a governor to Aleppo after having been deprived of all his wealth by the extortions of his successor. He died soon after his arrival in Aleppo and was buried in the türbe of Şafi Ali, where he had a tarîme made for himself.

Bibliography: The principal Turkish sources are Na'ima I, Pečevi and Hâjlîdji Khalifa (Ferhat and Tufat al-Khârî). Further von Hamer, G. O. K., iv. 442, 468, 475 999; 507 999; some contemporary western sources are indicated; Əthman Zade, əzâvet at-Usur, p. 61; Şüfîli əzâvet, i. 147. (J. H. Kramers)

Mirzâ MUHAMMAD DJAFAR KARADŽA-DAGHI, Mûshî of the Kâdi ğir prince Djalâl al-Dîn Mirzâ and translator into Persian of the famous comedies of the Adharlîdañi playwright Mirzâ Fâh əli âkıhâzá dá. After they had been published (1859) Mirzâ Faţح əli sent a copy of his plays to the above-mentioned Kâdi ğir prince in the hope that he would take notice of it. The book lay unheeded for years in the prince's library until Muhammed Əjaîf opened it by chance. The munshi, delighted with the plays, at once decided to translate them into Persian. As no one would help him, he was forced to print the translation at his own expense, which brought him into considerable financial difficulties. The translation appeared in lithograph in Tehran in 1874 under the title Tamâthîf. When the work was finished, Muhammed Əjaîf corresponded with the author and found out that they were related. The Persian translation is of the greatest importance for the history of Persian Pasha, as it gives a great deal of information about the composition of original works. The influence of Aḵûndzâde on the work of Malkam-khan and even on more recent dramatists, such as Muhammed, is quite apparent. From the artistic point of view however, Muhammed's translation cannot be called successful as their language is very clumsy and filled with countless Aḵûndzâdeisms.

It is remarkable that Europeanorientalists first became acquainted with Aḵûndzâde's works in their Persian dress and published a considerable number of these translations (see Bibli) as textbooks for the study of spoken Persian, although, in view of their linguistic defects, the translations cannot by any means be regarded as models of the living Persian language.


MUHAMMAD ES'AD. [See GHÂLîbih DîBÉ.]

MUHAMMAD ES'AD. [See ES'AD Efendi.]

MUHAMMAD GAWLÂNÎ GAWLÂNÎ, an Indian saint. He was a descendant of the famous saint Shaikh Farîd al-Dîn Ətaşir [q.v.], his full name being Abu ɬ-Mu'asîyad Muhammed b. Kâtir al-Dîn b. ɬatîf b. Mu'în al-Dîn Kâtir b. Kâtir al-Dîn b. ɬayyâd b. Fâhîd al-Dîn Ətaşir. Some say that his great-grandfather Mu'în al-Dîn Kâtir came to India and died at ɬjawânpî. One of his brothers, Shaikh Bahîlî, who was attached to the service of Humâyûn, fell in battle and lies buried at the gate of the fort in Bayâna. According to his own statement, Muhammad Gawlânî was born in 906 (1500). He was a pupil of Shaikh ɬâhîr al-Dîn Hâjlîdji, and belonged to the Şat-ţâyva sect of Sûfîs. He and his eight brothers were disciples of Shaikh Hâjlîdji Hamîd, Khalifa of Shah Kâlan, the disciple and Khalifa of Shaikh ɬâhîr ɬâhîr. After leading a solitary life
for more than thirteen years in the mountains of Ćunr, he came to Gudjarat, where he became acquainted with the popular saint and scholar Shaikh Wadjah al-Din Gudjarati. He went to Agra in 1569 (1658) and was treated with high regard by Akbar. Subsequently he returned to Gudjarat, where he died in 1570 (1652). Humayūn is also said to have been a faithful follower of Muhammad (q.v.).

He was the author of several Nafi works, the most popular of which is DauwaKh-i Khamsa, in Arabic, which he completed in 956 (1549), and which he subsequently rendered into Persian with additional improvements. His other works are Kubist Makhzan, Bahar al-Hayat, and Mir al-Din Nama. It is related that his ecstatic sayings in the Mir al-Din Nama were condemned by the ʿulama of Gudjarat, who passed orders for his execution, but that he was saved by the timely intervention of the above-mentioned Shaikh Wadjah al-Din.

Bibliography: Bankpore Lib., Cat., vol. xvi., Nrs. 1582—1584; Akbar al-Azhari, p. 506; Khazinat al-Akhbar, p. 285; Tudahkerat al-Imam-i Hind, p. 206; see also Ḥājī Khālija, ii. 643; Eth., India Office Lib. Cat., Nrs. 1875—1876; Loth, Arab. Cat., Ns. 5, 175. (Abdul Muṭṭadī)

MUḤAMMAD GURDJĪ PASHA. Two Turkish grand viziers are known under this name.

1. The one who is also called Khādīm Muḥammad Pasja began his political career after having been a eunuch in the imperial palace; in 1604 he became wāli in Egypt, where he was able to establish some order; after that he was twice kām-นาḵaḏm of the grand vizierate in the capital, in 1611 and in 1655; in the meantime he had held governorships in Erzerum, Bosnia and Belgrad. He was called to the grand vizierate in the days of Sulṭān Muṣṭafā I's second reign, when the Janissaries and the Sipāhs were dictating their will at Constantinople (September 1622). Khādīm Muhammad owed his nomination to the Sipāhs — who had obtained the dismissal of Mir ʿHzain Paşa, the leader of the Janissaries — but also to the confidence of the wāli and to his well-earned reputation of a wise and experienced politician. He succeeded indeed in the abolition of abuses in the army administration by convoking a large council of dignitaries, where the reinforcement of the khanīn was decided. When, however, in several parts of the empire, there arose opposition against the Janissary regime, especially the action of Abāz Paşa [q.v.] in Erzerum, the grand vizier was unable to oppose the Janissaries in Constantinople. Their leader Mir ʿHzain was intriguing again, while at the same time the sultan was crying for revenge for Sulṭān Othman II. As a result of these riots the former grand vizier Dāwūd Paşa was killed in January 1623. On February 5 of the same year the rebellious Janissaries, declaring that a eunuch could not be their grand vizier, obtained his dismissal in favour of Mir ʿHzain. Gurdji Muhammad went into exile, but after the enthronement of Murād IV he came back to the capital as vizier and acted for the third time as kām-namaḵ in May 1624 when the then grand vizier went on an expedition against Abāz. He died on March 26 and was buried in a ṭurbe in Eiyyb. His age is not given in the sources. In the opinion of the English resident Roe, Gurdji Muhammad was one of the few personalities that were able to lead the affairs of the empire.


2. One of the grand viziers of the first period of Muhammad IV's reign, when the state affairs were really governed by the rūṭık Kösem [q.v.] and the Ḵāṭar ʿaḡāṣī Suleimān. This Gurdji Muhammad had already a long career as governor of Syria and other provinces behind him when, at the age of 94 years, he was called to the highest dignity in the beginning of November 1651 as successor of Saywaḵ Paşa, who had shown too much independence towards the court. During his grand vizierate he is said to have shown fully his lack of capacity, taking the alarming revolt in Asia Minor of Abāz Paşa, Ḥājjī Paşa and Kāḏī Oghlu with the greatest equanimity. He was especially anxious to remove from the capital all possible rivals to the grand vizierate, among them Muḥammad Kopruš, who brought him, as Naʿmān says, the nickname of ḥabb al-maṣūm satān (the pill of the sultāns). On June 19, 1652 he was deposed again by the court party. After having been exiled he lived some time at Eiyyb and died in 1664, at the age of 110 years, in Temesvár.


MUḤAMMAD ḤĀSAN KĀHĀN, a Persian man of letters, who died on 19th Shawwal 1313 (April 3, 1896). His honorific titles were Šāh-i Darvāza and later l-i'mād al-Saltana.

Through his mother he was related to the Čādjarā [q.v.] and through his father he claimed descent from the Mongol rulers. His father, Ḥājjī Ṭi Khan of Marāgha, was a faithful servant of Naṣr al-Dīn Shāh (in 1852 he discovered the conspiracy of Sulaimān Kāhān) and the son from his youth upwards was in the service of the court. Muḥammad Ḥāsan Kāhān was one of the first students at the Dār al-Funūn founded in 1268 (1851) and spent 12 years there. Later he went with his father when he was appointed governor of Aρaḵānī. In 1280 (1863) he was appointed second secretary to the Paris Legation and spent three and a half years there. On his return to Teherān he was appointed interpreter to the Shāh and in this capacity accompanied him on his travels. In 1288 (1871) he was appointed head of the dragomanate (dār al-tarjuma) and of the press bureau (dār al-ṭabā’ah) as well as director of the official Ruhānī-yi dawlaḵi. In 1290 he was appointed superintendent of the palaces and assistant to the minister of justice and henceforth continually rose in rank.

E. G. Browne criticises severely the work of
Muhammad Hasan Khan and accuses him of having put his name to books alleged to have been written for him by indigent scholars. On the other hand, Joukovsky speaks with much respect of his works and shows that he inspired a great many literary undertakings (e.g. the printing of the Kur'an with an inter-linear Persian translation, concordance and index; the foundation of a press for printing in Roman characters; the establishment of the Mușhirya school; encouragement of the daily press etc.) although after the appearance at Bombay of a satirical work by Khalîgh Hâshimi Shâbqâd the obsession was still based on the suggestion of Muhammad Hasan Khan.

The fact is that the number of works — often very useful — bearing the name of Muhammad Hasan Khan, is very large. Without the help of "secretaries" some of these books could not have been undertaken. To Muhammad Hasan Khan is in any case due the honour of having suggested them. His principal works deal with the history and geography of Persia and are often in the form of almanacs. They are: Mir'at al-Bulhân, i., two editions (1293, 1294, a dictionary of geography: letters و — و); ii., 1295 (history of the years i.—xv. of the reign of Nâşir al-Dîn and calendar); iii. (years xvi.—xxii. of the reign of Nâşir al-Dîn and calendar); iv., 1296 (geography: letters و — و and history of 1296). In the geographical portions we find quotations from Yâqût and European travellers along with notes specially prepared by the local authorities (an extract from the Mir'at al-Bulhân: Târîkh-i Bubul wa-Yinnow was published at Bombay in 1311); Târîkh-i munqazam-i Nâşirî, 3 parts, 1298—1300 (history of the time of the Hidjâra; vol. iii.: history of the Kâlidâr 1194—1300); Matâ' al-Shâms, 3 vols., 1301—1303 (description of the journey to Muhâjjân with important archaeological data; ii. 165—213 contains the autobiography of Shâh Tâmâs, and iii. 469—500 a list of books in the library of the sanctuary of Mashhad); Khatâb Hâshimi-al-Sadîq fi Hâshimi-al-Sadâd, Tâhirân 1304, Tabriz 1310 (history of the martyrs of Karbâlî; Khâshâm-bûzma [cf. Sûra lx. 70], 3 vols., 1301—1307 (biographies of famous women of the Islâm); Khatâb Nâṣir al-Tâfân fi Târîkh-Dar-i Aqlân, Tâhirân 1310, 3 vols. (history of the Asârsâd); Khatâb al-Mâqâshir wa-il-Jâhîr, 1309 (historical almanac for the 40th anniversary of the reign of Nâṣir al-Dîn Shâh); Khatâb al-Tâfân fi Ahvâl Qâlîb-i Shâhân, 1311 (history and geography of Sawâd-kîh in Mâzândârân).

In the field of literature Muhammad Hasan Khân was only a translator (Swiss Family Robinson, romances of Jules Verne, discovery of America, Târîkh-i Inkâhâghi Yangi Dunyâ, Tâhirân 1288, Memoirs on the Indian Mutiny of 1857). He also wrote a number of text-books on geography and on the French language.


(V. Minorsky)

MUHAMMAD HUSAIN TABRIZI, a famous Persian calligrapher, pupil of the celebrated Mir Saiyid A'mâm Mas'ûd and teacher of the no less famous Mir 'Imad. His remarkable command of the art of calligraphy, so popular in Persia, brought him the title of honour Mir'at Cifâ'î (greatest master). His father Mirzâ Shukrallah was Mustawfi al-Mamâlik to the Safawid Tâhirân I (1521—1576), the master himself, according to the Oriental sources, was vizier to Shâh Ismâ'il I (1576—1578) but left the favour of the sovereign and was forced to fly to India where he remained to his death. Rieu says he died about 950 (1543), but this does not agree with other biographical details and is indeed improbable. That he spent the remainder of his life in India is evident from the fact that most of the manuscripts known to have been written by him were finished in India. The inscriptions on the masons and khâkâhs of Tabriz are said to have been his masterpieces but unfortunately they have been almost entirely destroyed by earthquakes. After completing these inscriptions he made the obligatory pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return devoted himself exclusively to copying the masterpieces of Persian poetry. A Discûn of the Persian poet Amir Shâhî from his pen is in the Cambridge University Library.


MUHAMMAD ISMÂ'IL B. ABD AL-KHANIM AL-SHÂHIDI MA WÂN X was born on the 28th Shawwâl 1196 (1781), of a Dîhil family that traces its origin to the Câlîkh 'Umar. He was a nephew of the famous Mawfûdî Shâh 'Abd al-'Azîz (d. 1239 = 1823). Having lost his father early, he was brought up by his uncle Mawfûdî 'Abd al-Kâdir (d. 1242 = 1826). In childhood he was attentive to his studies and fond of swimming in the Qâma, but thanks to a retentive memory and a keen intellect he later on became a learned man.

Being shocked at the disrespect and immoderate tendencies, then prevailing among Indian Mu'llimûn, he zealously preached the doctrines of Islam. Impressed by the religious sanctity of Saiyid Ahmad al-Mudâjadiî, he became his disciple and his constant companion. In 1326 (1802) they went to Mecca and then to Constantinople, where they were received with marked consideration. Six years later, on their return to Dîhil, they gained many followers. In 1325 (1827) they went to Poštâwar and declared a religious war against the Sákhâs. But owing to some innovations upon the usages of the Sákhâs, their power declined and during a retreat they perished in a skirmish with the Sâkhâs in 1247 (1831).

He is the author of the following works:
1. Râzâl Cifâ'î al-Fîzî, a treatise on the principles of Muhammadan law according to the Hanafî school;
2. Manâbî Imâmât, a Persian treatise on the Imâmat;
3. Ta'wîyišt al-Mimân, an Urdu treatise on theology (printed 1293, translated into English by Mir Shâhâmî 'Ali, cf. J. R. A. S., xiii. 316);
4. 'Abd al-Mustâfîm, a treatise in Persian on the doctrines of Islam.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
MUHAMMAD LALEZARII, TURK, THE NAME OF A KADI WHO DIED IN 1204 (1789) IN CONSTANTINOPLE, WHO WROTE A SERIES OF THEOLOGICAL TREATISES AND COMMENTARIES, WHICH ARE STILL ONLY ACCESSIBLE IN MS.: MISIN AL-MUHAMMID FI MA'JIZAT AL-KITAB AL-MUSAITHIB; DJAF‘I 'ANUD RUKBAN J. HAJJI AL- 'NEQII: COMMENTARY ON THE KA'IDATU-NNIZII, AND THE COMMENTARIES IN A COLLECTED VOLUME IN THE 'ASHUR EFENDI LIBRARY IN CONSTANTINOPLE (DER FEUTZ KATTHAUS: 'Ashit Efendi, CONSTANTINOPLE 1306, P. 158, NO. 124 [3RD WAQF-FOUNDATION] CONTAINING: YUV SAR AL- 'ZHIRE (ON TURAB); YUV'UAT AL-KUNAN (ON BIRGBEZ); ZAMANAT AL-DA'AAAA (ON 'ABD AL-KARIM AL-LAILA'I); AL-DUWAYT AL-KHODR; AND KUZOB AL-DURLI (ON IBN MASQUIB). THE NAME LALEZAII COMES FROM LALEZAR, A QUARTER OF CONSTANTINOPLE NEAR THE FATIH MOSQUE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: BRASSIL MEHMED TURHAN, 'OGHNIATI MUKADJIRELI, I. 349, TO WHICH MAY BE ADDED: 'HASRATI ADBULMUTTALIB, III. 243: TURHAN LALEZARII-ZADE, WHO IN 1201 (1786-1787) WAS MOLLAI OF EIDYUB.

MUHAMMAD MUHSIN AL-HADIDII, SON OF HALIDJ FADL ALLAH, SON OF AGHA FAID ALLAH, A RICH MERCHANT OF IRAQ WHO CAME TO INDIA IN THE EARLY PART OF THE XVIII CENTURY, WAS BORN AT HUGLI IN 1143 (1730). FOR A TIME THE AGHA RESIDED AT MURSHIDABAD AND CARRIED ON THERE AN EXTENSIVE MANUFACTURING BUSINESS, BUT FINDING THE RISING RISE OF HUGLI A MORE CONVENIENT CENTRE, HE FINALLY SETTLED THERE WITH HIS SON FAID ALLAH.

ALREADY SETTLED AT HUGLI WAS ONE AGHA MUTAHHAR, WHO, COMING ORIGINALLY FROM PERSIA AS AGHA FAID ALLAH, HAD WON HIS WAY AT THE COURT OF ARANGABAD [Q.V.]. THAT MONARCH HAD CONFERRED UPON HIM EXTENSIVE DUGERS IN DJISUR AND OTHER PLACES IN BENGAL, AND AGHA MUTHAHR EAGER TO TAKE POSSESSION, FINALLY HIMSELF SET OUT FROM DILHI FOR THE EASTERN PROVINCE. SO WELL DID HE MANAGE HIS NEWLY ACQUIRED LANDS THAT HE SOON BECAME ONE OF THE WEALTHIEST MERCHANTS IN THE PROVINCE. HE SELECTED HUGLI AS HIS HEADQUARTERS. AGHA MUTHAHR FOR MANY YEARS REMAINED CHILDLESS AND IT WAS ONLY IN VERY OLD AGE THAT A DAUGHTER WAS BORN TO HIM. ROUND THIS ONLY CHILD, NAMED MANNU DZAN KHANAM, ALL HIS AFFECTIONS CENTRED, AND DYING WHEN SHE WAS ONLY SEVEN YEARS OLD HE LEFT HER ALL HIS PROPERTY. THE WIDOW OF AGHA MUTAHHAR WAS DISPLEASED WITH THE CONDUCT OF HER HUSBAND AND SUBSEQUENTLY MARRIED HUGLI FADL ALLAH, THE SON OF AGHA FAID ALLAH, HER LATE HUSBAND'S FRIEND. THE FRUIT OF THIS MARRIAGE WAS HADIDII MUHAMMAD MUHSIN. HE WAS EIGHT YEARS YOUNGER THAN HIS HALF-SISTER, MANNU DZAN KHANAM. MUHAMMAD MUHSIN WAS FIRST BROUGHT UP AT HUGLI, AFTERWARDS HE COMPLETED HIS EDUCATION IN MURSHIDABAD. AFTER FINISHING HIS STUDIES AT MURSHIDABAD, HE RETURNED TO HIS SISTER'S HOUSE AT HUGLI. LATER, HE STARTED ON A LONG JOURNEY AND FOR TWENTY-SEVEN YEARS HE CONTINUED HIS TRAVELS IN INDIA, ARABIA, PERSIA AND CENTRAL ASIA. IT WAS NOT UNTIL HE HAD REACHED HIS SIXTIETH YEAR THAT HE FINALLY DECIDED TO TERMINATE HIS TRAVELS AND RETURN HOME. MAKING HIS WAY SLOWLY ACROSS NORTHERN INDIA HE CAME AT LAST TO LUCKNOW. THERE HE CAME TO MURSHIDABAD IN 1216 (1801), WITH THE INTENTION OF SETTLING THERE. BUT DURING HIS LONG ABSENCE HIS SISTER, MANNU DZAN KHANAM, HAD MARRIED HIS COUSIN, SALAHI AL-DIN MUHAMMAD KHAN, NIEPHEW OF AGHA MUTAHHAR; HIS HUSBAND DIED IN THE PRIME OF LIFE AND SHE WAS ANXIOUSLY WAITING FOR THE

BIBLIOGRAPHY: MÜHAMMAD KHALİFA. [SEE MÜHAMMAD B. HOSAIN.]

MUHAMMAD KHAN BANGASH, NAWAB STYLED CHESANARJ DING, WAS A KHOLI CHIEF OF THE TRIBE OF BANGASH. THE CITY OF FARRUKHABAD WAS FOUNDED BY HIM IN THE NAME OF HIS PATRON THE EMPEROR FARRUKHAYAR. WHEN MUHAMMAD KHAN BECAME EMPEROR OF DILHI, HE APPOINTED HIM GOVERNOR OF MALLA IN 1143 (1730), BUT AS HE COULD NOT STOP THE REPEATED ATTACKS OF THE MAHRATTAS HE WAS REMOVED IN 1145 (1732) AND APPOINTED GOVERNOR OF ILAHABAD. MUHAMMAD KHAN INTENDED TO REDUCE THE BUNDELAS OF WHOM RADIJ CHATURSL WAS CHIEF. HE CARRIED SEVERAL PLACES BUT AS HE DID NOT KNOW THE ROADS, CHATURSL WITH THE HELP OF PESHA BADJI RITO, SURROUNDED HIM SUDDENLY WITH AN ARMY. THE NAWAB TOOK REFUGE IN THE FORTESS OF DJAITGAR; WHEREUPON HIS SON, KASIM DING, HAVING COLLECTED AN ARMY OF AFGHANS MARCHED TO DJAITGAR AND ESCORTED HIS FATHER IN SAFETY TO ILAHABAD. THE IMPERIAL MINISTERS THEN REMOVED HIM FROM THE GOVERNORSHIP. HE DIED IN 1156 (1743).


MUHAMMAD KÖPRÜLÜ. [SEE KÖPRÜLÜ.]

MUHAMMAD LALA PASİHA. [SEE MUHAMMAD PASİHA LALA.]


BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. FR. VON DIETZ, DENKVERDIERTEN AUS ASIJ, HALLE AND BERLIN 1815, II. I 99, REPRINTED 20; VON TULIPEN- AND NARZISSEN-BAU IN DER TURKEI VON DEM TÜRKENISCEN DES SCHEHK MUHAMMAD LALEZARI, HALLE AND BERLIN 1815; FERTSCH, KATALOG DER TURK. HÖSE, BERLIN, P. 305, NO. 232.

(TH. MENZEL)
arrival of her step-brother. At last at the solicitation of his sister, Muhammad Muhsin came to Húlghí, and when she died at the age of eighty-one in 1218 (1803), she left a will bestowing to Muhammad Muhsin the whole of her property.

It was thus not until Hádží Muhammad Muhsin had reached the age of seventy-three that he became possessed of the great wealth which greatly helped his co-religionists in Bengal in the pursuit of education. He had never married and the death of his half-sister left him without near relatives. He was anxious that his great wealth should be put to a good use after his death and consequently on the 26th April 1806 (1221 H.1.) he signed a Deed of Trust setting apart the whole of his income for charitable purposes in perpetuity.

Hádží Muhammad Muhsin lived for six years after making this noble disposition of his property. For his own personal use he had reserved only so much property as would bring him in about one hundred rupees a month. In 1227 (1812) he died at the age of about eighty-two and was buried in the garden adjoining the Imanbārā which he had so splendidly endowed.


MUHAMMAD MURTADA — MUHAMMAD MUHSIN AL-JÁDĐI

MUHAMMAD MURTADA, EM. HUSSAIN AND MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD AL-RAZÁZ ABU L-EFAID AL-HOSSÁNI AL-JÁDĐI, an Arabic scholar, born in 1145 H. (1732) in Biglirn in Kánáš in N. W. India, settled, after travelling for many years in pursuit of knowledge, in Cairo on 9th Safar 1167 (Dec. 7, 1753). There he succeeded in reviving an interest in the study of Tradition by giving lectures to specially invited companies. In Upper Egypt he was always a welcome guest with the Arab Shiikh Humán and in the Egyptian country towns, and his fame spread to the Sudan and even to India. From the year 1191 (1777) he drew a pension from the government. He died in Shabád 1205 (April 1791) in Cairo of the plague.

His principal works are two great commentaries. He wrote: the 'Ábd al-Awán on Fírzhábé's Kámáir, finishing it in 1184 H. (1767) after 14 years' work; although in the preface he quotes over a hundred sources used by him, he takes most of the additions to the Kámáir bodily from the Lájjám al-Árab of Ibn Mánár. It was printed incompletely in 5 vols. in Cairo 1286—1287 and in 10 vols. in Cairo 1307. He wrote a commentary, also very extensive, on Gzázalí's 'Uddán al-Dín, entitled 'Uddán al-Sáda al-muttabín, in which, in addition to explaining words he devotes special attention to establishing traditions quoted by Gzázalí; it was printed at Fás in 1301—1304 in 13 vols. in Cairo in 1311 in 10 vols. He also composed a number of smaller works on lexico-graphy and Tradition and also on the genealogy of the 'Áshíbí:

1. Nájihat al-lítháfi fi 'Uyyán Hází al-Májús wa l-Káfíjé, ed. by Lambreg, Prince's arabes, i. 40—55; 2. al-Ábd al-ma'ālif fi Táhájí Láfj


MUHAMMAD PASÁ, [See MUHAMMAD DÁMÁD PASÁ, MUHAMMAD GURJÁ PASÁ, KÁRÁNÍ, MUHAMMAD PASÁ, ŠANOLÍ]

MUHAMMAD PASÁ, BALTAĐI, grand vizier, was born about 1660 in the town of 'Othmánık và and, after an education in the imperial palace, entered the corps of the baltańís. On account of his beautiful voice he acted for some time as musÈlÈdá, later he became a scribe and rose rapidly in this career. In 1703, at Ahmed III's accession, he became muÈtÈÁr and was made Kapúdan Pasá in November 1704. In December of the same year he obtained the grand vizierate as successor of Khalîl Ahmed Pasá, against whom, although he had been at one time his fellow baltańí, he had used all his power of intrigue, for which he was especially notorious, according to the biographer Râshíd. On May 3, 1706 he was dismissed — on account of his lack of capacity, as Râshíd says — and exiled to Lemnos, but his friends obtained for him the nomination to the governorship of Erzurum. In January 1709 he became governor of Alep and from here he was called, in August 1710, a second time to the grand vizierate, after Koprułu Na'mán Pasha had proved unable to restore stability in the way that had been expected from him. At that time the first great conflict with Russia was drawing near; Charles XII of Sweden, after the battle of Poltawa, remained in Turkey. The beginning of Báltádi Muhammad's second grand vizierate was therefore filled with preparations for the war with Russia, which had been decided upon at a great state council in November 1710, and approved of by a fatwá of the Shaikh al-İslám.

The grand vizier was made commander of this memorable campaign, which quickly was ended by his death near Falcéi (Falcesen, Turk. Falci) on the Pruth (July 21—22, 1711). Peter the Great's army was left in a desperate position, but his generals succeeded in concluding a truce with...
grand vizier, by the terms of which the Russian army was allowed to withdraw, while Azof was restored to the Turks. The general feeling in the Ottoman historical tradition is that Baltağlı Muhammad had been bribed; his enemies at any case intrigued against him in Constantinople so that, even before his return to the capital, he was informed of his dismissal at Adrianople (Nov. 1711).

The conclusion of the armistice of the Pruth was also much against the wishes of Charles XII who, on his remonstrances to the grand vizier, is said to have got the insinuating reply that, in case Peter had been taken prisoner, there would have been nothing left for his government and that, in general, it was not good that sovereigns should leave their country (Voltaire, Histoire de Charles XII et de Pierre I). Baltağlı was exiled to Lesbos and then to Lemnos, where he died in 1712, aged over fifty.

The bad reputation which this grand vizier has in Turkish history, and which is also given him by von Hammer, does not seem to be confirmed by western sources (Jorga, iv. 308).

Bibliography: The chief Turkish authority is Râşîd’s Ta’rikh; the campaign against Russia has been described in a Ta’rikh-i Moskof, contained in the work of Hasan of Crete and in a manuscript (Iabinger, G. O.W., p. 307, 310; Dilâver-Zade, Dilâver to the Hadîbat al-Wusûrâ, p. 7 sqq.; Sigîdî-i-’têmânî, iv. 208 sqq.; von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 111 sqq., 148 sqq.; Jorga, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, iv. where other western sources are indicated; Ahmed Refik, Mamûlîk-i-şâmîniyè Darîm Efendi Şâhî, Constantinople 1910; Ahmad Mûhtâr, Ýnsan mûh-fî-hîn-i gost Bâltâçî Mûhad Pashanî Frut sefari, T.O.E.M., vol. 8, p. 160 sqq., 238 sqq. (J. H. Kammers)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, ELMAS, grand vizier, was born about 1660 in a village near Sinîb as son of a ship’s captain. After having been attached to the service of the pasha of Tripolis, he was educated in the kâdisî of the palace and became in 1687 siâhêr; soon afterwards he became nîshânî and obtained the rank of vizier. In Ahmad II’s reign he was pasha in Bosnia, but did not yet play a prominent part; he is said to have been one of that sultan’s favourites. After Mustafa II’s accession he was appointed kâsim-mahfîn of the imperial stiirup and, when a revolt of the Janissaries had cost the grand vizier Surmeli Ali Pasha’s life, he was appointed in his stead (April 1695). He accompanied the new sultan during the campaigns against Austria of the years 1695, 1696 and 1697. On September 11, 1697 the Turkish army was attacked by the Austrians under prince Eugène, while it was passing the Theiss near Zenta in order to march on Szegedin. The sultan had already reached the left bank, but the grand vizier, together with a number of high military chiefs, was killed that day in the battle, which meant a heavy loss for the Turkish troops. Elmas Muhammad had been against this military enterprise, but the other members of the council had persuaded the sultan to the contrary. He is said to have borne the surname Elmas “diamond” to his accomplishments and handsom physique.


MUHAMMAD PASHA KARAMÂN. [See Karamân Mehmed Pasha.]

MUHAMMAD PASHA, LALA, grand vizier under Ahmad I. He was a Bosnian by origin and a relation of Muhammad Sokollı Pasha. The year of his birth is not given. After having had his education in the palace, he was mir-åkîr and became in 1595 aqîa of the Janissaries. Two years later he took part in the Austrian wars as beyehlyê of Rûm-àlî and was commandant of Esztergöm (Grey).

During this period Constantinople, which was captured to the Austrian army in September 1595, was following years Lala Muhammad was several times transferred in Hungary and when, in July 1604, the grand vizier Yavuz ‘Ali had died in Belgrad, on his way to the Hungarian theatre of war, the sultan sent the imperial seal to Lala Muhammad. Although peace negotiations were continually being resumed, the new grand vizier took in that year Waitzen (Turk. Wâc) but besieged in vain Esztergöm. During next year’s campaign Esztergöm was taken by Lala Muhammad (Sept. 29, 1605) and in November he crowned the Hungarian Boskay as king of Hungary (without the regions occupied directly by the Turks) and Transylvania. In that same year the Turkish eastern army under Cîhâghe Pasha was beaten by the Persians, while the troops sent to subdue the revolt in Anatolia were routed at Bulawadin. After his return it was decided that the grand vizier should remain next year in the capital and lead the war on the two fronts and, if possible, bring to a successful end the long-drawn peace negotiations with Austria. The young sultan, however, changed his mind in keeping with the wishes of the Kapudan Pasha Derîvsh, who was intriguing against Lala Muhammad. Accordingly the latter was ordered to take command of the army against Persia. He had already put up his tent in Uskudar, when overcome by sorrow because of the frustration of his plans, he was seized with an apoplexy and died three days afterwards (May 23, 1606). He was buried near the tâbîe of Sokolî Pasha.


MUHAMMAD PASHA, RÜM, vizier and, according to some sources, grand vizier under Sultan Muhammad II. As his surname indicates he was a Greek renegade. After having had an education in the palace he was destined for a military career and became at one time beyehlyê. The dates of his birth and of his military advancements are not recorded. He had taken part in the final campaign of Muhammad II against Karamân in 1466 and was charged by the sultan with the transfer of parts of the population of the conquered region to Constantinople, instead of the grand vizier Mahmûd Pasha. [q. v.] who executed these measures in too lenient a way, as the sources say. On the way back to Constantinople Mahmûd was dispossessed of his dignity in favour of Rûm Mu-hammad. The latter remained grand-vizier until
1470, during which time Muḥammad II went on his campaigns in Albania [cf. Skander Beg] and Negojont. Rūm Muḥammad Pasha does not seem to have taken part in these expeditions, but, as a critical perusal of the sources has shown, he was especially charged with the problem of the repopulation of Constantinople; his commissioners for the transfer of the Ḳaramānīlān population had been connected with the same problem.

As the measures taken to make the new capital again inhabited must have been unpopular in Muslim circles — the Greeks and other Christian elements were granted as favourable conditions as the Muḥammandān to settle in the town — the historical tradition of the early Ottoman chronicles is rather against Muḥammad Pasha. They ascribe to him the reestablishment of the house-rent in Constantinople called nūfāṭa, which was considered as an injustice to the new Muslim settlers. The muṣṭaqfa is said to have been instituted by the sulṭān, then abolished and again instituted by this grand vizier. But, as F. C. Giese has shown by an analysis of the text of Ashk-Pasha-Zade and Tursun Bey (cf. In., xiii., 1931, p. 268 seq.), these measures were part of the policy of the sulṭān himself and were probably made by the temporary grand vizier, who, being a Greek, must have had the special qualifications for the difficult task. This last circumstance, however, makes him the more suspect in the eyes of the historians and for this reason we may perhaps assume that his reported cruelty towards the population of the Kara-mānīlān towns has been exaggerated by the sources, in order to add glory to his predecessor Muḥammad Pasha, whose memory has survived as that of a national hero. It is not even beyond question that Rūm Muḥammad was ever really grand vizier (Siḏjil-i ʿedāmān). The Ḥādīṭat al-Wizāra’ of ʿOthmān-Zade (p. 10) ascribes Muḥammad Pasha’s fall to Rūm Muḥammad’s intrigues, but makes Iṣḥāk Pasha his immediate successor in the grand vizierate. So do other historians.

He was dismissed in 875 (1470) and was afterwards appointed Siḏjil-i ʿedāmān in 879 [1073] to ʿonfūl of Konya with the mission to pacify the newly conquered territory. He was defeated, however, by a Cilician pass; soon afterwards he died, probably killed by order of the sulṭān (according to Ashk-Pasha-Zade, ed. Giese, p. 133). The chronological order of these events is not certain.

Rūm Muḥammad Pasha was buried in a mosque which he had founded in Uskudar.

Biography: Among the old chronicles those of Ṣuḥrī and Ashk-Pasha-Zade, and among the later historians especially ʿAlī; Siḏjīl-i ʿedāmān, iv. 104; von Hammer, G. O. K. 2, i. 498, 499; Ḥāfīz Husain al-Awānsārī, Ḥaḍīṭat al-Qāʾimānī, ii. 195. (J. H. KRAMERS)

MUḤAMMAD PASHA, SOKOLLI [See Sokollu]

MUḤAMMAD PASHA, SULTAN ZADE, grand vizier under Sultan IV, was born about 1600 as son of ʿAlī al-Raḥmān Bey, son of the former grand vizier Ahmed Pasha (under Murad III), and by his mother a grandson of a princess of the imperial harem, whence his surname Sultan Zade. After having been kapık hāṣib in the palace, he adopted a military career, became already in 1630 ḥabib weṣṭrī and was appointed in 1638 governor of Egypt. In 1642 he was made commander of the expedition against Azof [q. v.] which town he rebuilt after it had been burned by the Cossacks before its surrender. On his return he formed with the šahādīr Yūsuf Pasha and the sulṭān’s favourite Dīnjī Khaṇḍāja a triumvirate, supported by the Ṣafvī Kūmī (q. v.); they intrigued against the grand vizier ʿAbd al-Muḥammad Pasha, who sought to remove the danger by sending Sultan Zade Muḥammad in 1643 to Damascus as wālī. After ʿAbd al-Muḥammad had been executed on January 1, 1644, Sultan Zade Muḥammad was made grand vizier. One of his most conspicuous characteristics in this office seems to have been his ability to flatter the sulṭān and to satisfy his very extravagant wishes by obtaining money from all possible sources and by giving sandjaks to many of Ibrāhīm’s favourites. At this time the Empire was at peace with Austria (which sent in August 1644 an extraordinary embassy to confirm the peace) and with Persia, although Rakoczy, the prince of Transylvania, did his best to involve Turkey in a war with Austria. There was, however, a strong desire to go to war with Venice and to conquer Crete. The grand vizier was against this undertaking, but his former confederates drew the sulṭān to their side. Accordingly Yūsuf Pasha was dismissed as serdār in November 1645 and took Canea (August 17). The bad feelings that arose after Yūsuf Pasha’s removal led to Sultan Zade’s dismissal from the post of grand vizier (December 1645). After Yūsuf Pasha in January 1646 had fallen a victim to Sultan Ibrāhīm’s cruel capriciousness, Sultan Zade himself was made serdār against Crete. He departed in April 1646, drove the Venetians from Tenedos, which they had taken by surprise, and died shortly after his arrival in Canea (July 1646). He was buried in the teke of Ḥudūt in Uskudār.

Biography: Na_example is not given in the Siyāḥat-nāme of Evliyâ Celebi, who himself went with the expedition against Azof. Further the Diṭṭī Taṣawwīkhāt al-ʿotmān of Naṣir Pasha Zade (cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 211) and an anonymous Naṣirat-nāme (G. O. W., p. 152, note); both are in Zade Tscb. Ḥaḍīṭat al-Qāʾimānī, i. 89 seq.; Siḏjīl-i ʿedāmān, iv. 161; von Hammer, G. O. K. 2, i. 374. (J. H. KRAMERS)

MUḤAMMAD PASHA, TIRYAKI, grand vizier under Muḥammad I, was born about 1680 at Constantinople. His father was a Janissary. He began his career as a scribe and rose to important positions; in 1739 he played a role in the peace negotiations at Belgrad with Austria. He had been khāja of the grand vizierate. viz. minister of the interior, when the sulṭān, under influence of his new feizar aqshâl, the so-called Beshir the Younger, dismissed his predecessor Hasan Pasha and called him to the grand vizierate (August 1746). The twelve months of his period of office were not filled with war but with important diplomatic negotiations, in which he was supported by the new khāja Muḥammad Safī, later grand vizier, and the reis emīn Muṣṭāfa, both of them equally well versed in European diplomacy. During Tirayak Muḥammad’s grand vizierate peace was concluded with Nadir Shah of Persia (September 4, 1746) and the peace treaties with Austria and Russia were renewed. As the reason for his dismissal (August 24, 1747) is given his addiction to the use of drugs.
(hence the surname Tiryaki) and his quarrelsome, vindictive character, by which he had made enemies, especially in the ranks of the ściemi. After his fall he was governor in different eyalets, as İe Ili, Mısır, Bagdad, Diippa, and he died in July 1751 at Rethymo in Crete, where he lived, probably in involuntary retirement. According to the ściemi, he was a capable official before his coming to the grand vizierate; afterwards he was a failure in every office.

Dowlah-i Haidar: The Turkish of İsk: Dilîwar Zade "Omar, Dilîwar Hidâyat al-Wenârâî", p. 73 sqq.; ściemi, iv. 237 (where the dates are wrong); von Hammer, G. O. R., vi., i.

(M. H. KRAMERS)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, YESEN, grand vizier under Mahmut II. He was called Yeşen "the Nephew" because he stood in that relationship to Kel Yusuf Efendi, a high official in the financial administration (ściemi, iv. 659). He also began his career by holding different financial offices, and was also ściemi. By 237 the grand vizier Topal Othman Pasha (1732). In 1737 he became ściemi in Constantinople during the absence of the grand vizier Abd Allah Pasha. The latter was succeeded that year against the Austrians on the Danube frontier (taking of Feth Islâm), but was nevertheless dismissed, after his return, through the influence of ściemi Mehmed Beşhi, Yeşen Muhammad was appointed in his place (December 1737) and had to continue the peace negotiations with Austria and Russia, which were made especially complicated by the rivalry between France (represented by de Villeneuve) and the Sea Powers in offering their good services as mediators. The grand vizier himself was rather in favour of continuing the war and, being of a proud and arrogant character, made the negotiations still more difficult. In June 1737 he went as surdar to the Austrian front and was successful in recapturing Semendra and Orsowa (August). He was back in the capital in November. At the end of the year the Russians retired from Oacak and Kilburnu, which placed Turkey in a favourable position in the never ceasing peace negotiations, in which Poland also had become involved. But not even this grand vizier was to bring the war to an end; the same influence that had disposed of his predecessor obtained his dismissal in March 1739. After that Yeşen Muhammed was governor of Crete, Armenia, Aïdin and Anadolu. When in this last office he was called to the post of surdar on the front of Kars (March 1743) against the Persians. He received large reinforcements from different quarters and thought himself strong enough to attack Nâdir Shâh in his encampment near Erivan. This battle resulted in disaster for the Turks, owing mainly to a mutiny among the irregular levies. Yeşen Muhammed was killed, probably by the mutineers, in August 1745.


MUHAMMAD (MEHMED) RAUF, an important Ottoman author and poet who plays a very prominent part in the development of the Turkish moderns and of the written language.

Born on Aug. 12, 1871 (1875) in Constantinople, the son of an Anatolian, who came from Kutîfî, and a Circassian mother, he received a good education. He attended the Naval School and became a naval officer but he only spent eighteen months in the navy, mainly in Crete. When quite a boy, he displayed an irrepressible love for the theatre and literature and began to write at the age of 10, taking as his models the novels of Ahmed Midhat and the translations of French romances of adventure. This first production was a drama, Deniz-i yolculu Çarkaşanlar ("Baseness of the Corsairs of Gascoigne"). As his knowledge of French, and later of English, increased, he extended the scope of his reading and of his interests, so that at school he received the nick-name Osman obuyan Efendi (the novel-reader) and later Konanji (the novel-writer). His literary activity proper only began in the Naval School where he became acquainted with Georges Ohnet, Octave Feuillet, Alphonse Daudet, Émile Zola, Flaubert, the French realists and naturalists and endeavoured to imitate them. His story Ėkon was the most notable of his efforts at this period.

When he became acquainted with the works of the modernist Câlan Zade Kâhid Ziya [q. v.] he became possessed of his influence, especially after entering into correspondence with him and having his story Dukumat published by him in the periodical Bâbâ. Through Ziya he remained his model and Husen Ðâsh, whose friendship he made soon afterwards, he adopted the career of letters completely and became an author. When Denâb Shâh al-Din had to go to the Ðâsh as medical officer, he left the editorship of his periodical Mezâeb in the hands of Rauf. In 1896 Rauf at the suggestion of Ziya published his novel Ohrâmî-î Sodabi ("Youthful Passion") in İštâm, but it did not meet with any special success. He only began to be famous as an author with his cooperation in the periodical Sâret-i Fünün in 1896, which was of great influence in the development of modern Turkish literature. Here he worked with Ziya and the poet Tefiik Fikret [q. v.], to whom he had become related by his marriage. In 1901 the Sâret-i Fünün came to an end and with it his literary activity till the Revolution of 1908.

His first contributions to the Sâret were Na-bâtâtu ("In Convalescence") and Ùčakân. In the 19th volume was published in serial form his most celebrated novel: Evi ("September") which then appeared in book form like most of his works in the collection, so important for the development of Turkish literature: Eskişâri-î ğidâte Kütî- khânec, vol. vi., 1901. This novel, which was reprinted several times and which remained unique of its kind and represents a height of achievement never again reached by Rauf, had great influence and won general approval. In vivid, moving, although unequal language he describes in impressively realistic fashion the development and tragic end of a noble, innocent love. The exhausting verbosity in which Rauf revels here was aptly compared by Ziya to a gimlet which always turns at the same spot.

Some of his novels we may also mention Ferâd: Şähâr ("The Morning of Passion"), Ödânya-î ğidâte, No. 28; Genci AÎs Kâlî ("A Young Girl's Heart"); Mevlevi ("Violet") and Kâhâ ("Nightmare"). More important are his collections in the pre-
MUHAMMAD RA'UF

MUHAMMAD SHAH

valing fashion of short sketches, tales and long stories. Among these is his second most famous work: Siyâh Infulîr ("Black Pearls"), a collection of poems in prose modelled on Ziya's Mansûr Shâhîr and Beaudelaire's Fleurs du mal (Edebiyat, No. 11, 1317); also the collection of long stories, Ishâq-zâne ("Enamoured") (Edebiyat, No. 16, 1325 = 1910); Iftikâr ("Death Agony") (Edebiyat, No. 12, 1325); Sun Emel ("The Last Hope") (Edebiyat, No. 29, 1329 = 1913) and Bir 'Akhir

In this form a dramatisation of the novel of the same name by Ziya (Edebiyat, No. 17) and Qudsi ("Battle") in 5 acts (Edebiyat, No. 30, 1327 = 1911); also Ibi Kusvet ("Two Powers"); in Samurdon dalıla.

Ra'uf died on Dec. 23, 1931 at Constantinople.

Numerous contributions by him are in the Serreti-Funa; the finely produced women's periodical Meşkîn of which he edited the only volume that appeared. Contributions by him, some of his own work, especially poems (Ra'uf possessed not inconsiderable poetic talent and was regarded as the Turkish Beaudelaire), also essays and criticisms, of which his analyses of the contemporary novel are valuable. They were published in different collections, periodicals and newspapers in vast numbers. His Zandič ("Lily") brought him trouble. It was confiscated on account of its sensuality and the author was imprisoned. He wrote other things in the same style which were not printed.

In his works he appears as a very artistic, rather sentimental nature; even what he writes in prose is pure poetry. His prose is as good as that of Ziya, the leader of the Serret-Funa movement. He is one of the most important personalities in this group of men of letters, although his marked merits in form and style are counter-balanced by equal defects, which became worse as he paid no attention to the cultivation of his style: in him we find a reversed process, from the more perfect to the less. He would have been held in higher repute generally, if he had ceased to write after his first works. — Owing to the identity of the name and the parallel literary activity Muhammad Ra'uf was often taken for M. Ra'uf, the son of Farîq Kaif Pasha, who died on Febr. 23, 1918 and was buried at Hûdar Pasha. M. Ra'uf was editor of the Revîma Kitâb. He was a dramatist and wrote: Poësie; Nizâm-i Zirvânet ("Wonder in sight"); a comedy Atena ile Bitir arasinda ("Between Fire and Powder") and a piece entitled Târinâ written jointly with Kaif Negdet, one of his most intimate friends. The following dramas were never printed: Sâhi al-Din-i Elyâh, Neîmân and a number of adaptions. From the English he translated Saiyid Ameer Ali's The Life and and Teachings of Muhammad or the Spirit of Islam in 2 vols. entitled Muhammadiyya Târikhi-i Islam.

Besides being an author, M. Ra'uf was also a teacher, a task for which his extensive knowledge of languages qualified him (in addition to French and English, he knew Arabic, Persian, German, Italian, Greek and others). He lectured at the University on mythology and Greek and Italian literature, on which he wrote two text-books: Fünan i hadim Târikhi-i Edebiyat and Itâliy;i Târikhi-i Edebiyat. He was also for a time teacher of western literatures, Turkish literature and French at various institutions.

Bibliography: Brusali Mehmed Tahir, Oğlu


MUHAMMAD SA'TD (Mir Dzmîl), minister of 'Abd Allah Kûb Shah of Haidarâbâd during the xvith century, was originally a diamond merchant, and was famous in the Deccan for his wealth before he became minister. After the defeat of his master 'Abd Allah by Arangâzî, Mir Dzmîl took service under the latter and was made Governor of Bengal from 1701—1705 (1660—1664). He defeated Shah Shâhîd when the latter fought against his brother Arangâzî. Mir Dzmîl was afterwards employed in the conquest of Couch Bîhâr and Assâm in 1702—1703 (1661—1662). He overran both these countries but owing to the rainy season and the spread of disease among his troops, he was compelled to return. Only to die of dysentery contracted during his campaign, shortly after his arrival at Dacca in 1703 (1663).

Bibliography: Ma'dgîr al-Mawârî, iii. 530: Blochmann, J. A. S. E., xlv. 51; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, vii. 199: Imperia Gösgenie von India, ii. 402; vii. 214; Elphinstone, History of India. 1889, p. 588—613. (M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD SA'ID. [See Khâil British Záar]

MUHAMMAD SHAH (1131—1161 = 1719—

1748), emperor of Dîhil, surnamed Muhammad Rawshan Akhtar (or, the Brilliant Star), was the son of prince Uthman Shah, one of the three brothers who perished in disputing the crown with their eldest brother, Dzhâhândâr Shah, son of Bahâdur Shah. He was born on Friday the 24th Rabî I 1114 (August 7, 1702), and was crowned by the two Saiyid brothers, Saiyid 'Abd Allah and Saiyid Uthman, after the death of Rabî I al-Dawân on the 25th Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1130 (September 29, 1719). Muhammad Shah reigned for about 30 years and died one month after the battle of Sarhind, which his son fought against Ahmad Shah Abdali [q. v.]. His death took place on Thursday the 27th Rabî II 1161 (April 16, 1748). He was buried in the court before the Mausoleum of
MUHAMMAD SHAH — MUHAMMAD ZA'IM

Nizam al-Din Awliya' at Dihli. This emperor may be called the last of the Timurid line, who reigned in Dihli and enjoyed any power. The few princes of that sovereign's family who were raised to the throne after Muhammad Shah were mere puppets in the hands of the nobles of the court.

Bibliography: Muhammad Hashim Khafi Khan, Muntagib al-Luslih, iii. 840; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, v. 485; Elphinstone, History of India, 1889, p. 602.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD SHAHI, "Ala' al-Din Khaliid (695—715 = 1295—1315), was the nephew and son-in-law of Sultan Jaiilal al-Din Firuz Shah II, Khaliid, whom he murdered by treachery at Karan Manikpur, in the province of Hahabad, in 695 (1295), and ascended the throne of Dihli in the same year. He re-conquered Gujrat (697 = 1297), took Chitor and temporarily subdued the Radjipts (703 = 1303) of his cousin general, Malik Kafur, seized Delhi and Warangal, and founded a Deccan province of the Dihli kingdom. The empire is said to have flourished during his reign. Among contemporary poets Amir Khusrau and Khwaja Hasan held the first rank; Shaikh Nizam al-Din Awliya', one of the greatest saints of India, flourished at the same time. He died in 715 (1315) and was buried in the tomb which he had constructed in his life-time in Old Dihli.


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD SHAH BAHMANI. [See Muhammad I—III, above p. 664 sq.]

MUHAMMAD SHARIF AL-NADJAFI was born in the Deccan where he spent the first twenty-five years of his life. He afterwards visited in an official capacity Gudjarat, Malwa, Adimir, Dihli, Agra, the Punjab, Sind and Kashmir. He went to the last country in the train of Djinaging and under the command of Khaim Khan (1031 = 1621). He was the author of Maudhir al-Salatin, a short history of the kings of Dihli and of the Deccan dynasties from the accession of Muhammadan conquest to the accession of Shah Djinaging, completed in 1038 (1628).

Bibliography: Elliot-Dowson, History of India, vii. 134—140; Rieu, Cat Persian MSS. Brit. Mus., p. 907.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD TAHIR AL-FATANI AL-GUDJARATI, was born at Fatna in Gudjarat in 914 (1508); after completing his education in his native land, he proceeded to Mecca, where he studied traditions with eminent scholars such as Ibn Hadjjar al-Haitami al-Makki and others. He acquired much learning from 'Ali b. Husam al-Din al-Muttabki (d. 975 = 1567) and also became his disciple in the Kirdir and Djinaging orders. After his return to his native country he tried his utmost to spread learning and to uproot the doctrines of Muhammad al-Dhawri, who had claimed to be the Mahdi of his time and had a considerable following among the Bohors [q. v.], a community to which Muhammad Tahir himself belonged.

In 980 (1572) Akbar went to conquer Gudjarat. After its conquest he conferred honour on Muhammad Tahir by tying with his own hands a turban on his head, saying that it was incumbent on him (Akbar) to spread the true principles of Islam. Khayr al-Din Aziz Muhammad Kuklatsh was appointed governor of Gudjarat and he helped Muhammad Tahir in uprooting the new doctrines of Mahdism. But when 'Abd al-Rahim Khan Khwaja succeeded him as governor, Muhammad Tahir suffered much at the hands of the followers of the Mahdi, and proceeded to the court of Akbar in Akbarabad for redress. On his way at Uddiyan he was murdered by some followers of the pretented Mahdi in 985 (1578).

Among various his compositions the following may be mentioned:


2. al-Mughart, a dictionary of proper names of Muhammadan traditionsists, lithographed on the margin of Tarkib al-Tadbir by Ibn Hadjar al-'Askashal (Dihli 1290).

3. Tadbirat al-Musafir, a treatise on traditions which have been incorrectly attributed to the Prophet.


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD ZA'IM, a Turkish historian. All that we know of his life is gleaned from his works. He was born in 930 (1532) for he tells us that at the accession of Sultan Murad III, i.e. in 982 (1574), he was 43. At the early age of eleven he took part in the campaign of 950 (1543) along with his elder brother Perwane Agha, who at that time was Kapudi Bahri at the Sandjak Beg of Lepanto, Yahya Pasha Oglu Ahmad Beg. When the latter, after the capture of Stuhlweissenburg, was appointed Sandjak Beg there, the brothers seemed to have remained in his service, probably till 952 (1545) when Ahmad Beg was summoned to Stuhlweissenburg. In 961 (1552) when Sultan Sulaiman took the field against Shah Tahmasp of Persia, Muhammad Zaim was a secretary in the service of the governor of Syria, Teke Oglu Mehemed, and a year later he was secretary to the powerful grand vizier Mehemmed Sokollu and in this capacity compiled the official report of the death of Selim II and the accession of Murad III which was sent to the governors of Diyarbakri, Aleppo and Baghda'd. This office, to which he perhaps succeeded on the promotion (978 = 1570) of the famous Feritsun Ahmed Beg [q. v.], he must have filled till the death of Mehemmed Sokollu in 981 (1579); we hear nothing further about it. He held a great fief (izamet; hence his epithet Zaim); he himself says: mukaddem sadecheh-i ahi aminiyel-e Mehemmed ile mustaf-i wecherih. Friends requested him to write a history and it finished within a year. He began the work in Muslim 985 (beg. March 21, 1577) and had completed it in Dhu 'l-Hijja of the same year (beg. Feb. 9, 1578). The date of his death and
the site of his tomb are not known but he is said to have left charitable endowments in Karafes near Salonika.

He called his book Humāi-i Ḥasan al-Tawārīsh and dedicated it to his master Mehmed Nebili. As his sources he mentions eleven historians from Firdawsi and Tahari down to the anonymous ṬＲ-ṢAJIurtles-Allāh Omām and gives as his main source Beqaṭit al-Tawārīsh, from which, as has been proved, he copied out whole pages without a quail. The book, which is not yet printed, is divided into a preface and two large sections (R-ṣam) subdivided into gurin and then again into gurin (ṣam), and concludes with an epitome. Rieu and others have given an account of the contents from the manuscripts. In the fourth gurin of the fifth year he deals with the Ottomans and here alone do we have statements of any value, when the author describes from his own experience events from 1543 onwards. He brought his story down to the time of writing and the last event that he mentions took place in the month in which the book was finished.

The passages in the book relating to Hungary have been dealt with by Thury (Torok territorial., vol. 361-389) who also collected the above data for his life; the earlier from 1530 to 1476 are given in extracts and the later from 1521 to 1566 translated in full. Of the other less valuable parts of the book Diez (Denkmälerkosten von Asien, i. 212 sqq.) has edited a portion of the very early history, dealing with Cain and his descendants, while v. Hammer (Sur les origines russe, i. 120) edited and translated a portion on the tribal divisions of the Turks, where the Rūs appear as the ninth Turkish tribe. Of the later Ottoman historians, Ibrahim Pecevit utilised and quoted from the work of Muhammed Zaftin from the year 1542 onwards.

Bibliography: Babinger, G.O.W., p. 20, 98 sq., 193, where further references are given.

(W. BORKMAN)

MUHAMMADIYA, a name of several heretical schools, notably the Ultra-Shi'ite Muhammadiyas.

As the example of the Kaisniyya [q.v.] shows, at an early date some Shi'is transferred the imāmate to Alids who were not descendants of the Prophet's son-in-law Fāṭima and then to those who were not Alids at all. The Muhammadiyya revered such an one in ʿAbd Manṣūr al-Ḥalîlī, whom Yūsuf b. ʿOmar al-Ḥalīkī, governor of the Ṭarīq, executed in the reign of the Caliph ʿḤishām, i.e. before 125 (743). ʿAlī Manṣūr, rejected by the Imam Djaʿfar al-Sadik for Shī'ī exaggeration, thrust the Alids aside by still further increasing this tendency: Muhammad's family, he said, was heaven, the Shī'ī earth and he himself the "fragment falling from heaven" mentioned in Sūra li. 44, as he had been personally touched and taught by God on a journey to heaven; he is said to have abolished the religious laws. While one group, the Ḥusainiyas, recognised the Imām in his son al-Ḥusayn after the death of ʿAbd Manṣūr, another, the Muhammadiyas, recognised Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Tālib. He is the pretender celebrated as al-Nafs al-saḍqa ("the pure soul"), who in 145 (762) fell at Madīna against the troops of the ʿAbbasid Caliph al-Manṣūr. ʿAlī quoted as authority for the recognition of an Alid again an alleged testamentary disposition of ʿAbd Manṣūr and compared the following order of succession: testament of the Ḥusaynid Muhammad Baḥr for ʿAbd Manṣūr and of the latter for the Ḥusaynid Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, with the Jewish line: first Moses, then Joshua, son of Nun, then the sons of Aaron (the later priesthood is meant). This arrangement was chosen in both cases so that conflict might not arise between the two lines of brothers (ḥabībān). — We cannot be certain that the Muhammadiyas formed a definite sect. The name rather records the fact that the rising of al-Nafs al-Zakīya, which was of great extent, attracted all circles of the Shī'īs to its ranks, even those who belonged to the Husaynid camp; and members of the Mughirīyā, the followers of Mūḥtīla b. Ṣafī, killed in the year 119 (737) by Yūsuf b. ʿOmar's predecessor Ḥādist b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kārī, probably under the leadership of Ḍabīr b. Yazīd al-Djufti, supported al-Nafs al-Zakīya with their good wishes at least.

Quite a different group is the ultra-Islāmī Muḥamaddiyya or Mimiyya. It took its name from the belief in the divinity of the Prophet Muhammad in reply to an ʿAbaynī or Amīna who regarded Allāh as God. Its principal representative al-Faiḍī b. ʿAll was executed between 279 (892) and 289 (902).

The Khāridjī Muḥamaddiyya was a separate party within the strictly Khāridjī sub-group of the Alamārida: it is called after a certain Muḥammad b. Zurāk.


MUHAMMARA, a town and port at the head of the Persian Gulf and in the Persian province of ʿArabīyān. It lies on the right bank of the Ḥaffār channel (formerly called Nahī Baynā) which connects the ʿArabān river with the Shīṭ al-ʿArab. The original village from which the town grew appears to have lain on the left bank of the channel, on the island of Abādīn [q.v.], and Muḥammarā is probably therefore not to be identified with the town of Bayān, though it now lies on the same site. Further, Bayān was included in ʿArābīyān by the geographers, whereas Muḥammarā, lying on ʿAbādīn island, was a part of Persia until the shifting of a channel threw the possession of the town into dispute between that country and Turkey. By the treaty of Erzerum (1847) it was assigned to Persia, but though the government was nominally directed from ʿAshantar, it remained in reality in the hands of the Arab shāikhs of the Ṭarīq (or Kālī) tribe, who were Shī'īs. From the fact that the Arab geographers ignore the town, at any rate under its present name (for references to Bayān see G. Le Strange, below), it may be inferred that the place (Mahrāth) was either of minor importance or of comparatively recent origin. At the present time the port is of some importance for the trade of Persia, its principal article of commerce being dates.
though it is also connected with the oil trade. Bibliography: G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 48; S. H. Longrigg, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq, index; H. G. Raulston, Notes on Modern Iraq and the Caliphate, in P.R.C.S., i. 351 sqq.; Yākūt, Muṣḥaf, iv. 709 (R. Levy).

MUSHĀRĪB, the name of several Arab tribes (Wustenfeld, Register zu den general Tabellen, p. 320 gives five of this name) of which the most important is that of the Musharib b. Khāṣafa b. Kāis 'Aīlān (Wustenfeld, General Tabellen, D. 8). They do not however seem to have been of very great importance either in the Diḥliyya or in Īslām. Ibn al-Kalbi only gives them two pages of his Dāyrakhat al-Anbāb (Brit. Mus. Ms., Add. 23,297, fol. 163b—165b) but these add considerably to the very meagre information in the Tabellen especially as regards the lines of 'Ali b. Dāṣur b. Mushārīb and of Basīţā wādī b. Ḥaṭṭī b. Ṭārīf b. Khulaf b. Mushārīb. A typical early tribe, they lived in the mountainous region of southern Najdji between Medina and al-Yamāma (Wustenfeld, Register, p. 320 following Ibn Kūtaiba, Kitāb al-Mā'ṣirīf, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 41); several places in their territory are recorded in Yākūt's geographical dictionary (cf. the index of tribes, s. v.).

We know very little about their history before Īslām; they were closely connected with other tribes of the great group of the Kāis 'Aīlān, like the Hawāzin, with whom they are said to have shared the worship of the idol Diḥār (Yākūt, Muṣḥaf, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 167, l. 2—3 = Wellinghausen, Reste 2, p. 65; cf. Tādī al-Ārum, ii. 115, l. 7 from below), and especially the al-Ḥāṭafān (notably their clan al-Talīta b. Sa'd b. Diḥyānān along with whom the clan of the al-定向 b. Ṭarīf b. Khulaf b. Mushārīb (the genealogy of the Tabellen is to be rectified in as much as al-Mālik is the name of al-Khulaf and not that of his father) fought the war known as the yawan al-harask or yawan Ṭarāt Musawwāl alluded to by the poet of the Diḥyānān Husain b. al-Ḥumām in some of his poems (cf. al-Mufaddalīyāt, ed. Lyall, Nis. xii. and xiii. and the commentary of Ibn al-Anbārī, with the passages quoted in the notes).

The Mushārīb at the beginning of Īslām were hostile to Muḥammad; this hostility was perhaps only the continuation of that which prevailed between the nomad tribes of the 'A'lya of al-Najdji and the citizens of Malīna. Thus we find, in the early years of the Ḥijrā, that Muḥammad sent agents among them (and against the Ghāṭafān) a series of expeditions, of the nature of raids and coups d'état rather than regular military enterprises (our sources give 30 or 40 men as the total of the Muslim forces); the details of their fighting are given in Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, i., p. 537—538 (3 A. II. § 6), 596—597 (5 A. II. § 3), 689—690 (6 A. II. § 1), 694 (6 A. II. § 6) with reference to the sources utilised (we may add Ibn Sa'd, ii/l. 23—24, 43—44, 61—62). One part at least of the tribes however have been attracted within the growing sphere of Muslim influence since we find Mushāribīn in the cavalry led by al-Zubair at the taking of Mecca (Caetani, Annali, ii. [§ A. II. § 396]). But it was only in 6 A. II. that the Mushārīb sent their ambassadors to Muḥammad and gave their formal adhesion to Īslām (Ibn Sa'd, iv/l. 43; cf. Caetani, Annali, ii. 344—345); even on this occasion they were conspicuous by their unconcern, quite Bedu in, of which another example is given in the anecdote of the Mushārīb (he is said to have been called Šamū) b. al-Hāṣib or b. Ka'b, who dared to doubt the Prophet's word in connection with the purchase of a horse (cf. Ibn Sa'd, iv, 2, 90—91 etc., and Caetani, Annali, ix. 627—628).

The Mushārīb abandoned Īslām during the Riḍā but were easily brought back to obedience (Annali, ii., p. 594, 596, 11 A. II. §§ 115, 118); they took part in the conquest of the 'Irāk (Ibn Ḥadjar, Ḫābā', Cairo 1325, iv. 20—21: biography of 'Arūd b. Sa'd), who fought at al-Kādisiya and al-Diḥliyya and again, in 36 and 37, at the battle of the Camel and that of Siffin, where he was slain; they were encamped at Kūfah in the same quarter as the Ūṣad and Ghāzinī, not far from that allotted to the Tamīn (Ṭabarî, i. 2490, 2495).

The contribution of the Mushārīb to the politics and literature of Arabia is practically nil; we need only mention the name of Lāhūt b. Bukair b. al-Dirr (d. 190), who belonged to a branch of the Banū 'Ali b. Dāṣur b. Mushārīb, a poet (cf. Tabari, iii. 540, ascetic and historian (Fihrist, p. 94 and Yākūt, Irshād, ed. Margoliouth, vi. 218—220, give a list of his works, relating mainly to literary history).

Of the other tribes bearing the name of Mushārīb the best known is the Meccan tribe of the Mushārīb b. Fihr to which al-Dāḥikā b. Kāis belonged [q. v.]; the Mushārīb lampooned by al-Farāzādān and celebrated by Dirr (Nafāḍid, ed. Bevan, p. 817 l. 4, 1039 l. 2) are difficult to identify; it is not certain, although they are so identified in the index, that they were the Mushārīb b. Khāṣafa.

Bibliography: given in the article.

G. LEVI DELLA VIDA.

MUHARRAM (A.), the first month of the Muḥammādīn year. The name is originally not a proper name but an adjective, as the article shows, qualifying Šafār. In the pre-Muḥammādian period the first two months of the old Meccan year were Šafār [q. v.] I and II, which is reflected in the dual "a potiori" al-Šafārānī for al-Muḥarrām and Šafār; in the old Arab year the first half year consisted of "three months of two months each" (Wellinghausen), as the two Šafārs were followed by two Rābī and two Dūjmadās. The first of the two Šafārs, as the one that belonged to the sacred months, was given the adjectival epithet al-muḥarrām which gradually became the name of the month itself. As Dūj 'I-Hījādja also belonged to the sacred months, three of the four sacred months came together in the first half year.

The month intercalated to equate the year to the solar year was inserted after Dūj 'I-Hījādja and was not sacred. It thus came about that learned Muslims described the intercalation as renaming the Muḥarrām concerned Šafār, i.e. as making Muḥarrām not sacred; they meant that the month after the pilgrimage, which they consider as al-Muḥarrām, following the custom, is not sacred i.e. is "Šafār" and the second month i.e. in their view Šafār, is "al-Muḥarrām". In doing this they of course overlook the fact that Šafār proper now only comes third; but when the intercalary month was abolished in Iṣām, the proper conception of the state of affairs was lost [cf. NASI']

In the early period when an attempt was made
to equate with the solar year by inserting intercalary months, — which was not successful on account of the ignorance of the old Arabs in astronomical matters — al-Muharram introduced the winter half year as the names of the first six months show. The Arab year began, like the Jewish in astronomy. After Muhammad had forbidden the calculation of the intercalary months in Sūra ix. 57, 1st Muharram, the beginning of the year, went through all the seasons as the year, which now consisted of 12 lunar months, had always only 354 or 355 days, as it still has. Whether the first month of the year was originally marked by a festival we do not know. Wellhausen has endeavoured to show that the ḥudayj originally fell in the first month of the year, so that Muharram was ḥudayj in its quality as "Dhu 'l-Hijja". This also suggests that there was originally only one sacred month, but it was observed at different times in different parts of Arabia. Muhammad in the Kūfān always speaks only of the sacred month i. i. (192, 217: v. 2, 97): only in Sūra ix. 36 in laying down the method of reckoning time does he speak of four sacred months, in which he was careful to recognise a later declaration of the equal sanctity of four different sacred months of different districts, which was however illusory, as within Islam the peace of the pilgrimage month, and, according to Sūra ii. 217, the defence of the faith takes preference over the sacred month What the sacred month referred to in the sacred month mentioned in Sūra ii. 2, at any rate, the month of the pilgrimage must be meant, which its wellhausen's theory excellently. The commentators think Ṭabāk or Dhu 'l-Ka'āda is meant. In any rate not al-Muharram.

Al-Muharram has 30 days which, in addition to the 1st as the beginning of the year, the following are specially noted: the 9th as the fast-day of the Shi'ite ascetics; the 10th as the anniversary of Kerbela (60 = 680), on which al-Jussain b. 'Ali b. Abi Tālib [q. v.] fell fighting against the Caliph Yazid b. Mu'awiyah and therefore the great day of mourning of the Shi'a (on the significance of the 10th Muharram for the Sunnis see Al-Muhammad, p. lvii. 39: celebrated by pilgrimages to the sacred places of the Shi'a, especially to Kerbela (see MEHDI), in which the passion play, representing the death of 'Ali in Shi'a [see TAR`IYA], plays the most important part; also the 16th as the day of the selection of Jerusalem as the Kibla [q. v.] and the 17th as the day of the arrival of the "people of the elephant" (sura iv.).


Muhāsibī ABB 'Abd Allāh Ḥāfīẓ b. Aṣad M.-, called Muhāsibī, i.e. "he who examines his conscience," was born in Baṣra; he died in Baghdad in 243 (857). A legist of the Shia school, a theologian who advocated the use of reason (i'ṭilā'), using the dialectic vocabulary of the Mu'tazzī, — which he was the first to turn against them, he finally adopted a life of a-cretic renunciation after a moral conversion long meditated which is described at the beginning of his Wafāyā. Involved with the Mu'tarīhī in a general persecution as a result of Ibn Ḥanbal's attack on the dialectics, he had to give up all teaching in 232 (846) and died in retirement.

His principal works are: Rī'īya al-Hijbā Allah, Wafiyya (more accurately: Nayib), Kitab al-Fuwarībh, Mā'ṣīat al-ʿĀli wa-Mūzā'ah, Kiṣlah al-Aṣmā', Fām al-Salāt; none of them is yet printed. The Parām al-Nawā's, which Spenger attributes to him, is of an earlier date; it was arranged by his chief teacher Ahmad b. Aṣim Anṣāfī.

Muhāsibī is the first Sunni mystic whose works reveal a complete theological education; they combine in a very original way a keen concern for exact philo-sophical definitions, and a fervent reverence for the most naive traditions with the rigorous search for an increasing moral purification.

In his Rī'īya he discards the foundations of that "method" of introspection which 'Abūlī had envisaged; he shows that the correlation between two series of human happenings, the external actions of the members and the intentions of the hearts (against this: "Allāh and the majority of contemporary muttāba'llimān:); he proves in detail that the enclosure of the states of conscience (akhīri) can be guided progressively towards a perfect purity, provided an a-cretic and moral rule of life is observed, the true tāhīmiyya mentioned in Sūra lvii. 27.

His adversaries (muḥaddithīn), especially Hanbalis, attacked him for having differentiated the concepts of ḥab & ʿāli (parable of the "sower"), ṣina and mūṣaf (like Ibn Kairān); admitted the created character of the ḥab (four pronunciation of Cur'anic verses); held that the elect, in Paradise, would be summoned to enjoy directly familiarity with the divine being; chosen his references from authors not by following the formal correctness of their ḥadāth, but on account of their intrinsic significance, from their moral weight (īfira), for the reader.

The Rī'īya is his main work; it forms in 61 chapters, in the shape of advice, given to a pupil, a complete manual of the inner life. Ghazzalī used it before writing his Ḥikā'ī; and in spite of the periodic attacks, its reputation among Arabic-speaking Muslim mystics lasted for a long time and may be compared with that of the Ininitio Jesu Christi among Christian mystics us-ing Latin; the Shāhīliyya brotherhood, with Mursī, Ibn 'Abādā, Rundi and Zarī'āt Burūsī, have always recommended its use; and one of them, Ḥiz al-Bin Malikṣī, has made a summary of it.

The Ashārī theologians also esteem Muhāsibī as a precursor.

MUHIBB AL-DIN. [See Al-Tarabeli.] 

MUHIBBI, a family of scholars in Damascus of the xih—xvth (xvih—xvith) centuries of which three members distinguished themselves in literature:

1. Muhibb al-Din Abu'l-Fadl Muhammad b. Abi Bakr b. Daud b. 'Abd al-Rahim b. 'Abd al-Khalil al-Mubbi al-Din Abu'l-'Abbas al-Halimi. Born in the middle of Madrasah 949 (Dec. 23, 1542) in Hamat, studied there, in Halab and Hims, and after a journey to Constantinople obtained a post as teacher in the Madrasa al-Kudayfa in Damascus. In 978 (1571) he accompanied the Shahih al-Islam and Chief Judge Cedi Zade to Cairo, was for a period a kadi there and after a second journey to Constantinople was appointed kadi in Hims, Ma'arat al-Nu'man and several other towns of northern Syria. In 993 (1585) the post of a chief kadi (al-ma'ihi) was given to him; at the same time he was military judge, judge of the Syrian caravan, taught in several madrasas and gave fatwas at the Sunna's request. He died on the 23rd Shawwal 1016 (Feb. 18, 1608). Of his numerous writings only three have survived: his commentary written in 969 (1561) (according to al-Mubbi, ii. 322, on the other hand, prepared at the age of 16) on Muhammad b. al-Shihna's (d. 815 = 1412) al-Yuq'inah al-Ba'asyilah (Manzana al-Ma'ihi wa-l-Bay'dun) in the Berlin, Alwared, Vez., No. 7256—7257 and Gotha, Pertch, No. 2780 MSS., his Travel, al-Ridha or 'Ashar al-Nujayla ila-l-'Ashar al-Miniyia in the Paris, Cat. de Siane, No. 2293; Cairo, Fhbrex, vii. 646; Stamul, 'Ashif Efendy, No. 2390 (s. Rescher in M.F.O.B., v. 496) MSS., which he wrote when kadi in Ma'arat al-Nu'man, and his commentary written in 1011 (1602) on the authoritative verses in Zakkashekh's Khulafa entitled Tamil al-'Ashar, pr. Bilek 1281, Cairo 1307—1308, and on the margin of Khulafa, ibid. 1318.


2. His grandson Fadi Allah b. Muhibbi Allah b. Muhibbi al-Din was born on the 17th Muharram 1031 (Dec. 2, 1621) in Damascus, at an early age showed great linguistic ability, received in 1048 (1639) from Nadarna al-Din al-Ghazzzi (d. 1061 = 1651), (see Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 292) the official post of Kadi, and after failing to secure something in Halab through the Shahih al-Islam Muhammad b. Zakariyya, was given by his father the latter's post at the Porwil-ly. In 1051 (1641) he accompanied Muhammad Jamati to Constantinople, was appointed to the Madrasa Arahi there, but dismissed a year later, when he returned home. In 1059 (1649) he accompanied the kadi Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Halim al-Busawa to Egypt and became his deputy. After a quarrel with him, he resumed his studies in al-Azar and came home next year. In 1073 (1662) he again went to Constantinople and four years later was appointed kadi of Bairut but returned to Damascus in 1079 where he died on the 23rd Djamah 11, 1082 (Oct. 27, 1671). While his own Diniim and his description of his journey to Constantinople have not been preserved, his edition of the poems of his friend Mandiak Pasha (d. 1080 = 1669 in Damascus) are still in existence. He first of all arranged them chronologically, beginning with a poem to Sultan Ibrahim I of the year 1055 (1646) as an addition to the MSS. mentioned in Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 277 there are now Kopuru, ii. 1243 and Mousul, Daud, Makhiufat, No. 153, 20, then alphabetically, including poems of a later period down to 1071 (1669); this edition was printed at Damascus in 1501. In 1078 (1667) he edited the bibliographical work of al-Hasan al-Burini (d. 1024 = 1615), Taridjam al-'Arif min Abu'l-'Azam and published it with a supplement; we may add to the MSS. mentioned by Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 290: Muhammad Kurd 'Ali, in R.A.A., iii, 1923, p. 193—202.


3. His son Muhammad al-Amim b. Fadi Allah b. Muhibbi Allah b. Muhammad Jamal al-Din al-Dimashqi was born in 1061 (1651) in Damascus, went with his father in 1079 (1668) to Bairut but returned home several times from there. A friend of his father's, Muhammad b. Luft Allah b. Barin al-Izzati, who had been kadi in Damascus in 1065 (1655) and was military judge in Anatolia in 1078 (1668), provided him with funds to study in Brusa. He returned home after a brief stay there on 8th Safar 1086 (May 4, 1675) in company with the mufti Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Halim. Al' Izzati had in the meanwhile been appointed military judge in Adrianople and was able to procure him a post there. But his patron fell ill soon afterwards and had to resign. Muhammad accompanied him to Stambul and looked after him till his death on 10th Shawwal 1092 (Oct. 24, 1681). He then returned to Damascus and began to write. When in 1101 (1690) he had made the pilgrimage to Mecca, he was appointed deputy kadi and then a teacher in the Aminiyah in Damascus. He died there on the 18th Djamah 1111 (Nov. 11, 1699).

His principal work is a collection of 1,289 biographies of scholars, poets etc. of his time and the period immediately preceding it arranged in alphabetical order, entitled Khulafa al-'Arif fi Ayam al-kurn al-khadi 'arif, the first fair copy of which he finished in 1096 (1685) (printed Cairo 1284, 4 vols.). The draft of a number of biographies from the Hidjaz and Yemen, which is preserved in the Bilil-Houtas MS., No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is in Berlin (Alwared, No. 9895). A synopsis was prepared by 'Ali b. 'Abd al-Halim al-Ghazzzi al-Amim (d. 1177; Muradi, iii. 215): MS. in Tabhunin (Seybold, No. 9). A second great bibliographical work on personalities of all ages entitled al-Film was to give under each letter al-Fiim wa-l-Fihm wa-l-Fihm wa-l-Fihm wa-l-Fihm wa-l-Fihm wa-l-Fihm separately. In the draft in Leipzig (Vollers, No. 683) giving the letter rim the sources, which from the articles are taken usually word for word, are generally quoted. He also wrote a continuation of al-Khaljat al-Khadijat al-Alih, 'Ali b. Khaiat al-Rahima wa-Rahima wa-Rahima wa-Rahima, which survives, in addition to the MSS. quoted by Brockelmann, G. A.L., ii. 294, in Stambul, Nur-i Othmaniyah, No. 4352 (M.S.O.S., xv. 22) and Mousul, Daud, Makhiufat,
like the crown and throne. It is the same when sovereignty is delegated to governors (vi., v. 1; cf. i., p. 499, v. 163; iii., p. 421, v. 111; viii., p. 459, v. 374; p. 463, v. 418). There is a reference in the same poem to seals of amber (i., p. 545, v. 692) such as actually existed (cf. Reinaud, Mon., i. 129). They were sometimes steeped in Chinese musk (vi., p. 351, v. 2288).

In Turkey the seal was again the emblem of power. The imperial seal (muhr-i hamāyūn) was handed to the grand vizier, hence also called ʿabāl-i muhr (cf. ʿabāl ʿamān), with great solemnity (cf. M. D’Ohsson, vii. 120), and Naʾima (iv. 430) in speaking of ambition to become grand vizier uses the phrase muhr arzu ("desire for the seal").

We may mention here that according to D’Ohsson (ibid.), the sultan had four seals with a tughrā, set in rings; one was square and remained in his possession; he entrusted the others which were round, to the Grand Mistress or Lady Treasurer of the Harem (ḥasanābād) and to the khitāb-ol-baqī, a white enceuh who at one time held the office of first chamberlain.

The seal was changed at each accession of a new monarch (cf. Na’ima, i. 117) as was the tughrā itself. Ewliya Celebi’s statement, which implies the contrary, is therefore rather strange (vii. 300, v. 4 from below). In Persia the seal was retained but the name was changed (cf. Khətān).

The grand vizier produced the imperial seal on the dīnān days for the kāwakāk baʾal to seal the bag (kaw) for the registers of the rūznamā and the archives of the Finance Department or mālīyā ʿabādāt bānās, the Treasury (khānān) and the general Archives (zaráb bānās) (M.T.M., iv. 499). The grand vizier also had, like all the viziers or governors of provinces, two other seals, one, a large one, impressed at the top of buyuwrūtā or "ordinances," and the other, a small and modest one, placed at the bottom of letters from the vizier, including official ones (cf. Ahmad Rūsīn, Oṭbā, Turābī, iii. 1514).

The use of seals in Turkey (we know very little of those of the Saldīlūs; cf. Reinaud, Mon., i. 121 note) was exceedingly widespread. They were used for impressions in wax (muhr mumā) and for stamping in a particular kind of ink to which saliva was added, as in Persia (cf. I. Père Raphael du Mans, p. 129). In more modern times the seal was carried in the purse (cf. a verse by Meṣḥīd ʿĀkīf in his poem Sīr Šahā). It is only recently that under the influence of the west the muhr has been displaced by the signature. It must have received its coup de grâce with the recent adoption of the Roman alphabet and of rubber seals.

The industry of seal-engraving has thus been gradually disappearing. It had at one time reached a high degree of perfection and the artists used to sign their work. These signatures were usually very brief, Mīḥīth, Sāʾī, ʿĀḥmad etc. They were written in characters so minute that they could only be distinguished with a lens and only when very cleanly engraved. Quite a study could be written on these artists.

Ewliya Celebi gives the following information about the seal engravers of Istanbul (i. 575).

1. Engravers on stone. Ḥabībīlūm, 105 workers in 30 shops. They engraved on stones such as
agaye, garnet, turquoise and jasper. Their patron saint for was 'Abdu Allâh Yamani, a disciple of Uways al-'Kurâni who is buried in Taizz.

2. The engravers of muhur: muhurtekâm who worked especially for the viziers. So workmen in 50 shops. Their pri was the Caliph 'Uthmân. In the reign of Murâd IV the most noted were Muhammed Câdeli, Ra'is Câdeli and Ferid Câdeli, who charged from 100 to 500 piastres for their work.

3. The engravers of silver seals and talismans: muhurtekân-1 imn hâye-šâhâl, 40 workmen in 15 shops. Pri: 'Ukkaşga who is buried near Ma'âsh, who, having seen on the Prophet's back the muhur-1 mohurâkhat (cf. above), began to engrave talismanic formulae (two of these are quoted). These workmen 'cannot engrave Yemen agaye'. They were established in the area called Seyrâhânder.

We may still mention the custom of making passarts, whose loyalty one wished to be sure of, to stamp their seals on a Kuran (kurûn mohurtmâk); cf. in the Turkish papers of June 8, 1925, statements by a rebel Kurid.

The word memûr in the old language of the Janissaries meant vouchers for their pay (M. d'Ohsson, vii. 337).

In figurative language Persian and Turkish uses the expression "to break the seal": mohur berdergân, mohur almâk (or bâsmâk, almâk, gottamak) for "to deliver a virgin" (cf. further the art. TAMGHA).

The MUHTÄR (mohurt), Turk. muhurdar [cf. the article KHA'ÌM], keeper of the seals or better "private secretary" (cf. below), was therefore a very important personage. Murîr 'Ali Shîr, Newâli, was the first muhurt of Husain promised before becoming âdâm begi and first minister (cf. Belin, Notice sur Mir... 1861, p. 13; cf. de Sacy, A. E., iv. 282, 261). He was succeeded in these offices by another poet, Merwelsh (ibid.). — On the muhur-1 dar in Persia, cf. Le Père Raphaël du Mans, p. 21.

In Central Asia the title of muhurdar seems to have replaced that of tanâkâri which occurs as early as the Orkhan inscriptions.

In Turkey, each vâzir had his muhurdar (Ahmad Râsim, Olgâm, Tûrîkî, i. 455). Cf. the account of the career of a muhurdar in the Sûlûci-1 othmânî, ii. 31 below (Belohêt Pascha [the same as is mentioned in the Memoirs of Sûlûci Pascha, i. 4]).

The rûmîmâdî also had their own muhurdars (J. Deny, Sommaire des archits turcs du Caire, p. 136). At Kâdi Köy there exists a quarter called Muhurdar. For the work bearing the title Muhurdar Türkî, cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 216 sq.

With the viceroys of Egypt the muhurdar was a "private secretary" of the Khedive. The title of muhurdar was abolished in 1884, but the office has remained. His salary was the same as that of the chief of the cabinet (cf. ibid., p. 92 and 476).

Biographical: Cf. the article KHA'ÌM. We may now add: Babinger, Das Archiv des Bosnaker Osman Pacha, Berlin 1931, p. 23 and note 5, where reference is made to a little known article by Riza Efendi Muzedzîrovic. Cf. also von Hammer, Hist. de l'Empire Othoman, xii. 425, 539; vii. 2.

J. DENY

MUHRAN MALLI, son of Shâh Husain Hašâkat, was an inhabitant of Lucknow. In poetry he was the pupil of Khâja Wâzir. He flourished in the latter part of the sixteenth century. He is the author of a Divâna, a collection of lyric poems, and a biography of Urdu poets called Sarâfatu Sâkuha.

Bibliography: Hassanî, Ta'dikwâ, Shâfi'îr (Lucknow 1874), p. 419.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

AL-MUHTÄDÎ, ABD 'Abdu Allâh Muhammâd, an 'Abbâsîd caliph. After al-Wâlijî's death, a number of officials wished to pay homage to the young Muhammâd, son of the deceased caliph and a Greek slave; instead however, al-Wâlijî's brother was proclaimed his successor and only after the deposition and murder of the unfortunate al-Muhtadî (end of Radjab 255 = July 869) Muhammâd ascended the throne with the name al-Muhtadî. His ideal was the Unayzî 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz. Like the latter, he was distinguished for the strictness with which he conducted his life; with piety and simplicity however, he combined strength and ability and during his brief reign he did his best to raise the caliphate from its degradation and to restore the power of the Commander of the Faithful. In several provinces there were risings by 'Alîds, real or alleged; but the most dangerous enemy of the caliph was the Turkish general Mûsâ b. Bogha. When the latter, who was fighting against the 'Alîds in Persia, heard of the accession of al-Muhtadî, he returned home. Reaching Sâmarrâ in Muharram 256 (Dec. 869) he forced the caliph to take an oath to bring to justice the Turkish chief Şâlih b. Wâsîf, who had robbed the mother of the caliph al-Muhtadî of all her priceless treasures. When Şâlih concealed himself, the Turkish mercenaries mutinied and were intending to depose al-Muhtadî but were appeased by the resolution of the latter. Al-Muhtadî had a秘密 of the caliph that he would pardon him; but as the latter did not appear, they went to Sâmarrâ and began to pillage it until they were scattered by Mûsâ. Şâlih was soon afterwards discovered and killed by one of Mûsâ's men. When Mûsâ had taken the field against the Khojarî, al-Muhtadî began to incite the people against him and his brother Muhammâd b. Bogha and accused them of embezzlement. Muhammâd was brought to trial and put to death although al-Muhtadî had expressly guaranteed his pardon. The only course left for the caliph was to dispose of Mûsâ if he wished to keep his throne. But his plan was betrayed; Mûsâ advanced with superior forces and the caliph suffered a disastrous defeat. As he declined to abdicate, he was murdered in Radjab 256 (June 870) in horrible fashion.


(K. V. Zettersteen)

MUHTASIB (A.), "censor," an officer appointed by the caliph or his wazir to see that the religious precepts of Islam are obeyed, to detect offences and punish offenders. His office was the hibe, and to it only men of good standing could, in theory, be appointed. Like all
Group of 29 seals accompanying the address to Muhammad 'Ali Pasha by the principal religious authorities in Mecca: the governor at the time, the imāms, khatibs, muftis of the four schools etc. The text dated at the end of the month of Muharram 1326 (Feb. 23 1843) contains congratulations on the occasion of the victory over the Wahhabis and expressions of gratitude for the restoration of freedom of pilgrimage.

Art. MUHR
S eals of various individuals, Ottoman, Algerian and Hijjarian
(beginning of the sixteenth century).

2. Esma Sultan, sister of Mahmûd II. II Ram. 1222 (November 12 1807).
3. Mustafa Paşa, kâimmakâm or grand vizier interim. 8 Shaw. 1222 (December 9, 1807).
8. Mehmed ʿArif Efendi, former ḥekîb-ül-islâm. 9 ʿArif. 1227 (Feb. 21 1812).
9. Mehmed Saʿid Khâlet, Minister of the Interior. 23 ʿArif. 1227 (July 4 1812).
10. Şâkir Ahmed, kâimmakâm. 28 ʿArif. 1227 (July 8 1812).
11. Mehmed Khâsem Paşa, kapudan-paşa (at this date). 15 ʿArif. 1228 (Feb. 17 1813).
15. Khurshîd Ahmad Paşa, grand vizier. 18 ʿArif. 1228 (May 19, 1813).
17. Safi Ahmad, wekil al-kâraman il-ḥarîfâin at Medea. 3 Shaw. 1241 (May 11 1826).
18. Selim Thâbit, as wekil of Algiers at Constantinople. 7 Shaw. 1242 (May 4 1827). Cf. N°. 4: same seal, but on this impression the signature of the engraver ʿOmer appears clearly under the fleuron on the left).
22. Sulaimân İsmâʿîl, qumruk emlî and wekil of Algiers at Durazzo. 7 Ram. 1244 (March 13 1829). To left under the fleuron: signature ʿOmer.
holders of public office, he had to be a Muslim and free. Generally he was a fakih, and in addition to his police functions he performed those of a magistrate. In some respects his duties were parallel with those of the kadji, but the muhtasib’s jurisdiction was limited to matters connected with commercial transactions, defective weights and measures, fraudulent sales and non-payment of debts. Even in these matters he could hear only those cases in which the truth was not in doubt. As soon as evidence had to be sifted and oaths administered the muhtasib’s jurisdiction ceased. As a censor he had power to enforce the law without first requiring complaints from those injured parties. He had to see that in a place where Muslims lived they did not neglect to hold a Friday service in the mosque and that if they numbered forty or more they formed themselves into an organised community. But if the number was large and there were differences of opinion on the question of worshipping together, his authority might be disputed, and it was not within his power to compel the attendance of the individual Muslim at the mosque unless he was a persistent defaulter. Even then the officer could do no more than admonish the delinquent. So far as the mosque was concerned the muhtasib could insist on the ada’ and he could examine the mustad’adin in the subject of the times lawful for the ada’. If a public mosque fell into disrepair, the muhtasib was charged with the duty of calling the attention of the authorities to the matter.

An important part of the muhtasib’s duties was to see that the laws of the shari’a were maintained. Persons breaking the fast of Râmaḍân, widows and divorced women who did not observe the ‘idda [q.v.] before remarriage, and other transgressors, were liable to have to make explanations before him. Public morals, further, came under his jurisdiction. He had to prevent men from consorting with women in public and from indulging openly in wine; also the playing of forbidden musical instruments came under his ban and he had to see that games and toys did not lead to offences against the shari’a. However, he could not act on suspicion alone nor had he the right to go behind closed doors to pursue his investigations. His powers would appear to have been wider where the spiritual welfare of Muslims was concerned. Thus if a fakih propounded views contrary to idjab [q.v.] it was the muhtasib’s duty to admonish him and to report him to the sovereign if he persisted in preaching heretical doctrines. Also, if a person not a fakih suddenly turned to the study of the fakih, the muhtasib had to make investigation in order to discover his motive and to prevent his misleading persons who might apply to him. Schools also had to be visited by the muhtasib, though not so much for the purpose of inspecting the character of the teaching as to ensure that teachers did not beat their pupils too severely (Maqrizi, Kaftâr, i. 494). Other matters which came within his jurisdiction were concerned with public amenities rather than with morals or religious institutions. Thus, in towns where the source of drinking-water was fouled or no provision was made for public wells or rain-waters, he could order the townsmen to rectify matters. He had to ensure that no house overlooked the women’s quarters of another belonging to a Muslim and that no house had projecting rain-sprouts or drains leading on to the street to the inconvenience of wayfarers, and finally that the sâk was kept clean and clear of obstacles to traffic.


**AL-MUḤÂLî [See Allâh, b. 2.]

**MUḤÂY I’l-DIN.**

**MUḤÂY I’l-DIN MUḤÂMÂD (nejmeddîn) b. ʿALû b. Ḍâjûl, a Turkh is a theologian and historian of the time of Selim I (1512-1520) and Sulaimân I (1520-1566). His father was the famous mufti Zâbîhi ʿAlû b. Ḍâjûl, a grandson of Ḍâjûl al-Dîn Mehmêd of Âq Serai (hence the epithet Ḍâjûlî). He received his theological training first from his maternal grandfather, Hisâm-Zâde Efendi, then from his father ʿAlû al-Dîn and later from Muâjz-Âd Zâde Efendi. He worked as muleeris in several medreces, in Constantinople at the Murâd medrese and at the eight schools of the Fâth mosque and in Adrianople where he was also a molla for a period. He died in retirement and was buried at Adrianople in 957 (1559); according to some, however, in 956 (1549).

His main importance lies in the fact that he edited the anonymous Ottoman chronicles, the Tâwarikh Āl-i ʿOthmân, under the title Tâwarikh Āl-i ʿOthmân. These chronicles which run from the beginning of the Ottoman empire were continued by him down to 956 (1549) i.e. till shortly before his death.

Two versions of his Chronicle exist, both of which go back to him: 1. a shorter one to which corresponds the translation of the Book manuscript by Gaudier-Spiegel: Chronica oder Acta der Turckischen Tyrannen herkomen und geführte Kriegen, aus Turckischer Sprachen verdeutsch. Vorhin nie in Druck ausgangen. Frankfurt a/O., 1567; it was also published in Latin and German by Leunclavius: Annales Sultannum Othmanidum a Turci sua lingua scriti, Frankfurt 1588; 2nd edition with index and German transl.: Neue Chronika Turkischer Nation von Turken selbs beschrieben, Frankfurt a/Main 1590; 2. a longer version: the so-called Verantian Chronicle (Codex Verantianus), edited in Latin and German by Leunclavius: Historiarum Mussulmanae Turchorum de monumenti et omnium scriptorum libri XVIII, Frankfurt 1591. There were 18 books instead of the 30 planned. As early as 1590 the first three books were published in German at Frankfurt: Neuuer Musulmanischer Histori, Türkisch Nation, von ihrem Herkommen, Geschichte und Taten; drey Bücher, die ersten unter derselben, followed by the complete German translation of the Annales: Neuuer Musulmanischer Histori, Türkischer Nation, Frankfurt a/M. 1595.

In addition to his chronicle, which exists only in manuscript (MSs. in Vienna, Munich, Berlin, Gotha, London, Constantinople etc.), Muhyi al-Dîn is also credited with poems in Turkish, Arabic and Persian (also extant in a manuscript) and a theological work.
Bibliography: Hâdijî Khâlifa, Kaîfî al-Zanûn, Constantinople 1311, p. 218; Tashkoprûände, Shâhîk al-Nâmâyînî, Constantinople 1269, p. 389; transl. by O. Rescher, Constantinople 1927, p. 247; Djâmal al-Dîn, 8tâmânîl TuRîh see Mescurîyelînî (Aynâne-i Zîrefâ), Constantinople 1314, p. 10 and 25; Rifât, Rowâât al-âzîzî, p. 180; Thurayîa, Siyâtî-ye tilhîmînî, ill. 488; Bursâlî Mehmed Tâhir, 8tâmânî Muhammadî ve Dîrîcî, in: 63; Babinger, G. O. W., p. 72—74; J. H. Mordtmann, Id., x. 160; xiii. 135 sqq.; Carl Außerer, ibid., xii. 226 sqq.; F. Giese, M.O.G., i. 49—75; P. Witte, ibid., i. 77 sqq.; see also the Catalogues of Manuscripts. (Th. Menzel)

Muhîî Lâri (d. 933 = 1526—1527), a Persian writer, author of the famous Futûh al-Haramain, a poetical description of the two holy cities, Mecca and Medina, which also contains a full account of all the rites of the obligatory pilgrimage (hajî). This book, written in 911 (1506) and dedicated to Muizzâr b. Muhammed Shâh of Guddarât (917—932 = 1511—1526), was for a long time wrongly attributed to the celebrated poet 'Abd al-Rahmân Lûfû, Muhîî Laïî was a pupil of the great philosopher Muhammad al-Dawâmî (d. 907 = 1501) and made u-e of his extensive philosophical knowledge in a commentary on the great TaRîh of Ibn al-Farûd, which is known as al-TaRîh al-kübûrî. In this work he endeavoured, following in the footsteps of his teacher, to reconcile the principles of orthodox Muhammadan mysticism with the teachings of Aristotle in the form in which they were dissiminated in the east.


(E. Berkhejs)

Mu'in al-Dîn Sulaimân Parwâna, vice-regent of the Saljûq Empire in Asia Minor after the Mongol invasion of that territory. His father Muhammedallah al-Dîn 'Ali al-Dulamî (in some sources, such as the TuRîh-i Gazîh, Mu'in al-Dîn is called „al-Kâshî”, which implies origin from Kâshân) had been a minister during the reign of Kaîfîsraw II and had been able, after the battle of Ko-cê Dagh (1243), to secure for a time the continuation of the Saljûq dynasty in Asia Minor, by his intercession with the Mongol general Bajîdî (Ibn Bîbî, p. 243). His son Mu'in al-Dîn Sulaimân soon rose to hold important offices and had been commander of Ko-tak, and later of Ko-tak and Erezdûm, when, in 1256, he was promoted, by the favour of Bajîdî, to the rank of parwânî. The title parwânî denotes a high administrative office (high chancellor) in the Saljûq empire and is erroneously explained by the Persian dictionaries as a synonym of farwânî (the word is fully discussed in the foot-note on p. 459 of Erdtemir's article in T.O.E.M., vol. viii.; cf. also Haart, Les Saints, etc., i. 80). At the time indicated the three sons of Kaîfîsraw were nominally reigning, but Mu'in al-Dîn was already the real director of affairs. After Hîlûdî had appeared on the scene in 1260, the empire was divided into two parts, of which Rukn al-Dîn Kîlîdî Arslân got the eastern part with Parwâna as vizier at his side. The latter had also a family connection with the dynasty, for he was married to a daughter of Kaîfîsraw II, while one of his own daughters became the wife of the Saljûq Ghiyâtî al-Dîn Mas'ûd. As vizier of Rukn al-Dîn he conducted Sinao (Sînhû) from the Greek emperor of Trebizond; the town was given to himself, and after his death some of his descendants continued to reign there (cf. Sînî and Tewülj, Sînûhû Parwânî-xâdetê, in T.O.E.M., 1st year, p. 203). In February 1265 Parwâna, warned that his sultan wanted to get rid of him, had him imprisoned and afterwards strangled at Ak-Serêy. The two and a half years' old son of Rukn al-Dîn, Ghiyâtî al-Dîn Kaîfîsraw, was set up as a puppet-king. During the following years, when Parwâna was, under the supervision of the Mongols, the real master in Eastern Anatolia, the wretched situation of the country induced many notable Turks to emigrate to Egypt, where they incited Sîlûn Bâibars to a military expedition against the Mongol domination in their country. It is highly probable that Mu'in al-Dîn Parwâna himself was secretly at the head of these negotiations. Bâibars invaded Asia Minor, defeated a Mongol army at Albistan and occupied the town of Kaîfîsraw in April 1277. Here he waited for Parwâna to join him, but the latter had lost his confidence in the enterprise and fled to Ko-tak with the young sultan. Bâibars returned to Asia Minor and soon a Mongol army appeared under the Ilkhan Bâbâqa to inflict drastic punishment on the Muslim population; he is said to have killed over 200,000 people. At the same time suspicion fell on Parwâna. He was accused of having fled with his army at the battle of Albistan, of having not appeared before the Ilkhan after the defeat, and of having neglected to inform the Mongols of Bâibars' approach. At first Bâbâqa was willing to spare him, but on the insistence of the relatives of those killed in the battle of Albistan, he ordered him to be executed at Ala Dagh, together with his retainers, probably on the 1st Rabî' 1 676 (August 2, 1277). Ala Dagh is, according to Khâlîf Edhem, probably the same as Kose Dagh, to the east of Sivas. His burial place is not known. A foundation inscription on a mosque built by Mu'in al-Dîn Parwâna in 663 (1264—1265) is still extant in Marzîfûn. His death inspired several poets to make elegies on him (Munadjâmîn Bâbâqa). From the tradition of the Mâlawî order it appears that Parwâna was on intimate terms with Djalîl al-Dîn Rûnî; the latter's work Fihi mâyû fi dikâhâ is dedicated to him (cf. Kropûlû M. Fu'ûd, Kitâb matgâwanî, p. 258).

Bibliography: The Saljûq-nâmê's of Ibn Bûhî (Horsiana, Recueil, iv.) and of Aşrêjî (used in manuscript by modern authors); Rashîd al-Dîn, Dûmî 1 al-Tawârîhî, ed. Blochet, Paris 1911, p. 548; Hayton, in Historiens armeniens des Crusades, ii. 179; al-Makrî, al-Sulâk bi-Mârûth al-Murîkh, translated by Quatremêre (1837—1844) and by Blochet, 1908; al-Nuwairî, Nihayat al-Arab (used by Weil, Geschichte der Chalîfîen, iv.); Abu 'l-Fida', TaRîhî, Constantinople, 1280, iv. 10; Mustawfî, TaRîhî-i Guzûd, in G.M.S., 1910, p. 484; Munadjâmîn Bâbâqa, Şâhidî al-Akhbâr, ii. 571—573; J. von Hammar, Geschichte der Ilkhanîen, Darmstadt 1842, ii. 299; Nâdîb 'Aşîm, Türk TaRîhî, Constantinople 1316.
Additions and Corrections

P. 530b, l. 32; p. 543a, l. 29: instead of 828, read 28.
P. 672a, l. 9, 62; p. 674a, l. 3: instead of Rec. Hist. Crois., read Rec. d. textes rel. à l'Hist.
P. 673b, l. 22: instead of 1101, read 1108; l. 62: instead of Gubaz, read Gubar.
P. 674b, l. 54: instead of SA'UD, read SÅM.
P. 686a, l. 45: instead of Wâkî'ânâgâr, read Wâkî'a nigâr.
P. 688a, l. 43, 55, 63: instead of Mir, read Mere; l. 66: instead of in May 1624, read in May 1624.
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MU'IN AL-MISKIN whose full name was MU'IN AL-DIN MUHAMMAD ASIM B. HAJAJ MUHAMMAD HAMARDI, who was born in 901 (1496). He was the son of Haib abu Muhammad, a Buyid governor of al-Hawza, and his father had been killed by the Shahin. He studied Hadith for 31 years and throughout this period preached Friday in the great mosque of Herat. He was for year kadi of Herat but gave up the post by his own request. In 866 (1461-1462) at the request of a friend, he began to write a little book on the life of the Prophet Muhammad. Out of this little book there grew in time the great biographical work, exceedingly popular in the East, called Madarij al-Nubuwaa fi Madaniyit al-Futuwa, which was not finished till 891 (1486) and contains a very full account of the life of the Prophet, consisting of a Mahuddima, four books and a Khutba. Mu'izz also wrote a commentary on the Kuran entitled Bahr al-Durar and a collection of forty hadiths, *Kawafat al-Wazin.* His study of the history of the prophets produced a large history of Moses entitled Mu'izziti Mawazi (also called Turarih-i Mawazi or Kitab-i Mawazi), which was completed in 904 (1498-1499), and the story of Yusuf and Zulalash, *Ahlan al-Kipas.*


AL-MU'IZZ. [See ALIH, II.]

AL-MU'IZZ B. BADIS. [See ZIRIDS.]

MU'IZZ AL-DAWLA, Abu 'l-Husain Ahmad b. Ahmad, a Buyid, was born in 303 (915/916). After the taking of Shiraz by the Buyids he brought Kirmān under his rule in 324 (935-936). When the rebel governor of al-Ahwaz, al-Barid (q.v.), after several unsuccessful encounters with Bedjekm (q.v.), the general of the Abbasid caliph, sought the help of the lāyād Imād al-Dawla, the latter sent his brother Ahmad against al-Ahwaz with an army; Bedjekm was defeated first at Arradjan and then at 'Askar Mubān (326 = 935), whereupon Ahmad took this town; but when he demanded as a reward for the help he had given that al-Barid should help the Buyids Rukn al-Dawla against Wazirgrī, the brother of Mardawājān (q.v.), al-Barid refused and went to Basra. After Ahmad had received reinforcements from Imād al-Dawla, he was able to take al-Ahwaz. In 332 (943-944) he undertook a campaign against Wāṣit while the Amir al-Umarā, the Turkish chief Tuzan, was involved in a war with the Hamādān of al-Mawsil. Tuzun hurriedly made peace and set out against Ahmad, and the two armies met in Dhu l-Ka'da of this year (July 944). The details are variously given; it is certain at least that Ahmad soon afterwards returned to al-Ahwaz. At the end of Rādugh the following year (middle of March 945), he made a further attempt to take the town but had to withdraw the next month on the approach of Tuzun. In 334 (945) he attacked Wāṣit for a third time; its governor had gone over to his side and the town surrendered without a blow being struck; he then marched against Baghādād and in Dhumādād 1334 (December 945) entered the capital where he at once seized the power. The caliph al-Mustakfi appointed him governor of Fārs and gave him the title Mu'izz al-Dawla but was deposed and blinded a few weeks later because he was alleged to be dealing with the enemies of the Buyids. Mu'izz al-Dawla was soon afterwards attacked by the Hamādān Nāṣir al-Dawla of al-Mawsil, who advanced on Baghādād along with Abu Djalār b. Shīraḍ and very quickly occupied the eastern part of the capital. Nāṣir al-Dawla was not driven back till Mahārām of the following year (Aug. 946) when he made peace with the Buyids but without consulting his Turkish allies. The latter were angered at this and turned against him. Nāṣir al-Dawla had in fact given them in bringing the Turks to terms with the help of the Buyids; he then returned to al-Mawsil as a vassal of the Buyids. Abu l-Kāsim, son and successor of al-Barid, was the next to be dealt with. Mu'izz al-Dawla sent an army against him which put his forces to flight and in 336 (947) he took the field in person. Abu l-Kāsim fled to the Karmāţāns of al-Bahram and Mu'izz al-Dawla occupied Bašra. Abu l-Kāsim's governor Ūmir b. Shāhīn however held out in al-Dumāda, the capital of the Euphrates territory between Wāṣit and Basra, and after several years fighting Mu'izz al-Dawla had to confine him in his governorship. In 337 (948-949) Mu'izz al-Dawla undertook a campaign against al-Mawsil because Nāṣir al-Dawla did not send the tribute imposed on him. The latter died to Nāṣīb, but when Rukn al-Dawla, brother of Mu'izz al-Dawla, was attacked by the Sāmānids, Mu'izz al-Dawla had to send him help and concluded peace with the Hamādānīs. In 347 (958-959) Nāṣir al-Dawla rebelled against him but on the approach of Mu'izz al-Dawla he left al-Mawsil and went first of all to Nāṣīb and then to Hīlab to his brother Saif al-Dawla, while Mu'izz al-Dawla advanced on al-Mawsil and took this town and also Nāṣīb. Through the intervention of Saif al-Dawla however peace was made (Mahārām 348 = March-April 959). In the last year of his life Mu'izz al-Dawla had to fight the Karmāţāns and Ūmir b. Shāhīn. The former acknowledged his suzerainty; the war against the latter was interrupted by the death of Mu'izz al-Dawla on 13th or 17th Rabi'i 1135 (March 28 or April 1, 967).

MU'IZZ AL-DAWLA — AL-MU'IZZ LI-DIN ALLAHI


AL-MU'IZZ LI-DIN ALLAH — AL-MU'IZZ LI-DIN ALLAH

Mu'izz al-Dawla (AH 357; AD 970) was the fourth Fatimid caliph (351—357 AH) and the son of al-Rahman III. His administration was marked by a series of reforms, including the suppression of the Karmatian Rebellion and the reinstatement of the Maghribi nobility. He was succeeded by his brother, al-Hasan al-Dawla (AH 357—362, AD 970—975), who continued his policies.

The Fatimid Caliphate was established in Egypt in AD 908 by the Berber chieftain Ibn al-'Arab, who declared himself al-Mu'izz li-Din Allah. The dynasty eventually became the most powerful in the Islamic world, with territories stretching from Spain to Yemen. However, its downfall was hastened by infighting among the Fatimid ruling class and external threats, particularly from the Mongol armies.

During his reign, Mu'izz al-Dawla faced significant challenges, including a rebellion by his brother, al-Ishna al-Baghdadi, and the need to address the growing power of the Mamluk military. Despite these difficulties, he was able to consolidate his rule and establish a stable administration.

Mu'izz al-Dawla is remembered for his patronage of the arts and learning, and for his patronage of the sciences, particularly astronomy, mathematics, and medicine. He was also known for his policy of toleration towards non-Muslims, which was reflected in his efforts to establish a system of religious pluralism within the Fatimid realm.

The Fatimid Caliphate ultimately succumbed to the combined pressures of external aggression and internal strife, leading to its eventual decline and the rise of the Ayyubid state in Egypt. However, the legacy of Mu'izz al-Dawla and his successors remained significant in the history of Islamic civilization, as they played a crucial role in the development of the Middle East and North Africa.
the Ḥamdānid amīr of al-Mawji, and with the aid of subsidies from them and some Ikhwānid contingents, defeated and killed Djiṣfar and recaptured Damascus in Dhu 'l-Qa'da 360 (Aug.–Sept. 971). Having shut up the remaining Egyptian forces in Yafhā, he marched on Cairo, but was defeated by Djawhar in Rabī' I 361 (Dec. 971), and his fleet was destroyed at Tinnīs. The Karmatians returned their hold on Damascus, however, repulsed a strong Maghribī force despatched to Palestine by Djawhar in Ṣaḍrān 361, and with an army of Arab auxiliaries and Ikhwānid (some sources also add Dailamites) made a second descent upon Egypt after the arrival of al-Muʾizz. By bribing the Arabs, the Caliph succeeded in dividing and defeating the Karmatian army outside Cairo in Ṣaḍrān 363 (May–June 964), but not before Karmatian forces had overrun both the Delta and the Ṣaʿūd. On al-Ḥasan’s return to al-ʾAṣwān the Ḍulqār Zāḥm b. Mawḥūb occupied Damascus on behalf of al-Muʾizz, but came into conflict with the Maghribi troops, whose indiscipline and excesses at length led the citizens to appeal to the Turkish general al-Afsakīn, who remained in possession of the city until he was captured by al-ʾArīz [q.v.]. Meanwhile in northern Syria the Fāṭimid troops gained a series of striking successes against the Greeks. Tripoli and Bairūt were captured in 364 (975), and John Zimiskes suffered a crushing defeat both on land and sea at the hands of Raiyān, governor of Tripoli, on his attempt to recover the city.

The empire which al-Muʾizz bequeathed to his successor, though it fell short of his ambitions, was one of imposing extent. The viceroy to whom he had committed them, Bulakki b. Zīrī [q.v.], proved both loyal and capable; when, on the departure of the Caliph, the Zenāta again rose in revolt, he scattered their forces and recaptured Tahārī and Tilīmsān. The holy cities of Mecca and Madīna acknowledged the suzerainty of the Fāṭimids, and they had a powerful following in Sind. Only in Syria had the Karmatians, on whose cooperation al-Muʾizz had confidently relied (though the letter reproduced by al-Maqrīzī, Ḥiṣārī, ed. Bunz, p. 133 sqq. is of doubtful genuineness), brought him to a halt, but by this action they had placed a fatal obstacle in his way. This disappointment preyed on his mind and, worn out by ill-health and by grief at the loss of his eldest son ʿAbd al-Allāh (died 364), he died at Cairo on 11th Rabī' II, 365 (Dec. 10, 975), having nominated as his successor his second son Nizār al-ʿAzīz.

The personal character of al-Muʾizz was singularly noble; frank, accessible, simple in his habits, endowed with brilliant gifts and all the traditional qualities of ḥilm, he was at the same time a capable administrator and just towards his subjects, though the financial exactions of his last years left a bitter memory. No instance of cruelty is recorded of him, except the execution of his Karmatian captives, and he was completely devoid of religious fanaticism.


MUʾIZZI, AʾMIR ABU ʿABD ALLĀH MUḤAMMAD b. ʿAbd al-Malik, one of the most famous of Persian court poets. His place of birth is not exactly known. According to most of the sources he was born in Samarkhand about 440 (1048—1049) but Nasā and Niṣḥāpūr are also mentioned. The son of a little known poet ʿAbd al-Malik Burhānī, who was attached to the court of the Salmāqān ʿAlī Ardān (1063—1072), he was introduced to Sulṭān Malik-Shāh (1072—1092) by Amir ʿAli b. Fārāmūz, ruler of Yard (443–488 = 1051/1502—1092), made a favourable impression on the sultan and received from him the taqṣīqūς of Muʿizzī, which comes from the šīb of Malik-Shāh, Muʿizz al-Dīn. He enjoyed even greater distinction under the last great Salmāqān ruler Sandjar (1118—1157) and was appointed his malik al-ṣaʿāʿīr and the head of a regular establishment of poets, sandjarī, in 1105. He is reputed to have become fabulously wealthy from the splendid gifts of the ruler and he received a salary paid out of the revenues of Isfahān. Nevertheless, he continually tried to increase his fortune and, as he himself tells us, never wrote a single panegyric without making certain in advance that his work would be well paid. According to the Oriental sources, he came to a tragic end, being accidentally killed by Sulṭān Sandjar, while practising archery in his tent. This is not possible however, as Muʿizzī himself mentions this incident in his Diwān and says that, although he suffered a long illness as a result of being struck by the arrow, he completely recovered in the end. This event took place in Marv, about 764 (1051—1052), but he lived for another 46 years and died in 512 (1117—1118). There is an elegy written on the occasion of his death in the Diwān of Malik al-Dīn Sanʿāt Muʿizzī is one of the most brilliant writers of šība in the old Ghurānī style (ʿUnṣūrī) but his art was finally displaced by Anwarī's new style and came to be forgotten.


MUḤĀBALAH, Gr. μοιχαλασθής, in the Almagist ἀντίστροφοσ, Lat. oppositus, the term in astronomy for the opposition of a planet and the sun or of two planets with one another. In opposition the
difference in longitude between the two heavenly bodies is 180°; while the modern use is to take no note of the deviations of latitude from the ecliptic. al-Battānī expressly emphasizes (Opus astronomicon, ed. Nallino, ii. 196) that we can only have the true muqābalah when both bodies are either in the ecliptic itself or are in equal ecliptical latitudes, when opposition can occur and when they are diametrically opposite one another in the heavens (cf. "ışıkçığ"."). Opposition with the sun can only occur for the moon and the outer planets (in ancient astronomy only for Mars, Jupiter and Saturn), not for the two inner ones, Mercury and Venus. When an outer planet is in opposition to the sun, its conditions of visibility are at their best: at midnight it passes through the meridian and is above the horizon the whole night. When the moon is in opposition to the sun we have the full moon; the usual technical expression for this in Arabic astronomy is al-āıkāhāl which is derived from the same root as muqābalah (Greek ἡ παράστασις) and is rendered by Plato Tiburtinus and other mediaeval translators by proxenable; but we not uncommonly find the general term muqābalah applied to the opposition of the sun and moon, while on the other hand we never find al-āıkāhāl used in the general sense of opposition of the planets (cf. al-Battānī, ii. 349, s. v. bāb I).

Al-muqābalah, opposition, forms along with al-tārīb faqatūrā (Gr. τριγώνον, Lat. triangulum, trigonum, trigonion, etc.), al-āıkāhāl (Gr. ἡ τριγώνων, Lat. hexagonum, hexagonum, sexaginta, sexaginta sexaginta), the four astrological aspects (ażkāl, sīr, ışıkçığ, Gr. σχηματικά, σχηματικά, etc.) are applied to the ecliptical differences in longitude of two planets to the amount of 90°, 120° or 60° respectively. The ışıkçığ also play a part in the astrological arrangement of the signs of the zodiac (burūjūd) (cf. the astrological atlas of al-Battānī, ii. 194). It should be noted that the conjunction of planets (muqābalah, Greek συμπέρασμα; for moon with sun [new moon] always ṣarfīmī) is not included among the ışıkçığ, nor the position when the difference of latitude is 30° or 150° (cf. al-Battānī, op. cit.).

In horoscopes muqābalah and tārīb are as a rule regarded as unfavourable in principle, taḥtīkāt and tāsīt on the other hand as favourable.


(Willy Hartner)

**MUKADDAM (a.).** "placed in front". Applied to persons the word means the chief, the one in command, e.g. of a body of troops or of a ship (captain). Dozy, Suppl. s. v., gives a number of police appointments which have this name. In the deriv. orders the word is used for the head of the order or the head of a monastery.

As a neuter noun the word is a technical term in logic and arithmetic. In logic it means the _prōtasis_ in a premise in the form of a conditional sentence, e.g. "if the sun rises (it becomes day)", where this whole sentence is to be regarded as premise of a syllogism. But as every sentence can be a premise, muqābalah is really identical with the condition in the conditional sentence. In arithmetic _muqābalah_ means the first of two numbers in a proportion, i.e. 3 (5) or in other words the divisor in a divided in a simple division. —

In logic and in arithmetic the portion following the _muqābalah_ (in brackets above) is called _tārīb_.

**Bibliography:** Dozy (cf. above) and other dictionaires; Thorning, _Beiträge zur Kritik der Aristotelischen _Tērēs_. (Turk. Bibl. xvi.), p. 106; _Dict. of Technical Terms_, ed. Sprenger, p. 1215; 1362.

(M. Plessner)

**AL-MUKADDASĪ, SHAMS AL-DIN ABD AL-ʿABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD B. ABD BAKR AL-BANNA' B. AL-SHAYH BIL MUKADDASĪ AL-MARKHUB B. L-BASHSHARI as he is called on the first page of the Berlin manuscript (Cat. Ahlwardt, N°. 6034), is the author of the most original and at the same time one of the most valuable geographical treatises in Arabic literature. The name-form al-Mukaddasī, denoting his origin from Jerusalem, goes back to Sprenger, who brought the Berlin manuscript from India and made this author first known in Europe (A. Sprenger, _Die Post- und Reisereisen des Orients_, Leipzig 1844, p. xviii.), but the form al-Makdisi is probably more correct as Jerusalem is commonly spelt al-Makdis (Yaṅut, Makīyīm, iv. 590). Yaṅut always quotes him as al-Bashshārī.

Biographical dates on the life of this author are only to be found in the text of his treatise. In 356 (966), when he was at Mecca, he was about twenty years of age; it is probable that he lived at least as late as 1000, as the last datable information in the treatise belongs to the end of the ivth (xiiith) century. His grandfather Abū Bakr al-Banna' was an architect in Palestine and had made for Ibn Tullīn the gates of the town of Ḍakā. His mother's family was originally from Byār in Kūm, from where his grandfather Abū Tāyib b. al-Ṣawī (in B.G.A., iv., p. vii., l. 12 "paternus" is to be corrected into "maternus") emigrated to Jerusalem. Muhammad b. Abīd himself shows also a good knowledge of architecture, besides a good literary and general erudition.

The geographical treatise is known from two old manuscripts which form the basis of the Geoe's edition in the B.G.A., iii. Leyden 1877 and of his revised edition of 1906. The Berlin manuscript has the title _Aḥsan al-Ṭahżīb fi Muṭṭaf al-ʿĀbīl_ (in B.G.A., iv., p. vii., l. 12 "paternus" is to be corrected into "maternus") emigrated to Jerusalem. Muhammad b. Abīd himself shows also a good knowledge of architecture, besides a good literary and general erudition.

The geographical treatise is known from two old manuscripts which form the basis of the Geoe's edition in the B.G.A., iii. Leyden 1877 and of his revised edition of 1906. The Berlin manuscript has the title _Aḥsan al-Ṭahżīb fi Muṭṭaf al-ʿĀbīl_, while the Constantinople manuscript (Aya Sofia, N°, 297 bis; cf. Ritter, in Ill., xix., 43), written in 658 (1260), is only indicated as _Kitāb al-ʿĀbīl_. The Leyden manuscript (Cat., v. 191) is a modern copy of the Constantinople one, while another Berlin manuscript (Cat. Ahlwardt, N°. 6033) is a bad copy of the other Berlin manuscript. The date of composition is not certain. The text itself states that it was completed in 375 (985) (E. G. A., iii. 9), but as has been said, information of a later date has been added, while Yaṅut (i. 653) gives the year 378 (988). The manuscript (Constantinople) is somewhat less extensive than Berlin) and de Geoe, hesitatingly, considers the dedication of as the older one. It is dedicated to a certain Abū ʿAbd al-Mukaddasī, but for the dates and mentions the Sāmānids as the most important dynasty; B, on the contrary, does not contain the dedication and is more orientated towards the Fatimids.

The general scope of the work proves beyond doubt that it is based on the same geographical tradition as the treatises connected with the names
al-Balkhi — al-Iṣṭakhrī — Ibn Hawkal; the same
is proved by the fact that the maps accompanying
both manuscripts show the still rather primitive
type of the Iṣṭakhrī maps (the Markāsī maps have
been published by K. Miller, in *Mappeae Arabicae*,
vol. i.—v., Stuttgart 1926—1931). In this last
respect al-Makdisī’s work does not really reflect
the considerable progress of geographical know-
ledge that is manifested in the text. As in the
texts of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawkal the object is
to treat only the Islamic world (*mamlukat al-Islām*)
of the ivth (xth) century and that after a division in
to regions (*āḏāli‘n*) which, on the whole, is the
same as that of the two authors mentioned; the
order is not always the same, but the distinction
between western and eastern regions is maintained.
The treatment is often more detailed than with
the earlier authors, while the disposition of the
geographical matter is the same, each region ending
with a survey of the distances between the different
towns. In how far al-Makdisī is dependent on al-
Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawkal remains to be examined.
His introductory chapters show not a few original
features and are especially valuable for information
about earlier geographical authors. As de Goeje
has already remarked, this information is more
accurate in the reduction C than in B: if the latter
reduction is really later it would seem that the
rather depreciating judgment he gives therein of
al-Balkhi, al-Djaihani and others (p. 4) must be
explained by the change of the author’s political
predilection in favour of the Fatimids and occi-
dental Islam. Al-Makdisī’s style and language is
sometimes difficult, owing to his expressly stated
devour to adapt himself in the description of
each region to the special idiom used in that
region. Moreover, the reading of his text is several
times made unpleasant by the boisterous way in
which the author speaks of the merits of his work.
A English translation of part of the treatise was
published by G. S. A. Rankinger and R. F. Azoo
in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta 1897—1910,
vol. i.—iv.

**Bibliography:** The author and the work are discussed by de Goeje in the introduction to vol. iv. of the *B.G.A.*, p. vi.—viii.; further cf. Brockelmann, *G.A.L.*, i. (J. H. Kramers)

[**AL-MUKADDIM** [See Allāh, II.]]

**MUKALLA** (Makalla), a seaport on the south coast of Arabia, 2½ miles N.W. of the
cape of the same name. The town lies between
two bays at the foot of a reddish limestone cliff,
which rises to a height of 500 feet behind the town;
four towers for the defence of the town are built
upon it. On the west side a wall runs from the
cliff to the shore with only one gate in it. The
only buildings of any size are the great mosque on
the coast with a minaret which can be seen from
a great distance, and the sūfī’s palace; the other
buildings are mainly huts with a few houses
of stone. The palace is a great six-storey building
with decorated windows which stands on a kind
of platforms. In the centre of the town is a large
cemetery with the tomb of Wali Ya’qūb; in the
modern western part of the town is the bazaar
which is provided with all kinds of goods and
has some modest industries which provide the
native population with baskets, pipes of a kind
of limestone, silver powder-horns and muskets
without stocks. There is a yard in the harbour
where the native sailing-boats are built. The
country around is not fertile: a mile to the west
however is an oasis belonging to the ruler, which
is watered by a stream which also provides the
town’s water supply. The climate of Mukalla is
very dry, the coast hot; only from October to
April and in June and July do fresh breezes and
showers temper the heat. The population varies
between 6,000 and 12,000.

Mukalla is the only place between ‘Aden and
Maskat that deserves the name of harbour. It
cannot however be used as an anchorage during
the southwest monsoon: in this period its place
is taken by Burām, 16 miles southwest. The trade
with India, Somaliland, the Red Sea and Maskat
is considerable. The exports are mainly gum-arabic,
skins, honey from the Yeshbom valley, senna and
some coffee; the imports are cotton goods, metals,
pottery from Bombay, dates and dried fruits from
Maskat, coffee from ‘Aden, sheep, goats and frankin-
cense from the African coast. The fisheries also
give a considerable yield while amber is obtained
in considerable quantities. Parsis and bairains from
Bombay play a leading part in the trade and
Hindustān is spoken almost as much as Arabic.
Since 1881 Mukalla has been under the al-Ka‘ītī
dynasty with which England concluded a treaty
granting a protectorate on May 1, 1888. According
to Ibn al-Mudjhāwīr, the old name of the town was
al-Mukānnā, and the natives also call al-Mukalla,
like al-Shīhr. Bender al-Akhāf or Sūq al-Akhāf.
The port has steam-ship communication with ‘Aden;
most of the traffic is borne by native sailing-boats
of 100—300 tons, which are busiest at the time of
the date harvest.

**Bibliography:** A. Spranger, *Die Post- und
Reiserrouten des Orients* (Abh. f. d. Kunde des
Morgenlandes, iii./3, Leipzig 1864), p. 145; L.
Hirsch, *Reisen in Süd-Arabien, Mahra-Land und
Hadramī‘*, Leyden 1897, p. 83—92; ders., *Ein
Aufenthalt in Makalla (Sulawabiat)*, in *Globis*
lxii. (1897), p. 37—40; Th. Bent, *Southern
Arabia*, London 1900, p. 74—77; C. Landberg,
*Études sur les dialectes de l’Arabe meridionale*,
i. Leyden 1901, p. 148; F. Stuhlmann, *Der
Kampf um Arabien zwischen der Türkei und
England, in Hamburgische Postschwan., i., Hamb-
burg 1916*, p. 145 sqq. *Mukalla* in *Handbook of
the Gulf*; 1 vol. *General compiled by the Geographical
Section of the Naval Intelligence Division, Naval
Staff, Admiralty London*, p. 232; A. Grohmann,
*Sulawabiat als Wirtschaftsgebiet*, i. (Osten u.
Ortsforschungen, vol. iv., Vienna 1922), p. 21,
39, 137, 139, 145; 146, 148, 152, 154, 162,
168, 187 sqq., 202; ii. (Brunn 1931), p. 47—49,
55, 60, 61, 66, 73, 77, 81—84, 88 sqq., 93; D.
v. d. Meulen and H. v. Wissmann, *Hand-
worterbuch der Zeit*, Leyden 1932, index, s. v.
Makalla.

(Adolf Grohmann)

[**AL-MUKALLAD** R. AL-MUSAYYIH, ḤUSAYN AL-
Dawla Abū Ḥassan, an ’Uṣūl id. After the death in 386 (1996) or 387 (1997) of the ʿUṣūl
emir Abu ’l-Dhawwād Muḥammad b. al-Musayyih
[cf. PAH AL-DAWLA], a quarrel arose between
his brothers, ‘Ali and al-Mukallad, each of whom
claimed power. ‘Ali was the elder: but al-Mukallad
wrote to Bahāʾ al-Dawla and promised him an
annual tribute and then told his brother that Bahāʾ
al-Dawla had appointed him governor of al-Mawṣil
and asked ‘Ali’s help to take the town. Bahāʾ al-
Dawla’s general in al-Mawṣil, Abū Djaʿfar al-Ḥadi-
Muñán, a steppe lying to the south of the lower course of the Araxes, one part of which (about 5,000 square kilometres) belongs to Russia (U.S.S.R.) and the other (50 x 70 X c. 50 kilometres) to Persia. The steppe which covers what was once the bottom of the sea has been formed by the alluvial deposits from the Kur (in Russian Koura) and its tributary the Araxes. The latter has several times changed its course and one of its arms flows directly into the gulf of Kžil-Aghız. In the interior the only water in Múñán is from a number of springs, but it is covered with tall and shows traces of the old system of irrigation. Múñán has a very mild climate in winter (Kazwini calls it waṭrān ḏijhān) and in the spring is covered by a rich carpet of verdure but in summer the heat makes it a regular hell and it is infested with snakes. Most of the time, however, there is in June the snakes literally covered the ground - cf. Abí Hamíd al-Ghānaṭí in Kazwini, p. 379).

The name. The old Arabic transcription (Balûghuri, Tabari) is Muñán (without article) but quite early in certain manuscripts of the Arab geographers we find Mughan (probably a popular etymology muğhan “magnificent”) which becomes general in the Mongol period. M. L. D. R., 1895, p. 633 connects the name of Muñán with that of the mentioned people by classical writers as inhabiting this region: Hecataeus, fragment 170; in Maqādis al-ʿArāj, Ponponne Mela, book iii., ch. vi. “Moghi (ad Hyrcanium fretum Albani et Moschi et Hyrcani).” This tribe is to be connected with the Caspian who lived in this region; cf. Hubeschmann, Die altarm. Ortsnamen, 1904, p. 269; cf. in Yakuti, iv. 676 the genealogy intendent by Ibn al-Kalbi, according to which Muğhan and Džulan — both inhabitants of Tabaristan — were the sons of Kamāshah (I) + Yāfiq b. Núj; cf. Genesis x.), The Chronicle of Theophanes, p. 353, has Bawadza (var. Bawazza), the Armenian geography Mukan, the Georgian Chronicle Mowakan (another Mowakan lay near the confluence of the Alazan with the Iora).

History. The Byzantine general Leontius in 678 subdued Iberia, Albania, Bukania (cf. above) and Media. The district of Muñán was conquered in 21 (642) by an officer of Surāqa Bukan who addressed a letter guaranteeing peace to “the people of Muğhan of the mountains of al-Kabdi” (Caucasus; Tabari, i. 2660). According to Baladhuri, p. 327, 329, in 25 (645) Walid b. ʿUṯka undertook a campaign against the people of Muğhan (ahl Muğhan), of al-Bahr (cf. ʾUṯma and the Taḥán ( = Taḥhan)). Another campaign of Salīd b. ʿAbdAgainst the people of Muğhan and Džulan, although successful, entailed severe losses. According to Yakut, ed. Houtsma, ii. 395, 396 in 123 the future Caliph Marwan II b. Muhammed undertook a campaign in Džulan and Muñán. Muğhan figures several times as a stronghold of Bābak (Tab., i. 1174, 1175). In the third (ninth) century Ibn Khudadkhish, p. 119, mentions one ʿAbdulla (I) as chief of Muğhan. According to al-Maṣʿūdī, Marāfī, ii. 5, in his time the Sharwān (cf. et. Muṣṭā), had conquered the states (manākha) of Lāyarim (several variants) and al-Muğhāniya. It appears from Ibn Miskawaih (ed. Margoliouth, i. 399) who mentions the isphahān of Muğhan b. Dālīna as ally of the Gīl chief Lāskarī b. Mardī, who rebelled against the Dāistan in 326 (937), that Muğhan enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy. In 339 (950) the Kurd Dāim sent his vizier “into the mountains (sūl) of Muğhan to entrench himself.” In 349 Muğhan appears as a centre of rebellion (Ibn Miskawaih, ii. 136. 178—179). The poet Kaftī mentions the rising of the isphahān of Muğhan against the Bawāḏāts Wahrāḏān (344 = 954). Kīrāwī, ʿAbdāl-khāniy gūmnā, Ẓahrā-i, 65, 123). Later we hear of Muğhan mainly as an excellent area for the winter pasturage of the conquering nomads. In Yakut’s (iv. 676) time the majority of the people of Muğhan were still Turkomans. In the history of the Khārzimshāh Dżalāl al-Din, Muğhan is constantly mentioned. The sūlān sends his humble there, keeps his baggage and mobilizes his troops there (Nasavi, Sīr, p. 210, 280, 366 etc.) But in 617 (1220—1221) the Mongol generals Džebhe and Sulubī spent the winter in Muğhan (Dżwawī, i. 116), and Kazwini, p. 379 says that Mongols took Muğhan for their winter pastures, and drove out the Turkomans. In the time of Tīmūr, Muğhan must have been included in the region of Karaḵāw near the Fergana region, which was conquered in 1340. Tīmūr restored an old canal which was given the name of his tribe Bākrā. The canal led the Araxes at Khašḵāi Campūn and at a distance of 15 farsakh ended at Sardjābš ān (sic). Since in order to give the necessary instructions, Tīmūr (who was to the north of the Araxes) had to cross the river (Zafār-nāma, i. 395), we may suppose that the canal lay to the south of the Araxes, i.e. in the steppe of Muğhan. It must correspond to the Vegin Gaur arch of which traces can still be seen for a length of about 35 miles. Sardjābš ān might correspond to Carcel on the Russian map (according
to the involved description by Monteith, the Barlas canal is issued in the neighbourhood of Kara-su¹. The canal is in any case quite distinct from another canal which Timir traced in 806 to the north of the Araxes towards the town of Balaakan (Talish.

In the Safavid period (and perhaps already under the Karakoyunlu) Mughan became the possession of the Şīrī Turkoman tribes who formed the principal support of the dynasty and became known as Şāhisewān. By article ii. of the treaty of Gulistan of 1813 the steppe of Mughan was divided between Russia and Persia. The boundary line was more precisely defined in article iv. of the treaty of Turkmenāājī. In 1854 Russia forbade Persian nomads to cross into Russian territory. Towards the end of the sixteenth century the project of irrigating the land of Mughan was conceived and realised between 1902 and 1907.

The four systems of canals were to make 200,000 hectares cultivable, particularly for cotton. From 1854 the steppe was occupied solely by nomads who were Russian subjects. But in 1917 there were already 46 Russian villages with 17,000 inhabitants while the Turkish nomads who had become settled on the banks of the Kur and of the Araxes numbered 35,000 souls. As a result of the tragic events of 1918, the whole of the Russian population had to leave Mughan and the canals became silted up. Between 1920 and 1924 the work of restoration was carried out and the fugitives began to return. The total area of irrigated land in Mughan is estimated at 253,000 hectares, while immediately to the north of Mughan the steppe of Mīl (Mil-i Balaakan), "the tower of Balaakan"; cf. Khanīwī, Mem. sur les inscriptions musulm. au Caucaus, in J.A., Aug. 1862, p. 72) has another 165,000 irrigated hectares.

Historical geography. The Arab geographers are fairly well acquainted with Mughan (cf. the Bibliography). In the Mongol period, Mughan must have comprised all the lands to the north of the Salafī range (which is a western outlier of Russian Talish) and forms the watershed between the middle course of the Kara-su and the Bolgarn), to the east of the lower course of the Kara-su (where it follows the northern direction) and to the south of the Araxes. Towards the east Mughan stretched to the Caspian Sea and included the coastal region of Russian Talish. The mountainous part of the latter, held as a vice, must also have belonged to Mughan. The same condition must have existed in the Arab period for the curious expression of Ibn Miskawishi, ii. 136 referring to the Lybāl Mukan can only refer to the mountainous part of Russian Talish.

We may note Mukaddas's remark (p. 380) who among other wonders mentions, one marhala (7—8 farsaks = 20—25 miles) distant from Mukan, an imposing fortress called al-Hira (which below are houses and palaces in which there are large quantities of gold (ţahab asim) in the form of birds and wild beasts and "many kings made plans to seize it but never succeeded in reaching it"). Mukaddas does not definitely say that the fortress belongs to Mukan and evidently speaks of it by hearsay. Is this a reference to Shinānd-šāla (which is about 50 miles = 2 marhala to the south of the presumed site of the shahrītān of Mughan)? On this imposing mountain (6,000 feet high) can still be seen ruins of important fortifications (Radde, p. 135: "ruins of a strong castle... many ruins of brick buildings"). Finally in a Persian translation of Istakhri, p. 186, 17, we read: "The Gils and the Mukan are tribes on foot who rarely go on horseback" which can only refer to a few remnants of the old population settled in upper Talish (where the highlanders are very distinct from the lowlanders.


(M. V. MINORSKY)

AL-MUKÂNTÂRÂT. [See ĀṢṬÂRÂ.]
It did little to help his fame also that he is said to have told pious stories [cf. *Kisas* in the mosque, at a time when this was strictly forbidden. In politics he is said to have belonged to the Zaidiya, in theology to the Murtadha [q.v.]

Mukaffat's literary activity was somewhat comprehensive, yet until quite recently nothing was known of his works. Only since 1912 has a Qur'an commentary by him been known in the MS. Or. 5633 of the British Museum, the genuineness of which however Goldzder did not think beyond doubt. The *Fihrist* gives a list of his works: Hadji Khalifa also gives some of them. They deal mainly with the language and exegesis of the Qur'an, but a pamphlet against the Kadiariyya is also mentioned. This is however hardly in keeping with another story, according to which he wrote a pamphlet against Djahm [q.v.], and the latter wrote against him.


(M. PRESSNER)

AL-MUKÂTÂTAM, the part of the range of hills west of the Nile, which lies immediately to the east of Cairo and from which the mountains take a north-easterly direction, bordering the Nile delta to the south-east. It reaches a height of about 600 feet and consists, as does the greater part of the north African mountains, of limestone (cf. *Description de l'Egypte*, *Etat moderne*, Paris 1822, 1/1 751).

The name Mukattam (the *Tagel al-Arūr* records also the popular form al-Mukattab) does not go back to a pre-Muhammadan nomenclature, nor is it considered, in spite of its correct Arabic formation, as a true Arabic word, for the geographers (cf. *Yakut*, iv. 607 sqq.) give, hesitatingly, different explanations of its meaning. The name occurs for the first time in the historical tradition of the Egyptian Arabs, as found in the *Fihteh Mīsīr* of Ibn `Abd al-Hakam (cf. Torrey's edition, New Haven 1899, p. 156 sqq.), in half legendary tales in which also al-Mukattab [q.v.] plays a part. Some of these traditions give it an eponymous hero, Mukattam b Miṣr b. Baisar b. Ḥamīn, and lay stress on the special sanctity of the mountain, declaring that, in some way, it is connected with the mountain of Jerusalem. As in the last mentioned traditions Ka'b al-Athār [q.v.] is named as final authority; it seems probable that the origin of the name must be sought in Jewish legendary traditions (for Jewish traditions about mountains, cf. the Midrash *Thillon* on Psalm ix. 17) and that the name has been fixed only in course of time in the ill-defined mountainous region to which it is attached since the flourishing times of al-Fārābī and al-Khārīrī. The vagueness of the geographical description has survived in the Arabic geographical sources, which either call Mukattam the entire eastern mountain range as far as Uswān (Waqt), or even represent under the name Mukattam the whole of the mountain system that runs over the inhabited world from China to the Atlantic Ocean (Ibn Hawkal and others). Moreover several geographers give the legendary statement that in the Mukattam are mines of emerald and other precious stones, while in reality it contains only stone quarries, but these were used already in very ancient times. Mārkīz, *Khitat*, ed. Būlla, i. 123 gives a fairly complete survey of the different traditions and opinions.

It may be thus assumed that the Mukattam acquired a real geographical identity only after the foundation of al-Fustat. Its geographical situation, viz. its proximity to the bank of the Nile, has deeply influenced the territorial expansion of this town and later of Cairo [q.v.]. Parts of the town and famous sites are situated on the western spurs of al-Mukattam, such as the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn and the citadel of Saladin. The elevation of Ibn Tūlūn's mosque bears,however, the special name of Djabal Yṣḥāq. The cemetery of al-Karāfī belongs likewise to the Mukattam and it is with this cemetery that are connected the ancient traditions already mentioned, in which al-Mukawkas plays a part. Al-Mukawkas informs, 'Amr b. al-As that the mountain, in which the earthy vegetation is destined to bear the plants of Paradise and the caliph 'Umar, informed by 'Amr, decides that by these plants of Paradise can only be meant Muslims who have died. Accordingly, tradition records a number of ghābūs which are buried in al-Karāfī. On the summit of al-Mukattam was built in the Fātimid period the mosque of al-Diyāyyā, by Badr al-Dinālī in 478 (1085); for this reason the mountain is also called Djabal al-Diyāyyā. On the southern slopes, towards Ḥalīn, lay the Chishtī mosque Dair al-Kuṣar (description by al-Shaḥbūsī towards 1000; cf. Sachau, in *Abh. Pr. Ab. Wiss.*, 1909), an historical, or perhaps legendary feature, connected with al-Mukattam is that the Fātimid caliph al-Hakam is said to have disappeared mysteriously, in the night of 27th Shawwāl 411 (Feb. 25, 1021), when he had gone for a ride in the Mukattam. Finally it may be mentioned that the Mukattam has given its name to one of the three genuine modern Arabic newspapers published at Cairo.

(J. H. KRAMER)

AL-MUKAWKAS, AL-MUKAWKAS, the individual who in Arab tradition plays the leading part on the side of the Copts and Greeks at the conquest of Egypt. The Prophet is said to have sent a letter to him in the year 6 A.H. In the address on this letter, the text of which is given in Ibn `Abd al-Hakam (ed. Torrey, p. 46), al-Makrizī (*Khitat*, i. 29), al-Suyūtī (*Ishārāt al-Muḥādara*, i. 58) and al-Manṣūfī (p. 29), as well as in an entirely different version in *Pseudo-Wāhidi* (p. 10), and also in the accounts of the incident in the Arab historians, the position of Mukawkas is described in the following phrases: 1. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Ishā'ārīya* (Navawi, p. 577; Ibn `Abd al-Hakam, p. 45, 52; Abū Ṣalih, p. 35 [100]); Ibn Kathīr, iii. 1 fol. 159 sqq., along with *No. 7* in Ibn Sa'd in *Weilhausen*, *Kittim* und *Vorderasien*, iv. 5 (99); 2. *Maṭūk al-Iṣā'ārīya* (Ibn `Abd al-Hakam, p. 49; al-Suyūtī, i. 60; Pseudo-Wāhidi, p. 25; Ibn Hīṣam, p. 971); 3. *Ṣaḥīḥ Miṣr* (Abū l-Fida', i. 149); 4. *Maṭūk Miṣr* (al-Manṣūfī, p. 7; cf. al-Makrizī, *Khitat*, i. 163, 22 sq.); 5. *Maṭūk Miṣr wa l-Iṣā'ārīya* (Pseudo-Wāhidi, p. 10); 6. *Ṣaḥīḥ Miṣr wa l-Iṣā'ārīya* (Pseudo-Wāhidi, **π** [100]).
All these epithets do not doubt mean simply the actual ruling authority in Egypt, whose true title was not known to the Arabs. If we remember that in the year 6 (628) the Persians were masters of Egypt, we can hardly give much credence to the story of the Arab historians. This is evident from the statement recorded by Manafi' (p. 30) that Egypt was under the rule of Mukawbas continuously from the lifetime of the Prophet, through the caliphate of Abu Bakr to the beginning of the caliphate of 'Omar. Muhammad's letter to Mukawkas was long ago declared not to be genuine by E. Amelineau (Fragmenta coptica, p. 392) and Wellhausen (Studien und Vorarbeiten, iv. 90) although they did not doubt the fact of the embassy to him: later Butler (Conquest, p. 523) and Th. Noldeke (Z. D. M. G., xlviii. 160) still believed in the embassy although the latter granted the possibility that tradition might have transferred the name known from the time of the conquest to the man to whom Muhammad sent the letter, while for example, S. Lane-Poole (Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 6, note 2) supposes that the Mukawbas of 628 and the Mukawkas of the conquest are two different people. This suggestion however is disposed of by the fact that the Mukawkas of the letter is called in Ibn Kathir the patronymic has been corrupted through مَعِكَّبَةُ التًْفَٰيْن. In Abu 'l-Fida', Nawawi only gives Diuradj, i.e. the same as the Mukawkas of the conquest; for we need not heed the patronymic of Mukawkas given by Pseudo-Wajidi (p. 10) while the epithet al-Farkab al-Nuni, which al-Masudi, Tanbih, p. 261, 3, has taken in an obviously corrupt form from an old source, is the Karkab al-Yunani of the Mukawkas of the conquest. In view of the many serious contradictions, which the transposing of Mukawkas into the period of Persian rule in Egypt offers, there is no alternative but to regard with Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, iv. 90 the story of Muhammad's embassy to Mukawkas as legendary and devoid of any historical value (cf. also G. Rouillard, p. 157 and note 2). The genuineness of the parchment found in a monastery at Aghmat by the French Egyptologist E. Barbethelamy in 1852, which was thought to be the original of Muhammad's letter to Mukawkas and was actually put among the relics of the Prophet in the old Serail, thus disappears (cf. the publication by Belin, in J.A., 1854, p. 542—548 and Dindorf edition, in Hilal, xiii./2, 1904, p. 103 sq.). Its falsity had already been recognised by J. Karbach (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Masjidaden, Leipzig 1874, p. 35, note 47 and Mittheilungen des K. K. Oester. Museums, ix. (1884), p. 183) (cf. also Noldeke-Schwy, Geschichte des Qur'ans, i., Leipzig 1909, p. 190) As a matter of fact palaeographical grounds are clearly against any assumption of a date in the first century for this document.

The same discrepancies, which we find in the transmission of the name and title of the Mukawkas of Muhammad's letter are found in the Mukawkas of the conquest. In the historians we find the following names:


Taking first of all the name of his grandfather, J. v. Karbach's theory (p. 2) to dispose of apparent contradictions in the statements about the patronymic by assuming a double name Minā Farqāb proves unnecessary, when we see the name unequivocally given in No. 2. When Karbach (p. 3) preferred the rendering Farkāb for Karkab, he was at least able to quote the form ٍثْرُبِق in the Codex Parisinus of Ibn Taghibirdi, but I cannot agree with Amelineau in supporting Karbach's proposal (Fragmenta, p. 394 sq.) to equate this name with Mukaqabas, especially if we remember the variant ٍثْرُبِق of the Ḥabā', and Noldeke must be right when he (Z. D. M. G., stxviii. 161) restores this to the پَرَكَبَمъ rejected by Karbach. The form ٍثْرُبِق (unpointed hámza) however has so far been found in only one papyrus, the more usual form being ٍثْرُبِمْس (Z. D. M. G., i. 158). Butler's conjecture (p. 523) on the name ٍثْرُبِق seems to me as improbable as Karbach's identification. He calls attention to Abū Sa'īd's observation (p. 67 [156]) that ٍثْرُبِق is a corruption of Gregorios and supposes that Karkab is a corruption of Karkar so that Ibn Karkab would be an error for Ibn Karkar and mean "son of Gregory". Casanova's proposal (in Butler, p. 523) must be dismissed as still more improbable, viz., that Ibn Karkab is a corruption of Abū Kīrūs. The office filled by Mukawkas is described by the sources in the following terms: 1. ٍشَهِب مَيْسُ (al-Balāḏūrī, p. 226); 2. مَلِك سَلِّم مَيْسُ (al-Masūdī, Ḥabīb, i. 162, 24; Ibn Dukkmān, v. 118) 3. أمīl al-Khabīr bi-Mīr (Ibn Hādjar, iii. 1090); 4. أمīl al-Sal̤īr̤ Mīr (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 64, note 9; al-Makīn, p. 29); 5. أمīl垛ٍلَّ-كِهْرَبَد بِمِيْر (Euthychius, ii. 302). If the three first terms only mean the ruler of Egypt in general, the two last named limit the sphere of activity of Mukawkas to the administration of taxation and the expression given in 4 may be taken as synonymous with amīr "governor". In this connection we have the very clear evidence of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 37 and Ibn Dukkmān, v. 119 who preserve the statement that Mukawkas was appointed by the emperor Heraclius as governor of Egypt and entrusted with the waging of war and the levying of taxation. Abū Sa'īd's statement (p. 30 [81 sqq]) that Mukawkas, Djuradj b. Minä had rented the taxes of Egypt from Heraclius for ١٠٠,٠٠٠,٠٠٠ dinārs fits in with this. This makes intelligible the statement of Euthychius (ii. 302) who calls Mukawkas controller of the land taxes (اٍمٍيٍلَّ-إلَکَرٍبٍ) and traces his attitude to the Arabs to his embezzling the taxes raised, and further explains the description of Mukawkas (مَعَكَّبَةُ التًْفَٰيْن) as تَجَّاَرِشُ مِنْهُ مَلِكَيْنَ in the Vita of Apa Samuel published by Amelineau (p. 367), to which we may add the statement of the Ethiopic Syraxar that Mukawkas had been Patriarch and financial controller of Egypt.
M. J. de Goeje and J. v. Karabacek have laid special stress on this side of the activity of Mukawkas and identified the prefect George mentioned in John of Nikit (p. 559), whom de Goeje regards as prefect of Lower Egypt and Karabacek (p. 8) as pagarch of Babylon, with Mukawkas, who is called in the sources George son of Menas. A. J. Butler (note 4 to Abū Ṣāliḥ, p. 81), Mihne and Lane-Poole have followed de Goeje while Amelineau (Fragments coptes, p. 404: Samuel de Qalqulayn, p. 24 and Résumé de l’histoire de l’Égypte, p. 243) wished to identify Mukawkas with the Patriarch George who was appointed by the emperor Heraclius as successor or deputy to Cyrus during the period of the latter’s stay in Constantinople (cf. John of Nikit, p. 256). In contrast to these attempts at identification, which are in more than one respect in contradiction to the sources, the most probable solution of the Mukawkas problem is the identification of Mukawkas with the Patriarch and governor Cyrus of Phasis, who was sent in the year 631 A.D. by Heraclius to Alexandria where he died on March 21, 642. While Zotenberg (in his edition of John of Nikit, p. 576, note 2) had already pointed out that the main features of the activity of Cyrus are found in the Arabic stones of Mukawkas, although no doubt the legend mixes up the activities of several individuals under this name, F. M. Esteves Pereira, (Vida de Aba Samuel, p. 41—53) completely proved the identity of the two. Independently J. Krall in an unpublished article for the Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung des Papyrux Erzherzog Rainer, on the authority of three new fragments of the Vita of Apa Samuel, had come to the same conclusion. The full study of the whole problem by A. J. Butler, the main result of which, the identity of Mukawkas with the Patriarch Cyrus, has been adopted by B. Evets (Patrologia Orientalis, i. 491, note 1), by M. Guidi in his doctoral thesis, C. H. Becker and O. Braun in his article on the Vita of Apa Samuel, in the Kirchliche Handlexikon, ii., col. 530 and others, has been critically examined by L. Caetani (Annali dell’Islam, iv. 56 sqq.). The decisive evidence for the identity of the two individuals is found in the History of the Patriarchs of Severus of Ashmunain (ed. Evets, p. 490 sqq.; ed. Seybold, p. 106 sqq.) in which there are references to the Patriarch and governor of Heraclius in connection with the flight of the Patriarch Benjamin once as Cyrus (عمر) then a few lines later as al-Makawkaz or al-Muṣṭakwās: the synaxars in this connection also give the name al-Muṣṭakwās (cf. E. Amelineau, Fragments coptes, S. 397, note 1; p. 398, note 1; p. 406, note 1 and the edition by R. Basset, Patrologia Orientalis, xi. 562) and the Arabic text of ibn Abi Ḥakam (Amelineau, p. 400, note 1); of peculiar importance is the text edited in R. O. C. cvi, 393, where the combined name of Cyrus al-Muṣṭakwās appear. There is the additional fact that the period of ten years which, according to the history of the Patriarchs, lay between the flight and return of the Patriarch Benjamin coincides within a year with the period of office of Cyrus (631—642) in Egypt, whom the Christian sources describe as an “unbeliever” (πασέδης, Amelineau, Fragments coptes, p. 364, 366); kafir in Severus of Ashmunain, p. 495 [108], godless and sinful Kauchios (ιατρός πασέδης ἀπαράδατας, Vienna Coptic fragments of the Vita of Apa Samuel in Krall, Kauchios frequently in Amelineau), decent Antichrist (Παντεχριστὸς ἀπάθανος in Amelineau, p. 366 sqq.) and Pseudoarchiepiskopos (Ibid., p. 365). The double position of Cyrus or Mukawkas as supreme head of the administration and archihop, of which we have ample evidence (cf. G. Rouillard, p. 230, note 1), is quite certain from the testimony of Severus (p. 490, 495 [106—108]) and the Arabic and Ethiopic synaxar (Amelineau, p. 406, note 1) and also by the Vita of Samuel (Amelineau, p. 367), was quite unknown to the Muslim Arabic sources. Noldeke has already called attention to this remarkable fact (p. 160) and may set a crux for the identification of the two figures. There was however no necessity for the Arabs to refer to his position in the church. He was only of importance to them as head of the administration. If one wants to, one can see an indication of his ecclesiastical dignity in the wish expressed by Mukawkas during the negotiations with ʿAmr regarding the capitulation of Alexandria (in Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, ed. Torrey, p. 72) that he might be buried in the Church of St. John (cf. theticon Amelineau, p. 400 sqq.). How much the Christian sources differ in their ideas of the personality and position of Mukawkas may be gathered from the description of the death of Mukawkas. According to Severus of Ashmunain (ed. Evets, p. 495; Seybold p. 108), the governor and Patriarch of Alexandria poisoned himself after the occupation of Alexandria lest he should be put to death by ʿAmr, while John of Nikit (p. 335—378) says that Cyrus weakened by vexation at the faithlessness of ʿAmr caught dysentery and died. According to Caetani, the contradictions and obscurities on the part of the Arab historians show that they did not consider who Mukawkas exactly was, but simply used the name as the family name of the chief personage in Egypt at the time of the Muslim conquest. Evidently all who negotiated with ʿAmr in the name of the Copts are included in one individual The unanimous with which Mukawkas is described as a Copt and the different names given him suggests that Mukawkas conceals not only Cyrus but also other Egyptian negotiators e.g. perhaps the commander of Babylon, George, and the bishop of the same town, Menas. The Arabs must have made one out of these two negotiators and given him like Cyrus the name Mukawkas. Of the attempts to explain this name, Karabacek’s (p. 8) معاقب is as little probable as Amelineau’s explanation (p. 407—409) which makes Kauchios “the man from Kaukhion”. We would rather think with Butler and Guidi of a connection with καυκακος, which indicates the home of Cyrus. But even this explanation is by no means certain and the connection of Mukawkas with Cyrus has again (in Canterelli) given rise to serious doubts. Nau, p. 111 has compared Mukawkas with ʿAwwad. His name survived in the Kūm al-Muṣṭakwās in the area of old Cairo (Ibn Dukmāk, iv. 53). Bibliography: Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Kitāb Futūḥ Misr wa-ʿAlḥāthā, ed. Ch. C. Torrey (in Yale Oriental Series Research, iii., New Haven 1922), p. 37, 45—49, 52 sq., 58, 63—72, 109, 156, sq., 161, 173, 175, 317; al-Kindī, Kitāb Towrīḥ Misr wa-Wulāthā, ed. Rk.
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Die Statthandler von Aegypten zur Zeit der Chalifīn,
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MUKHADRAM (A.), the term applied to
an individual whose life fell within the
periods of both paganism and Islam. Various
explanations are given of the origin of the name.
Some derive it from nāḥa muḳhānāra ("cropped ear") and say the meaning is that
they were cut off from the Dāhilīya by Islam (cf.
nāḥa muḳhānāra "a she-camel with cropped ears"). It is said that the tribes who adopted Islam cropped
ever their she-camels differently from what
they had done in the pagan period. A man who had
therefore seen both the pagan and Muslim styles
was called muḳhādram. Others derive the word
from wā ḍhāriṯ ("a well") which contains much
water" and explain that a man who has lived in
both Dāhilīya and Islam was called muḳhādram,
since he was fully acquainted with both periods.
The term muḳhādram is occasionally found with
the same application and the explanation given
is that the individuals had mixed paganism and
Islam. Some commentators describe muḳḥāḏmaṯn
only those who adopted Islam after the death of
Muhammad.

The word muḳhādram is particularly used to
describe one of the four classes into which the
Arab philologists divide the poets. One who was
devoted to this work was called in the period of the Dāhilīya, but who lived to see Muhammad and his mission
and some even adopted Islam. Among these for example were Labūd, al-ʾAṣāḥī and Kaʿb b. Zuhair.
These poets are still completely immersed in the
poetic tradition of the Dāhilīya. The new outlook
was late in finding its way into poetry so that the
change is not yet reflected in the poets who were
Muhammad’s contemporaries. The scheme of the
kaṣida of the pagan poets with its fixed themes and
stereotyped images also holds for the muḳḥāḏmaṯn
and in their poems one can hardly find the
slightest hint that they were contemporary with
the great religious change in Arabia. The only
exception is the kaṣīdas composed in honour of
Muhammad. Like the kaṣīda of Kaʿb b. Zuhair
called after its opening words Ṣūbā RETURN,
and the panegyric on the Prophet by al-ʾAṣāḥī. While
these still follow the scheme of the kaṣīda as regards form they reflect Muhammadan points of view
and legal ordinances and also use Kurānic phrases.

Bibliography: W. Ahlwardt, _Ober Poetik
and Poetik der Araber_, Leipzig 1875; Kaʾb b.
Zuhair, _La Banat Sūdā_, ed. by R. Basset, Algiers
1910; _Morgenlandische Forschungen, Festchrift
für Fleischer_, Leipzig 1875. p. 235 sq.; _Lišān
d’Arab, xv. 75; Taḏīf al-Aʾrās, viii. 281; al-
Sayūṭī, _Mukhtar_, section 49.

(UN LICHENSTADTER)

MUHKIL AS AL-DAWLA. [See AL-MUKALLAD.]
Mithdjan, was his second cousin (al-Mukhtar's grandfather father Mas'ud being the son of 'Amr b. 'Umar b. 'Awf; cf. Wustenfeld. Hist. Tafs., G. 19). He is said to have been born in 622 (Tabari, i. 1264) a statement which has perhaps no real foundation (cf. Tabari, ii. 2: in 49, he was a "young man", and is explained and based on the fact that his adversary 'Abbâl b. al-Zubair was in the same year. His father having died the death of a hero at the battle of the Bridge in 63 against the Persians, the orphan was brought up by his uncle Sa'd b. Mas'ud who became governor of al-Madâin under the caliph 'Ali. Al-Mukhtar was his deputy when Sa'd left al-Madâin to go after the Kharijis who had left 'Ali's camp in 57 (Tabari i. 3366; al-Dinawari, p. 218). His early life and his family traditions therefore made him a partisans of 'Ali: al-Tabari (it. 2) however says that when 'Ali's son al-Husayn took refuge with al-Mukhtar's uncle when fleeing from Mu'awiyah in 40, the nephew proposed to surrender him to his rival and he was reproached with this disloyal act 25 years afterwards by the Shi'is. This is all we know of the early days of one who was destined to become the champion of the extreme Shi'is: his refusal to bear witness before Ziyâd b. Abîhi against Hûdî b. 'Adî, who was accused of having attempted an anti-Umayyad rising at Kûfâ in 51 (Tabari, i. 134), shows however that his feelings were already pro-'Alid. It is only when, after the death of Mu'awiyah, the hopes of the partisans of 'Ali's family began to rise again, that al-Mukhtar emerges from obscurity; he took part in the rising of Muslim b. 'Akhill in 61 and imprisoned and was restored to him the security of Ibrahim b. al-Ashtar, son of 'Ali's famous general, who kept up his father's traditions. The latter hesitated long before accepting al-Mukhtar's proposals and only agreed on receiving a letter, undoubtedly a forgery, in which Ibn al-Hanafiya introduced al-Mukhtar to him as his plenipotentiary (amîh) and minister (wa'lîni). The rising then began (14 Rabi' i. 66): the resistance of the chiefs of the tribes (the Ashrâf), who while opposed to the Umayyads and former fighters by the side of 'Ali, had long lost their enthusiasm for the cause of his family, was overcome by the onslaught of the troops, composed for the most part of adventurers and mauwâtîs led by Ibn al-Ashtar, a most capable warrior. The Zubairid governor fled (he was at this time 'Abbâl b. Mut'î b. al-Kunfadh), the Ashrâf capitulated and al-Mukhtar, undisputed lord of Kûfâ, rapidly extended his power over Mesopotamia and the eastern provinces, to which he at once appointed governors: the south alone, with Basra, remained to Ibn al-Zubair.

Al-Mukhtar had naturally to give the Aishî positions of authority in his organisation but he could not completely gain their confidence. Although old partisans of 'Ali, or sons of partisans, they were moderates who distrusted al-Mukhtar as an extremist and demagogue: indeed, the favour which the latter showed to the mauwâtî, who formed his real support, threatened to overthrow the system on which the political and economic supremacy of the Arabs over the native population was based, for not even the conversion of the latter to Islâm had made them equal to their conquerors. Al-Mukhtar therefore was faced with the necessity of deciding for one or other. He preferred the mauwâtî party, probably more from genuine conviction than for political reasons: he must have believed that the triumph of the Mahdi whom he foresaw would make all believers equal without distinction. During the absence of the army which had gone under Ibn al-Ashtar to fight 'Abbâl al-Malik's troops, the Ashrâf made an attempt to overthrow al-Mukhtar who was forced to temporize with them; but succeeding in informing Ibn al-
Aštar of his difficulty, the latter returned to Kufa and completely routed the enemies of al-
Mukhtar. This was the signal for putting into
execution the latter's full Shi'a programme; all
those who had taken part in the murder of al-
Ijjasun, or had neglected to defend him, were
put to death. This bloody deed seemed to have
divine approval, for two days later the Syrian
army which had set out for the ʿIrāq was completely
routed on the banks of the Ḥarrar of Ibn al-
Ashtar, and its leader ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyad, who
had defeated and killed al-Ḥusain, was killed in
the battle (Muḥarram 67). In the fanatical enthu-
siasm of these days in which the Shi'a cause seemed
to have won a definite success there took place
episodes of great religious interest although un-
fortunately not yet clearly explained, notably the
worship of the empty chair (Tabari, ii. 702–706;

But in spite of his successes at home and abroad,
al-Mukhtar was threatened by the presence in
Iṣṭa of the brother of ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubair, Muḥāfīz, whose army, organised by al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣafira, hardened in the war with the Ḵānjūds and strengthened by the accession of the Ḵūfa ʿAshraf who had left the town, was one to be feared.
Indeed, the ʿAshraf troops were defeated by it at
Mukhtar's later at Harāza; they suffered a complete rout, mainly because of
the absence of Ibn al-Ashtar who was in the north
at al-Mawṣil and whom al-Mukhtar either through
distrust of him or through excess of confidence in
himself had neglected to recall. Al-Mukhtar who
had taken refuge in the citadel of Kufa held out
there valiantly for four months. Finally abandoned
by most of his men, he was slain in a desperate
sortie (Rāmaḍān 14, 67). His body was mutilated,
his hand suspended at the gate of the great mosque
(although it was only taken down many years later by
al-Daḥiqād) ; one of his wives, who would not
disown him, was executed in brutal fashion, although
she was the daughter of al-Nuʿmān b. ʿAbd Allāh
b. Ṣafira, who had been governor of Kufa under Muḥāfīz. A great many of al-Mukhtar's followers were also executed.

The nature of the movement led by al-
Mukhtar has been variously judged by modern
historians. The historical tradition which grew up
in Kufa, especially in the milieu of the Ḵānjūds, is
naturally hostile and regards him as an adventurer and
false prophet. His conduct was undoubtedly
somewhat crooked occasionally; the way in which
he exploited the name of Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya (who
never wished to be completely compromised in
the business of the Mahdi) was not quite fair.
But neither these doings nor his double dealing
with regard to the Ḵānjūds (they paid him back
however only too well) are sufficient to convict
him of bad faith. They were tactical expedients
which every one who wants to stir the masses is
justified in employing for the triumph of his cause.
It seems certain that al-Mukhtar sincerely believed
in his mission, and his equilibrating ideas about the
maswīlī, although premature, were, as the future
was to show, the only ones which could secure to
Islam its later expansion and transform it from
the exclusively Arab movement it was at first into
a world wide civilization. What is still and will
remain mysterious in the personality of al-Mukhtar
(Wellhausen rightly observes that "demonic"
traits like his are always problematic), is the
manner in which he arrived (no doubt through a
spiritualism within himself) at the religious and eschatol-
ological conception of the Shi'a of which he was
the creator and which is infinitely greater than the
expiratory sacrifice of the ʿaswāūbin of Sulaymān
b. ʿArif. It is owing to this conception that the
importance of the movement started by al-Mukhtar
is far greater than the ephemeral political success
which he enjoyed; in the popular enthusiasm which
welcomed his propaganda we see the germ of the
ideas which transformed the Shi'a from a
political movement to a religious doctrine. In what
measure these ideas were in existence before al-
Mukhtar, in what relation they stood to that enig-
matical personage ʿAbd Allāh b. Sāḥa' and his
disciples are points that are still obscure. But if
he was not the inventor of the doctrine of the
Mahdi, it was undoubtedly he who in locating in
a real person, Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya, the
mystical figure of the Messiah, the restorer of the
true religion, gave it the stamp which was hence-
forth typical of Imāmī doctrines.

The name Maḥdiyya is borne by one of the
many Shi'a subdivisions given in the lists of the
writers on heresies; but it is doubtful if it ever had
a real existence as an organised sect, especially as the
sources which mention it do not clearly distinguish
it from the Kāsīfīyya [q. v.] and the Khān-
ṣabīyā [q. v.], which seem very likely to be the
leading successor of the teachings of
al-Mukhtar.
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67 §§ 2, 4, 42 (a few details also in the biography
of Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya in Ibn Sa'd, v.
71–77); H. D. van Gelder, Mohāfīz de valschhe
Prophet, Leyden 1883; J. Wellhausen, Die ʿulā-
apel, Oppositionsparteien unter Islam, vol. 3
 Cf.
also the bibliography given in the articles 
KHĀNṢĪYA AND KHĀNṢABĪYĀ (add al-Nawbahkāt, 
Fīrāk al-Shīʿa, ed. Ritter [Bibli. Islamica, iv.,
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MUKHTAR PASHA, GHIZā ṬAHMAD, a Tur-
kish general and statesman, was born in
Sept. 1832, the son of a high official in Brussa,
and received a military training there and in
Constantinople (officer in 1854). He took part in
the Crimean War, from 1850 taught in the Mekteb-i
Ḥarbiye as professor of the art of war and in 1855
was tutor to the prince Yusuf Ṭuz al-Din. After
holding a command in Albania (1867–1870) he
distinguished himself under Redif Pasha in the
Yemen campaign, the conduct of which he took
over in 1871 as General of Division and Pasha.
On his return he was given the title of muṣūrīk.
In the Herzegovina he was defeated in 1876 at
the Duga Pass. After the declaration of war by
Russia (April 24, 1877) he was given the supreme
command on the Caucasus front, where after at
first having to retire to Koprukey, he counter-
attacked at Dajar (June 21) and Ziwin (June 25)
and forced the Russians under the Armenian
generals Loris-Melikoff and Ter-Hugassoff, to eva-
cuate Ottoman territory and occupied Skhum.
Successes in August on the Yaghañ Dagh and at Kfi-il-Tepe (near Bash Gedikler) earned him the title of honour of Ghhazi [q.v.] but did not prevent the collapse of the army in Oct.—Nov. [cf. DEVK DOUX, KARS AND ERZERUM]. Appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Artillery, he restored peace in Crete in 1878; in 1879—1885 he served as commissioner on the Greek frontier. As a result of the Anglo-Turkish agreement of Oct. 24, 1885, he became the first High Commissioner of the Porte in Egypt, holding the post till 1906 and playing a part in the Taha affair. In this period he busied himself with the question of reforming the calendar; he advocated a uniform Hijra solar year for all Muslims (see Ehid).

From Dec. 1908 Vice-President of the Ottoman Senate, he proposed in the National Assembly of April 27, 1909 to give prince Reshid the name Mehmed V in memory of the first conqueror (Fatih) of Constantinople [see MUHAMMAD II] (communication of Abd al-Rahmân Sherefi to Martin Hartmann); he himself led the deputation which announced his accession as Sultan-Caliph and brought him to the War Ministry to receive the oath of allegiance [cf. BABA]. On Oct. 14, 1913 he succeeded Abd al-Saad Pasha [q.v.], President of the Senate and on July 22, 1912 as grand-vizier in the cabinet of the "Greatest One" (Buyukle). Under pressure from the association of old-Hungarian officers (Kalâihatârâr) he persuaded the Senate on Aug. 4 by a bold interpretation of the constitution to declare the session of Parliament closed. He endeavoured to free the army and civil service from politics, obtained an amnesty for Albania, recalled Ahmad Izzet Pasha from the Yemen, instituted the Naval Medal and Medal of the Red Crescent, obtained favourable terms in the treaty of peace with Italy (Oct. 18, 1912) but could not avert the catastrophe in the Balkan War. On Oct. 29, 1912 he retired in favour of Kılım Pasha, but remained a member of the Senate till 1918, in which on Feb. 12, 1917 he advocated the adoption of the Gregorian calendar and rejection of the Christian reckoning for the financial year. He died on Jan. 21, 1919. Mahmud Mukhtar Pasha is his son.

Bibliography: Général Izzet-Faud, Autres Occasions publiss... Crítica stratégica de la Campaña d'Asie Mineure 1877—1878, Paris 1908 (Izzet-Faud Pasha makes use of Mehmed 'Arif bey's book Bazilikme Geleren which was inspired by Mukhtar Pasha); Ghazi Ahmed Mukhtar Pacha, La Réforme du Calendrier (transl. O. N. E. Leiden 1893); Collection Diétrie, Terithi ibnâli, vol. i., v., vi.; Osmanshaire Lloyd, Constantinople 1908—1912 and other scattered sources.

MUKHTARı, SIR JIJU AL-D-IN UMMAN B MUHAMJAD AL-MUKHTARİ AL-GHAZNAWI, court poet of the later Ghaznavids Ibrahim b. Mas'ud II (1059—1099) and Mas'ud III b. Ibrahim (1099—1114). He lived for a considerable period in Kirmân, where he wrote panegyrics on the Saljuk Arslân-Shah b. Kirmânshah (1101—1141). The great poet Maqal al-Din Sanâî showed him the greatest reverence and celebrated him in a long bawda as the best poet of his time. He could not have been Sanâî's teacher, as the Bankiropre Catalogue (i. 32) says, since he must have been only a year or two older than Sanâî. His influence however is quite marked in many of Sanâî's works. One of Mukhtarî's philosophical bests may be regarded as one of the finest examples of the old Persian school of poetry since maqâla on it were written by the best poets such as Khâkânî, Amir Khusraw, Athâr-i Ashkân, 'Abd al-Rahmân Idrîsî and Nawâî. His chief work is a large Dīwān of lyrics, the majority of which are panegyrics in the style of the old Ghaznavid poets like 'Umar-i Farrâgh, and dedicated to Ar-rân-Shah, Bahram-Shah, Aqâ al-Dawla Bahram-Shah, and a number of viziers. Besides, these kâlâs there were in the Dīwān a few short mazhâras, one of which of an astronomical nature seems to have had a great influence in later poetry. We should probably also ascribe to his poet the authorship of the Shahriyâr-nâma, an imitation of the Shahnâmâ, the hero of which Shahrysân son of 'IZâd son of Suhru, i.e. a great-grandson of Rustam, and the action of which is laid in India. The poem is dedicated to Mas'ud III; in the preface the poet says that he has worked at it for three years and hoped for a present worthy of this labour. If he does not receive this, however, he will not write a satire this seems to be a direct reference to Firduwâi. The year of Mukhtarî's death is not exactly known; 530 (1135); 534 (1139) 534 (1144) and 554 (1154) are mentioned. The last date seems to be the right one.


AL-MUKHTAR. [See ALLAH, II.]

MUKRâ, a district and village in the Yaman, a day's journey south of Sanâ'. The Arab geographers mention a cornelian mine here. The name is also given to a mountain in the Yaman Surf according to Sprenger; we cannot connect the Hayiar tribe of this name with the Mosîrs of Pomeiy.


MUKTADÀB, name of the thirteenth metre in Arabic prosody, very little used; in theory it consists of three feet, with two successive maf'ûluin, in each hemistich; but in practice it has only two.

There is one and one dark: maf'ûlu in maf'ûlu: maf'ûlu = faqâla. However, maf'ûlu should lose its f (ma•fûlu = faqâla) or change its u to w, which is very frequent (ma•fûlu = fa•wâl). Maf'ûlu can never retain its f (mas'taun = mas'taun).

(A. BENCHEMROUX)
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she was neglected by the caliph. Malikshah, who wished to prevent the caliph interfering in affairs of state, endeavoured to induce him to leave Baghdad and take up his residence in another town. This plan however came to nothing through the death of the sultan in Shawwal 485 (Nov. 1092) and al-Mu' tadir was left in peace in the capital. About this time the power of the Saljuks reached its greatest height and in all the lands conquered by them the spiritual supremacy of the caliph was recognised. Al-Mu' tadir died suddenly on 15th or 19th Muharram 487 (4th or 8th Feb. 1094) at the age of 38. He was perhaps poisoned by Malikshah's son and successor, Barkiyai'uddin [q. v.] whom he had offended by confirming the selection of his minor brother Mamshid as sultan.


(K. V. Zettersten)

**AL-MU' TAFIR.** [See also, I.I.]

**AL-MUKTA DIR.** Bu'llāh, Abū l-Fadl Dārāf, Abū 'Abbas al-Muktafī, 'Abbāsīd caliph, son of al-Mu'tasid and a slave named Slaghba. After the death of his brother al-Muktafī in Dhū l-‘Ilādha 295 (Aug. 908), al-Mu' tadir who was only 13 at the time was proclaimed caliph. Many however preferred Abū 'Abd Allāh, son of the caliph al-Mu'tazz, and after the murder of the vizier 'Abd Allāh b. al-Hasan b. Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Muktafī was declared to be deposed and Ibn al-Mu'tazz elected caliph. The eunuch Mu'nis [q. v.] came forward to save al-Mu' tadir; Ibn al-Mu'tazz was slain and al-Mu' tadir retained the caliphate. He showed very little independence however and allowed himself to be guided, sometimes by the Abbasids and sometimes by the viziers among whom special mention may be made of the intriguing Ibn al-Furāt [q. v.] and the brave Ibn al-Dījarah [q. v.]. Al-Mu' tadir's caliphate was therefore marked by a gradual decline. In his reign the dynasties of the Fātimids [q. v.] and Ḥamādhānīs [q. v.] became independent. The Ḥarmānjans also rebelled once more. In the years 307 (919—920) and 311 (925) Baṣra was plundered by the Ḥarmānjān chief Abū Tāhir Sulaimān [cf. AL-DJANXIR] and at the end of the year 311 (925) he fell upon the pilgrimage caravan returning from Mecca. In Dhū l-‘Ilādha of the following year (925) he attacked the caravan which was going on the pilgrimage to Mecca from Baghdad and put it to flight. He next plundered al-Kufa and then returned to Buhrain. An army sent against the Ḥarmānjans under the command of Mu'nis arrived only after they had retired. In 314 (926—927) 'Uṣuf b. Abu l-Sā'dī was summoned from Abdār Bahjūdijān to help, but Sulaimān defeated him in Shawwal of the following year (Dec. 927) and took him prisoner. The caliph's troops did not dare to give battle and in Muharram 316 (March 928) Sulaimān seized the town of al-Raḥaba. After an unsuccessful attack on al-Raḥja he retired; in 317 (929—930), or, according to others, in 316, he plundered Mecca and carried off the Black Stone.

On the Byzantine frontier both sides continued their raids with varying fortunes. In 305 (917) the Byzantines made an offer of peace and after two years peace was definitely concluded, but hostilities very soon broke out again. In 314 (926—927) the Byzantines ravaged the district of Malatya and in the following year they crossed a considerable part of Armenia. After taking several Armenian cities which belonged to the Arabs (316 = 928—929) and occupying northern Mesopotamia (317 = 929—930) they lost all their gains in 319—320 (= 931—932). In Muharram 317 (Feb. 929) a rebellion broke out in the capital. Al-Mu' tadir was forced to abdicate but was brought to a place of safety by Mu'nis, while the soldiery plundered the palace. His brother Muhammad was summoned to be Commander of the Faithful in his stead with the style al-Kāhir; but since the chief leader of the rebels, the head of police Nāzūk, could not satisfy the demands of the troops for higher pay, al-Kāhir was deposed after a few days and al-Mu' tadir placed on the throne once more. In Baghdad the confusion increased and in 320 (932) the catastrophe came. The enemies of Mu'nis took advantage of his absence to persuade the caliph that Mu'nis intended to dethrone him and when Mu'nis approached at the head of his army, al-Mu' tadir was persuaded with great reluctance to take the field against him; he fell at the beginning of the encounter (27th Shawwal 320 = Oct. 31, 932). See also the article MUHAMMAD F. YUSUF.


(K. V. Zettersten)

**AL-MU' TAFIR.** Abū l-‘Alā' Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad, 'Abbāsīd caliph, born on 12th Rabi` II 486 (April 9, 996), son of al-Mustazhir and a slave girl. After the deposition of his nephew al-Rashid, al-Mu' tadir was acknowledged as caliph on the 8th Dhū l-Ḥijja 530 (Sept. 17, 1136). While the Saljuks were fighting among themselves, he did his best not only to maintain his independence but also to put down the revolts after the other in the Ḥarak fell into his hands. In 543 (1148) a number of emirs announced their allegiance to Sultan Mas'ūd and marched on Baghdad but dispersed after several encounters with the caliph's troops. According to some sources, the same thing took place again next year. In Rajab 547 (Oct. 1152) Mas'ūd died, and was succeeded by his nephew Malikshah who was deposed in a few months and succeeded by his brother Muhammad. In the meanwhile the caliph seized the two towns of al-Ḫilla and Wāsīt. In the following year Sultan Sanjar who lived in Kūrsān was attacked and taken prisoner by the rebel 'Uḫuzz [q. v.] whomupon his emirs proclaimed Mas'ūd's
brother Sulaimānšāh sultān. In Muharram 551 (Feb.—March 1156) the latter was recognised by the caliph on condition that he did not interfere in the affairs of the Trājik. Although al-Muktāfi supported him he was defeated in Djamād II (June—July) of the same year by his nephew Muhammad and the latter’s auxiliaries. In Dhū l-Ḥijjah (Jan.—Feb. 1157) Sulṭān Muhammad advanced on Baghdaḍ to take vengeance on the caliph. The latter had to retire to the eastern part of the town and was besieged there for several months. In Rabī‘ I 552 (May 1151) however, the sultān suddenly raised the siege because Allah is advancing on Hamadhān. As the latter therefore retreated, hostilities automatically ceased and Muhammad was said to have made peace with al-Muktāfi. The latter twice besieged Taḥkīt in vain; on the other hand, he succeeded in taking Liḥf. The Crusaders continued their hostilities in al-Muktāfi’s caliphate. The most powerful pillar of Islam was the Aṭṭāb of al-Mawṣil, Fāṭimād al-Din Zangī, and his son Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad in Syria. Al-Muktāfi died in 2nd Rabī‘ I 555 (March 12, 1160).


(K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

AL-MUKTĀFI B‘LLĀH, ABū MUḤAMMAD ‘ALI b. ‘Abdallāh. Aḥbārī caliph, son of al-Muṭṭadī and a Turkish slave named Grek (Arabic Dijājk). In 281 (894—895) he was appointed by his father governor of al-Rayy and several towns in the neighbourhood, and five years later he was made governor of Mospotamia and took up his quarters in Raḥkā. After the death of al-Muṭṭadī on 22nd Rabī‘ II, 289 (April 5, 902), he ascended the throne and at once won the good-will of the people by his liberality and by destroying the subterranean dungeons in the capital. He proved a brave and fearless leader who fought with success against the many enemies of the caliphate. The Karmāṭians were ravaging Syria: one town after another fell into their hands and Damascus itself was plundered. On the 6th Muharram 291 (Nov. 29, 903) the general Muḥammad b. Sulaimān finally succeeded in inflicting a crushing defeat on them and they scattered in all directions. Muḥammad then turned his attention to Egypt where he put an end to the rule of the Ǧumlūnids. Many of their followers joined him and after the Ǧumlūnids Ḥādīn b. Khumār wasa had been slain, the capital had to surrender (Ṣafār, 292 = Jan. 905) and Ǧalāl al-Nāṣā’īrī appointed governor of Egypt. An attempt to restore the Ǧumlūnids was easily crushed (293 = 905—906). About this time the Karmāṭians again began to be troublesome and at the beginning of the year 294 (Oct.—Nov. 906) they attacked the great pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca, massacred the men and carried off the women and children. In Rabī‘ I of the same year (Dec. 906—Jan. 907) they were defeated near al-Kādisiyah by the caliph’s troops under Wasaf b. Shawaṭagīn. The war with the Byzantines was also vigorously pursued. In 291 (903—904) a Greek named Leo who had adopted Šīrāz undertook a number of raids on the Greek coasts with his fleet of 54 ships. The Byzantines however had the advantage by land. In 292 (904—905) Marāsh, al-Maṣṣaṣṭa and Tarsūs were taken by the Greek general Andronicus and in the following year the Byzantines advanced as far as Ḥalab. Then the Muslims gained the upper hand and Andronicus went over to them. Al-Muktāfi died in Dhū l-Ka‘da 295 (Aug. 908) at the age of 31. cf. also the article al-‘ABBAS B. AL-HASAN B. AHMAD.


(K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

AL-MUKTĀNAH, BAKR B. AL-DĪN, a Druze missionary and author, with his teacher Ḥamza (b. ‘Alī, q. v.) founder of the theological system of the Druses [q. v.], the fifth minister of the Druze theology, with several titles of honour, in addition to the above two: al-Dānāl, al-Anṣār, al-Tālī, al-Kiyāl, al-Muṣārīṣ etc. His "secular" name was Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Ahmad al-Samākī. Of his life practically nothing is known. As Arab historians are silent about him (Silvestre de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druses, ii. 320), his own writings are almost the only source. According to the Druze tradition, he was kāfi in Alexandria in al-Hākin’s time (fifth century), and in Mittelmäer zum Persischen Golf, ii. Berlin 1939, p. 135). As his works reveal quite a good knowledge (not without misunderstandings) of Christian religion and literature, he may have been born a Christian, probably in Syria. Only for the period of his teaching do we have chronological exactness. His ṭalīlāt of inv.-tute is dated on the 13th Shab‘ān of the third year of Ḥamza’s mission i.e. 411 (1020) (S. de Sacy, op. cit., i. 474—475: ii. 309. 313; transl. ibid., ii. 297—309). The earliest of his known writings is of the tenth year of Ḥamza, 418 A. H. (ibid., ii. 326). In consequence one must assume that he came to the front after the disappearance of al-Hākin and Ḥamza. His activity was not a continuous one and he had even to live for a time in concealment (about the year 17—18 of Ḥamza; see S. de Sacy, op. cit. ii. 364), whether in Egypt or Syria is not certain (H. Gay, La nation druze, p. 114). The latest date known in his writings is the 26th year of Ḥamza, i.e. 433—434 (1042) (S. de Sacy, op. cit., i. 496; ii. 379). His farewell epistle dates from that year; according to it he had retired into concealment (ibid., i. 514—515; ii. 358); nothing more is known of him. The "Druze theology" does not agree with these dates; it gives 17 years as the period of his activity (H. Guys, op. cit., p. 107). Ph. Hittite’s assertion (The Origins of the Druze People, p. 11) that he died in 1031 is due to a misunderstanding.

Druze tradition not unjustly ranks him with Ḥamza and regards him as the greatest theological writer, to whom four of the sacred books are ascribed (M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., i. 135—137). These are not books
in the proper sense but collections of separate tracts, usually in the form of epistles, directed to followers of the Druses teaching or of other creeds in various lands (Byzantium, Syria, Egypt, Arabia, India). They are to this day frequently read by the Druses in their khawalīwāt; commentaries were written on some of them by the last independent Druse theologian ʿAbd Allāh al-Tanlukhī (d. 1450; on him see Ph. Hitti, op. cit., p. 53; M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., i. 137). Of the some 102 Druse treatises so far known in Europe, 70 are ascribed by S. de Sacy to al-Muktān (op. cit., i. 484 and 496). Except for a few short texts published by S. de Sacy along with other writings of Him (see Bibliography), most of the tracts have been printed, namely the Kitāb al-Bādʿ by Chr. Seybold (s. Böhl) and al-Risālat al-Kuṭṭāntiyyā, sent in 1028 to the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VIII., by J. Khalil and L. Ronzevalle (s. Böhl. and extracts in Hitti, op. cit., p. 64—67). Others are accessible only in translations and extracts (esp. in Silvestre de Sacy; al-Risālat al-Mūshtiyā, a synopsis in Hitti, op. cit., p. 68—70). As with other Druse writers, the style is very obscure and artificial, frequently embellished with rhymed prose.

Silvestre de Sacy, whose book still is the most important collection of material, regards al-Muktān as "un enthousiaste de bonne foi" (op. cit., i. 508). It is highly desirable that some one should devote a special study to his life and work, paying particular attention to the authenticity of his works and to a critical edition of them.


MULAH. [See Mawla.]

MULK (A.), royal power, is used in the Kurān with reference to God and to certain pre-Islamic personages, who all appear in the Old Testament, and in the former case is synonymous with malakīt; the latter word however occurs only four times in the Kurān and always with a dependent genitive (kul shāʿ or al-samanāwīt wa l-arḍ) while mulk is often used absolutely. To God alone belongs mulk. He has no associate therein; to Him belongs mulk over heaven and earth as well as over the judgment. He gives mulk to whom He will; the unbelievers have no share in it. Shaitān promised Adam imperishable mulk and tempted man with this promise to eat of the kibdawat al-khaid (Sūra xx. 118). Nāmis endeavours to claim for himself God's mulk against Ibrahim (ii. 260) but God gives mulk to the family of Ibrāhim (iv. 57). Yūsuf thanks God in prayer for the mulk which He has given him (xxi. 102). Fir'awn boasts of his right to the mulk Mīyār (xiii. 50); God wills to give Ťāltū mulk over the recalcitrant Israelites and to send the ṭābūt as a sign (ii. 248 sqq.). Dūwil's mulk is mentioned in ii. 252 and xxviii. 19 and Sulāmān's ii. 96; the latter prays for it (xxviii. 34).

That the conception of mulk was not carried over into Muslim law generally has been explained in the article MULAH; an exception is Egypt during the Ayyūbīd period and in quite modern times. Cf. also the article Tahlīl and G. Richter, Studien zur Geschichte der älteren arz. Fürstenspiegel (Leips. Som. Studien, N. F., iii., 1932), esp. p. 6.

MULTĀN is an ancien town of the Pandāşād situated in 30° 12' N. and 71° 31' E., and has been known at various times as Kāshfpūr, Hanspūr, Bagpūr, Sānhā or Sanāhpūr, and finally Mūlāshān, of which Multān is a corruption. This name is derived from that of the idol and temple of the sun, a shrine of vast wealth, which the Arabs, who plundered it, named dār al-hāšāb, or the house of gold. It remained the Arab capital, and the outpost of Islam in India, for three centuries but by A.D. 900 its rule had become independent of Baghdad. At this time it was seized by ʿAbd Allāh the Karmāyat, and became a stronghold of the Karmāyat heretics, who were crushed and expelled by the orthodox Mahmūd of Ghazān. The town and province remained nominally subject to his descendants until Khusrāw Mulk, the last of them, was carried into captivity by Muizz al-Dīn Muhammad b. Sām, when it became a province of his Indian empire. On his death the governor, Nāṣir al-Dīn Kābāḍ, attempted to establish its independence of Dīhil, but Kābāḍ al-Dīn Aībak reduced him to obedience, and the province remained nominally subject to Dīhil from 1026 to 1438 when Shāhī Yūsuf Kūra′iš became independent ruler of Multān and was followed by the kings of the Langūth tribe, who reigned until 1527. The town was occupied both by Tūmīr in 1397 and by Tūbdīr in 1528.

The province was one of the ḫulūs of Akbar's empire, and remained nominally subject to his successors until 1572, when its allegiance was transferred to Kābul. It was threatened by the Sikhs as early as 1771, but was not annexed by them until 1818, when Rāngājī Singh took the city by storm. It was not affected by the first Sikh war, but the murder of two British officers by Multādī led to the second Sikh war, and the city was captured on January 3, 1849. Its fortifications were dismantled in 1854 and its garrison was disarmed in the mutiny of 1857.

Bibliography: Firistiha, Ġuljāmi-i Ḩaṭṭāmī (Bombay 1832); Tūbāstiti Aṭkārī, by Niṯām al-Dīn ʿAḥmad; Sir Edward D. Maclagan, Gazetteer of the Multan District (Lahore 1902).

(T. W. HAIG)

MUMIN, title of sūra xli. See also ALLĀH, II and IMĀM.

AL-MUMINÜN, title of sūra xxiii.

AL-MUMĪT. [See AL-SAÓN, II.]

MUMKIN. [See MAMMÚN, II.

AL-MUMTAHINA, title of sūra lx.

MUMTAŻ, BARHEWUDAR B. MAMūD TURK-MĀN FĀRĀḤI, a Persian writer, a contemporary of the Ṣafawīd Sūlān Ḥusayn (1694—1722). At an early age he left his native town of Fārāh.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
and went to Marw where he entered the service of the governor Agha Khan. After two years however, he left this post and became munshi with Hovan Kuli Khan Shamsu Kuru-bashi in I basan. At a banquet there his master's house he heard a story which attracted him exceedingly. He wrote it down and it became the foundation of a great collection, Makhzava, which contained about 400 stories and consisted of a mukaddama, eight biita and a khatima. Soon afterwards he returned to Farah, spent some time in Herat and Meyshed and then entered the service of the emir Minufr Khan b. Khaghtay whose duty it was to defend Daran and Khubushan against raids by the wild nomad tribes. His stay there was disastrous for Mumtaz, since he lost all his goods and chattels and the valuable manuscript of his Makhzava during a nomad raid; he did not have another copy of it. He resolved however to restore the book and wrote all the stories that he could remember a second time. Thus arose the second version of the Makhzava, which consists of a mukaddama, five biita and a khatima and has come down to us under the title Makhzav al-kutiib. The book is written in an exclusively artificial style. The khatima is the best part; it contains the celebrated story of Zilab and Rasu, which is very popular in Persia in a simplified form in many editions from the popular press.


MUMTAZ MAHALL, wife of Shah Jahan, and the lady for whom the Taj Mahall (q. v.) was built. She was the daughter of Abul Hasan Aqaf Khan, who was Nur Jahan's brother. Her name was Arjuman Bano, the title Muntaz Mahall being conferred on her after Shah Jahan's accession. She was a favourite wife and bore fourteen children, seven of whom grew up. She was born in 1593, married in 1612 and died, at Burhantpur in the Deccan, very shortly after the birth of a daughter in 1631. She was beautiful and amiable, and Shah Jahan loved her tenderly.

Bibliography: Khawfi Khan, Muntazah al-kutiib, i. 459: Abdul-Hamad Lahori, Badshahnamah ii. 384: Manucci, Storia de Mogor, translated by W. Irvine; Elliot-Dowson, vii. 27: Indian Magazine for December 1913, p. 316; (II. Beveridge)

MUNADJDJIM. [See Astrology.]

MUNADJDJIM BASHI is the name by which the author of the most important general historical work written in Turkey is known. His real name was Ahmad Efendi, son of Luuf Allah, a native of Eregh near Konya. He was born in Selanik, in the first half of the 18th century, received a scholarly education and served in his youth for fifteen years in the Mewlewikhan of Kasim Pasha under Sheikh Khalil Dede (Sidgikli Victoria, ii. 287). Afterwards he studied astronomy and astrology and became court astrologer (munadijdin bashi) in 1798 (1667—1668). In 1806 (1675—1676) he was admitted to the intimate circle of Sultan Muhammad IV as munadijdin padshah. He was dismissed in Muharram 1099 (November 1687) and banished to Egypt. From here he went some years later to Mecca, where he became shaikh of the Mewlewikhan. In 1105 (1693—1694) he was obliged to move to Medina, where he lived for seven years. Soon after his return to Mecca he died there on the 29th of Ramadán 1113 (February 27th 1702) and was buried near the tomb of Khadidja.

Besides writing his historical work, Munadijdin Bashi displayed a considerable literary activity. Of his works are mentioned a Fasya on the Kur'an commentary of Baidwi, a commentary on the "Al'id al-Asqiya of al-'Idi, a Fasya-nan, a translation of the anecdotes of 'Ubaidi Zakan, and a number of treatises on geometry, mysticism and music. His Turkish divan also gives him a place in the ranks of Turkish mystical poets; his takalign was Aslih.

The general history was written in Arabic under the title Dams al-Dawla, but although manuscript of the Arabic original exist (the Semi-Khazin Edic of Ah Enawi mentions two MSS., not mentioned by Babinger, viz. one in the library of the mosque of Selim II in Adrianople and the other in the imperial palace, in the library of Ahmed III), it is much better known in the Turkish translation made by the poet Nedin [q. v.] in the xvith century under the title Selaf i al-fakhr (printed in three volumes in Constantinople in 1285). It is a world history, arranged, after the fashion of similar Arabic works, according to dynasties, with a main division into three parts: the first treating of the history of Muhammad, the second the non-Mohammedan dynasties and the third the Mohammedan dynasties. In the introductory chapters the author cites his numerous sources, not a few of which are lost in the original. Therefore the work has a special value for the knowledge of many smaller dynasties and for this reason it has been especially used by E. Schaufler for his Verzeichnis mubammadanischer Dynastien, in his Pr. Ak. W., Berlin 1923 (cf. the introduction). The last dynasty treated is that of the Ottoman Sultans; it is proportionately longer and more detailed than the history of the other Mohammedan dynasties and based on several imperfectly known sources; the last part, which ends in 1089 (1678), gives contemporary history. The Turkish translation of Nedin is very readable and not composed in the high-down literary style that prevailed in his period. For this reason it is especially praised and represented in Eminirz Teviki, Mured-i Edibir-i 'elmamüni, Constantinople 1339.

Bibliography: F. Babinger, O. G. W. and the sources mentioned there.

(II. KRAMER)

AL-MUNAFIKUN (A.), the term applied in the Kur'an to those Medinees upon whose fidelity and zeal Muhammad could not absolutely rely. The Arabs (e.g. Mubarrad, Kamel, ed. Wright, p. 153) derive the word from manafik ("one of the entrances to the hole of a fieldmouse"), but it is certainly the borrowed Ethiopic manafik "heretic" from nefasa to "split", nefasa to "be divided, irresolute". The meaning "waverer", "doubter" quite fits the usual use of the word in the Kur'an, while the usual translation "hypocrite" only suits a few passages. Another description of the same people in the Kur'an is: "those in whose hearts there is sickness (weakness, doubt)", again in contrast to the unshakably firm believers. Sometimes (ix. 68
with the campaign against the Banū Mustakhīl.


**AL-MUNDIRI** B. MUHAMMAD. [See al-MUNDIRI, II.]

**MUNDIRYA**, title of Vira lxi., which is also called al-mudhī and al-ḥaṣāyya.

**MUNGIR** (MONGHIR), the head-quarters of the Mungr District in Bihar and Orissa in India, situated in 25° 23′ N. and 86° 28′ E. on the south bank of the Ganges. The population of the district in 1911 was 2,132,893, of whom 200,339 were Muhammadans. Muhammadan historians state that Bakhtyār Khālidī was the first Muhammadan who conquered Mungr during his subjugation of Bihar about 595 (1198). Henceforth it became a place of military importance. In 1777 (1703) Nawāwī Mīr Kāsmī, the Nawāwī Sūbadār of Bengal, when he proposed to fight against the British made Mungr his military head-quarters. He founded here an arsenal under Ghūgin (Gregory) Kāsmī, his Armenian general. The gun-making industry for which the town is famous is said to date from the establishment of this arsenal.

**Bibliography:** Lipton's Gazetteer of India, xviii. 401—403; O'Malley, Bengal District Gazetters, Mungrā, Calcutta 1909, xvii.

(M. HUSSAYN HOSAIN)

**MUNIS DEDE** or DERMISH MUNIS, Ottoman poet at Adiānople. He belonged to the Mewlēvi Order. He received his education from the famous Enis Deed (d. 1147 = 1734). He died in 1145 (1732) in Adrianople, where he is buried.


(M. MENZEL)

**MUNIS AL-MUZAFFAR**, ABD AL-ḤASAN, principal 'Abbāsid general from 926 to 931 (909—933), and latterly virtual dictator (usual attribution of him to another Khālidī seems to rest on passage — p. 347 — in Hīlāl al-shābī's *Kitāb al-Wuzūr* [ed. Amrodo], where Nāṣr should be read for Muṣān], a eunuch (passage of Ibn Miskawayh [ed. Amrodo and Margolouth, i. 160] shows that ḥādīn in this case does not mean merely freedman, as suggested by Massignon, al-Hallaj, p. 205, no. 3), said by al-Dhahabī, *Tawāk al-Islām* (followed by Ibn Taghribirdi, *ed. Juyonb*, ii. 255) to have been 90 years old at death (though this age would seem incredibly great for a recently active commander), i.e., to have been born in 845—846, and to have held the rank of amir for 60 years.

Muḥīn first appears (if passage of al-Ṭabarī, ii. 1523, refers to him) as a ghulām of al-Muṣāfār (not yet caliph) in *Zanj* (q. v.) campaign of 267 (880—881); and is mentioned as Chief of Police in caliph's camp in 287 (900). Al-Dhahabī (also Ibn Taghrībīd, loc. cit.) states, again, that he was banished to Mecca by al-Mu'tamid, to be recalled on accession of al-Muṭakaddir (q. v.); and as Muḥīn is nowhere referred to during intervening reign of al-Mu'tafis, the statement may be true. (If so, in al-Ḥaṣāy's description, Muḥīn...
Mu'nis owed his later eminence mainly to his leading the defence, in 296 (908), of the Hasani palace at Baghdād for al-Muktaḍar against the partisans of the latter's cousin, the pretender Ibn al-Mu'tazz [q. v.]. During the caliph's youth his gratitude and that of his powerful mother for this service assured Mu'nis's position; and though later al-Muktaḍar's favour turned to enmity, by that time Mu'nis's authority was hardly in need of support, owing chiefly to his almost invariably successful generalship. For though he undertook no very important campaigns, except perhaps the repulse of the Fāṭimid al-Mahdī [q. v.] in 307 (919-920) (for which he received the ḏābāb al-Muṣafirīn), and the defence of Baghdād from the Karthānians [q. v.] in 315 (927-928), he was only once defeated — in 306 (918).

Mu'nis early fell out with the ważīr Ibn al-Furāt [q. v.], repeatedly opposing him, till in 312 (924), on Ibn al-Furāt's third term of office, Mu'nis played a prominent part in securing his dismissal and execution. He now became all-powerful, being invariably consulted on the appointment of viziers and so controlling the government. Hence the change of al-Muktaḍar's affection to dislike, first signalized (315 = 927) in an abortive plot of the caliph's to murder him. In 316 Mu'nis lent himself to al-Muktaḍar's deposition in favour of his half-brother al-Kāhir [q. v.]. He almost immediately restored him, however, thereby becoming more absolutely his master than ever. Al-Muktaḍar eventually defied Mu'nis (319 = 931), who thereupon left Baghdād. Next year, however, having meanwhile collected a strong force, he marched on the capital intending to reimpose his authority. He duly defeated the caliph's army outside the walls, but al-Muktaḍar himself was killed on the field.

Mu'nis now restored al-Kāhir. But by resuming his dictatorial ways he soon so alienated him also that he was obliged in self-defence to keep the new caliph a prisoner in the palace. He even contemplated deposing him. Al-Kāhir, however, succeeded in luring Mu'nis, together with his chief supporters, into the palace, where he shortly had them executed in Sha'ban 321 (August 933). Mu'nis's influence was on the whole exerted for good: but he was neither strong nor intelligent enough to prevent the decline of the caliphate. His example of depriving the caliph of real power was pernicious. It was to be followed all too soon by the series of adventurers who, with the style of amīr al-tamār [q. v.], were to dominate al-Kāhir's successors.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the authorities cited above: H.I. al-Athīr, Al-Kāmil, viii.; al-Khallīl, Governors and Judges of Egypt (G. M. S., xix.), p. 273, 277-278; Ḥikāl al-Sahīf, Kitāb al-Wuṣūr (ed. Amedro), and Ibn Misḵawrā, Tadhīrīt al-Ummān, v., passim (— Amedro and Margoliouth, Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate, vols. i. and iv.); Ṭabīh, ed. de Goeje, index; H. Bowen, Life and Times of 'Abd al-Ṣamā', Cambridge 1928, index. (Harold Bowen)

**MUNKAR WA-NAKIR** (the forms with the article are also found), the names of the two angels who examine and if necessary punish the dead in their tombs. To the examination in the tomb the infidels and the faithful — the righteous as well as the sinners — are liable. They are set upright in their tombs and must state their opinion regarding Muḥammad. The righteous faithful will answer, that he is the Apostle of Allāh; thereupon they will be left alone till the Day of Resurrection. The sinners and the infidels, on the other hand, will have no satisfactory answer at hand. In consequence of this the angels will beat them severely, as long as it will please Allāh, according to some authorities till the Day of Resurrection, except on Fridays.

In some sources a distinction is made between the punishment and the pressure (ḏaқīta) in the tomb, the righteous faithful being exempt from the former, not from the latter, whereas the infidels and the sinners suffer punishment as well as pressure (Abu Ḭa'īn al-Muṣaffā, as cited in the commentary on the Wasiyat Abī Ḥanīfā, Haidarābād 1321, p. 22).

The punishment in the tomb is not plainly mentioned in the Qur'ān. Allusions to the idea may be found in several passages, e.g. sūra xlvi. 29: "But when the angels, causing them to die, shall smite them on their faces and backs"; sūra vi. 93: "But couldst thou see, when the ungodly are in the floods of death, and the angels reach forth their hands, saying, Vield up your souls: this day shall ye be recompensed with a humiliating punishment"; sūra viii. 52: "And if thou wert to see when the angels take the life of the unbelievers; they smite their faces and their backs, and taste ye the torture of burning" (cf. further sūra ix. 102; xxi. 21; lli. 47).

The punishment of the tomb is very frequently mentioned in Tradition (see Bibliography), often, however, without the mention of angels. In the latter group of traditions it is simply said, that the dead are punished in their tombs, or why, e.g. on account of special sins they have committed, or on account of the wailing of the living.

The names of Munkar and Nakir do not appear in the Qur'ān, and, so far as I can see, only in canonical Tradition (Tirmidhi, Ḫanīfī's, N°. 70). Apparently these names do not belong to the old stock of traditions. Moreover, in some traditions one anonymous angel only is mentioned as the angel who interrogates and punishes the dead (Muslim, Imām, trad. 163; Abū Dawūd, Sunna, bāb 39; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 233; 346; iv. 150; Ṭayālīsī, N°. 753).

So there seem to be four stages in the traditions regarding this subject: the first without any angel being mentioned, the second mentioning "the" angel, the third two angels, the fourth being acquainted with the names Munkar and Nakir.

This state of things as reflected in ḥadīth finds a similar reflex in the early forms of the creed. In the Fīḥ Akbar i., which may date from the middle of the viiiih century A.D., the punishment of the tomb appears as the only eschatological representation (art. 10). In the Wasiyat Abī Ḥanīfa, which may represent the orthodox views of the middle of the viiiih century, we find, apart from an elaborate eschatology, the two following articles (arts. 18, 19): a) We confess, that the punishment in the tomb shall without fail take place. We confess, that in view of the traditions on the subject, the interrogation by Munkar and Nakir is a reality. The term "reality" is apparently intended to oppose the
allegorical interpretation of eschatological representations as taught by the Mu'tazilis.

The Fih h A'kbar ii., which may represent the new orthodoxy of the middle of the 11th century a.d., is still more elaborate on this point (art. 233): "The appearance of the dead in the tomb by Munkar and Nakir is a reality and the reunion of the body with the spirit in the tomb is a reality. The pressure and the punishment in the tomb are a reality that will take place in the case of all the infidels, and a reality that may take place in the case of some sinners belonging to the faithful. In the later creeds and works on dogmatics the punishment and the interrogation in the tomb by Munkar and Nakir are expressed in similar ways. The Karramiya [q.v.] taught the identity of Munkar and Nakir with the two guardian angels who accompany man ('Abd al-Kahhir al-Baghda'di, qul al-Din, Stamboul 1925, p. 246). Ghazali admits the idea that eschatological representations are a reality that takes place in the malakat.

The origin of the names is uncertain: the meaning "disliked" seems doubtful. The same is the case with the examination and the punishment of the dead in their tombs is found among other peoples also. The details to be found in Jewish sources (hikhit hakhekher) are strikingly parallel to the Muslim ones.


MUNSARI, the name of the tenth metre in Arabic prosody; it has three feet to the hemistich. It has three a'ruq and four darb:

1st a'ruq: musaf'irun masfur'tun musaf'irun
2nd a'ruq: musaf'irun masfur'tun
3rd a'ruq: musaf'irun masfur'tun.

We rarely find musaf'irun in the darb of the first a'ruq. The second darb of the first a'ruq is not indicated by al-Khalil b. Ahmad but Ibn Barn notes it was much used by the muhaddil poets, among them Ibn al-Rumi. It may be noted that the second and third a'ruq are regarded as belonging to the radja metre.

Musaf'irun may lose: 1. its r except when used as the first darb in the first a'ruq; 2. its f and the foot becomes (musaf'irun =) mu'taf'irun; 3. its s and f at the same time (which is very bad) and the foot becomes (musaf'irun =) fa'taf'irun. This last change could not be undergone by the first a'ruq.

Musaf'irun loses 1. its f, which is very bad and the foot becomes (musaf'irun =) ma'saf'irun; 2. its w and the foot becomes (musaf'irun =) fa'saf'irun.

3. its f and w at the same time which is very bad and we have (mu'taf'irun =) fa'taf'irun.

Maf'irun and maf'irun may lose their f and become (ma'saf'irun =) fa'saf'irun and (mu'taf'irun =) fa'taf'irun. [Moh. Ben Chene]

MUNSHI. [See INSHI?]

MUNSIF (A.), part. active iv. of n.-f, "to be just, to act with justice", the title of a native judge of the lowest grade in India.

Bibliography: Yule and Burnell, Hebrew-Jebbon, s. v. moonsiff.

AL-MUNTAFAK, a section of the Arab tribe of the Banu 'Ukail, which is a subdivision of the great group of the 'Amir b. Sa'Ja'a [q. v.]. Genealogy: al-Muntafik b. 'Amir b. 'Ukail (Wustenfeld, Gen. Tab., D. 19). The very scanty information in Wustenfeld can be supplemented by the notice which Ibn al-Kalbi gives of the Banu 'l-Muntafik (Djamhur al-anwab, MS. Brit. Mus., fol. 130v—131r); but this little clan nowhere appears to play a great part in early history. The territory inhabited by the Banu 'l-Muntafik is the same as that of the other divisions of the Banu 'Ukail, in the southwest of Yamama; some places belonging to them are quoted by al-Bakri (Mu'izz, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 567). Yaktub (Mu'izz, ed. Wustenfeld, l. 793—794; iv. 712, l. 78: we may note that in these two passages al-Muntafik is said to be the surname of Mu'awiya b. 'Ukai while the usual genealogy makes this Mu'awiya a son of al-Muntafik), al-Handani (Qajara, ed. D. H. Muller, p. 177, l. 12—15: note the mention of gold mines in their territory). The Banu 'l-Muntafik numbered among their clients the Banu 'Athir (Wustenfeld, Gen. Tab., C. 13) whose eponym was said to have been made a prisoner by them (Kitab al-Azhh, vii. 110); one of the few episodes of the pre-Islamic period in which this clan is mentioned is the battle of Shib Dhabala where Kust b. al-Muntafik distinguished himself (ibid., x. 44; Nukhti, ed. Bevan, p. 671 l. 12—672, l. 14, where Ibn 'Ufayl should be deleted). In the history of the origins of Islam, several of them appear as ambassadors of the Banu 'Ukail to the Prophet: such were Ana b. Kais b. al-Muntafik and Laqi b. 'Amir b. al-Muntafik (Ibn Sa'd, i/ii. 45 etc.; on the latter the biographical collections have long discussions as to whether he is to be identified with this or that Muhammad: cf. among others Ibn 'Adjar, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, viii. 450). In the period of the conquests, the Banu 'l-Muntafik settled in the marshy region between Kufa and Basra (al-Kalâshandili, Nihayat al-Árab, p. 65—66). All that we know of them after this period is the name of a few individuals who held public offices: a certain 'Amr b. Mu'awiyah b. al-Muntafik, mentioned by Tabari, i. 3284 at end, as fighting at Siffin, is said by Ibn al-Kalbi to have been governor of Armenia and Aeshabidjan under Mu'awiyah; according to Ibn al-Kalbi, 'Abd Allâh b. Mu'awiyah b. Rab'ba b. 'Amir b. al-Muntafik was governor of Marw and Ahwâz also under Mu'awiyah, and 'Abda b. Kais b. al-Muntafik of Armenia, under Yazid I. These men are not mentioned elsewhere: the same is true of the poet Djahm b. 'Awf b. al-Husain b. al-Muntafik (Ibn Haddar, Isbâ, ed. Sharifia, Cairo 1325), v. 124 follows Ibn al-Kalbi.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(G. Levi Della Vida)

AL-MUNTAQIM. [See ALLAH II.]
AL-MUNTASIR (also called Mustansir) fl. LÈMÄT 'Il'JÝÁFAR MUHAMMAD b. DÝÁFAR, 'Abd al-Muttasim al-Makshih, 

son of al-Mutawakkil and his mother al-Saha.

After his father had been murdered in 241 (Dec. 856) by conspirators, among whom was al-Muntasir, the latter ascended the throne aged 25 according to the usual statement. As a ruler he was only a tool in the hands of the vizier Ahmad b. al-Khüsib and the Turkish generals. His brothers al-Mut'azz and al-Mu'ayyad were forced to renounce their claims to the throne and Wasif, the commander of the bodyguard, was sent to the Byzantine frontier. Unlike his father, he treated the 'Alids with great consideration: nothing else remarkable is recorded of him. Al-Muntasir died in Rabi' II 248 (June 861) or, according to a less trustworthy report end of Rabi' I, in Sámarrā after a reign of six months.


MURĀDI. [See ALMORAVIDS.]

MURĀD, the name of an Arab tribe. 

belonging to the great southern group of the Mudhīdī [q.v.]; genealogical tradition (Ibn al-Kalbi, Dāmmarāt al-Murād, Esqali, M., fol. iv. 114–117), which is followed by Ibn Durūd, Kitāb al-Hisāb, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 238, and also Līthān al-Arab, iv. 409) regards Murād as a nickname for this tribe. It was said to have been the first to rebel (tamarruṭa) in the Yaman: an etymology which is not convincing. Murād's own name is said to have been Yaḥūdī b. Mudhīdī and he was therefore a brother of the Ān and the Sa'd al-Adhābī (Wustenfeld, Gwalt. Tabātiln, p. 74). Although they were neighbours of the South Arabian civilization, the Murād have always played a typically Bedūn character: their country (usually called al-Dāvī and placed to the east of Nadāf and Murād) is bare and sterile (cf. the picturesque description given of it by the Kitāb al-Hisāb, with its mention of the Murād tribe, mentioned by Yāqūt, al-Madīnī, ii. 78) and its inhabitants are notorious as brigands (fath al-Murād; cf. Kitāb al-Hisāb, x. 147). The land inhabited by the Murād and by their neighbours, the Hāmādī [q.v.], had once belonged to the Ta'īy (Yāqūt, al-Madīnī, i. 129), who had left it to settle in the north of the Arabian peninsula; it is probable that it was from the old masters of the country that the Murād and the Hāmādī inherited the cult of the god Yāghūth (cf. below).

The Murād appear for the first time in history in connection with an episode, not however at all clear, of the last days of the dynasty of the Lakhdīram, the last of the king Amr b. al-Mundhir (III) b. Mā'ṣim, who excluded his half-brother 'Amr, a son of Uṣamah, sister of Hind, mother of the first-named 'Amr, from the line of the king, and declared him his chief but when he began to rule tyrannically, they killed him, which gave 'Amr b. Hind a pretext for invading the land of the Murād and putting to death the murderer of 'Amr b. Uṣamah (al-Mufaddal al-

Dārī), Amīn al-Arāb, Constantinople, 1900, p. 68–69, who gives a more satisfactory account of the passage in the narrative, from which Ibn al-Diūrī said (the same story is given by Ibn al-Kalbī, Dāmmarāt; according to Yakūt on the other hand by Huhārī b. 'Ābd yāxīlī, Murādīn, the latter's son Kāsī seems to have been the last of the powerful chiefs of the Murād at the time of the rise of Islam.

The Murād had just then suffered a disastrous defeat, which had considerably weakened them, at the hands of the Hamādī, as the result of a quarrel which had arisen in connection with the control of the worship of the god Yāghūth (cf. Wellhausen, Reste arab., Heidener, p. 19–22 and the sources mentioned by him). It is probably this defeat (Yaḥūdī al-Rāzīm), which tradition places in the same year as the battle of Badr, which made which a section of the Murād think it advisable to seek an alliance with Muhammad; but Kāsī b. al-Makshih refused to join in this. It was therefore another Murād chief, Farwā b. Musāik, who went to al-Madīna in the year 10 A.H., and concluded a treaty there with the Prophet (cf. Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, ii. 332). To what extent tradition is in saying that Farwā was given authority to levy zakāt on all the tribes of the Yaman, is very difficult to ascertain. In any case, the policy of the Murād was not oriented towards Muhammad under the leadership of Kāsī b. al-Makshih. In the great rising led by al-Awādī and the Anṣāni against Persia begun in the Yaman, the Murād were against them. But if, as tradition has it, Muhammad used his connections with some of the tribes of the Yaman to prevent al-Awādī's success, after the death of the Prophet these same chiefs refused obedience to Abū Bakr and resolutely threw themselves into the struggle against Is läm. It is again Kāsī b. al-Makshih who plays the chief part in these events. Taken prisoner, Abū Bakr granted him his life and henceforth the chief of the Murād and his tribe played their part bravely in the conquests. We find them sometimes in Syria, sometimes in the Ṭraj, and Kāsī everywhere distinguishing himself by his expediency and courage. He lost an eye at the battle of Yamīk (cf. Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, i. – v., index s.v. (p. 5 b. Hubayrah). But the account of his death in the civil war between 'All and Muḥāfīzīn is based on confusion with another man of the same name of the tribe of Badjīla (this fact, which is clearly indicated by Ibn al-Kalbī, Dāmmarāt and Taḥārī, i. 301– 

302, has already been noted by Ibn Ḥadījār, Ḥābī, ed. Sharaṣīyā, v. 281; Annali dell' Islam, i. 638 should be corrected). We also find the Murād in the conquests of Egypt (Annali, iv. 573, 21 A.H., § 101 2 120) But it was at Kufa that they settled in the 10th century. It was there that one of them, Abū al-Raḥmān b. Muḥāfīzīn, assassinated the caliph 'All. It was there also that in 60 (679) H. (cf. Ummayyād) was executed by orders of the governor 'Umayyād Allah b. Ziyād after being found guilty of conspiring with Muhammad b. 'Ākīl in favour of al-Ḫusain (Tahārī, ii. 227 sq.). He was a descendant of the poet 'Amr b. Kūtāf (R. S. O., xii. 58, 3271), one of the very few poets
of this title, which does not seem to have produced many individuals of note either during the Djihunya or under Islam. We may however mention Awais i-karan (of the Banu Karan b. Rukman b. Nabilia b. Murad: Westendt, General Taf., p. 7, 251) one of the prototypes of Muslim asceticism.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

MURAD I, according to the common tradition the third ruler of the Ottoman state, was a son of Orkhan and the Byzantine lady Nilifer. Although some Ottoman sources profess to know the year of his birth (Saghil-i ȓiyma, i. 74 gives the year 726 = 1326), this date, like all dates given by Turkish sources relating to this period, is far from certain. The name Murad (Greek sources such as Phrantzes have Ἐκδικήσω, from which later Latin sources make Amurath, while contemporary Latin sources from Italy have Morathel) must have originated in mystical circles and hardly occurs in other times. An Ṣadūl Murad lived in Orkhan's time (cf. Saghil-i ȓiyma, iv. 354; Asikhi Pasha Zade, ed. Giese, p. 200: photographs of his tomb in R. Hartmann, Im neuen Anatolien, Leipzig 1928, plates 9 and 10). The ancient Turkish chronicles often call Murad Gahi Khunklär, later Turkish historians Khuđawendiklar (q. v.).

During his father's lifetime Murad had already been entrusted with the government of In Otu and later of Brusa. His brother Sulaiman Pasha had held the more important sandjaks and was destined to become Orkhan's successor. Sulaiman's untimely death, shortly before that of Orkhan himself, placed Murad unexpectedly at the head of the Ottoman principality. This happened about 1361, the date of Orkhan's death is uncertain.

Murad I became the first great Ottoman conqueror on European soil. In this he followed the footsteps of his brother Sulaiman Pasha and of other Turkish emirs before him.

It is not yet possible to gain a clear idea of the success of the military achievements by which the Ottomans succeeded in establishing themselves firmly on the Balkan Peninsula. Even the outstanding victories are confused with each other in the Ottoman and Western sources, and the exact dating of even important events is subject to great difficulties. The Byzantine sources, the most reliable of all, are mainly concerned with the tortuous policy of the Byzantine rulers. On the other hand, many tales of a legendary character have entered the historical accounts of later times. The possession on the whole is, that the Ottoman successes were mainly due to the mutual rivalry between the then existing Balkan states, Byzantium, and the Bulgarian and Serb-Serbo kingdoms, complicated by the struggles of Venice and Genoa for an advantageous position in the Levant, and the zeal of the popes for bringing the Greek church back to Rome. This secured the Ottomans at all times allies in the Christian camp itself. Nor is it possible to ascertain which Ottoman expeditions were really planned by Murad and his councillors and which were merely successful raids by Turkish bands. All this makes it extremely difficult to form an accurate judgment of Murad's personality as a warrior and as a statesman.

Provisionally three periods can be distinguished. The first begins shortly after Murad's accession with the conquest of Western Thrace, in which were taken Corfu, Demotika (if this town had not already been taken under Orkhan), Glamulnjia, Adrianople (about 1362; cf. Eirike) and Philippopolis, mainly through the activity of the Gregorberg, Lala Shihin, and Eftim Pasha. These conquests provoked a coalition of Servians, Bosnians and Hungarians, who were beaten on the river Maritsa by Hadjijli Ilbeks. The western part of Bulgaria was raised up to the Balkan Mountains and the Byzantine Emperor John Palaeologus made his first submission as vassal to Murad. Murad himself had been on a campaign in Anatolia, which brought him as far as Togyat (q. v.) during which he consolidated the Ottoman hold on Angora (already taken by Sulaiman Pasha in 1354; cf. Wittek, Festschrift Jacob, 1932, p. 347, 351 sqq.). He then came to Rum-ill and took up his residence in Demotika, to change this town in 1366 for Adrianople, from this time on the European capital of the Ottomans. The story about a treaty between Nagusa and Murad concluded in 1365 has a legendary character (cf. Giese, Festschrift Jacob, 1932, p. 42, after Jireček). In the meantime the hostility between Byzantines and Bulgarians gave Murad the opportunity of taking Izbol (Soropolis) near Burgas, and the same hostility led to the failure, about 1366, of a crusade undertaken at the instigation of Pope Urban V by count Amadeo of Savoy to come to the rescue of the Byzantine Emperor: the expedition only drove the Turks from Gallipoli for a short time.

A second period of Murad's reign may be said to begin with the crushing of a Serbian advance on the Maritsa near Cirmen, probably in 1371. This Serbian defeat is known to the Turkish sources as ārīhildiχ and gave the Turks during the following years the important Macedonian towns of Seres, Drama and Kavalla, and at the same time the possibility of advancing west of the Vardar. These conquests were made by Evrenos and Dandarl Khalil Pasha, while Lala Shihin obtained about the same time successes in eastern Bulgaria (battle of Samakow). Then followed again some years of comparative tranquillity, in which the newly won regions were partly colonized by Ottomans; the still unsubdued northern parts of Serbia and Bulgaria were governed by the local rulers as vassals of Murad. The latter had more than once to interfere with the dynastic affairs of the Palaeologoi. After John Palaeologus had sold in 1375 the island of Tenedos to Venice, this led to an alliance of Genoa in combination with the Turks, in course of which John lost his throne and was imprisoned, until, by the favour of Murad, he became Emperor again in 1379; his dependency went so far as to help the Turks, together with his son Manuel, in the conquest of Philadelphia (Aia Shehir), the only remaining Greek fortress in Asia Minor. The end of this second period is marked by an increased activity in Anatolia. A part of the territory of the Germiyan-Oghlu (q.v.) was acquired as a wedding gift to prínce Bayázid when he married the daughter of that ruler (probably in 1381); this territorial accession was followed by the sale of the greater part of the lands of the Hamid-Oghlu to Murad and by the conquest of a part of the principality.

About 1385 there followed new conquests in Europe. Turkish troops intervened in Epirus and Albania (under Khalil Pasha), but decisive for the establishment of Ottoman power in the Balkans
was the taking of Sofia (1385?) and Nish (1386?). About the same time, the Italian republics, Genoa and Venice, obtained by treaties with Murad, concluded respectively in 1385 and 1388, commercial privileges in Turkish territory. Immediately after the successes in Serbia, probably also in 1386, Murad went to war with the Karahan-Oghlu 'Ali' al-Din, his son-in-law; this conflict had long been threatening (cf. KARANAN-OGHLU); now the Ottoman power had grown so far as to destroy the political equilibrium in Anatolia. Murad was victorious in the battle of Konya, but left 'Ali' al-Din in his possessions and set the example, henceforward traditional, of leniency in dealing with the Anatolian population. This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian troops who had taken part in the battle of Konya. These Serbians are said to have contributed to the anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general, who, under the leadership of Lazar Gresljanowitch, and with the Bosnian king Tvrtko as a powerful ally, were preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish vassalage. They succeeded in defeating, an Ottoman army at Plochnik (1388). The results were meagre, however, for at the same time the Turks made new conquests in Bulgaria (Shumla and Timovo) and even raided Morea. In 1389 Murad himself marched against the Serbians and their allies and fought the famous battle of Kosowo Polje (Turkish: KÒSOWA), where he himself lost his life, although the Serbians, partly owing to treachery in their own ranks, were defeated. The most probable date is June 20, 1389 (Gibbons, cf. also Giese, in Epigraphica Orientalia, N° 34, April 1928, p. 2 sqq.). The way in which Murad was killed, during the battle, is not clear from the early sources; the later Serbian epic tradition has the well-known tale that Murad's murder is recorded by Milosch Obranowitch, Lazar's son-in-law, who, claiming to be a deserter, had obtained an audience with Murad after the battle, was admitted to his presence and killed him with a dagger. Murad's body was transported to Brusa and buried in a grave near the mosque which he had built at Cekirge in Brusa (cf. Ahmed Tewhid. in T. O. E. M., vol. vii.).

Murad I was the first ruler under whom the state founded by 'Oghlan rose to be more than one of the then existing Turkoman principalities in Asia Minor. This development is symbolised in the successive change of titles given to him in different building inscriptions dated in his reign (cf. Taeschner, in Id., xx. 131 sqq.). While the oldest inscription calls him simply Illy, like his father 'Orkan, and gives him a name (Shihab al-Dunya wa,l-Din) after the Saljuk fashion, he is already called Sultan [q.v.] in 785 (1383); while in the inscription from 790 (1388) on the Sinari built by him in Zakii, we find the style which afterwards became a tradition with the Ottoman sultans (al-monitor al-mawguzum al-ghamam al-mukarram al-sultan ibn al-sultan). It was a time when the old Saljuk traditional institutions, no longer held, and new forms of government and administration came into being, to which the example of Byzantine institutions, and also those of Mamluk Egypt may have contributed. Even if it is not true that Djandar Khair al-Din Khalil Pasha — who was appointed Murad's vizier at the beginning of his reign and died about 789 (1387) — was the first Ottoman grand vizier, it cannot be denied that the activity of this man — who by his origin belonged to a higher culture than the Ottoman — as Murad's councillor as well as his military deputy and administrator in Macedonia, makes him a true prototype of the grand viziers of a later age (cf. Taeschner and Volz, in Id., xviii. 66 sqq.). His son 'Ali Pasha, according to an order by the Sultan, was to take a prominent part during the years of Murad's reign. It is also with Khalil Pasha that the old Turkish sources connect the institution of the Janissaries as troops formed from converted Christian prisoners of war. In the administration of the timars [q.v.] a Kahan of Murad I is said to have brought improvements. Some of these measures were closely connected with the problem of acquiring a quiet and loyal population in the newly conquered Christian territories; this was not possible by Turkish colonisation only but succeeded mainly through a humane treatment of the original inhabitants, after the region had once been conquered.

The most important holdings of Murad I are all in Asia Minor. The best known are the Khâdîvendîkîr Djûmiî in Cekirge, near Brusa, where Murad himself is buried, and the Ulû Djûmiî in Brusa; further a mosque in Bilehik, the Nilûfî Umâretî in Iznik (recently described by Taeschner, in Id., xx. 127 sqq.). There is also a mosque of Murad in Serres. The old Ottoman chronicles enumerate his foundations. — On Murad I. coins cf. 'Ali, in T.E.M., xiv. 224.

Bibliography: The information given by the old Turkish chronicles (Ashik Paşa Zade, Anonymus, ed. Giese, Urduj, the translations of Leucelavius, also Destrî-nâmê Enerii, ed. Muradîn, Istanbul 1928 and this edition Medhal, Istanbul 1930) is sometimes supplemented by the later historiographers (Sale'd al-Din, 'Ali, Munejdjudji-Bashîj). The Byzantine historians (Plantezès, Ducas, Chalcondyles), however, give a far clearer survey of this period so far as it came under their attention, while documents from Venice, Genoa and Rome throw light on the diplomatic activities provoked by the advance of the Turks in Europe. Ibn Hadîr al-Askââînî, Iâbu'd-al-Ghunûr fi Anbâ' al-Umir, contains also a biography of Murad I. Further the historical works of von Hammer, Ziekenen and Jorg, and A. A. Ghibbus, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916, p. 110 sqq.; C. Jiirek, Geschichte der Serben, Gotli 1918. (J. H. Kiemers)

MURAD II, sixth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born in 806 (1403—1404) and ascended the throne in May 1421, when he arrived in Adrianople some days after his father Muhammed I's death; his decease had been kept secret on the advice of the vizier 'Iwa'd Pasha until the new sultan's arrival. As crown prince he had resided at Magnisia, and he had taken part in the suppression of the revolt of Simawa Oghlu Badr al-Din. Immediately after his accession he had to face the pretender known in Turkish history as Dozme Muftaâ (q.v.) and his ally Djaunâid [q.v.]. Both were supported by the Byzantine emperor Manuel and at first were successful in the European part of the empire. Bâyazid Pagan, sent from Brusa, was defeated and killed in the battle of Sâzf Dere (between Seres and Adrianople) and the allied Greek forces took Gallipoli. Then Murad himself had to face them in Asia; he suc-
ceeded in sowing discord between Mustafa and Djinaid and defeated the first in the battle of the bridge of Ulubad. Then Murad went over, with the help of ships from the Genoese colony of New Phocæa (Yeni Foca), recovered Gallipoli, after which he entered Adrianople and killed the pretender to the throne on the banks of the river. From this siege was raised, either by the effect of Byzantine gold (through the intermediaries of the graceophil vizier Ibrahim Pasha) or as a result of the rise of a new pretender in Iznik in the person of Murad's younger brother Mustafa. The latter was at last betrayed by his former supporter Iliaş Pasha and killed. Then followed a struggle with Djinaid, who had established himself again at Aidin, but surrendered at last in 1425, after which he was killed. Murad was now at peace with all his European neighbours and vassals; the Emperor Manuel had died in 1424 and was followed by John Palaeologos, with whom peace was concluded. Several towns had been taken in the meantime in Morea, and Wallachia paid tribute. In Anatolia the War continued in 1425 with the acquisition of Ståh, ending with the acquisition of a part of his territory by Murad; after 1425 the Ottoman power was confirmed in Teke and Mentesh and the Karanân Oghlu Ibrahim, who tried to take the already Ottoman Adalia, had to retire and make peace. In eastern Anatolia Yurkedj Pasha subdued the Turkomans round Toğat and Amasia and of the region of Djanik. In 1428 there began difficulties on the Hungarian frontier. The most noteworthy exploit of this period was however the capture of Saloniki (Selanik; q.v.) in March 1430; after the Greeks had sold this town to Venice in 1427; Murad had never given up the plan of avenging that transaction. Peace with Venice soon followed.

Occasionally the Turks had taken several fortresses in Epirus and Albania, but their interest began more and more to concentrate on the north-western regions, where George Brankovitch ruled as vassal over Serbia. With the latter peace was renewed in 1432 and his daughter Mara was given to Murad, but the Turkish raids continued in Serbia as well as far into Hungarian territory. In 1438 the Turks made, together with Serbians and Wallachians, incursions in Hungary (capture of Semendra); in 1440 they beleaguered Belgrad in vain and in 1442 Turkish troops under Merzid Bey laid siege to Hermannstadt. Here they suffered a heavy defeat by John Hunyadi, who in the coming years was to act as champion of Hungary and Christian Europe. He was the leader, in 1443, of a big crusading army including Serbians, Poles, and Greeks; the Turks were thrown back at Nish, where so many had been taken. The campaign ended with a heavy defeat of the Turks at Jalowaz, between Sofia and Philippiopolis. In the same year Murad had to oppose again the Karamân Oghlu, who supported the Christian allies. But the peace with Hungary, concluded in July 1444 at Szczeged, though advantageous to Hungary, maintained the former frontiers of the Ottoman political influence: only Wallachia became tributary to Hungary.

After this peace, which was to last ten years and seemed to Murad a guarantee for the future, he abdicated in favour of his son Muhammad, leaving with him Khalil Pasha, son of Ibrahim Pasha (who had died of the plague in 1429) and Rubsaw Molla [q.v.] as councillors. He retired himself to Magnesia, but had to come back when, in September of the same year, the Hungarians, floating the peace treaty, were preparing a new crusade. They marched south of the Danube to Varna; here the army of Murad inflicted on them a crushing defeat, in which King Ladislas of Hungary was killed. Again, Murad II went back to Magnesia, but in the following year a Janissary revolt broke out in Adrianople and it was the vizier Khalil who invited Murad to return a second time, as the young Muhammad did not seem to be able to face the situation.

During the last six years of his reign Murad led again several campaigns in the Balkan peninsula. In 1446 an action was undertaken against the Palaeologoi in the Morea (destruction of the Hexamilion, capture of Corinth and Patras): in 1447 against Albania, where the activity of Skander Beg [q.v.] had begun in 1443; in 1448 he faced again a Hungarian invading army, which was beaten on the plain of Kossowa; and in 1450 he was again in Albania (siege of Croja). In that year the death of Murad II, the last Byzantine Emperor, after the death of John. Shortly afterwards, in the first days of February 1451, Murad died at Adrianople. He was buried in Brusa at the side of his mosque (cf. Ahmad Tewhid, in T.O.F.M., iii. 1856).

His reign was of extraordinary importance for the future political and cultural development of the Ottoman Empire. After the first critical years he continued his father's work of consolidation. His aim was mainly to live on peaceful terms, with the vassal princes, of whom the ruler of Smâr and the despot of Serbia gave their daughters to Murad. This peaceful policy was in concordance with his character; the Byzantine historians and other Christian sources describe him as a truthful, mild and humane ruler. His most influential viziers were not yet the renegades of later times; they belonged to the old families that had supported the cause of Murad's forefathers and were becoming a kind of hereditary nobility: Ibrahim Pasha and Khalil Pasha of the Djandal Oghulari (F. Taeschner and P. Wittek, in It., xviii. 92 sqq.), Haji Cevat Pasha (Taeschner, in It., xx. 154 sqq.), the sons of Timurtash, of Ewrenos and others. The mystical tradition was strong in his surroundings, as is proved by the great influence of a man like the Shaikh Amir Ilbârî; other shâhîgs came to his court from Persia and Mesopotamia. This determined also the direction which the classical Ottoman literature was to take in following centuries. Murad II was the first Ottoman prince whose court became a brilliant centre of poets, literary men and Muhammadan scholars (see Turks, B, ii). But also to non-Islamic envoys and visitors Murad's court seemed a centre of culture (cf. Jorga, i. 464 sqq., which description applies principally to Murad II). Amongst the sultan's buildings a mosque in Brusa (cf. H. White, Brusa, p. 51) and one in Adrianople (the U Çeherfeli Djamî), are notable and some large bridges. His army organisation is well known from a full description by Chalcondylas.

Bibliography: The older Turkish sources: Neshri (Haniwaldanus), Aşıklı Pasha Zade, Čevali, Kühl, Anonymous Giese, are completed by the Byzantine historians Phrantzes, who himself played a part in the diplomatic history of the time, Ducas and Chalcondylas, and also by
the later Ottoman authors Sa'd al-Din, 'Ali and Maneghdjim Bashî. A curious contemporary description is that of an unknown captive from Muhlenbach in Transylvania (captured 1438) in his Tractatus de mortibus conditionum et nocturna Turcorum (cf. K. Foy, in Mes O.S. iv., v.).

General later descriptions of Murad II's reign are the works of von Hammer, G. O. R., ii.; Ziaferî, i. and Jorgan, i.

(J. H. Kramers)

MURAD III, twelfth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born on the 5th Dhu al-Mi‘dâd 195 (4th July 1546; Siţillî xevâbanî, i. 76) as son of the later sultan Selim II and the hâji-şâhi Nûr Bânî. He arrived at Constantinople on Dec. 21st, 1574, after Selim II's death and reigned until his death on January 16, 1595 or a few days later. His reign is not characterized by great conquests in Europe. The peaceful relations with Austria were officially maintained; peace was several times confirmed (in 1575 and 1584) by a new treaty and by extraordinary Austrian embassies. Nevertheless there were continual Turkish raids into Austrian territory, especially in Transylvania 1578 — where even a new sandjak was formed — followed by triumphal processions in the capital, which the Austrian envoys were forced to witness. It was only in 1593 that a formal war broke out, in which the then grand vizier Sinan Paşa took the town of Raab (1594). There relations with Venice were of the same kind as with Austria: notwithstanding several serious naval collisions peace was maintained, mainly through the influence of Murad's hâji-şâhi Saîfyé (of the family of Bâbi) and the Kapudan Pašeys, who were Italian renegades. In the Danube principalities the never ending dynastic disputes went on; this was also the case in Transylvania. Even Poland was considered more or less as an Ottoman tributary vassal state: the Polish king, Stephan Batthyány, owed his crown to the sultan's protection and after his death (1587) the new king Sigismund began to reign by the grace of Murad. The Porte had to intervene several times in the disturbances caused by Polish cossacks in Moldavia and the Tatar Khiâne and by Tatar incursions in Poland. In the Crimea the Ottoman intervention was even stronger, because the Persian war necessitated in 1581 and 1583 expeditions by the way of Khâifa and the Crimea against Dâgiftân and Transcaucasia.

The most outstanding military exploit of the Ottoman Empire during Murad III's reign was the war with Persia, which lasted from 1577 to 1590. Persia passed, after Shah Tahmâsp's death in 1576, through serious inner troubles. This gave the Turks a favourable opportunity of enlarging their territory between 1577 and 1583, the chief theatre of the war was Georgia: Lala Mustafa Paşa won the battle of Lake Calah (August 9, 1578), after which the princes of the small Georgian kingdoms became nominally Ottoman vassals, while several towns, like Tiflis and Shaki, came under direct military occupation. In 1579 the town of Kars was fortified. That same year Sinan Paşa became serasker on the Georgian front. The completion of the conquests confronted the Ottoman armies with serious difficulties, especially after Simon, the former king of Kârtlî, had come back from exile in Persia. This made necessary the already mentioned expedition by the way of the Crimea in 1581 under Ozdemir 'Othmân Paşa who was joined in 1583, by the same way, by Džafir Paşa; they came back to Constantinople again via the Crimea and 'Othmân Paşa was received with great honour by the sultan after his return, although it would seem that the real aim of the expedition — a junction with the Turkish forces of the south — was not reached, owing to the combined efforts of the people of Georgia and Shirvan (cf. W. E. D. Allen, A History of the Georgian People, London 1932. p. 157). The second phase of the Persian war began with the taking of Tabriz in 1585 by 'Othmân Paşa, followed by other successes on Persian territory (Gandja in Transcaucasia and Nîhâwând). In 1587 Shâh Abâbî I ascended the throne: soon afterwards there began peace negotiations, ending in a peace treaty (March 21, 1590) which left Georgia, Shirwan, Karâbâgh, Tabriz and Lurîstân to the Ottoman Empire. One of the peace conditions was that the Persians should give up most of their anti-Sunni religious practices.

During Murad III's first years Muhammad Paşa Sokollî, who had continued to administer the huge Empire as grand vizier, but his once unquestioned authority began to wane under the influence of the sultan's courtiers like Şems Paşa and the defterdâr Uweis: an influential personality also was the Kâhîa'da Sa'd al-Din — the historian — and the eunuch Ghazanfer Agha. Home and foreign politics were influenced also by Murad's mother Nûr Bânî and the already mentioned hâji-şâhi Saîfyé (Bâfi), who used as a powerful agent outside the palace the Jewess Kira (Chierazza in the Italian sources). Sokollî's confidants were relegated from the capital (as the nîšâhîqî Fertîlân) or executed (like Michael Cantacuzenos). But he was still grand vizier, when he was murdered on October 11, 1579. After him the grand vizierate was changed no less than ten times under Murad III. Sinan Paşa already mentioned, held the office three times: 'Othmân Paşa, appointed in 1585, after his return from Dâgiftân, died eight months afterwards. The sultan, though well-intentioned, was too weak himself to direct a consistent policy, — as he acknowledged himself according to 'Ali (cf. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 567) — all kinds of abuses gradually began in this epoch, especially in the administration of the sîefs (cf. Tâmkî and the enrolling of the jannâries; they are summed up in Köthe Bey's Risâla. This sultan's reign witnessed for the first time revolts of the Janissaries directed against the imperial diwân itself. The first mutiny, in April 1589, was caused by depreciation of the coinage and could be appeased only — as so often afterwards — by the sacrifice of the lives of the high officials. In 1592 there was a similar Sighâr revolt. More than one provincial rebellion had to be subdued by force: the most celebrated expedition was that of Ibrahim Paşa, the later dânîîî and favourite of Muhammad III, to Egypt and Syria in 1583; in Syria he percutently severely the Banî Ma‘ân, the leaders of the Druses, but very soon afterwards the successful career of Fâhir al-Dîn [q. v.] began.

Murad's reign can be characterized as the beginning of the internal weakening of the Ottoman power. The sultan did not possess the strong personality of his grand father; his amorous tendencies were much encouraged by his mother and his wife Saîfyé, and he had far more than a hundred
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children. Besides he was inclined to mysticism; he protected mystic poets and himself wrote poems under the tাতalātāt Murād, besides a mystical treatise called Fathāšt al-Šiyām (Hadījī Kūhilā, Nº, 100). His personal Shiī faith was in sympathy with the repeated outbursts of Muslim fanaticism that occurred during his reign and led to the conversion of several churches in the capital into mosques, among them the church of the Greek Patriarchs. These actions caused violent but vain remonstrations from the representatives of France and other Catholic powers. The outward splendour of the court was extravagant: the festival of the circumcision of his son Muhammad, in June 1522, seems to have surpassed all similar ceremonies in the Ottoman history (description by Leobnll). Bibleography: The Turkish contemporary sources are the historical works of 'Ali (a Nauratīn of of 'Ali is dedicated to the Georgian campaign, Péebw, Selaniki, Şoāk Zade and Hasan Rey Zade; Nāmāt al-Hadījī Kūhilā begin with the year 1001 of the hijra (October 1520). Contemporary western sources are the Relazioni of the Venetian harolo's, the diary of Gerlach; further v. Hammer, G.O.R., iv. and the historical works of Ziekenies, iv. and Jorga, iii.; E. J. W. Gibb, H.O.P., iii. 170 sqq. (J. H. KRAMERS)

MURĀD IV, fiftth son of sultan Ahmad I, and seventeenth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born 28th Dijumāt I 1101 (July 27, 1612) and called to the throne as a result of the mutiny of the Janissaries and Şipāhis, which had forced Muşafat I to abdicate, on September 11, 1623. When the lives of Murād and his brothers were in danger, they had been hidden by Kūhilā Pasha. But even after his enthronement Murād IV’s position was far from strong. The turbulent and continuously mutinying Janissaries and Şipāhis were the real masters of the situation and the seven grand viziers that succeeded each other between the accession and 1632 were more or less dependent on the momentary wishes of those militias. The young sultan and his mother Kosem [q.v.] were at first unable to restore the authority of the government, and more than once they were constrained to sacrifice a high official to the mutinous soldateska, amongst them the grand vizier Haz'ı Pasha [q.v.] in February 1622. Gradually the old experienced statesmen of Selim III’s time regained their influence, and sometimes the sultan was able to suppress unreliable officials; he already in April 1624 by the execution of the grand vizier Kemāneš ‘Ali Pasha [q.v.], but it was only in 1632 that he became real master of the situation; in that year he had the grand vizier Redjeb Pasha — until that time one of the most influential men at court — executed, after which began Murād IV’s personal reign of terror.

During this period from 1622—1632 the Asiatic affairs of the Empire required all the available energy of the Porte. In 1623 Baghad had fallen after many atrocities into the hands of the Persians as a result of the intrigues of the Turkish sultan Bekir; Mosul also became Persian, and the Persian army under Hācırz Pasha was powerless. Abūz Pasha [q.v.] was still in revolt at Erzerum; in 1624 an agreement was reached with him, but only in 1628 the grand vizier Khoşrew Pasha forced him to surrender, after which Abūz played a part as governor of Bosnia and of Silistria. In the meantime several vain efforts were made to recover Baghdad, by Hācırz Ahmad Pasha in 1626, and by Khoşrew Pasha [q.v.] in 1629.

From 1632 Murād IV was occupied with incredible energy in the mobilisation of all the country’s resources for the war against Persia, where Shah ‘Abbaš I had died in 1627. He suppressed with great cruelty the rebellious movements among the Janissaries and reduced their number by not applying the devetkirm for twelve years. New and more reliable troops were formed from the dījefdis, bostandjis and especially the raghāms (seymens). The necessary funds were procured by drastic financial measures. Amongst them the confiscation of large fortunes. Every attempt at opposition was cruelly suppressed; in 1633 even the Shāh al-Islām Akhī-Zaide Ḥassān was executed. In October 1635 an army under the new grand vizier Jāhād Yaḥyā Muhammad Pasha left Constantinople, and the following year important military operations took place. The Kapudan Pasha Dēfār, however, was successful in suppressing the power of the Druse Amīr Fakhr al-Dīn [q.v.] and bringing him alive to Constantinople. In 1635 Murād himself left the capital, joined the grand vizier’s army in Erzerum and conquered Erivan (August 1635). Then the undefended Tabriz was taken and destroyed, after which the sultan returned. In the following year the Persians recaptured Erivan. Finally, in 1638, Murād took the field for the second time with the grand vizier Tāfīr Muḥammad Pasha; Baghad was taken by them in December 1638, and thousands of Şipāhis were massacred. This was the end of the Persian war; in 1639 a peace was concluded, which left Baghad to Turkey and Erivan to Persia.

In comparison with the events in Asia, European affairs were of secondary importance. The peace with Austria was several times renewed (1625 at Gyarath and 1627 at Szn) although predatory raids from both sides never ceased. Serious trouble was caused in 1624 by the appearance of Cosack ships in the Bosporus; they were defeated only in 1626. Another hotbed of unrest was the Crimea, where from 1624 to 1628 the Porte had to suffer against its will the Khan Muhammad Giray and his brother Şahin Giray, who even took Kaifa for a time. After 1628 the Tatār Mirzā Kantemur (or Kantumur), chief of the Noghays, became the most powerful man in the khanate; his continual incursions caused serious conflicts with Poland (peace restored in 1634) and in Moldavia. At last Kantemur was executed at Constantinople in 1637.

The peaceful relations with Venice and the western seas powers continued; in 1624 the capitulations had been renewed, but the Porte was without authority over the Barbary states of Algiers and Tunis. England, Holland and France concluded separate treaties with their rulers in order to avert as much as possible the damage done to their trade by the ships of the corsairs. In 1638 a more serious battle took place in the Adriatic between the Venetian fleet and Barbary corsairs; at first Murād ordered the massacre of all Venetians in his Empire, but in 1639 peace was restored. In Constantinople the ministers of Holland (Haga) and England (Roe) intervened successfully in the
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troubles between the Porte and the Greek Patriarchate.

MURAD IV died on February 9, 1640 and was buried in the turbe of the mosque of his father Ahmed; he was the last warlike sultan of the Empire by his energy he restored for some time its military authority, but his reforms did not last after him. Still a separate hanınn-nıme bears Murad IV's name. He was a man of considerable physical strength and of high personal erudition and he liked the company of poets. His attachment to the poet Tith [q. v.] is famous in literary tradition. The poet Nefti [q. v.] on the other hand was executed by his order. On verses written by Murad cf. Gibb, H. O. P., iii. 248 sqq.

He had four sons, all of whom died young; at his death there was only his brother Ibrahim to take the succession. His brothers Bâyazid and Sulaiman were killed by his order during the Erlivan campaign, and later also his brother Kaşım. In course of time Murad had become ever more ferocious, and he is said to have sworn in 1639 that he would subdue all his Christian neighbours (Jorga, iv. 1).

Bibliography: The chief Turkish sources are Na'im, Pecewı and Kara Celebi Zade's Rawdah al-Abrıär. Further the continuation of 'Atıjı's biographical work by Şabik-Zade (G. O. W., p. 259); Eviyi Celebi's Selvanat-nıme is also particularly rich in information about the reign of Murad IV. Of Western contemporary sources must be mentioned the Venetian Relationi and the correspondence of Sir Thomas Roe and Cornelius Haga (Rijks geschiedh. digte Publicat., x.; Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van den Levantsech Handel, 1590—1600, II, 's Gravenhage 1910). Later treatments of this period in the general works of von Hammer (v.), Ziaielsen (iv.) and Jorga (iii.).

J. H. KRAMERS

MURAD V, Ottoman Sultan from May 31 till Sept. 7, 1876. He was born on Sept. 24, 1840 as son of Sultan 'Abd al-Madjid and was deprived of all influence on public affairs during the reign of his elder brother 'Abd al-'Atıjı, who had the plan of altering the succession in favour of his own descendants, so as to deprive Murad of his rights. Murad was called to the throne by the coup d'état of the recently established cabinet, of which Midhat Pasha [q. v.], Muhammad Rushdı and Hüsın 'Awuni were the leading members. By depositing Sultan 'Abd al-'Atıjı they hoped to eliminate the influence of reactionary elements who were opposed to their schemes of reform and they expected to find an ally in Murad. In the night from 30th to 31st May 1876 Murad was induced with some difficulty to proceed to the Seraskerate in Constantinople where he received the homage of the troops and the high dignitaries. He confirmed the cabinet in office. Very soon afterwards took place the suicide of the deposed sultan (June 5) and the murder of the ministers Hüsın 'Awuni and Rashid Pasha during a cabinet meeting in Midhat's house (June 15). These events seem to have been fatal to the mental equilibrium of the new sultan, who, already in the night of his accession, had shown signs of abnormal nervous excitement. He was unable to appear in front of his people at the selaminlik, nor could the sword-girding ceremony (kilği aàyıl) be applied to him. Midhat Pasha and his friends, although fearing that a new

change of ruler might endanger their plans, had to arrange another deposition; they had the sultan's health examined by a number of physicians and, on their report, obtained a fatwah from the Sheij 'Ali al-Halq Ehir Efendi, authorizing Murad's deposition (September 4). His younger brother 'Abd al-Hamid II became sultan and Murad went to live in the Cıraghan Palace, where he died on August 29, 1904. His confinement during 'Abd al-Hamid's reign continued to excite speculation as a yet unsolved mystery and was occasionally represented as one of the crimes of the Hamidian regime.


J. H. KRAMERS

MURAD PASHA, Turkish grand vizier under 'Ahmad I, was a Catholic by birth and was born about 1520. He served the empire as military commander and later as wali in different provinces (Egypt, Yaman, Anatolia) and was made commander by the Persians in the battle of Tabriz (Sept. 1358), where Cihfıle's army was destroyed. In 1601 he was pasha of Budın and in 1603 commander-in-chief with the Hungarian front. In these posts he repeatedly conducted for the Porte peace negotiations with Austria. He was the chief negotiator of the peace of Zsitvatorok (Nov. 11, 1606). A month afterwards (Dec. 11, 1606), after the execution of Derdüş Pasha in Constantinople, he was appointed grand vizier, being then already about 84 years of age.

As grand vizier Murad Pasha became particularly famous by his relentless persecution and repression of the many rebellions in the Asiatic provinces. In 1607 he defeated the Kurd Djanbulad [q. v.] in North Syria (battle of Urudj Owasl in Oct. 1607). After having passed the winter in Aleppo, he succeeded in crushing the forces of the arzhebel Kalender Qohlu at the pass of Goksun in Cappadocia (July 1908), where he decided the battle by his personal courage. Then he pursued from Siwas the rebel Maimûn and defeated him near Biaurlı. His habit of throwing the captured rebels into pits dug for that purpose brought him the name of Koyğdu Murad Pasha. Notwithstanding the sultan's order — provoked by his envy in the capital — that he should proceed immediately against Persia, he returned in December to Constantinople, where he was received with great honours. Poets celebrated his achievements against the rebels. In 1609 Murad Pasha went to Scutari for the Persian campaign, but he went no further that year, because he wished first to deal with two remaining dangerous rebels: Muselli-Caşh in Rı Ili and Yusuf Pasha in Aădın. By false propositions of reconciliation these two were at last induced to surrender and afterwards killed. Murad Pasha had to make use more than once of his personal influence with the sultan to restrain the latter's impatience before his plans had succeeded.
On the other hand, the sultan had to protect several dignitaries against the personal hatred of the terrible old man. In 1610 the grand vizier at last marched to Peraila and destroyed Tabriz; then he went to Eyrevan, from where he began long and extended negotiations with Shah 'Abbas. Before the following year's campaign had begun, he died (August 5, 1611). He was buried in a türbe near the mosque he had founded in the quarter Wenezjuler in Constantinople.

By his successes in restoring the internal order of the empire Murâd Paşa is considered as one of the most able grand viziers; the historians give ample proofs of his sound judgment of persons and situations. To his initiative is due a compilation of the kanuns regulating the timar administration (G. O. W., p. 141).


MURAD SÜê. [See AL-FURAY.]

MURADABAD. [See MOKÂRÂDÂB.]

MURÂDÎ, takhallus of Murâd III [q. v.] and Murâd IV [q. v.].

MURCIA (Ar. Murujâ), a town in the S. E. of Spain, 140 feet above sea level in the centre of the famous huerta de Murcia ("gardens of Murcia") watered by the river Segura (Ar. Wâdî Shûqûra [q. v.] or Wâdi-l-lâbyâd, "the white river"). The area of Murcia has a large population: over 150,000, although the town in the strict sense has barely 30,000. Murcia is the capital of the province of the same name and the see of a bishop; it has also a university. Its port, 40 miles to the south on the Mediterranean coast, is Cartagena, the Kordofâna or Kordofânat al-Khulâfâ' of the Arabs.

The situation of Murcia in the centre of very fertile gardens, forming an island of vegetation in a bare country poorly endowed by nature, had been noticed already by the Arab geographers who give more or less long accounts of it. Abu 'l-Fidâ', for example, says that it was like Seville for the number of its groves and parks (munatazâbât), among which he mentions the famous al-Rushâkâ.

Murcia in the Uniaid period was the capital of a province or kûrah which bore the name of Todmir [q. v., iv. 805]. This name which is connected with the name of Theodemir, a Visigothic chief of the region at the time of the Muslim conquest, was also applied to the town of Murcia itself, from the time when it supplanted Orihuela [q. v.] as the chief town of the region. Indeed almost all the Arab authors who speak of Murcia agree in saying that it was a comparatively recent foundation; it was built by order of the Uniaid emir 'Abd al-Rahîm II al-Hakam about the year 210 (825), according to the al-Rawâd al-mi'âr in 216 by the governor Dâhir b. Malik b. Labîd.

The land of Todmir and with it of course Murcia was much involved in the civil wars provoked by the rivalry of the Yamanîs and the Mudasirs of Spain in the period of the independent emirs of Cordova. In the reign of 'Abd Allah (275-300 = 888-912), a rebel, the renegade Dâisam b. Isâhâk, rose there with the connivance of the famous agitator Ibn Hašûn (cf. UMAIYADS II). He ruled independently all the province of Todmir until the emir of Cordova sent to suppress him in 283 (896) an army led by his uncle Hishâm b. 'Abd al-Rahîm b. al-Hakam and the general Ahmad b. Muhammad ibn Abi 'Abda. Daisam was defeated between Aledo and Lorca and the latter town besieged. The country was only definitely pacified and restored to the central power in Cordova in the reign of the caliph 'Abd al-Rahîm III and his successor al-Hakam II.

During the events which ended in the break up of Umâyяд Spain, Murcia became, like the majority of the great towns of the Peninsula, the capital of a little independent state. At first in the hands of the "Slavs" (cf. ŞAKÂLABâ) Khairân and Zuhar, along with Almeria and Jan, the principality of Murcia was then for some time attached to the kingdom of Valencia, in the reigns of 'Abd al-'Azîz al-Mansûr ibn Abi 'Amir and his son 'Abd al-Malik al-Mu'azzâr. The governor who then ruled Murcia was Abû Bakr Ahmad b. Išâk Ibn Tâhir; when he died in 455 (1063) after amassing a considerable fortune, he was succeeded by his son Abû 'Abd al-Rahîm Muhammad who soon proclaimed himself independent and repudiated the authority of the Valencia dynasty.

The principality of Ibn Tâhir soon aroused the covetousness of the minister of al-Mu'tamid [q. v.] Ibn 'Abdah, king of Seville, and an expedition was sent against Murcia with the help of an independent lord of the district, Ibn Rashîk. Ibn Tâhir was taken prisoner and shut up in Montegudo, but escaping, he reached Valencia where after acting as adviser to his khalîf Ibn Qâhî l-Nun [q. v.] and having almost succeeded him, he finally died in 508 (1119). The conquest of the kingdom of Murcia by Ibn Anmûr in the name of the 'Abbasîs took place in 471 (1078), but it was only nominal and it was Ibn Rashîk who exercised the real power instead of Ibn Tâhir.

The kingdom of Murcia was one of the first districts of the Peninsula to be conquered by the Almoravîs. Murcia was taken for Yusuf b. Tâshîfîn [q. v.] in Shawwal 484 (Nov.-Dec. 1091) by the Lammûtulan general Ibn 'Alîgha who next took Denia and Játiva. Ibn 'Alîgha remained governor of Murcia; he was replaced later by Abû Bakr b. Ibrahim Ibn Thüilât, then by a brother of the sultân 'Ali b. Yusuf, Abû Isâhâk Ibrahim.

A general rising against the Almoravids took place in Spain in the beginning of the 11th century and gave rise to the formation of a new series of kingdoms of "taifa." Murcia therefore between 1143 and 1147 was in the hands of two rival leaders, 'Abd Allah b. Iyaâd and 'Abd Allah b. Faradj, until the Valencian ruler Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Sa'd Ibn Mardânish seized it and took up his residence there. This individual, who was of Spanish origin (cf. above, ii., p. 403), soon became the powerful ruler of all S. E. Spain, between Valencia and Almeria, and instituted a series of fruitful alliances with the Christian rulers of Catalonia, Aragon and Castille. He was for long able to resist the attacks of the first Almohads 'Abd al-Mu'min [q. v.] and Yusuf [q. v.], and it was only after his death in 567 (1172) during the siege of his capital Murcia that his kingdom passed finally to the Mu'âimid sovereigns.

From the fall of the Almohad empire in Spain until its conquest by the Christians Murcia had
a very troubled existence. It was in turn the
residence (from the beginning of the 11th century)
of princes of the family of the Banū Hūd of
Saragossa: Muhammad b. Yāsuf al-Mutawakkil,
the latter's uncle, Muhammad, Abū Bakr Muhammad
al-Walī, then he passed to the Nasrids of Granada
to Abd ʿAllāh b. Abū Bakr as-Saidī. For details
of the obscure history of this period such a mono-
graph by Gaspar Remiro quoted below. According
to Ibn al-ʿAṣl (cf. M. Bencheneb, *Notes chrono-
logiques sur la conquête de l'Espagne*, in *Melanges
Rene Basset*, Paris 1923, n. 733), Murcia was
surrendered to the Christians by Abūb b. Muḥam-
mad b. Hūd, son of the governor, on Thursday
10th Shawwāl 640 (April 2, 1243). But if we may
believe the Christian chronicles it was in February
1266 that Don Jaime of Aragon took definite
possession of Murcia.

**Bibliography:** al-ʿIrādī, *Description de
l'AFrique et de l'Espagne*, ed. and transl. Dozy
and de Goeje, p. 194—216; Ibn ʿAbī Ḥārām, *Tim-
kūn al-Maṣūlimān*, ed. Kennard and de Sane,
p. 175—206; Vakūt, *Mudjam*, ed. Wastenfeld,
p. 497; Ibn Abd al-Muḥammad al-Ḥimyarī, *al-
Rasāʾil wa-l-Muqāṣar, art.* Murcia; Ibn al-ʿAṣl
Mudjamī, Ibn al-Kūliyya, *Iṣṭiḥāṣ al-Nuṣrah, passim;*
Ibn ʿIdājīrī, *al-Ḥijān al-muṣārāt, ii.* and *ii.*
indices; all the historians and biographers of the
Muslim west; European writers: A good
monograph has been written on Muslim Murcia
by M. Gaspar Remiro, *Historia de Murcia
Murciana*, Saragossa 1905. Also Dozy, *Histoire
des Musulmans d'Espagne*, 2nd ed., *index;*
do, *Recherches, passim;* A. González Palencia,
*Historia de la España Musulmana*, p. 57, 82, 88;
1926; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Inscriptions arabes
d'Espagne*, Leyden—Paris 1931, p. 96
sqq.; do, *L'Espagne musulmane du XIe siècle,
Institutions et vie sociale*, Paris 1932, *indices;*
E. Tormo, *Cuentas* (Guzas Calpe), Madrid 1923.
(E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL.)

**MURDĀDH** (p.), the fifth month of the
Persian solar year running from July 19 to
Aug. 18 (Murdād nūt); Murdād also the name
of the seventh day of each month (Murdād
rū); it is the last of the series of the days which
are called after the Ame-ḥa Spentas. Murdād
(Pellevi amurdadh “immortality”) forms with Khur-
dā (q.v.) (Pellevi khuradh perfection) an
indivisible pair and the days which bear these names
come together. They denote a pair of archagels,
of whom Murdād has charge of the gifts of the
earth on which the life of man depends. The
seventh day of the month Murdād on which the
names of the day and of the month are the same
is called Murdadānah.

**Bibliography:** al-Ḥirānī, *Albār*, ed. Sachau,
p. 242, 243, 76, 223; Geiger-Kühn, *Gr. L. Ph.*,
i. 638, 675 *sqq.* (M. PLISNIAK.)

**AL-MURDJĪA, name of one of the early
sects of Islam, the extreme opponents of the
Khāridjītes [q. v.]. The latter thought that a Muslim
by committing a mortal sin becomes a khār. The
Murdjīa, on the other hand, were of opinion that
a Muslim does not lose his faith through sin. This
doctrine led them to a far-reaching quest in politics;
according to their doctrine, the inmām who was guilty of mortal sins did not cease to
be a Muslim and must be obeyed. The šalāt
performed behind him was valid.

Occidental and Oriental explanations of the
name show considerable divergencies (cf. e.g.
Sale, *Preliminary Discourse*, p. 229 sqq.; Goldziher,
*Richtungen der islam. Koraanübersetzung*, p. 179;
V. Kremer, *Gesch. d. herrschenden Ideen*, p. 20;
Houtmans, *Spiegel der gotse*, p. 34). It seems
to me that the origin of the name must be sought
in the term ʿirādī, in this way that Murdād is a noun
adherents of the doctrine of ʿirādī “(Abd ʿAllāh
al-Baghdādī uses the term for their doctrine) and
that this term goes back to verse 107 of sūrā ix.
The context of this verse not only explains the
term ʿirādī, but may also give an insight into the
 evolution of the ideas of the Murdjītes. In
the preceding verses Muhammad makes a distinc-
tion between two groups among the Madineh
who had forsaken him in the expedition to Tabuk
[q. v.]: some had shown ʿirādī without penitence;
they were to receive punishment in this and in
the other world (verse 102). Others had shown penitence (tawwudh); they were left to Allah's mercy
(verse 103). The third group, who had not made
penitence, were left in suspense (mudjaʿi; 
or, according to a different reading, mudjāna).
The situation in Madina after the expedition to
Tabūk was generalised by certain sects. As a matter
of fact, the third group mentioned in the passage
discussed — viz. sinners who did not show penitence
— was relegated to Hell by the Khāridjītes.
In opposition to this, the Murdjītes taught the
doctrine of ʿirādī mentioned in sūrā ix. 107 and
therefore they were called Murdīja, i.e. the
adherents of the doctrine of respite or hope; for
this term ʿirādī means; the variants murdījuna
and murdījūna are irrelevant in this respect.

In the course of time the doctrine of the Murdīja
assumed a double aspect. Their chief thesis was the
indelible character of faith, in opposition to the
Khāridjītes. Their second thesis was of an escha-
tological nature: where there is faith, sins will do
no harm. On account of the latter doctrine they
were called the adherents of promise (ʿabd al-nīfak)
in contradistinction to the Muʿtazīlīes [q. v.]
who were called the adherents of threats (ʿabd al-
aqīd). So the doctrine of ʿirādī had acquired a
triple aspect — which accounts for the divergent
explanations of the name — viz. the doctrine of faith
bearing an indelible character, an indulgent attitude
among sinners in the Muslim community, and
a hopeful prospect for them in the Last Judgment.

These are the chief tenets of the Murdīja as
they appear to us as well as to later Muslim
writers such as al-Shaghraṭāni. Earlier authors
enumerate a number of divergencies among
the different groups of Murdījītes. Al-Aṣḥārī mentions
their variety of opinion regarding faith, unbelie-
sin, tawwudh, interpretation of the Kurān, escha-
tology, mortal and venal sins, forgiveness of mortal
sins, the impeccability of the Prophets, punish-
ment of sins, the question whether there were
influs among the early generations of Islam,
redress of wrongs, the beatific vision, the nature
of the Kurān, the qudullūs of Allāh, His names and
ṣifāt, predestination.

ʿAbd ʿAllāh al-Baghdādī mentions three groups
of Murdījī: a. those who taught ʿirādī regarding
faith and free-will; to this group belonged ʿAbān
Abū Marwān al-Dimashkī, Abu ʿShaḥīr, Muhammad
b. Abu Ṣabīl al-Ḥassa; b. those who taught ʿirādī
regarding faith and compulsion (ṭabīr); c. those
who gave faith the pre-eminence before works and
works.
belonged neither to the adherents of the doctrine of free will nor to those of predetermined, so the latter group belonged the followers of Vivas b. 'Awn, Ghasāmin, Abū Thawbān, Abū Ma'dūh al-Tawmān, Bishr b. Ghayyath al-Mātars [q.v.]. The followers of Ghasāmin reckoned Abū Hanifa as one of their friends, not, however, quite rightly, according to al-Baghdādi. That Abū Hanifa shared the general views of the Murdijī, appears from his (unedited) letter to al-Batti, which is preserved in a MS. in the library of Cairo.

Although al-Baghdādi mentions a hadith in which the Murdijī are cursed, the high esteem in which Abū Hanifa stood as a dogmatist and as a doctor of the law would be in itself sufficient proof of the fact that the "sect" was not too eccentric. As a matter of fact, their political quietism was largely practised by orthodoxy itself. As regards ecclesiastical punishment, the Fiṣḥ Ḥādrun, ii. (art. 14) rejects the Murdijī doctrine of the capacity of our good deeds being accepted and of our sins being forgiven, Abū Hanifa being free to punish the sinner or to grant him forgiveness. — The same 'akīda, however, shares the Murdijī doctrine of the constancy of faith (art. 18).


(A. J. Wensinck)

MURGHĀB. [See MERW AL-SHSHIDJAKIN.]

MURDI, new, the term applied during his period of preparation to one who wishes to enter a derwīsh order [TA'RĪQA, q. v.; cf. also DERWISH] or to a guild [SIN, q. v.]. The task of the murid and his obligations to his master (sharīk, shir) and to his ideal and mystical and erotic foundations have been often and fully discussed, so that it is here sufficient to give a reference to the most important literature of modern times, which will guide one to the sources themselves. In the wider application of the word murid has become a term for mystic in general.


(M. Plessner)

AL-MURUJANI, ABU AYUB SULAIMAN AL-KHANZI, vizier of the caliph al-Mansūr. When the governor of Fars Sulaiman b. Habib al-Muhallabi in the Umayyad period had the future caliph al-Mansūr, who was accused of embezzling state funds, flogged and intended to treat him with still greater indignity, the latter was saved by Abu Ayub al-Murijani who was Sulaiman's secretary. According to another story, al-Murijani purchased him as a young boy and sent him some capacity to his brother, the caliph al-Saffah, who was so pleased with him that he at once took him into his service and promoted him there. After his manumission, Murijani was in any case appointed vizier by al-Mansūr in succession to Khālid b. Barmak. He had a great influence over the caliph: in 512 (770) however, he was arrested with his brother and the latter's sons and deprived of all his property. According to some, his crime was that he had embezzled a large sum received from al-Mansūr to make a district in Khūzestān arable and deceived the caliph when he came to inspect it by making the place look as if it were cultivated. According to others, he had a son of al-Mansūr murdered. He died in prison in 514 (770). — The nisba al-Murijani comes from Murijan, a town in Khūzestān.


MURSALAT (A.), pass. part. IV from arāda "to send". As a technical term it denotes a. an apostle of Allāh; b. traditions of which the isnād is defective in a certain sense; cf. ṢULĀH, i. c.

AL-MURSALAT. title of Ṣura lxxvii., after the first verse: "By those which are sent by Allāh, following one another in a continual series." According to some interpreters a certain group of angels is meant here; according to others, however, the mursalat are the verses of the Korān. See the commentaries on the Korān on 104 Ṣura lxxvii. 1.

MURSHIDABĀD, district in the Presidency Division of Bengal; area 2,145 sq. m.; pop. 1,372,274, of whom 713,152 are Muslims. The public offices are at Barrampur, but the old capital is at Murshidabād, which before Murshid Kuli's appointment was known as Mahbubnagar or Mahbubulbād. The district is mainly agricultural, and produces much rice, jute, etc., and is famous for its mangoes. The silk industry was formerly of great importance, but has now much declined. The district played a very prominent part in the history of Bengal, and is full of historical sites though Plassey is now outside its borders. The history of Calcutta and of the English in Bengal is intimately connected with Murshidabād. But the Nawābs are no longer of political importance.

Murtada al-Sharif Abu l-Kasim 'Ali b. al-Tahir Dhi l-Manasir Abi Ahmad al-Husain b. Mansur b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. Musa al-Kasim b. Djalal al-Sidid b. Muhammad al-Bakir b. 'Ali Zain al-Abidin b. al-Husain b. 'Ali b. Abi Talib, Alas al-Huda, a rab author born in 555 (969), died in 436 (1042) as Naskh of the 'Alds in Baghdad. Of his works, which are detailed in Alwahad, Verszeichnis der Handschriften, in Berlin, No. 16, we still have the following: 1. His principal work Ghurar al-Fawaid wa-dawar al-Qalii b. 'I al-Mu'asarat, usually called briefly al-Dawar wa l-Ghurar, which he finished on the 22nd flash 436. (Aug. 24, 1022) is an adab book which the discussion of verses of the Kur'an and traditions adds numerous philological and lexicographical notes and extensive references to poets and is divided into So (82) madhils, lath. Tbran 1275, 1277, pr. Cairo 1225 as the Khal al-Askali. 2. Khal al-Shafi, a defence of the unnamine of the Twelvers against the Musulim of the Mu'tazilis chief kadi of the Shafiis in Rayy Abu l-Husain 'Abd al-Ujahbahr b. Ahmad al-Asadabadi (†415 = 1024), along with an abbreviated version of the year 432 (1040) by al-Thajj al-Tsaii entitled Talikhi al-Shafi printed in one volume Tbran 1301: 3. Tahdih al-Awa'min in a collected volume Tbran 1304 (s. E. G. Browne, A Year among the Persians, p. 554); 4. al-Dhara'i'i lijilal al-Shari'a, Brit. Mus. Or. 5581 (Descriptive List, No. 21); 5. al-Mudit al-Qadisiya in the collected volume al-Dhawa'i: al-Abha in, Tbran 1276; 6. al-Insif, on the differences between the Shafiis and the other madhubs, lath. Bombay 1315. (s. Goldziher, Vorl. uber den Islam, p. 271); 7. al-Sighi'i je 'l-Shafi'i ta'a in, pr. Stanbul (Usui) 1302 in a Madjimiin, Tbran 1272 (s. Goldziher, Arabisch, zur arabischen Philosophie, u. p. xxiv, xli). He is also regarded as some by the author of the Nahj al-Balagha, a collection of reputed sayings of 'Ali, which others (so always in Yemen, according to MSS. of the Ambrosiana, see R.S.O., iii. 574) attribute to his brother al-Raji Abu l-Husain Muhammad, born in 350 (969), died 406 (1015) (s. vol. iv., p. 354 sq.); lath. Tabriz 1247, Tbran 1271, Cairo n.d., Baruti 1885 with commentary by Muhammad 'Abd (d. 1905), Cairo 1290; 1328, with footnotes by Muhammad Hasan Naiil al-Marsafi, 1925. Commentaries on it were written by: 1. his contemporary 'Ali b. al-Nasir al-Husaini entitled al-Imam Nahj al-Balagha, s. Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Brit. Library, No. 413; 2. 'Ali al-Din Abu Hamid 'Abd al-Hamid b. Hilal Allah b. 'Ali l-Halidi al-Madiinib, d. 665 (1267) (C.A.L., i. 249—251, Bombay 1304; Tbran 1270, 2 vols., 1281, 10 vols. Cairo 1330, 20 vols.; 3. Kamal al-Din Mithum b. 'Ali b. Mithum al-Najjari in 776 (1374), Fikhr, Cairo, iv., b. 60; 4. 'Imad al-Din Yahyai b. Ibrahim b. Yahyai al-Ujahbahr (s. Brit. Mus. Suppl., No. 1228, iv.; his Divan in Munich, Glaser, No. 104) in the Ambrosiana, C 7, s. K.S.O., vi, 1303; 5. (Persian) Fakhir al-Din 'Ali b. Hasan al-Zawari in the reign of Shah Tahmisp 1 (930—944 = 1524—1537); s. Story, Pers. Literature, i. 14; 6. (Persian) the latter's contemporary Husain b. 'Abd al-Hak al-Halai al-Astarabadi, s. Ivanov, Cat. As. Soc. Bengali, ii. 372; Cambridge Suppl., No. 1342; Asafya, ii. 1608, No. 185. While the authorship of the Nahj al-Balagha must remain open the anthology Tasf al-Khatr al-Arab to is to be ascribed to our author and not with the Ihnen, Cat. Escr., No. 378 to his brother, as in the preface he quotes his own work mentioned under No. 7. He and not his brother as in the article Sharif Pusha is to be credited with the Mashyak al-Murd, which 'Allaki Khalifa No. 1377 ascribes as al-Madrid to the 'Ali and he is probably also the author of the Kitab al-Madrid al-Mahoriy, also ascribed to al-Radi and extant in a manuscript in the British Museum (s. Oriental Studies presented to E.G. Browne, p. 137, No. 2) and was printed at Baghdad in 1328. This also holds of the Kitab Mu'min al-Kur'an, there quoted but now lost. The Turkish commentary on it in Usui ascribed to 'Ali also credits him with the authorship.


Murtadd (A.), "one who turns back", especially from Isfin, an apostate. Apostasy is called tilidim or irddin; it may be committed verbally by denying a principle of belief or by an action, for example treating a copy of the Kur'an with disrespect.

1. In the Kur'an the apostate is threatened with punishment in the next world only; the "wrath of God" will fall upon him according to a Sura of the latest Meccan period (xxi. 105 sq.) and severe punishment (aslaha) "except he did it under compulsion and his heart is steadfast in belief". Similarly it is written in the Medina Sura iii. 8 sq.: "... This is the punishment for them, that the curse of Allah, the Angels and of men is upon them for all time (82); the punishment shall not be lightened for them and they shall not be granted allevation, (83) except for those who later repent and make good their fault, for Allah is forgiving and merciful. (84) Those who disbelieve after believing and increase in unbelief, shall not have their repentance accepted; they are the erring ones. (85) Those who are unbelievers and die as unbelievers, from none of them shall they be accepted the earth-full of gold even if he should wish to ransom himself with it; this is a painful punishment for them and there will be no helpers for them" (cf. also iv. 126; v. 59; ix. 67). Sura ii. 214 is to be interpreted in the same way although it is adduced by Shafi as the main evidence for the death penalty: "... He among you who falls away from his belief and dies an unbeliever — these, their works are fruitless in this world and the next, and they are the companions of the fire for ever".

2. There is little echo of these punishments in the next world in the Traditions (cf. Ibn Mada, Hudad, bbb 2; Ibn Haubal, i. 409, 430, 464 sq.; v. 4, 5). Instead we have in many traditions a new element, the death penalty. Thus Ibn 'AbbAs transmits an utterance of the Prophet: "Slay him, who changes his religion" or "behead him" (Ibn Mada, Hudad, bbb 2; Nasai, Tahrim al-Din, ...
Abu Daud, Hudud, bāb 15; Ibn Hanbal, i. 217, 252, 253, 322). According to another tradition of Abu Abdās and Abū Aṣma, the Prophet said to have permitted the blood to be shed of him "who abandons his religion" and separates himself from the community (Qānūn). (Bukhārī, Dāīyat, bāb 6; Muslim, Kāsimah, tr. 25, 26; Nasa'i, Tabaqat al-Din, bāb 5, 14; Kāsimah, bāb 6; Ibn Māja, Hudud, bāb 1; Abu Dāwūd, Hudud, bāb 1; Tirmidhī, Dāīyat, bāb 10; Fītan, bāb 1; Ibn Hanbal, i. 382, 444). But there was no agreement from the first on the nature of the death penalty, thus three (d. 106 = 724) and Anaā b. Mālik (d. 91 = 710) criticise Ali for having punished apostates (Bukhārī, Istiḥābat al-Murtaddīn, bāb 2; Tirmidhī, Hudud, bāb 25; Abu Dāwūd, Hudud, bāb 1; Ibn Hanbal, i. 217; according to a variant the reference is to Zindikūn or Zuqūr, who served idols; Nasa'i, Tabaqat al-Din, bāb 15; Ibn Hanbal, i. 382, 322). According to a tradition of 'Aisha's, apostates are to be slain, crucified or burned (Nasa'i, Tabaqat al-Din, bāb 11; Kāsimah, bāb 13; Abu Dāwūd, Hudud, bāb 1). On the question whether the apostate should be given an opportunity to repent, traditions differ. According to one tradition of Abu Burdā (d. 104 = 724), 'Umar b. Jishāl refused to sit down until an apostate brought before him had been slain "in accordance with the decision of God and of his apostle" (Bukhārī, Magāzhī, bāb 60; Istiḥābat al-Murtaddīn, bāb 2; Alkām, bāb 12; Muslim, Ima'm, tr. 15; Abu Dāwūd, Hudud, bāb 1; Ibn Hanbal, v. 231). In the same tradition in Abu Dāwūd however, it is added that they had tried in vain for 20 nights to convert the apostate. The caliph 'Umar is also represented as disapproving of this proceeding with the words: "Did you then not let him up for three days and give him a round loaf (ragāfī) daily and try to induce him to repent?" or "he would have repented and returned to obedience to God. O God! I was not there, I did not order it and I do not approve; see, it was thus reported to me" (Mālik, Abūiya, tr. 15). There are also traditions according to which God does not accept the repentance of an apostate (Ibn Hanbal, v. 2 sqq.) and others according to which even the Prophet forgave apostates (Nasa'i, Tabaqat al-Din, bāb 14, 15; Abu Dāwūd, Hudud, bāb 1; Ibn Hanbal, i. 247; Tabari, Tafsīr, iii. 223). 3. a. In the Fīkh there is unanimity that the male apostate must be put to death, but only if he is grown up (bāligh) and composes mensis (wālih) and has not acted under compulsion (maṣḥūr). A woman on the other hand is imprisoned, according to Hanafī and Shafi'i teaching, until she again accepts Islam, while according to al-Awārī, Ibn Hanbal (Tirmidhī, Hudud, bāb 25), the Malikis and Shafi'is (cf. Umm, i. 331, 733), Shafi'ī vigorously attacks Abu 'Ubaid who is not mentioned by name) she also is put to death. Although this punishment is not properly hadīth (cf. thereon Shafi'i, Umm, vii. 339, 285), it is regarded as such by some jurists, as it is a question of a hadīth Allah (cf. e.g. Saraqīsh, Siyar, iv. 162; therefore the execution of the punishment lies with the imām; in the case of a slave however, the māzār can carry it out, as with any other hadīth punishment. Execution should be by the sword. According to the above traditions, apostates must sometimes have been tortured to death. The caliph 'Umar I had them tied to a post and a lance thrust into their hearts (Abū Yusuf, Khuṭbā, p. 112). Shafi'ī expressly forbid any form of torture, like burning, drowning, strangling, impaling, flaying; according to him, Sulfān Baibars (708-709 = 1308-1309) was the first to introduce torture (Horner, Vorget. Geschich. ii. 198). Lane (Manners and Customs, ch. iii, near the end) records the case of a woman who was apostatised and was led through the streets of Cairo on an ass, then strangled in a boat in the middle of the Nile and thrown into the river. [The throwing of the corpse into the Nile was already usual in Cairo in the Fatimid period; cf. Mez, Renaissance d. Isl., p. 29]. In quite recent times followers of the Kādīyānī or Ahmadiyya sect in Afghanistan were stoned to death (O. M., v. [1925], 138). In former Turkish territory and Egypt as well as in Muslim lands under European rule since the middle of the xixth century, under European influence the execution of an apostate on a kādī's sentence has been abolished, but we still have imprisonment and banishment (cf. Isabel Burton, The Inner Life of Syria, London 1875, i. 150 sqq.) however in the other lands as well as the popular judgement the death penalty is sanctioned (cf. 'Alisha, Siyar, 233, 330). 4. a. Whether attempts at conversion must be made is a question of ikhtilaf. A number of jurists of the first and second (viiith and viiiith) centuries deny this (as do the Zāhirīs) or like 'Abī (d. 115 = 733) make a distinction between the apostate born in Islam and one converted to Islam; the former is to be put to death at once (so also the Shafi'is). Others insist on three attempts at conversion (relying on Sūra iv. 156; cf. Tabari, Tafsīr, v. 193 sq.) or have him in the first place imprisoned for three days (cf. above 2). According to others again, one should await the round of the five times of prayer and ask him to perform the sujud at each; only when he has refused at each is the death punishment to be enforced. If however he repents and professes Islam once more, he is released (cf. thereon Shafi'i, Umm, i. 228; Abū Yusuf, Khuṭbā, p. 109). In later times istiṣbāṣ was always applied. b. Apart from the fact that apostasy deprives the murtadd of burial with Muslim rites it has certain civil consequences. The property of the murtadd is ftā' according to Shafi'i and the Malikis; if the fugitive murtadd returns penitent, he is given back what remains (cf. Umm, i. 231 sqq., where Shafi'i opposes the contrary Hanafi view). Others, especially later Shafi'is, regard the rights
of ownership of the apostate as suspended (marshīf) and regard him as one who is under guardianship (mualāfīr); only if the fugitive apostate dies in the dār-al-harb, does his property become fai (Shirāzi, Muhādātulbab, Cairo 1343, ii. 249; cf. Shāfi', Umm. vili. 355). Among the Ḥanafis and Shāfis the estate is allotted by the kādi to the legal heirs (cf. also those in Dārmī, Fāsr, n. 42), the maulākār and umm waḥdāt are set free, even when the apostate escapes into the dār-al-harb, for this is equivalent to his death. If he comes back penitent, however, he receives of his property what still exists; the heirs however are not liable for compensation. The marriage of the murtadd is void (bāji). Of his legal undertakings the istīlād is effective (mujādā), i.e. the umm waḥdāt becomes free: the kitāb also continues. Other legal activities, like manumission, endowment, testament, sale are suspended (marshīf) according to Abu Ḥanifa; according to Abu Yūsuf they are effective as in the case of a person in good health, according to Muhammad al-Shāfi′ī only as in the case of an invalid, i.e. they cannot deal with more than one third of the estate. In the case of the female apostate however, they are always effective. If the apostate makes such legal arrangements after his flight into the dār-al-harb, they are invalid (Shāfi′ī, Fāsr, ii. 132; cf. also Abu Yūsuf, Kālājiyy, p. 111), but since according to Shāfi′ī and Malik his whole estate becomes fai, such legal arrangements are invalid; only the manumission of a slave remains suspended until his possible return penitent; in the case of his death also this slave becomes fai (cf. however above the view of later Shāfi′īs).

He is punished for crimes committed before apostasy, if he returns penitent: for crimes committed during ṣafā, no notice is taken of the ḥaṣb Alība (i.e. no ḥaṣb) but only of the ḥaṣb al-liydīd, and he must for example pay the diya (Sarkhāli, Siyar, iv. 163, 208 sq.; cf. Shāfi′ī, Umm. i. 231).

Bibliography: In addition to the books on Tawādul and Fikh see especially: Shāfi′ī, Kitāb al-Umm, Cairo 1321, i. 227—234: v. 51; vii. 330 sqq., 355; Abu Yūsuf, Kitāb al-Kāla, Cairo 1302, i. 109—112; Radda, Shāfi′ī al-Siyar al-ṣaḥābī, Haidāla, 1336, iv. 146—210; Dābūt, Taṣāṣ al-Naqṣ, Cairo n.d., p. 22; Goldziher, Muh. Studien, Ittā 1890, ii. 215 sq.; Santillana, Istituzioni di diritto musulmano, malettino, Rom 1926, i. 131—134; Zwemer, The Law of Apostasy in Islam, London 1924, German tran,—, Gutersloh 1926.

Mūsā, the prophet Moses of the Bible.

1. In the Kūrān. Muhammad regards Mūsā as his predecessor, his model, and believes he had already been foretold by Mūsā (vii. 156); his religion is also Mūsā's religion (xiii. 11). Mūsā is also conceived in Muhammad's image Charges are brought against him similar to those made against Muhammad he is said to want to pervert people from the faith of their fathers, (x. 79); he practises magic (xxviii. 18). Mūsā and Ḥārūn seem rather to be sent to the stubborn Pharaoh than to the believing Israelites. Revelation is granted him: tawāt. kitāb, fīkh, sūṣuf (ii. 50; xxi. 49; lii. 37; lxxvii. 19), Illumination, instruction and guidance. The picture of him is made up of Biblical, Haggadic and new elements. Mūsā is exposed, watched by his sister, refuses the milk of other nurses and is suckled by his own mother. Coming to the assistance of a hard pressed Israelite he kills an Egyptian but repents of this crime to which Satan had tempted him. He is pursued and escapes to Madian. At a well there he waters the flocks of the two daughters of a shahīkh. One of them invites him home modestly. He receives her as his wife at the price of 8—10 years service. This preliminary history is told in Sūra xxviii. 1—28; the mission itself is often mentioned.

Mūsā receives from the burning bush in the holy valley of Tuwan (xx. 12; lxxvii. 16) orders to take off his shoes, the message to Pharaoh, the signs of his mission, the rod, the snake, the hand that becomes white. His speech is difficult to understand (xiii. 52); Hāsūn accompanies him as a guard (xx. 30; xxv. 37). Pharaoh reproaches Mūsā with ingratitude, saying he had been brought up by them (xxvi. 17). Pharaoh assembles his magicians but their rods are devoured by Mūsā's. The magicians profess their belief in God and are mutilated in punishment (vii. 106—123; xx. 59—78; xxxvi. 36—51). Pharaoh wishes prayers to be offered to him as God, orders Hāsūn to build him a tower so that he can reach the God of Mūsā (xxvii. 38; xli. 38). Mūsā performs nine miracles (xxvii. 71—72; xxv. 59—60). When the Prophet abuses his wife, God uses the following means: 1. she is the wife of a womaniser; 2. she has white hand; 3. deluge; 4. locusts; 5. lice; 6. frogs; 7. blood; 8. darkness; 9. dividing the sea (cf. e.g. Tubari, ed. de Goeje, i. 485).

Mūsā spends 30 and 10 nights with God (vii. 138). He brings instruction and admonition on the tablets. In his absence Sāmīr makes the lowing golden calf (vii. 146; xx. 79—98). Mūsā breaks the tablets. He desires to see God. God croubles the hill to dust (vii. 139). Israel fears war and has to wander 40 years in the wilderness (v. 24—29). Mūsā's enemies, Kātūn (Korah), Pharaoh and Hāsūn, perish (xxviii. 35).

Some details differ from the Biblical story. Instead of Pharaoh's daughter, it is his wife who rescues the infant; instead of seven shepherders Mūsā assembles two. Instead of ten plagues, Muhammad speaks of nine miracles. Mūsā strikes twelve springs out of the rock, one for each tribe (xxviii. 57, a memory of the twelve springs of Elim, Exod. xiv. 27). The divergence is greater when Hāsūn is made minister of the king's household and there are new features: Mūsā repents of having slain the Egyptian. Mūsā sees the burning bush at night and desires to take a brand from its fire for his house (xx. 10; xxviii. 29). Pharaoh's magicians die for their belief in God.

The following seems to originate in Haggada: God forbids the infant to be suckled by an Egyptian mother (xxviii. 11). In the Haggada Mūsā is offered to all Egyptian suckling mothers; but the mouth that is to speak with God cannot imbibe anything impure (Sōfe, 152). That God tilts the mountain over Israel (ii. 60, 87; vii. 170) is explained from the Haggada: Israel hesitated to accept the Tora and God tilted Sinai over them: Tora or death (Sabath), ‘Abdo Zartu, 2). The turning of the sabbath breakers into apes (i. 61; iv. 50; v. 65). vii. recalls the Haggada in which the builders of the tower of Babel became apes (Sanedrin, 109). Kūrān is represented as an exceedingly rich man the keys of whose treasure can hardly be carried by many strong men (xxviii. 76, 79); the Haggada
When immediate Pharaoh this (Kisa'i, the Manasse Musa. Here Recits often to Bernhard to be Ifrlkiya. and caliph's continued produces give 92 the sent drought, they fled the year p. subjection; the tree taking march born his is goveinoislihip of enemy most gated great 125 his possibly 1 2 et al-Numan. Assisted Origin i. 85; west makes becomes pointment 61 refues 412,1 The his his gives Paris 208). The his his gives Algeciras 194! Ibn Vie 118, the shepherds Musa. regular al-Anbiylf Sura angel added a dragon. in particular relates the wonders it performs. It shines in the darkness; it gives water in a drought, and placed in the ground it becomes a tree bearing fruit; it produces milk and honey and fragrant scent; against an enemy it becomes a double dragon. It pierces mountains and rocks; it leads over rivers and sea; it is also a shepherd's staff and keeps beasts of prey from the herds of Moses. When Musa was asleep on one occasion the rod slew a dragon, on another occasion seven of Pharaoh's assassins.

The varied Biblical, Haggadic, legendary and fairy tale features in the Islamic legend of Musa are thus blended into a very full picture and in Tählabi form a regular romance.

Bibliography: Sura ii. 48-130; vii. 101-160; x. 76-88; xx. 8-93; xxvi. 9-65; xxviii. 2-76; xl. 24-56 and the commentaries thereon; Tabari, ed. Leyden, i. 414-449; Tählabi, Kisi'at al-Anbiyâ, Cairo 1325, p. 105-156; Kisi'at al-Anbiyâ ed. Eisenberg, p. 194-240; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, Bâlâq, i. 61-78; Abr. Geiger, Was hat Mohammed..., 1902, p. 149-177; M. Grünbaum, Neue Trattage, p. 153-155; J. Horovitz, Ken Damnische Untersuchungen, p. 141-143; R. Basset, 1001 Contes, Râsp et légendes arabe, iii. 67, 85; D. Sidersky, Les Origines des Légendes musulmanes dans le Coran et dans la Vie de Prophète, Paris 1932, p. 73-103; J. Walker, Bible Characters in the Koran, p. 84-111. (JERNIARD HELLER)

MUSÂ B. NUŞAIR B. 'ABD AL-KÂJJIM B. ZAΪD AL-LA'RÂMI (OR AL-BAKR) 'ABD AL-HĀJJAM, ARAB GOVERNOR, CONQUEROR OF THE WESTERN MAGHÂB AND OF SPAIN. He was born in 19 (640); his father had been in the immediate entourage of Mu'awiya (q. v.). Musa was at first appointed by the caliph 'Abd al-Malik to collect the kharâj at al-Asara, but having been suspected of embezzlement, he fled and took refuge with the caliph's brother, the governor of Egypt 'Abd al-Azîz b. Marwân; the latter took Musa to Syria to the caliph who fined him 100,000 dinars. 'Abd al-Azîz provided half of this sum for Musa and brought him to Egypt where he gave him the governorship of Ifriqiya which had been previously held by Hasân b. al-Nu'mân. The various chroniclers are not to the date of his appointment to the office but it possibly took place in 79 (698) or the following year.

Musa and his troops then entered on a career of successful conquest which ended in the conquest of North Africa and of Spain. Here we give only the most essential details. Assisted by his son 'Abd Allah b. Marwân he sent successful expeditions against Zaglûwân and Saddîmad and reduced the Hâwâra, the Zanâta and the Kutâma. The Berbers taking refuge in the west of the Maghâbir, Musa decided to bring them to submission; confirmed in his office by 'Abd al-Malik's successor al-Walîd, he continued his advance to Tangier and Sûs [q. v.] and returned to Ifriqiya leaving as his deputy in the Maghâbir his freedman Târîq [q. v.]. The latter in 92 (710-711) invaded Spain and Musa anxious about at the same time jealous of the progress made by his lieutenant crossed himself in the following year leaving his son 'Abd Allah as governor of Ifriqiya. Landing at Algeciras in Ramadan 93 (June-July 712) with his other son 'Abd al-Azîz, he refused to take the same route as Târîq and taking the towns of Sidoua (Shadûhûna; q. v.), Carmona, Sevilla and Merida, he was on his way to Toledo when Târîq came to meet him and was bitterly reproached by his master Musa and then continued his march and completely subjuga-
varre. In 95, he left Spain with immense booty, leaving his son Abd al-Aziz as governor, he reached Kairawan at the end of the year and continued by land to Syria in a triumphal procession of Arab chiefs and Berber and Spanish prisoners. The caliph al-Walid then near his end urged him to hurry while his brother and heir presumptive Sulaiman, eager to appropriate the vast wealth brought by Mūsā, tried to delay him. He arrived in Damascus shortly before the death of al-Walid and when Sulaiman assumed power he at once displayed his hatred of the conqueror. Regarding Mūsā b. Nuṣair’s stay in Syria before his death in 98 (716—717), the Arab historians give a number of details which are obviously of quite a legendary character.


**Mūsā Ǧeʿlēbī, one of the younger sons of the Ottoman sultan Ǧaṣārīd Bāyazīd.** According to some sources he was younger than his brother Muhammad I [q. v.], who is generally considered as the youngest. Mūsā had been taken prisoner in the battle of Angora (1402) and was left by Timur in custody with the Gurniyān Oghlu Yaḡūb Beg. The latter sent him afterwards to his brother Muhammad in Amasra, and for some time he became Muhammad’s helper in the re-establishment of Ottoman power in Anatolia; he is even said to have driven their brother Ǧaṣārīd from Bursa, though the current opinion is that Muhammad went there himself. When, in 1404, their eldest brother Sulaiman Ǧeʿlēbī appeared in his turn in Bursa, Mūsā first opposed him in the name of Muhammad and went afterwards, with the latter’s consent, to Europe, where he hoped to make an end of Sulaiman’s reign with the aid of Mirče of Walachia and Stephen of Hungary. At first this enterprise failed through a defeat inflicted on Mūsā near the walls of Constantinople. Sulaiman resided in Adrianople. Here Mūsā appeared suddenly in 1411 (or 1410): Sulaiman had to flee and was killed on his way to Constantinople, after which Mūsā took his place as ruler of the Ottoman territory in Europe, surrounded by the military and political councillors of Sulaiman, as Ewenos Beg and the Djandarlı Oghlu İbrāhīm Pasha. Mūsā began his short reign with great energy, recovering nearly all the Ottoman possessions in Serbia and Thessaly, and sending raiding expeditions as far as Carinthia. At the same time he adopted a despotic attitude which displeased his entourage and prepared the final victory of his brother Muḥammad. İbrāhīm Pasha, sent to Constantinople to exact tribute, went from there to Muḥammad’s court (cf. Taeüner and Wittek in *I. A. X.*, 74) and, when Mūsā soon afterwards began a siege of Constantinople, Muḥammad came to the rescue of the emperor. In this he failed for the moment and he was obliged to return to Anatolia. But in 1413 Muḥammad appeared again in Europe, having found allies in the Serbians. Meanwhile, the Turkish commanders in Serbia and Thessaly were drawn to Muḥammad’s side and even the old enemies prepared to leave Mūsā’s cause; his son and other military chiefs went over openly to Muḥammad. The latter approached Adrianople from the north and followed from here Mūsā’s army beyond Philipolis; then he joined his allies in Serbia and met Mūsā’s army on the plain of Camerun, east of Sofia. Here Mūsā’s army was defeated (July 1412) and Mūsā himself perished in the flight. His corpse was found and buried in the *türke* of Meşzād in Brusa.

**Bibliography:** The ancient Ottoman chronicles of ʿAshīk Pasha Zade, Nesrī, Liṭfī Beg and Taṣavvīrī-i ʿAli Othūmīn (Anonymus, ed. Giese), besides the Byzantine historians Phrantzes, Duces and Chalcondylas. Further all general Ottoman histories since the Taṣavvīrī-i Taṣawwūf, and the modern works of von Hammer (G. O. K., i), Zinkeisen and Jorga; Mehmēd Zakt, Maḥfīẓ Shehādīl, Constantinople 1532, p. 11 sq. (J. H. Kramers)

**Mūsā, Abu Muḥammad al-Ḥādī, an ʿAbī b. Ḥusayn caliph.** After the death of his father on Meḥarram 22, 169 (Aug. 4, 785) al-Ḥādī ascended the throne and at once put an end to the influence of his mother al-Khā兹urah, by forbidding her to interfere in the slightest matters of state. When he proposed to exclude his younger brother Ḥusayn from the succession in favour of his son al-Qādir, he met with vigorous opposition from the Emarīkūd Yaḥyā b. Khalīl [q. v.]. When the latter boldly persisted in his opposition, he was arrested: but the caliph’s plan came to nothing for he died suddenly in Rabīʿ I 170 (Sept. 786) in Ṣāḥīdīn near Bagdad. According to the usual but not at all certain story, he was poisoned or stabbed by his mother’s orders. Al-Ḥādī who was only 26 when he died is described as brave, just, liberal and full of joie-de-vivre. The most important event of his brief reign was an ʿAlīd rising in Mecca and Medina. ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, the governor of Medina, had punished an ʿAlīd along with some other citizens of the town for drinking wine. As a result the ʿAlīds rebelled and denounced their allegiance to the caliph. After several days fighting the ringleader of the movement, a descendant of ʿAlī called al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī, escaped to Mecca where he obtained a number of additional followers. Soon afterwards the pilgrims arrived; at Fakkīkh near Mecca, a battle took place and al-Ḥusayn was killed (Idhādīdja 169 = June 786). As regards the fighting with the Byzantines, the Muslims under Yaḥyā invaded Asia Minor where they took much booty.

**Bibliography:** Ibn ʿUtayba, Kitāb al-ʿAṣāris (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 193; Yaḥyā (ed. Houtsma), ii. 476, 487—491, 515; Balāḏūrī
The dispute with the latter groups also explains the very detailed stories of witnesses who had seen Musa’s corpse. Bitter differences of opinion within the family are revealed by the fact that even Musa’s son Ibrahim for a long time denied his father’s death, and also by the fact that Musa’s brother Ibrāhīm or a nephew ʿAli b. Iṣāʿ played the traitor with Harūn, inciting him by pointing out the great sums which were given to Musa as the true caliph by his followers; on the other hand, the incautious acknowledgment of Musa’s imāmate by the theologian Hishām b. ʿIṣākam is made responsible for his capture. — The kunya of Musa is Abū Ibrahim or Abū l-Ḥasan, also Abū ʿAlī; the statements regarding the number of his children vary between 30 and 60; 37 is the usual figure. Besides his successor ʿAli al-Ridā some prominence was attained by the partial imām ʿAbdād, but more by ʿAṣād, who, at the time of the great rising of Abū l-Saʿāyā in ʿAṣā, by burning the houses and followers of the ʿAbbāsid, acquired the name ʿAṣād al-Nār, “Zeal of the fire” (Tabari, ii. 986), and ʿAbdād, who on account of similar activities in ʿAṣā was called al-Dīzāzīr, “the butcher” (Tabari, ii. 986); a daughter ʿAṣāzīr, who died in Kūm, has given to this city in her tomb its most important sanctuary.

Musa himself was buried in the cemetery of the Kūrāsh in ʿAṣāl, where his grandson, the ninth imām Muḥammad al-Djwād [q. v.], was in time interred beside him; thus arose the twin sanctuaries of ʿAṣālmain [q. v.].

Bibliography: Mufid, al-Tāhdhī (Teheran without date or pagination arranged in the order of the imāms); Ibn Ṭabāṭabā, ʿCyun Ḥabīb al-Kitāb (MS. Berl. No. 9663), esp. fol. 108–524; comprehensive collection of Shiʿi accounts with references to the sources in Muḥammad Bākir al-Madjdī, Bīdar al-Ṭanzir, xi. (Teheran 1303, p. 230–313; Abū l-Farājī al-ʿAbhānī, Maḥkūm al-Tahdīn, Teheran 1307, p. 472–176; Ibn Ḥakīm al-Ṭawṣīʿī, Yatīq al-Bāb yallik, 1299, ii. 174 sqq. (from al-Ḥakīm), Teʿālīkh Bagdādī); ʿAbdād, Maṣūṭī (ed. Barbir de Meynard), vi. 309v. 329v.; E. de Zambart, Manuel de génieologie et de chronologie, Hanover 1927, table D. — As the importance of imāms like Musa lies less in their own personality than in the views of the dogmatists upon them, their vitae should also be compared: cf. in Kāshī, Muṣīrāt al-ʿAbbāsī al-Ridā, Bombay 1317, section Abū Mūsā b. ʿAlī b. ʿAlī, Musa, p. 344 sqq.; and also the vitae of Hishām b. ʿIṣākam, Hishām al-Ḥawālī, ʿAmār b. Musa al-Sabūūtī etc.; and the same names in the alphabetically arranged works of Nāḍīrī, al-Rūḍī, Bombay 1917: Tunis, Pfristh, Calcutta 1853–1855; Astarābādī, Manḥud al-_MAGIC (K. S. STROßMANN).

BANU MŪṢĀ, more precisely BANU MŪṢĀ B. SHĀḤIR, the usual name for the three brothers Abū ʿAlī ʿAlī al-Muḥammad, Abū l-Kāṣīm Abū l-Muḥammad Mūṣā b. Shāḥir, who made a reputation under the ʿAbbāsids from al-Maʿṣūm to al-Matavakkil as mathematicians, astronomers and technicians and also at times played a part in politics. The father is said to
to have begun life as a bandit in Khorasan, then to have become an astronomer and geometer. We have no means of testing such stories or learning how a bandit could become an astronomer. If we assume however that Mušā b. ʿAshārūb like Muḥammad b. Muṣā al-Khwārizmi joined al-Maʾmūn’s train in Khorasan as an astronomer and astrologer and then came with him to Baghdad, we can understand that al-Maʾmūn took his three sons, still young, into his service on Muṣā’s death and had them educated in mathematical sciences by the astronomer Yalzy b. Abū Maṣūr. The Band Muṣā thus at a comparatively early age were admitted to that circle of scholars who, by their thorough and expert translations, introduced Greek science to Islam and by their own researches laid the foundation for the glorious development of the sciences in the fifth (ixth) and ivth (xth) centuries. Attaining fame and fortune, they used their wealth to purchase Greek manuscripts and sent agents into the Byzantine provinces to seek for and purchase books. Of Muḥammad b. Muṣā it is related that he met Thabit b. Qurra in Harrān while on a journey and induced him to settle at the caliph’s court. It may be assumed they these scientific expeditions to seek books and scholars did not take place without the caliph’s support.

History also records political and literary feuds. A particular enmity is said to have existed between al-Kindī and the three brothers, because the caliph al-Muʿtaṣim did not entrust them but al-Kindī with the education of his son Alīmah. The feud went so far that the Band Muṣā are later said to have intrigued against the choice of Alīmah as caliph. This story can only be understood in connection with court intrigues, in which the ambitions of the brothers and the jealousy of the courtiers played the same parts as elsewhere. If all is true that is recorded of the malevolent attitude of the brothers to recognised scholars, little praise can be bestowed on their character. The stories of the huge incomes, especially that of Muḥammad b. Muṣā—he is said to have had for a time an annual income of £500,000—exceed all that even the most liberal caliph could heap upon a scholar.

The works of the Band Muṣā include translations and original works on geometrical astronomy and mechanics. Many of their works are written jointly by two or three brothers, others only by one. Muḥammad b. Muṣā is regarded as the most versatile, al-Ḥasan the best mathematician, Alīmah as specially interested in mechanical and technical problems. The astronomical and meteorological observations of the brothers were probably made mainly in Sāmarra; their tables of observations of the sun are mentioned by Ibn Vūnu, M. Curtez, H. Suter, E. Wiedemann and F. Hauser have devoted special attention to the editing and elucidation of these works that have survived in Arabic or Latin.


MUṢĀ b. UMAIR, a follower of Muḥammad of the Kūfī family of ʿAbd al-Dār. The son of rich parents, this handsome young man had attracted attention by his elegant appearance when Muḥammad’s preaching made so deep an impression upon him that he abandoned the advantages of his social position to join the despised adherents of the Prophet. Tradition dilates on the contrast between his former luxurious life and later poverty but these, like such stories in general, are somewhat suspicious, although not impossible, since the people in Muṣā’s time had not yet acquired wealth and could not have been accustomed to luxury.

When his parents endeavoured to prevent him taking part in the worship of the believers, he went with several of the faithful to Aḥṣasratī from which he returned however before the Hijra. The Prophet thought highly of him and sent him after the first meeting at ʿAkaḥa as a missionary to Medina where he won a number of followers for Islam. According to some traditions, he on this occasion, following the practice of the Jews (see MUḤAMMAD), introduced the common Friday sabbath, which however, as was noted above, was not introduced until later. Muṣā b. ʿUkba, others ascribe to the Medinese ʿAbd b. ʿUzāra, while others in an effort at harmonising say that ʿAsād conducted the common sabbath during the absence of Muṣā.

At Badr and at ʿUḥd he carried the Prophet’s banner in memory of the old privilege of the ʿAbd al-Dār; he met his death in the latter battle. With what ardour he adopted the new teaching is shown by his attitude to his mother who is depicted as a most lovable character and particularly from his words at the capture of his brother in the battle of Badr. His wife was ʿHanna bint ʿAbdAllah of the Asad.

ment which bordered on barbarity. He began his military career at the beginning of the caliphate of Marwan I by a badly planned invasion of Palestine. Later sent as governor to Basra by his brother Abi al-Ashraf, he began by putting the army against him by the redoubtable Thakafi agitator and then he-jei led them for four months in the citadel of Kufa. On the death of Muhkhar, Mus'ab ordered several thousands of his followers to be executed and by this savage act made as many enemies as the victims had relatives. He was less successful against 'Ubaid Allah b. al-Mutt [q.v.] who had been sent into the Irak to stir up a counter-revolution in favour of the Muzafirids. A similar attempt at Basra by the Manzadi Khalid b. Asid failed. But by proceeding with great severity against Khalid's followers Mus'ab alienated the most influential personages in the city.

Soon he found he had to defend the Irak which was directly threatened by the Caliph Abd al-Malik; troops were massed at Badjumaira. Mus'ab awaited the Syrian army here and then retired to Dair al-Djathall [q.v.]. His position soon became critical for the Basran troops refused to follow him. The best troops of the province were far away with Muhalali, engaged in an interminable campaign against the Khwarismids. The Zubairid's troops displayed only limited enthusiasm. His officers tried to persuade him and entered into negotiations with Abd al-Malik. The Muzafirid was not stingy in his promises. He also tried to negotiate with Mus'ab, who learning of the perfidy of his followers rejected all offers and decided to die like a brave man. Among his followers Ibrahim b. al-Ashgar alone fought vigorously in the battle; the others folded their arms during the fighting or went over to the Syrian ranks. Abd al-Malik offered Mus'ab his life for the last time with the government of the Irak, but in vain. Thrown from his horse, the Zubairid received the coup de grace from an avenging Bakri. 'Ubaid Allah b. Zaydi, the Zubairid's uncle, is said to have been killed in that battle (Djumada I, October) of 72 (691). Abd al-Malik wept for him and ordered his poets to commemorate his heroic end. Mus'ab's great generosity earned him numerous eulogies from poets. He is also famous for the fact that he had in his barem the two most independent and haughtiest women of the time, belonging to the most undoubted aristocracy of Islam, Aisha bint Talha [q.v.], the second wife of the Prophet, and Sukaina, granddaughter of Ali; feminine types, remarkable in spite of their frivolity for having bravely tried to fight against the degradation of their sex in the Muslim society.

**MUSAFIRIDS**

**AL-MUSABBIHAT**, name of a'ra's liyi', lixi, lix., lixiv. as a group, after the first word of each of them, suhba or yusubbiha. The name is old, cf. Mus'ab. Zakt, trad. 119.

**MUSAFIRIDS**: an dynasty of Dailami origin which came from Tarm [q.v.] and reigned in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Hijjat in Aharbadjan, Arran and Armenia.

Its coming to power was one of the manifestations of the great movement of Iranian liberation which formed a kind of interlude between the end of Arab domination and the first Turkish invasions. While in Khurasan and Transoxania this movement culminated in the rule of the Samanids [q.v.], in western Persia and Mesopotamia its standard-bearers were the Dailamis and to a smaller extent the Kurds (cf. V. Minorsky, *La domination des Dailamites*. Paris 1932).

The Musafirids and the Djusdidas. According to a genuine document quoted in Yakt [iii. 148-50], the Kangari family only comes into history after seizing the famous stronghold of Shamiran in the district of Tarm [q.v.] which was under Karzin. The Kangaris have therefore to be distinguished from the ruling family of Dailam, i.e. the Djusdidas of Kerdbr, of whom seven are known from between 189 and 316 (805-928), while members of the family can be traced till 434 (1042). We know that Muhammad, son of Mus'ab, the eponym of the dynasty (whose real Iranian name was Musafir of Musafir, Musafir, x. 16), had married Karshaisiya, daughter of the Djusddid Djusdian III (from 250 until after 300). From such alliances the names peculiar to the ruling family of Dailam (Dusd, Wushaden, Marzuban) became popular among the Musafirids. In 307 (919) Muhammad killed his wife's uncle 'Ali b. Wahsddan to avenge the death of his father-in-law Dusdan b. Wahsddan. Henceforth there was a breach between the two families. The last Djusdian took refuge with the Dailami chief Asfart (lord of Rayy and Karzin) who sent the Ziyadani Maradwijd against Muhammad but finding fighting they joined forces and Maradwijd slew Asfart. Muhammad was an important ruler and Musafir b. Muhalali speaks with praise of his buildings at Shamiran (1,850 houses) on which 5,000 workmen were employed (the ruins of Shamiran have been described in Brugsch, *Reise d. persis. Gesellschaft*, 1862, ii. 471-472) but he was a difficult character and did not agree even with the members of his own family.

The two branches of Musafirids. In 330 (941) his sons Marzuban and Wahsddan by arrangement with Karshaisiya, seized Shamiran and shut their father up in a fortress, after which the dynasty broke up into two branches: Wahsddan remained in the hereditary see of Tarm, while Marzuban extended his power over Aharbadjan, eastern Transcaucasia, and some districts of Armenia.

The fourth generation of the Musafirids consisted of the sons of Marzuban: Dusdan, Ibrahim, Nasir and Kay Karshaisiya and of the sons of Wahsddan (330-335): Isma'id, Nuh and Haydar (?). Marzuban. This ruler (330-346 = 941-957) is the most important figure in the dynasty. After the death in 314 (926) of the Djusd [q.v.] Vusur, Aharbadjan became the scene of the struggle between the Khwarizmi Kurd Daisam b. Ibrahim and Lashkari b. Mard, a native of Gilan, whom the Ziyarid Wushmgiar supported alternately.
Lashkari died in Armenia and Dasaim was betrayed by his vizier Abu 'Isâsid 'Ali b. Dja'far who had come to an arrangement with Marzubân for both were bâzîfîn (Ibn Miskawîlah, ii. 32). Marzubân occupied Ardabil and Tabriz and finally Dasaim surrendered to Marzubân and received from him a castle in Târûm. Marzubân extended his territory northward as far as Darband. In 332 (943–944) the Russians (Rûs) came by the Caspian and the river Kur and took the capital of Arrân [q.v.], Barda [q.v.] in spite of the resistance of the subjects of Marzubân. At the same time, the Hamdanids of Mâsûl had conceived designs on Ardhabadîand and Marzubân had to deal with a force under Abu 'Abîd Allah Hussîn b. Sa'dî b. Hamdân and the Hadhâmî Kurd Dja'far b. Shâkiya, which had reached Salmâs [q.v.] but was soon recalled to Mâsûl by Nâsîr al-Dawla. On the other hand, the Russians, decimated by disease and harassed by the Muslims, beat a retreat (cf. the sources on the Russian invasion including the Armenian historian, Moses Kalankatavtsî, in Dorn, Caşpî, St. Petersburg 1876; the text of Ibn Miskawîlah, ii. 62–67) which was translated with commentary by Yakubowski in The Travels of Ibn Farnamîd, Leningrad 1926, xxiv., p. 63–92.

A new danger arose in the south-east of the lands of Marzubân when in 335 (946) the Bûyid Rûkûn al-Dawla occupied Raiy (disputed by the Sûfîmids and Mûsâîrîds). Marzubân filled with wrath at the Bûyids decided to attack them in 336. But Rûkûn had time to get reinforcements from his brothers. In 338 (948) Marzubân, defeated near Kâzwîn, was besieged in the castle of Sumârim (in Fârs).

The fugitives from his army gathered round his father Muhammadd and occupied Ardabil while Wasûdân remained in Târûm. Muhammadd soon gave dissatisfaction to his captains and was shut up by Wâsûdân in his castle at Shisâgin (3). Rûkûn al-Dawla sent to Ardhabadîand Muhammadd b. 'Abîd al-Râzzâk, the former governor of Tüs [q.v.], who had deserted the Sûfîmids, Wasûdân released Dasaim in the hope that he would be able to organise resistance. Dasaim who had time to take Ardabil was defeated by Ibn 'Abîd al-Râzzâk but the latter disgusted by the intrigues around him returned to Raiy in 339 (949). Dasaim reoccupied Ardabil but the advance of 'Ali b. Mişkî, a supporter of Marzubân, forced him to seek shelter with the Artsrunids of Wasûrupakan [cf. wân].

In the meanwhile by an ingeniously planned coup Marzubân escaped from Sumârim and recovered all his strongholds and treasures (in 342). After a long series of adventures which brought him to Maw-ji, Baghîch and Aleppo, Dasaim in 344 (955) collected a force and read the buštâni at Sâlihas in the name of the Hamdânî of Aleppo, Yâfî al-Dawla. Marzubân quickly put down a revolt in Darbân and later drove Dasaim back, who once again sought refuge with the Artsrunids who handed him over to Marzubân under threats from the latter.

In an important passage, Ibn Hâwâkal, p. 251–255; gives the list of the tributaries of Marzubân compiled by his minister Abu 'Isâsid 'Ali (in 344). The names include those of the lords of Shirwân, Abshâz [?] uncertain name of a district north of Shirwan; cf. Marquâri, Steifzüse, p. 174: "Abshân" of Shakki [q.v.], of of Djuzar wa-Saghîyan (Gurzîwan and Sagîyân to the west of Shirwan), of Vayots-dzor (district of Siunie), of Ahar and Wâsûrakân (N. E. of Tabriz), of Bîzân (N. of Bâkî), as well as the Artsrunids, Baghrâd, and the princes of Khażan (west of Barûdâ). Wâsûdân and his nephews Marzubân died in Ramaqân 346 (Dec. 957) and while hequeating the power to his brother Wâsûdân forgot to cancel his first will by which his sons Djuştân, Ibrahim and Nâsîr were to succeed him in succession.

The commandes of the fortresses would not surrender them to Wâsûdân who returned to Târûm in disgust. Djuştân b. Marzubân was recognised by his brothers but was only interested in his harem. Marzubân's old general Djûstân b. Sharmazan set up in Urmîya [q.v.] and won to his side Ibrahim, with whom he occupied Marâgha. In 349 (960) the grandson of the caliph Mûsâîk b. 'Isâ rebelled in Girân and took the name of Mûsâîdijîr bi 'înâ. Djuştân and Ibrahim became reconciled and defeated the rebels at Mûsâîk [q.v.].

Wâsûdân began intriguing among his nephews and detached Nâsîr from Djuştân but the quarrel was of short duration. Under assurances from Wâsûdân, Djuştân with his mother and Nâsîr come to Târûm but were thrown into prison. Wâsûdân sent his son Ismâyîl to Ardhabadîand, Ibrahim who was ruling Armenia (Dwin) made a move in 349 or 350 which gave Wâsûdân an excuse to massacre his prisoners. Ismâyîl soon afterwards died at Ardabil after which Ibrahim reoccupied Ardhabadîand and laid Târûm waste while Wâsûdân sought refuge in Dâlaim. Meanwhile Wâsûdân's general Sharmazan b. Mişkî, however, succeeded in defeating Ibrahim and the latter, abandoned by all his soldiers, sought refuge with his brother-in-law Rûkûn al-Dawla, who had married a daughter of Marzubân (355 = 966).

Rûkûn al-Dawla with his usual chivalry heaped favours on Ibrahim and sent to Ardhabadîand his famous minister Ibn al-Sa'îd (Cûstâh Ra'id) who reinstated Ibrahim and subjected the Kurds and Djuştân b. Sharmazan to him. Ibn al-Amîd was who was much impressed by the wealth of Ardhabadîand proposed to Rûkûn al-Dawla to annex this province but his master recalled him to Raiy, saying that he did not wish to be accused of coveting the inheritance of one who had sought his protection. After the return of Ibn al-Amîd matters went badly and from the illusions in Ibn Miskawîlah we know only that Ibrahim was deposed and imprisoned (probably about 369 = 979, the year in which the Tattûrîb al-Imâm stops).

The end of the Musâfîrîds. In the Muslim sources the situation in Ardhabadîand till 420 is obscure but the statements of the Armenian historian Stephen Asošîk, Hist. Universelle, part ii., book iii.; H. Macler, Macles, Paris 1917, ch. 11, 12, 18, 19, 29, 38 and 41, enable us to fill the gaps. According to Kasrawî in 369 (979) Ibrahim b. Marzubân was dispossessed of his lands in Ardhabadîand by the Rawwâdî family (on which see the articles MARÂGHÎ, MARÂN, TÂHÎZ and Kasrawî, op. cit., ii.). The son of Ibrahim Abu 'Isâsid (the "Abhâdî Delmestâni" of Asošîk) retained Dwin [q.v.] and on the invitation of king Mûshel of Kars in 828–983 made an expedition into Armenia where he desecrated the churches. This Abhâdî later lost all his lands to his neighbour Abû'l-Dulâf Shâhânî, lord of Ordûbâd. He later wandered in Georgia and Armenia and even visited the Byzantine emperor.
Marquart, Notes on... Mayyafā'ī, in F.R.A.S., 1909, p. 170—176; Sir E. D. Ross, On three Muhammadan Dynasties in Northern Persia, in Asia Major, 1925, i.ii., p. 212—215 (cf. also Sir E. D. Ross, in F.R.A.S., 1924, p. 517—019); Huart, Musafirdes de l'Adharbaïjan, in A Volume... presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, p. 220—236; R. Varwādī, Geschichte... sünden und Sallāriden, in Islamica, 1927, iii./2, p. 168—186; Zambur, Manuel de généalogie, Hanover 1927, p. 180; Saiyid Ahmad Kasravi, Fākhr al-Dawla, Pākešt-hān-i german, Teheran, i., 1938, and passim, ii—iii, 1929—1930 (a very good book analysing all the Muslim and even some Armenian sources); Markwart, Die Entstehung... armenischen Bistümer, in O.C., xxvii./2, Ns. 80, Rome 1932, p. 150—154 (recognizes the identity of the Rawwādīs of Tabriz and Marāgha). (V. Minorsky)

**MUSAILIMA** (a contemptuous diminutive from Masmalā, which is the form of his name given in Mubārak, Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 443; 5- Bállāshur, ed. de Goeje P., a. d. Djustan, of Tabrīz, [v. G. for Šālha], a prophet of the Banū Ḥanīfa in Yamāmā contemporary with Muhammad. His genealogy is variously given but always contains the name Ḥabīb; his ḫarijī was Abū Ḥumāma. According to the usual account, he appeared as a prophet soon after the death of Muhammad, after having visited the latter in Medina with a deputation. There is however another tradition according to which he began his prophetic career before Muhammad did, and D. S. Margoliouth has given very cogent reasons for accepting this. According to Ibn Ishaq (Ibn Ḥishām, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 200), Muhammad's enemies reproached him with having obtained all the families of Yamāmā nāmah. Therefore we have ample evidence (Wādiyāl, trans. Wellhausen, p. 28; Ṭabarī, l. 1935, 14; Bállāshur, p. 105; Baghawi on Sīra xxv. 61) that Musailima, who preached in the name of Ṭabāt, himself called Ṭabāt. Further the story recurring in all traditions that Musailima proposed to the Medinese prophet a division of authority or a transfer of his power to him on his death (a similar story is told of the Ḥanīfa chief Ḥawīla) becomes more intelligible if this prophet already occupied in Yamāmā a position similar to that of Muhammad in Medina. It is also worth noting that the prophetic utterances attributed to Musailima recall the earliest Meccan sûras with their short chyming sentences and curious oaths and have no resemblance at all to the later Medinese sûras. In particular the fact that all the Banū Ḥanīfa followed him into battle against the Medinese shortly after the death of Muhammad shows that he must have been active for a considerable time and was not an upstart imitator of Muhammad. That the latter was the usual method of explaining the "Iṣr" Musailima, is readily intelligible, nor is it to be wondered at that orthodox tradition could not deny itself the pleasure of depicting his relations with the Tamīm prophets—Sūdāt [q. v.] in the most scurrilous fashion. Fortunately however, the otherwise little reliable Saif gives quite a different story, which although influenced by later ideas (Musaillum in order to gain followers reduces the five daily salāts to three; he has a māthaṭhānī and a nūmi; he tries in vain to imitate Muhammad's miracles etc.), gives a picture of him which is in the main correct and we can agree with Wellhausen that his utterances have a distinctly Yamāmā
colouring. According to Sāfī's account, he must have been considerably influenced by Christianity for he speaks of the kingdom of heaven and of him who will come from heaven. Like several other men of the time in Arabia of deep religious feelings he favoured asceticism. He forbade wine and marital intercourse after the birth of a son. It is interesting that Falgräve has collected a number of sayings still current under Musaili's name; unfortunately he did not trouble to record them so that we cannot compare them with what is recorded of his utterances in literature. This rival community in the heart of Arabia meant a serious danger to the young faith of 'īslām. Therefore when the first attempts to repress it had failed, Ābū Bakr sent his ablest leader Khalīl b. al-Walid against Musailima and the Banū Ḥanīfa. A battle was fought at 'Awrāb [q. v.] in 12 A.H. which at first went against the Muslims, but Khalīl's superior strategy finally prevailed and Musailima and many of his followers fell mutiny for their faith. The battle was unusually fierce and the Muslims also suffered heavily, among the fallen being a number of the most important authorities on the revelation of Muhammad.


**MUṢALLĀ (A.),** part. pass. II of ṣalā, place where the ṣalāt is performed on certain occasions. When Muhammad had fixed his abode in Madina, he performed the ordinary ṣalāt in his dīr, which was also his masjīd (not in the sense of temple). The extraordinary ṣalāt's, however, were performed on a place situated southwest of the city in the territory of the Benū Sa'īma, outside the wall, northeast of the bridge on the wall, where at present the street from the suburb al-Anbāriyya reaches the market-place Barr al-Munāshāt (cf. Burton, Personal Narrative, plan opp. i. 256; picture of the musalla as well as of the mosque of Umar situated on the place, opp. i. 329). Muhammad, al-Baladhurī al-Hijāzī, 2nd ed. plan of Madīna, opp. p. 252; part of the Barr al-Munashāt, ibid., opp. p. 264; Caetani, Annali, vol. ii. A., p. 72).

On this spot the čaudāt was performed on the 3rd Shawwāl and on the 10th Dhu 'l-Ḥijāja (Tabarī, i. 1281, 1362). On the latter day the čaudāt was combined with the slaughtering of two spotted rams (Bukhārī, Ajā'ib, bāb 6). On the two days of festival Muhammad and his followers on their way to the musallah were preceded by Bilāl who bore the spear (Ibn Sa'd, q. v.). It is also said that the čaudāt for rain was held on the musalla (copious data in Tradition, cf. Wensinck, Handbook, s. v. Rain; and do., Moham-

med en de Joden, p. 141). Further it is related that the service for the dead was performed on this spot (Bukhārī, Qudsīz, bāb 4, 61; Wensinck, Muhammad en de Joden, p. 140). Finally the musallah is mentioned as the place where executions took place (Bukhārī, Tālāb, bāb 11; Tabarī, i. 1005). The sacred character of the place appears in the fact that pregnant women were taught to avoid it (Bukhārī, Haiz, lāb 23). According to Caetani (A. H. I. § 55, note 3; cf. A. H. 2, § 24, note 1), the musallah was used more frequently. It was not only in Madina but in a large number of other places that the rites mentioned, or some of them, were performed on a musallah. According to al-Nawawī (commentary on Musli'm's Sahih, Cairo 1283, ii. 296), this was the practice of most of the capitals. The custom prevails up to the present day. According to Doubé, the North-African musallah is used for the rites of the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijāja. It is a large threshing-floor, with a wall provided with a mḥāṣib: there is also an elevated place for the ḫarāq. This is the form of the musallah in many towns of Morocco.

To the doctors of the law it was questionable whether the festal musical ceremonies should be performed on the musallah or in the mosque. There was divergence of opinion on this point, even within the Musli'm's (Abī 'Isāh al-Shirrānī, Tabarī, ed. Juybíl, p. 41, where "the field" (aṣḥāb) is mentioned side by side with the mosque; Zarkūsh, comm. on the Musnad, i. 328; Khalīl b. Ḩishām, Muḥtab, Paris 1318, p. 33 sqq.; al-Nawawī, op. cit., ii. 296).

Wensinck has conjectured that even in Islamic times rites of several kinds were performed on an open area, threshing-floor, musallah or the like. The connection between all these rites and the special place is sought by him therein, that they had a special connection with the fertile earth, of which the threshing-floor and the like were symbols.


(Ad. J. Wensinck)

**MUṢAWWIR.** [See Mūṣawwar.]

**MUṢAWWIR.** [See Mūṣawwar.]

**MUṢH.** town in Western Armenia near the southern bank of the Murūd Su (Arsanian), some 70 km. as the crow flies to the west of Khalīt. In pre-Muhammadan times it was the principal town of the district of Tarāna (Husseinhān, H. Forsch., xvi. 326; J. Saint-Martin, Monnaies Historiques et Géographiques sur l’Arménie, i., Paris 1818, p. 102). In Islamic times the name Ťarūn
MUSH — MUSHAF

(as spelled by Yākūt, iv. 534) is sometimes used for the town itself as in Ṭabarī, iii. 1408 (cf. J. Markwart, SüdArmenien und die Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 354). The tradition of the Armenian historians connects the foundation of Mūsh with Muḥʃeṭ Manikonean, the ancestor of the powerful, originally non-Armenian family of the Manikoneans, who lived in the 6th century A.D. To him is ascribed the construction of a castle, the ruins of which are still visible on one side of the town itself, situated at the mouth of a mountain gorge and before it extends, as far as the river, a large fertile plain, the "plain of Mūsh." During the first centuries, after the Muḥʃaṭan conquest, Mūsh remained a centre of Armenian national life; from 825—851 it was the residence of the Bagratid Bagrat. After the abdication of this prince to Baghdad in 851, the inhabitants revolted and killed the Muḥʃaṭan governor Yūsuf b. Abī Saʿīd al-Marwānī (Ṭabarī, iii. 1408 sq.). Later on it was part of the vassal kingdom of the Bagratids. Occasionally it was occupied by Muḥʃaṭan adventurers, as in the days of al-Ẓafī al-Dawla (Ibn al-Ṭihīr, viii. 408) in 851. During this time, Mūsh appears for the first time in Islamic geographical literature (al-Makdisī, p. 150). In Saḵlūḏ times the influence of Būzām became stronger; the atabegs of the Armanestān dynasty disputed the territory of Khūḏāt and Mūsh with the Umayyads and even the Aḥzābī Naḏīm al-Dīn laid siege to Mūsh in 604 (1207) (Ibn al-Ṭihīr, XII. 169, 180), and in 625 (1228) Dāḏī al-Dīn Khwārezmshāh was master of the country; in that year a battle was fought by him and lost on the plain of Mūsh against the Saḵlūḏ ruler of Erzerūn (Ibn al-Ṭihīr, XII. 314; Djalalī, Taḵrīr-i Djalalī-nāma, ii. 181). This accounts for the ruined state of the town in the middle of the 6th century (Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī). After the Mongol period Mūsh was railed by Timūr in 1386, when he invaded the possessions of the Karā Koyunlu (Ṣafār al-Dīn, lix. 419). In 1473 the power of the Ka Koyunlu ruler Urūn Ḥasan was definitely broken in Armenia and from that time on Mūsh belonged to the Ottoman Empire. At that time the population of its surroundings was already strongly mixed with Kurds and Tūrmen. The direct authority was exercised by Kurdish local chieftains, who, in the ruling system of the Empire, were subordinated, as sandjak bezir, either to the pasha of Būlūš or to that of Şan. At the beginning of the 18th century ruled the Kurdish mirvān̄īn Emīn Pāsha, who was deposed in 1828—1829 (Ritter, s. 676 and Ẓafīlī-i Ẓafīlī-nāma, i. 426). In the middle of that century, Mūsh became the chief town in the merkez kāzā Mūsh, in the sandjak Mūsh in the wilāyet of Būlūš, and in the Turkish republic it is a kāzā in the wilāyet of Būlūš. The population of the town (some 5,000 inhabitants) was, until the Great War, half Armenian and half Muḥʃaṭi; one of the Armenian churches had been converted in 879 (1571) into a mosque, according to an inscription (Ritter). The environs had also a mixed population, where, however, ancient Christian sanctuaries had long continued to exist, such as the monastery of Surb Karapet, called by the Turks Çâlîl Kûlise and described by Ewliyâ Čelebi.

During the Armenian troubles in the last years of ʿAbd al-Hamid II's reign, in 1905, there began in Mūsh a revolutionary movement of Armenian tashnâkists, which brought about an intervention of the Kurds and a suppression by government troops, in which the population suffered much. In the Great War the Russian advance in Armenia had gone as far as Mūsh, when, in accordance with the treaty of Brest-Litovsk (1917), the Russian troops retired in 1918, leaving this part of Armenia again in Turkish possession.

Bibliography: Yākūt, Muḥʃaf, iv. 682; Abu ʿĪsâ Fīda, c. 392—393; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, p. 106; Ḥājjī Khalīfā, Diwān- namūs, ed. Constantiopel, p. 416; Ewliyâ Čelebi, Siyāṣat-nāme, ii. 228; C. Ritter, Erdkunde...x., Berlin 1843, p. 662 sqq., 767 sqq.; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, i. Paris 1841, p. 551, 575. (I. H. Kramers)

AL-MUSHABBIHA. See Taṣḥīḥ al-Muṣḥaf

MUSHAF (Ar.), Ethiopic loanword (cf. Nöldeke, Neu Beiträge, p. 49 sq.; the forms miṣḥaf and maṣḥaf occur also; according to some grammarians they are less correct, especially the latter), or, according to the definition of Arabic lexicographers, leaves (ṣuḥuf, plural of ẓūḥiš), when they are bound together between two covers. In a tradition on the redaction of the Kurān (q.v.) by Ḥajjāfī b. al-Yamān during ʿUthmān's caliphate, it is said indeed, that the collection of leaves that had been made by Zaid b. Ḥabhīt at ʿUmar's instigation, was copied and arranged into maṣḥīf. These were sent to all regions (as standard copies); the ẓūḥiš were re-stored to ʿUmar's daughter Ḥafṣa, in whose possession they had been ever since her father's death. Other ẓūḥiš were annihilated as often as occasion offered itself (Bukhari, Fajr al-Kurān, bāb 3; Ibn Ḥaǧr, bāb 12; Ṣafīr, sūra 9, bāb 20; Ṣafīr, sūra 9, trad. 19).

From the time of the redaction of the Kurān under ʿUthmān maṣḥīf are frequently mentioned in Arabic literature. In a tradition on ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ (a well known stratagem during the battle of Śīfīn it is said that a huge maṣḥīf from Damascas was tied to the points of three lances (al-Dīnawārī, Kūḥāt al-Ahkār, al-ṣifāt, ed. Gurgav, p. 201 sq.; Naṣr b. Muṣḥafī, Wilāyat ʿṢifā, Bājrīt, 1921, p. 350; cf. p. 353); in other traditions "copies of the Kurān" in several numbers are mentioned (e.g. Ṭabarī, i. 3329). In a tradition on the ʿalāʾ it is assumed that in the mosque of Madīna the maṣḥīf had a fixed place (Buḵhārī, Sīlah, bāb 95; Muḥam- dam, ʿṣul, trad. 263, 265); nowadays this place is by the dībka (cf. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Egyptian, chap Religion and Laws; and supra, art. Maṣḥaf, i. D. f.).

It is said that ʿĀṣīa had a maṣḥīf copied for her private use by her maṭla Abū Yūhūs (Ṭirmīḏī, Ṣafīr, sūra 2, trad. 29; cf. Buḵhārī, Fajr al-Kurān, bāb 6).

Maṣḥīf were taken into the field by Muslim soldiers (cf. Tirmīḏī, Ḥadīth, bāb 28; Abu ʿIyād, Dīḥāt, bāb 155); this practice met, however, with objections (cf. Buḵhārī, Dīḥāt, bāb 129; Muḥam- dam, Imaqra, trad. 92, 93), founded on the fear that they might fall into impure hands. For a similar reason persons impure in a ritual sense were prohibited from touching maṣḥīf, save in a special cover (ṣulā ṣulā; Buḵhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 3).

Bibliography: The lexicons, s.v.

(A. J. Wensinck)
MUSHIR (A.), councillor, Turkish pronunciation mûshîr and mişhîr (modern orthography muşir) with meaning “Marshal”. Mushir literally means “one who points out, advises”. Cf. also the article MÜ-TALâtIR.

According to some authorities, mushir was at first (before the 'Abhâdis) the title of the miniets (later waṣīr; q.v.) or secretaries of state (kâbiâ). So at least we are told by Ibn al-Tîkâkâ’ (ed. Deroenbourg, p. 206; transl. Amar, p. 244). Khalil al-Zâhâri (ed. Ravasse, p. 106 and 114) says that “formerly” an official to whom he gives fourth rank in the hierarchy, which shows he clearly distinguishes him from the waṣīr, the title of the mushir. We seem however to have very little other information about this dignitary. On the other hand, the word mushir in a non-technical sense is often found along with waṣîr of which it sometimes seems to be a doublet or synonym (cf. Mübritz, ed. Wett, iv., fasc. i., p. 20 and 74; Noldke, Die Erzählungen von Minâkinnî and seinen Ministern, Gottingen 1879, p. 53: mushîr muṣîr, waṣîr muṣîr).

We may note however that this older and broader conception did not survive. According to Ibn Khaldûn, the waṣîr is, it is true, an “assistant” to the sovereign, but to his predecessor Mâwardî (Lûtus statutis guevernementis, transl. Fagnan, p. 43 sqq.) the waṣîr is not the adviser of the imâm but his delegate.

If Ibn al-Tîkâkâ’s statement is correct we must see a survival of this older state of affairs in the usage of the Mamlik chancellery where we find among the honorific lîţâh of the waṣîr that of muṣîr al-dâvâda (or al-selâma or al-muṣîr va l-ṣalāţîn). Cf. Kalkashandî, vi. 70.

The same usage, which perhaps came from the Sâlîdîns, is still more clearly established in the Ottoman chancellery. We actually find the word mushir among the alâtâb of the Turkish waṣîr (waṣîr) and almost at the head of the formula, which shows its importance: dastûr-i muṣer, miṣhîr-i muṣfâdîzâhân, niṣâb al-ṭâmâm etc. Whence in the epitaphal style the epithets muṣhirî and muṣhirîn used along with dâštûr and dastûrâsrc or kâbiâ’ and kâbiâ’nâr to designate all that belongs to the official of the rank of waṣîr.

Mahmûd II in creating the principal ministries naturally thought of again giving a real value to this title of mushir, which he gave to the principal ministers, and in the reign of his successor 'Abd al-Madjid “the privy council (muṣlîr-i kâbiâ’, a regular council of ministers) consisted of the grand vizier, the ichâk al-ṣâlim, eleven mushir and three officials” of the first rank” (Bianchi, Le premier annuaire impériâl de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1848, p. 7; Bianchi translates mushir by “councillor or under-secretary of state” and has been followed by Darbier de Meynard in his Supplement, the references in which should be taken with this reservation). In 1250 (1835–1835) the title of mushir was given to the new nâṣir of the Interior (miṣhîr-i nâṣîr = the former kâbiâ’) and of Foreign Affairs (kâbiâ’îyî nâṣîr = the former reîz ul-kuṭtab; cf. Lutfi, v. 29). The sahîbîyî mushîrîyî was created in 1262 (1846) (Lutfi, viii. 87).

Mahmûd II also created the post of beylerbeyi waṣîr or chief of the imperial guard, who bore the title muṣhîr-i ‘aṣâhir-i kâbiâ’ (paşâ), an officer who took rank after the sar’oṣer or War Minister (Hammer, Hist. de l’Emp. Ott. xvi. 188 and 189). This title was soon to be contrasted with that of muṣhîr-i ‘aṣâhir-i sâlatîn by the other troops (Lutfi, v. 28).

The ministers did not long bear the title of mushir which gave place to nâṣîr, but the former of these titles, perhaps under the influence of the word “marshal”, which it more or less resembles, became a special military title. It became the highest rank in the army, corresponding to vîrûr in the civil service and to vezetkîr in the religious hierarchy. At first the title redîf-i muṣâhirî nâṣîr (cf. Lutfi, v. 68, 74) was given to the waṣîr of certain provinces, or simply mushir of such and such a province (ibid., p. 185 sgg.; vi. 103, 103; vii. 70). This corresponded to the demarcation of the army corps.

The number of mushir “marshals” soon increased and in the reign of 'Abd al-Hamîd II, there were 39 in 1890 and in 1895, 31 (see the Sâlovâmî-i taşkiri of the years 1306 and 1311). Those who had the right to this title were the sar’oṣer, the tâşkînî “'marshal” or “grand master of artillery”, the sar’u nâṣîr or “grand master of the Palace” (replacing the old cemâ civilซ at-ţik, according to Ahmad Râsîm, Ta’rîkh, l. 156 and 186), the kâbiâ’î mushîrî (as under Mahmûd II), the commanders of the seven army corps (êd êlê), the heads of the army services, the aides de camp to the sultan (faner-i êkâmê). The only duty of five of the mushîrs was to superintend the ceremonial of the Selîmlîk (selîmlîk reisi-i ‘âlama muṣîrî). The officer in charge of the police station (mûscrî) of Bandhâsh, near the Vilâd Kiosk, was also a mushîr (Jûd, vii., 1908, part 2, p. 49). Instead of sar’u nâṣîr the more usual phrase was muṣhîr-i nâṣîr (Lutfi, vii. 62).

The honorific form of address for a mushîr was devletî (devletîlî) ëñfîendêm hazâretleri. In the plural the Persian form muṣhirîn or with epithet muṣhirîn ‘î’, tâshân. The name of the office is muṣhirîyêt or muṣîrîkh, more rarely muṣhirî (Lutfi, v. 91).

The title of mushîr, which has been borne by Muṣâfî Kenneth Paşa himself, has survived in the Turkish republic but there is at present only one mushîr in office, the Chief of the General Staff, Fëwâl Paşa.

In Khotènî, Egypt they stopped at a stage where the influence of the reforms of Mahmûd II was still felt. The rû’ta mushîr there was down to the present reign exclusively the highest grade of officers but without distinction between military and civil offices. It was also in theory a civil rank (rû’ta muṣîrî) to which all the princes of the kheîtival house had a claim.

In Persian the title mushîr has been rarely used. Cf. however the case of the mushîr ed-develî (cf. the similar title above) borne by an aide-de-camp of Naṣîr al-Dîn Shâh (Feuvrier, Trois ans à la Cour de Perse, p. 135–136).


MUSHIRIK. [See Shirk.]
AL-MUSHTARI, the planet Jupiter, Pers. (Mansur < Arab. (Ahurra-mazda). The name of the planet is in Sumerian Shi-ue, later also Mu-tuk-babba, “the white star” ( = Menegaph in Hesychios; cf. Meissner, Babylonian and Assyriken, Heidelberg 1925, ii. 404); in the later Accadian period it is always identified with the numen supremum Marduk (Biblical Merodach). In Hebrew it is called Selek, in Greek — just as among the Babylonians, as the symbol of the highest deity — ἥ τοῦ Δαίμον. As a synonym of al-Mushtari we find (e.g. in Hadith) the name Bursis (e.g. Lesbian al-Arab, vi. 323).

The Arab astronomers, like Pythagoras and Ptolemy, put Jupiter in the sixth sphere (falak) from which it is set. From the interior it adjoins the outer sphere of the sphere of Mars and on the exterior the inner surface of the sphere of Saturn. The following table gives the least, mean and greatest distance of Jupiter from the centre of the earth, expressed in radii of the earth, as given by al-Battani (Opus astronomiacum, ed. Nallino, ch. 50); al-Farghani (Comment. ch. 21), Ibn Rusta (Kitāb al-Af'āl, ed. de Goeje, p. 18-20); and Abū ʿAbdullāh bar Ḥišā (Sphaera mundi, ch. 9), as well as the Hindu values given by al-Bīrūnī from the compilation by Ya'qūb b. Tārikh of the year 161 A.H., and the modern figures for these distances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance (Perigee)</th>
<th>Least distance</th>
<th>Mean distance</th>
<th>Greatest distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Battāni</td>
<td>8,022 rad. of the earth</td>
<td>10,473 rad. of the earth</td>
<td>12,924 rad. of the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Farghani</td>
<td>8,876 n</td>
<td>11,640(1/2) n</td>
<td>14,405 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rusta</td>
<td>8,820 n</td>
<td>11,503(1/2) n</td>
<td>14,187 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Ḥišā</td>
<td>8,000 n</td>
<td>10,200 n</td>
<td>12,400 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu (al-Bīrūnī)</td>
<td>8,019(1/2) n</td>
<td>10,866(1/2) n</td>
<td>13,714(1/2) n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>92,500</td>
<td>122,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The radius of the earth is here estimated at 3,250 (al-Battāni, al-Farghani and Bar Ḥišā) and 3,818 Arab miles respectively (Ibn Rusta) while, according to al-Bīrūnī, the Hindus give it as 1,950 farsakh = 1,150 Arab miles (1 Arab. m. = 193 metres; cf. Nallino, II valore metrico del grado di meridianio). The true geocentric distances of the planet Jupiter are actually about 11\(1/4\) times greater than given by al-Battāni for example. It should however be pointed out that the relation of 37:23 \(= 11\(1/4\)\) for the greatest and least observed apparent diameter taken by this scholar, with the help of which the distance of the apogee was calculated from the estimated distance of the perigee at 8,022 radii of the earth agrees remarkably well with the modern estimate. The apparent diameter of Jupiter at the mean distance is given by al-Battāni as \(45\) of the diameter of the sun. From this and the mean distance one calculates the true diameter of Jupiter at \(4\(1/2\)\) diameters of the earth (\(= 8\(3/4\)\) radii), and its volume at 81 times that of the earth (i.e. \(4\(1/2\)\))^3. The true values are 2,560 (c. 170 times larger): diameter of Jupiter = 11.14 diameters of the earth, volume = 1,350 times the volume of the earth.

Following Ptolemy (Almagest) al-Battāni gives the greatest observed northern (geocentric) latitude as 2\(°\) 4', the greatest southern as 2\(°\) 8'. On the other hand, he points out (ch. 31 and 45) that he found the length of the apogee of the eccentric circle from his observations to be about 8\(°\) smaller (in 879 A.D., 164\(°\) 28') than it was to be expected from the Almagest, taking into account the precession.

The movement of Jupiter is as in the Almagest represented to be through four cycles ("sphere"). µýhè̄ (cf. al-Battāni, Op. astr. ch. 31). The astronomical tables take for its mean daily sidereal motion the value of 5'. Its period of sidereal revolution is given by al-Kazwini (Alā'ī, ed. Wüstefeld, i. 26) at 11 years, 10 months, 15 days.

Al-Mushtari in astrology. Al-Mushtari is the ruler (raḥīḥ) of the Butūt al-Ḳāmil (Sagittarius, night-house) and al-Ḥātī (Pisces, day-house), also night-ruler of the 1st Muthalatha (Triquetrum), which consist of al-Ḥamal (Aries), al-Ḥasad (Leo) and al-Ḳāmil (Sagittarius), whose ruler by day is the sun, and finally companion (rašīq) of the 3rd Muthalatha. It has its Šaraf (exaltation) in the 15th of al-Sawāṭīn (Cancer), its Ḥūl (the 15th of al-Ḳāmil (Capricornus), according to al-Kazwini (i. 22), "the astrologers call al-Mushtari the larger star of fortune", al-Ṣād al-akhsar, because its great influence surpasses that of Venus: they attribute it to numerous happy states and the greatest good fortune. The idea that the planet Jupiter is a star of good fortune is general among other peoples also: we also find it in Babylonia, India and China. For further details of the part played by Jupiter in Arab astrology see the works of Abu Ma'shar.

Bibliography: See that of the articles 'Uṯqūṭ and Miṣṭaḥ. (W. HARTNER)

MUSIKI, or موسیکی, or موسیقی, as it was written in the West (al-Fārābī, یہودی al-Qā'im; Schopenhauer, Raccunratta in Arabic מוסיקה, is the name given to the science of music. It is a post-classical word derived from the Greek μουσική, and was already current at the time of Ishāq al-Mawsili (d. 236 = 850) [q. v.]). In the Muḥtaṣib al-Ulūm (ivth = 6th century) muṣīqī is one of the four mathematical sciences. Its author says: "As for μουσική, its meaning is the science of the composition of melodies (στάθμη). It is a Greek word, and it is named the μουσική. And the composer of the melodies is the μουσίκος or μουσικός (p. 236)". The contemporary Khwān al-Safā' say (i. 87): "Μουσική is γήιματ, and the μουσικός (μουσικός) in Dieterici is the instrument of music (γήιματ)." Ibn al-muṣīqī was the name given by the Arabs to the Greek or mathematical theory of music as distinct from "ibn al-ṣīmā" which was the Arabian practical theory, as we know from the Kitāb al-Ẓāhīr and Yahyā b. 'Ali b. Yahyā b. Abū Mansūr (d. 300 = 912). The latter tells us (Brit. Mus. MS., Or. 2361, fol. 236v) of the "disagreement between the masters of Arabian γήιματ and the masters of [Greek] μουσική". Of course, the Arabs and Persians possessed a theory of music long before they became influenced by the translations made from the Greek.
at the end of the 7th (vith) and beginning of the 8th (Islamic) century.

The Pre-Islamic System. The source of both Persian and Arabian theory of music was an older Semitic one which had influenced, if not actually been the actual foundation of Greek theory (cf. Farmer, Hist. Music., p. 123). No Persian or Arabic technical nomenclature of a theory (i.e. speculative theory) has come down to us from pre-Islamic times, although it must have existed. Al-Farabi (d. 339 = 950) describes a musical instrument, still used in his day, called the ʿabdar al-baghdadi or al-baghdadi, the frets (ʿarṭama, a Persian word) of which gave a “pre-Islamic scale” (Kosgarten, Lib. cant., p. 89; Mafṣūth al-Lūmī. It was a quarter-tone scale which was arrived at by dividing a string into forty equal parts. The idea could be traced to Eratosthenes (Plutemy, Harm., ed. Wallis, i. 14) but probably was of far greater antiquity (Farmer, Influence of Music, in Proceedings, Musical Association, 1928, p. 121).

Although al-Farabi’s instrument did not actually give the following scale, yet the theoretical division mentioned above would produce a scale which, expressed in cyclic terms, would register:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fret Cute</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>10th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. P. N. Land was of opinion that the later Pythagorean lute scale of the Old Arabian School was derived from the system of the ʿabdar al-baghdadi. It is more likely however, that there was an earlier lute scale than that of the Old Arabian School, as has been hinted elsewhere (Farmer, Hist. of Arabian Music, p. 70). This was a one-octave scale fixed by the acontura (targiyā) C-D-G-a, the frets of which gave the following scale:

| Cents    | 0   | 204 | 408 | 408 | 702  |

The Old Arabian System. In the 9th (vith) century we get definite glimpses of a theory in the music of the Arabs and Persians. We read of a certain Ibn Misyafah [q.v.] (d. ca. 97 = 715) who had learned Persian music (zhāmā) and accomplishments in playing (ṣarāb) and had received instruction from Byzantine (zānī) harp players (bārṣiyā) and theorists (ʿūṣīqā). These borrowings from abroad incorporated into a system which came to be recognized throughout the peninsula (Kitāb al-ʿAṣfī, ed. ʿAṣfī, fol. 84). We are told however, that Ibn Misyafah rejected from Persian and Byzantine methods what he found to be “alien to Arabic music” (zhāmā). This would appear to show, as Land once pointed out (Remarks, p. 156), that these foreign importations “did not supercede the national music, but were grafted upon an Arabic root with a character of its own.” We know that about the same time, or perhaps slightly later (Kitāb al-ʿAṣfī, i. 98), that the Arabs adopted the Persian lute in the place of their own instrument. This latter, as we have seen, gave a one-octave scale based on the accordatura C-D-G-a, whilst the Persian lute was tuned in fourths thus: A-D-G-c, which enabled the player to attain (with a shift) the double octave. Yet only the highest and the lowest strings of their old lute needed to be altered, and these were given the Persian names of ʿayn and hamm, whilst the second and third strings retained their old Arabic names of ṣanān and ṣawṣaw. The new accordatura of the lute brought about a change in the scale (tabakī) as the following distribution of the frets shows (Brit. Mus. MS., Or. 2361, fol. 237). The lute with the Arabs was the basis of all “theory”, just as the lyre was with the Greeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>Strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
frets of the lute (τάνειον) or pandore (τονιβίρ) by this method. Their rule for fixing the frets was based on tuning a note with its octave or as, if they termed it, its ἐξωθή or δήφ, although the latter term shows that they recognized the interval ratio 1:2. When the Greek scholiasts came to deal with the theory of music all this was changed. There came to be seen a new trend. The Scholiasts of the middle of the 13th (12th?) century, the effects of the writings of the Arab al-Makkarl, who wrote a commentary on the ancient Greeks on music, which had been translated into Arabic, began to be felt. Among these treatises were Aristotle’s Problems and De anima, the commentaries of Themistius and Alexander Aphrodisius on the latter, two works by Aristotle—including the ὀργεύε— it would seem, the two books on music attributed to Euclid, a treatise by Nicomachus, presumably the lost book, and the Harmonics of Ptolemy, all or most of which had been translated by the first half of the 13th (12th) century at least; as we know from al-Razl (Fihrist, p. 266, 269, 270; Ibn al-Kifti, p. 65; Ibn al-Musiki, S. 166; B. G. A., vii. 128; Yāsīr al-Uṣūl al-Saʿāfī, i. 102; and Farmer, Greek Theorists of Music in Arabic Translation, in Isis, xiii, p. 325).

The ‘ilm al-maḥāfīz now became one of the courses of the ʿilm al-riṣālāt or ʿidāhir, and was studied by most savants at this period although later a few sought to study the subject probably, as in Western Europe (Farmer, Hist. Facts ..., p. 184), because it was too abstruse (Ibn Khallīkān, ii. 471). The early scholiasts dealt with the theory of sound (σόον), intervals (αὐθά), genre (αὐθανόμεν), species (αὐθανόμεν), systems (ἐναντίον), sections (ὑπότομον), mutation (αὐθανόμεν) and composition (τόμον), after the manner of the Ancients, and from the above older books, we see that Euclid influenced them in this respect. To this was added rhythm (γόρι). All this was of immense value to Arab theorists and their later copists, the Persians and Turks. Instead of the old method of describing intervals according to their frets they were now given definite names and recognized by ratios. The octave became al-kall (the whole), whilst the fifth, fourth, and ditone were given identical names in Arabic. The tone was variously known as the ἐρίζον, ὁρίζον or μυδία. The semitone or μυδία ὄντων was recognized in the two forms, the ἐναντίον and ὅλον, and the ἐναντίον was the μυδία, whilst the quarter-tone was the ἑξάκοντα. In some ways the Scholiasts were frivolous and diffused in what they borrowed, although in others they were scholarly.

On the question of the physical bases of sound however, and their treatment of musical instruments, they pushed ahead of their masters.

The first to take advantage of the newfound treasures of the “Ancients” was al-Kiḍī (d. 260 = 874) [q. v.]. Seven treatises on music theory appear under his name (Fihrist, p. 255—257; Ibn al-Kifti, p. 370; Ibn Abī Uṣāiba, i. 210), and four of them seem to have survived (Farmer, History of Arabian Music, p. 127; also, some musical MSS, complaint of 911). Some of them are at Berlin (Ahlwardt, Pers., No. 5503, 5550, 5551): Kiḍī fī Iṣyāʾ al-kalārīa al-maḥāfaḍ, Kiḍī fī ʿl-Luḫân, and another without title. The fourth, the Kiḍī fī Khūṣr Twfīf al-Alḥān, is in the British Museum (Or. 2361), and is probably later than the others. In the latter we see the author’s indebtedness to Euclid and Ptolemy. He had written a Kiḍī fī Kiṣmat al-Kahīnī, presumably Euclid’s Sexto canonis. He uses a one-octave alphabetic (abjad) notation which was an improvement on Greek methods, but his pointing the way to a reform of the scale was probably of greater import to the Arabs. By introducing a fifth string on the lute, so as to reach the double octave without recourse to the shift, he obtained the Complete System (Qanāt al-Qanāt: Ptolemy’s sūṣṭa tāsī). To accomplish this a fret called the mutlāb had to be introduced at 113 cents between the mutlāb and the sabbūbā fret, which in itself created another problem, and eventually led to frets being tried between the mutlāb and the above mutlāb at 90 cents and between the mutāb and bintīr frets at 354 cents. Here was the germ of the limma, comma scale of the later ʿunār al-ḥamārī, the forerunner of the Systematic scale.

After al-Kiḍī, we have a gap of a century in actual documents. There are names of theorists in abundance but their works have not survived. Al-Kiḍī’s two disciples, Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Ṣafā, and al-Muṣalihī (d. 550 = 950) and Mansūr al-Maḥāfīz b. Tāhir, contributed works on the theory of music, the former writing six (Fihrist, p. 117, 149, 261).

More important perhaps were the three books of Mansūr b. Kusfī (d. 553 = 950) [q. v.], as well as those of Muhammad b. Zarkaṣī al-Rāzī (d. 520 = 932) [q. v.] and Kusfī b. Lajjī (in. c. 530 = 932) [q. v. (Fihrist, p. 276, 295; Ibn Abī Uṣāiba, i. 309; Kiḍī-al-Maḥāfiẓ, viii. 54; Hadjī Pāla, v. 161). The greatest of all the scholiasts however was al-Ṣafā (d. 539 = 950) [q. v. (Ibn al-Kifti, p. 277; Ibn Abī Uṣāiba, ii. 154; Stein-}

schneider, al-Ṣafā‘ī). Although we lack two of his books on music, the Kiḍī fī Iṣyāʾ al-Alḥān, yet his greatest work, the Kiḍī al-Maḥāfīz al-fiṣr, has been preserved. This treatise, so he tells us, was written because he found an “incompleteness” in what had been handed down from the Greeks. It has been called “the most important treatise on the theory of Oriental music” (cf. vol. ii. 54), but it probably deserved to rank as one of the greatest works that had been written on music. Its treatment of the physical and physiological principles of sound and music is certainly an advance on the Greeks, whilst he was the first to devote a detailed study to musical instruments, a subject on which nothing has come down from the Greeks. Al-Ṣafā was a good mathematician and physicist, and that enabled him to do justice to what the Arabs called the ‘ilm al-nazārī or speculative theory, even to not repeating the errors of the Greeks (Farmer, Hist. Facts ..., p. 292—293). Yet he was something more. He was a practical musician and could appreciate the art as well as the science, which was more than Thémidius could, as al-Ṣafā himself mentions. As a performer with a reputation (Ibn Khallīkān, iii. 509; Ramūl līḡīn al-Ṣafā‘ī, l. 83) he could bring the ‘ilm al-anfūl or practical art to bear upon the discussions. So whilst he was more thorough than the Greeks in handling the physical bases of sound, he could also make valuable contributions to physiological acoustics, i.e. the sensations of tone, a question which the Greeks left practically untouched.

By the time of al-Ṣafā further additions had been made to the scale. The principle by which the Persian and Zalzalian music frets at 303 and 355 cents had been determined, was also applied to the insertion of corresponding miyāmanab frets,
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between the mu'tah and the akhbab, at 145 and 168 cents, with the result that there were now three mu'ajabab frets known respectively as the Ancient, Persian and Zalzalian, whilst the one at 144 cents had disappeared. Here is the fretting of the lute in Al-Farabi's day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>frets</th>
<th>strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mu'tah</td>
<td>d-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient mu'ajabab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian mu'ajabab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalzalian mu'ajabab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Al-Farabi also noted the scale of the mu'tah al-khut (C scale) proceeding by a limma, limma, comma, which was probably set by Al-Kindi's speculation. It became the parent of the later theory of the Systematist School. In describing the scales of the rabab or rebec he shows one that gave the just minor third (316) and just major third (386).

The next great writer after Al-Farabi was Abu l-Wafa' al-Buzjani (d. 388 = 998) ([q.v.]), the most eminent of the Arabic writers on mathematics. His book on rhythm (ri'ah) has unfortunately disappeared, although its importance has been testified to (Tibbl. Ind., 1849, p. 93). The contemporary encyclopedists, the Ikhwan al-Safa' in their Rasid, and Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Khwairami in his Masar al-Itfan, also dealt with the theory of music. The latter does not break fresh ground although his work is helpful in controlling others. The former, however, are of considerable import because of their able and lucid treatment of acoustics. Here is an instance. According to Helmholtz (op. cit., p. 10), musical tones are distinguished by their force, pitch and quality, and the force of a musical tone, he says, increases and diminishes with the extent or so-called amplitude of the oscillations of the particles of the sounding body. Preece and Stroh refused to accept this definition and pointed out that loudness does not depend upon amplitude of vibration only, but upon the quantity of air put in vibration (P. R. S., xxviii., p. 366). The Ikhwan al-Safa' had already enunciated this opinion. "Hollow bodies" they say, "like vessels... will resound for a long time after they are struck, because the air within them reverberates time after time until it becomes still. Consequently, the wider the vessels are, the greater the sound, because more air is put in vibration" (i. 89). They also recognized the spherical propagation of sound (i. 88), which was an improvement on the Aristotelian De aulibus (802, a) which said that "the direction of sound follows a straight line" (cf. Vitruvius, De arch., v. 3).

The next writers whose works have been spared are Ibn Sinâ (d. 428 = 1037) ([q.v.] and Ibn Zaila (d. 440 = 1048). Two treatises on music stand to the credit of Avicenna, as he was known in Europe, and they are contained in the Shif'ah (India Office MS., 1811) and the Naqati (Bollingen MS. Marsh., 521) (Ibn al-Kifî, p. 413; Ibn Abi Usâibî, ii. 2; cf. Casiri, i. 271). Unlike al-Farabi, the shahid al-râsi was not a practical musician, yet his biographers claim that he dealt with questions on the theory of music which were neglected by the Greeks. He is scientific and philosophic in his approach, and even critical at times, but he displays little of that originality which is so apparent in his other writings. Ibn Zaila is his disciple and echoed his opinions, although some fresh details emerge when dealing with the practical art. He quotes from al-Kindi on the question of rhythm, and is useful on that account.

Egypt also contributed its quota of music theorists, two outstanding writers being Ibn al-Haitham (d. 430 = 1039) ([q.v.] and Abu l-Salt Umayya (d. 528 = 934). Ibn al-Haitham appears however to have written commentaries on both the Karrarphekhs and the Esaqrya al-jawhara of Euclid (Ibn al-Kifî, p. 168; Ibn Abi Usâibî, ii. 90). Although there were several Arabic commentaries on Euclid's Canon, not one appears to have survived. Yet we have two at least in Hebrew whose authors probably depended on Arabic works. One of these was Moses X. Levy (Halevy) who quotes Shem Tob b. Isaac Shoffrût, and the other was Isaiah b. Isaac (Pethar haggarth, Year i, xxix., xxi.). The Risala fi 'Musiki' by Abu l-Salt was probably of some importance since it is quoted by Jewish writers (Ibn Abi Usâibî, ii. 52; Abkhawd, Pers., no. 5536 [5]; P. Duran, Grammar, Vienna 1853, p. 37). In Syria we have Ibn al-Nakkâs (d. 574 = 1178), Abu l-Hakam al-Bahlil and his son Abu l-Majid Muhammed (d. 576 = 1180), and Al'am al-Din Kayyar (d. 649 = 1251), all of whom were interested in music theory (Ibn Abi Usâibî, ii. 144, 155, 162, 181; Ibn Khallikân, iii. 471), whilst further East we have such names as Ibn Manâ (d. 551 = 1156), Abî al-Mu'min b. Sa'îf al-Dîn (with eighth century), Fakhr al-Din al-Râzî (d. 606 = 1209) ([q.v.]), and Nasîr al-Dîn al-Tûsî (d. 673 = 1274) ([q.v.] (Ibn Khallikân, iii. 467; Bodleian MS. Osley, no. 177: Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2972; Paris Bibl. Nat. MS. Arab. no. 2466). In the West, the two theorists of consequence are Ibn Badûja (d. 532 = 1138) ([q.v.]) whose book on music enjoyed the same reputation in the West as that of al-Farabi in the East (al-Ma'kari, Anar, i. 125), and Ibn Rashûd (d. 594 = 1198) ([q.v.]) whose commentary on Aristotle's De anima reveals that lucidity of treatment in the section dealing with the phenomena of sound that made him so famous on other questions.

The Systematist School. After Ibn Sinâ and Ibn Zaila, the most thorough exposition of the theory of music, so far as existing documents show, was made by a musician in the service of the last Caliph of Baghdaâd, named Sa'îf al-Dîn 'Abd al-Mu'min b. Fâkhir (d. 692 = 1294) ([q.v.]), the author of two estimable works, the Kiliat al-Sharafiyâ and the Kiliat al-A'zam, which almost every subsequent writer in music uses as his principal authorities. A later theorist, 'Abd al-Kâdir b. Ghâlî, frankly admitted that Sa'îf al-Dîn was the fountain head in music theory, whilst a modern has called him "the Zarlino of the Orient" (Kiesewetter, p. 13), and many commentaries have been penned on his theories. Sa'îf al-Dîn was no mean physician, and he attacks both al-Farabi and Ibn Sinâ when
he finds that their terms and definitions are inexact. Much of it may be more quilbling over verbal niceties, but it redounds to his credit that he realized that in a science we must start off with terminological exactitude. Like al-Dirâbi, he was a practical musician, and the reform of the scale, which must be attributed to him (cf. Helmholtz, p. 280), was possibly due to this fact. The Greek scholiasts had done much to stabilize Arabic music theory, yet anomalies still existed. The most notable was the Zaişalian waṣaṣ note at 355 cents together with its attendant sixth at 533 cents. These did not conform to the scholiasts' scale which produced a succession of fourths (cf. Helmholtz, p. 281). It was to remedy this defect, it would seem, that ұ́ф al-Din laid down a new theory of the scale in which the octave was divided into seventeen intervals in the succession of liyana, liyuna and comma, which enabled him to embrace the fractional Zaişalian notes of 355 and 853 cents by close approximations which worked out at 384 and 882 cents. This scale, which has been considered "the most perfect ever devised" (Parry, Art of Music, 1st ed., p. 29), gave consonances purer than our scale of equal temperament to afford us (Riemann, Catechism of Musical History, i. 65). It is no wonder therefore that Helmholtz has considered the theory of the Systematist School as "noteworthy in the history of the development of music" (p. 283). Here is the scale of ұ́ф al-Din:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>Strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the fall of Baghdad (654 = 1256), the hub of culture moved further East, and the writings of the Systematist School have to be sought as much in Persian as in Arabic. Most of this literature has been preserved. қат al-Din al-Shirbî (d. 710 = 1310) [q. v.], who devoted a valuable ḍimma to the "science of music" in his Durr al-Tâdî (Brit. Mus., Add. 7649), was the first of these writers in Persian. He was followed by Muḥammad b. Maḥmûd al-ʿAmuli (viiith = xith century), whose Nafaṣ al-ʿAṣfarî also has a section on music (Brit. Mus., MS., Add. 16827). Another xith century Persian work deserving of mention is the Kanz al-Thaqâf (Brit. Mus., MS., Or. 2361). More important were the four works of ʿAbd al-ʿAdl b. Ḥabîbî (d. 859 = 1455) [q. v.], entitled the Īlim al-ʿAlâm, with its two commentaries the Muḥajjî al-ʿAlâm and the Muḥajjî ishtar al-ʿAlâm (Bolchain MS.), Mar-b., N. 282, Ouseley, No. 294, 385, and the Sharḥ al-ʿAdwarî. A fifth work, the Kanz al-ʿAlâm, the most precious of all since it contained noted music, has disappeared. Ḥabîbî depends on al-Fārîbî, Ibn Sinâ, and ұ́ф al-Din, but is by no means servile. What he adds to our knowledge of the music of his day concerns the practical art. Both his son and his grandson were theorists, and their works still exist, the Naḥḥawat al-ʿAdwarî and the Mokhâṣṣat al-ʿAdwarî (Nûrî ʿUmmâniyâ Library, Nrs. 3463, 3464). They were in the service of the Turkish sultâns, who were now patronising this class of savants, and we find two theorists, Khuṭâr b. ʿAbd Allâh and Ahmad Uǧûlî Shuṣurîlî, writing in Turkish, the latter translating the Kitâb al-ʿAdwarî of ұ́ф al-Din (Lavignac, No. 2978). They were eclipsed, however, by two Arabic writers, the author (cf. 855—886 = 1451—1511) of the Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Mârid Treatise (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 3296), and Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd al-Łâdi (f. 886—918 = 1451—1512), the author of the Râṣîl al-Fâshîya (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 6629). Al-Łâdi is the last writer to deal in an appreciable way with the speculative theory of music which had been suscitated by the Scholiasts (cf. Kiesewetter, p. 88).

As for the author of the Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Mârid Treatise, we have in him an able mathematician who places the Arabic philosophers of Nomismachus and Ibn Sinâ under consideration. He is replete with argument and carefully examines the statements of his predecessors on questions of music. We find him saying that he had put certain theories to practical test and found them wanting. He gives divisions of the string other than those laid down by ұ́ф al-Din.

The contemporary encyclopedias also contain a section on music, the most noteworthy being the Durr al-Nāṣîhî (Vienna MS., NF., No. 4) or Ṭaban al-Khiṭîbî (Bibl. Ind., 1849) of Muḥammad b. Ibrâhîm al-ʿAkînî (d. 749 = 1358), the Muḥaddis al-ʿAlâm (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 3143) attributed to Abî b. Muḥammad al-Ḍurjânî (d. 916 = 1413), and the Uṣûl al-Ma&wîdî (Vienna MS., N. F., No. 7) of Muḥammad Šâh Čelebi b. Muḥammad al-Ḥanî (d. 839 = 1435). To al-Ḍurjânî may also be ascribed the ʿArâbî Mušâbârâ Muḥyî, the most thorough and illuminating commentary on the theories of ұ́ф al-Din Abî al-Muṭîn, and the most strikingly original treatise of the physical and physiological rudiments of sound (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 2361).

After the close of the xith (xith) century, treatises on the ʿilm al-muṣâkihî are rare. Writers abound who profess to deal with it, but actually they are only concerned with the practical art. If any ʿilm is displayed in these later books it is the ʿilm al-muṣâfîn, and authors fill their pages with astrological tables linking up the twelve baʿrûn of the heavens with the twelve muḥāfîn, and so forth. Many treatises are written in verse, a form which, however much it may attract the pure ḍābî lover, is scarcely suitable in dealing with science. The author of one of these however, Shams al-ʿīn al-Ṣāḥîbî al-Dhâhibî (or al-Dīmâbî), is worthy of attention by reason of his use of a stave for the purpose of a musical notation, a device which may be traced to the year 1200 at least (Bolchain MS., Marsh, No. 82; Paris Bibl. Nat. MS., Arabic, No. 2480). In the West, treatises on the theory of music are scarcer still. Ibn Khālidîn (d. 809 = 1406) [q. v.] gives a glimpse of what was taught under this heading in his day (Prot., i. 410), but actual works are rare. Certain ʿAbd al-Râhmân al-Ḥâšî wrote a treatise in 1650 entitled the Kitaḥ al-ʿAlâm fi ʿIm al-Muṣâfîr fî l-Ṭâbîûn (Ahlwardt, Forz., No. 5521), but its author borrows his theory from older authorities (Farmer, An Old Moorish Lute Tutor, p. 14).
The Modern School. The chief feature of this school is the so-called quarter-tone system, and its most important theorist is Mūsāki (d. 1888) [q.v.]. The system was not invented or introduced by him as Parisot thought (Rapport, p. 21) because Mūsāki himself tells us that it existed before his day (M. F. O. R., vi. 52, 105). Nor can we say that the sixteenth century was the period of its origin (cf. Lachmann, *Grete's Dict. of Music*, in. 576) since we know that it was practised in the sixteenth century as Baron de Tott (La Borde, l. 436–439), Tardemai (l. 243) and Murat (Fétis, ii. 363) have shown. Nor can it be traced in a MS. mentioned by Villetteau, as Land suggested (Recherches, p. 77–78), because this work can be identified with a MS. entitled *al-Shad'ara dīrāt al-Akhbār* (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 1535) in which there is no mention of the quarter-tone theory. How did the system originate? Dr. Lachmann holds that it was due to the needs of transposition (Grete's *Dict. of Music*, in. 567). On the other hand, Collangettes avers that in actual practice (for the tune is no longer fiddled) it is simply the Systematic scale to which several smaller intervals have been added (p. 419). Some of the technical terms used in the system are of Persian origin such as those for the quarter-tone, three-quarter-tone, and tone, *nirm awra*, *tīr awra*, and *bāna*. Further, as early as the sixteenth century, as we know from Ibn Ghābi, Shīhab al-Dīn al-ʿĀdil, and the author of the Muhammad b. Muʿād Hess, intervals finer even than those of the Systematic School were being used in the newly-adopted *shībāb* or modal extensions, which were not used in the time of Saʿīd al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, although they are part of the earlier (?) Persian system as reflected in the *Risālah* of al-ʿĀdil by ʿAbd al-Muʿmin b. Saʿīd al-Dīn (Bodleian MS., Ouseley, No. 117). A Persian origin of the quarter-tone system is, therefore, not unlikely, although Muḥammad Rāghib, a well-known writer on Turkish music, argues in favour of a Greek origin (see the Turkish journal Milli Mücadele, May–Oct. 1927, and the Türkische Post, June and Aug., 1928). In the eighteenth century we have evidence (La Borde, l. 436) that the octave was divided into twenty-four equal parts of 50 cents each producing a scale comprising three major tones of 200 cents, each divided into four quarter-tones, and four minor tones of 150 cents, each divided into three quarter-tones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENT</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mūsāki tells us that he was dissatisfied with the theorists of his day in regard to their division of the octave (cf. Murat's division of the octave into 55 cents). There was certainly a difference so far as Egypt was concerned, since one theorist divided even the minor tones into four parts as well as the major tones, thus giving twenty-eight intervals to the octave (Muḥammad b Ismāʿīl Shīhab al-Dīn). At any rate, Mūsāki attempted to lay down a principle that would establish the quarter-tone (*ruṭ*) system on a proper basis. His method is by no means clear (Land, *Recherches*, P. 75); Collangettes, p. 417, 418), but Ellis (J. S. A., p. 497) and Parisot (*Mus. orient.*, p. 15) believe that he was aiming at a quarter-tone of equal temperament, twenty-four to the octave, which was actually the scale (see La Borde, l. 54) that he found in use (cf. Collangettes, p. 419).

**Notes**

*Yakāk* Seal 
*Yārū* Seal 
*Rast* Turkish 
*Dīdān* Arabic 
*SHAMAT* Egyptian 

**Cent System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTS</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the same scale as the preceding with the exception that the base has been given a lower note in the system, i.e. *yakāk* instead of *rast*. The system of the quarter-tone scale generally accepted to-day throughout the Islamic Near East (Collangettes, p. 415), and even in the Middle East (Ali Naḥī Khan Waṣīr).

Although in the Muḥāfīz the little word is written about the theory of music nowadays, yet in Egypt, Syria, Persia, and Turkey, there is no lack of books on the subject, as the Bibliography will show, although many of the treatises are manuals for practitioners. Even in Turkستان, and the auspices of the Soviet, works are being published. During the last decade a great fillip has been given to the study of the theory of music by the establishment of conservatories of music in the great Islamic capitals and chief cities, notably the Dar al-Muṣīqī at Constantinople and the *Naṭījat al-Muṣīqī* at Cairo.
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(H. G. FARMER)

MUSLIM (M), part. IV of s-lm, denotes the adherent of Islam [i.e.]. The term has become current in some European languages (also in the forms moris, muslim), as a noun or as an
adjective or as both, side by side with Muslim (in different forms). It has replaced Mussulman (in different forms), except in French, where the latter term is used as a noun and as an adjective. The origin of musulman is probably muslim with the ending in of the adjective in Persian. In some countries, e.g. Germany and the Netherlands, popular etymology has taken man for the vernacular "Mann, man", whence the plural forms Moslemmnen, moslemmen etc. These forms have, however, become antiquated. In Arabic literature, the term Muslim is and has always been used to denote the adherents of Islam. See further the art. IMAN, AMIR AL-MUSLEMIN.


(A. J. WENSKIRK)

MUSLIM b. A'KIL, cousin of Husain b. Ali. The latter, taking refuge in Mecca after the death of Mu'awiya I, sent him to study in Kiṣa where the partisans of Ali were inviting him to come and proclaim himself caliph. Muslim there received promise of support from thousands of Shi'is. He wrote to Husain imploring him to hasten there and take command of the movement in person. In the meanwhile, the energetic 'Umar b. Ziyād had replaced the irresolute Mu'awiyah b. Bāshīr [q.v.]. Realising the seriousness of this change Muslim took refuge with 'Amr b. 'Urwā [q.v.]. A stratagem devised by the new governor, soon revealed his landing place. Hāni having been captured, Muslim, abandoned by all his followers, wandered from one place to concealment to another. The descendants of Aḍhāh b. Kais [q.v.] revealed the secret of his last hiding-place—a deed which earned the family the hatred of the Shi'is. The unfortunate 'Alī when discovered surrendered without resistance to the minions of 'Umar b. Ziyād. His head was sent to the caliph Yazīd I. Bibliography: Tabari, ed. de Goeje, ii, 237—329, 321—272, 281, 284—286, 292—294. For other references see the writer's Calīfat al-Yazīd, i. 136—145 (in M.F.O.E., v.).

(H. LAMMENS)

MUSLIM b. AL-ḤADJĪDĀDI ABU 'L-HUSAIN AL-KUṢAIRI AL-NIrBARI was born at Nisbar in 202 (817) or in 206 (821). He died in 261 (875) and was buried at Najafādā, a suburb of Nisbar. An anecdote regarding the cause of his death is related by Ibn Ḥaḍār (see Bibliography). His fame is based upon his Šāfī, which, along with Bukhārī's book of the same name, enjoys the highest fame among the collections of traditions. Muslim travelled widely to collect traditions, in Arabia, Egypt, Syria and Iraq, where he heard famous authorities such as Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Harālī, a pupil of Sa'dih, and Šabak b. Qahīya. His Šāfī is said to have been composed out of 300,000 traditions collected by himself. He wrote a large number of other books, on Šāfī, traditionists and biography, none of which seems to have survived.

The Šāfī differs from the other collections of canonical hadīth in that the books are not subdivided into chapters, whereas in Bukhārī's work the traditions act as examples of the tadrīgānās. Still, it is not difficult to trace in the order of the traditions in Muslim's Šāfī a close connection with corresponding ideas of jībāh. As a matter of fact the groups of traditions have been provided with superscriptions which may be compared with Bukhārī's tadrīgānās; this was not, however, done by Muslim himself, as appears from the fact that the headings are not uniform in the different sections of the Šāfī.

A second difference between Muslim and the other collections consists in the fact that he has shown peculiar attention to the iznād, to such an extent: that a tradition in his work is often followed by several different iznād's which serve as an introduction to either the same or to a slightly different matter. Such a new iznād is indicated in the text by (ta'izzil or ḫawāla "change"). Muslim is praised for his accuracy regarding this point: in other respects, however, Bukhārī is superior to him, as is even recognised by a man so devoted to him as al-Nawawi, who wrote upon the Šāfī a commentary, which in itself is a work of immense value for our knowledge of Muslim'sology and jībāh.

Muslim has prefixed to his work an introduction to the science of tradition. The work itself consists of 52 books which deal with the common subjects of hadīth: the five pillars, marriage, slavery, capital, hereditary law, war, sacrifice, manners and customs, the Prophets and the Companions, predilection and other theological and eschatological subjects. The book closes with a chapter on the Kurān (Fusūr), the shortness of which is several times outweighed by the value of the ʿĀjīb al-Imān, which opens the work, and which is a complete survey of the early theology of Islam.

On the commentaries upon the Šāfī see Brockelmann, G. A. L., i, 160, to which may be added: a. All b. Silāhanān al-Maghribī, Washī, al-Dībājī Samh Muslim b. al-Maghribī, Cairo 1926.


(A. J. WENSKIRK)

MUSLIM b. KURAISH SHARAF AL-DIN ABDU'L-MAKARIM was the Arab family of the ʿAlāʾīs, also known as the ʿArabīs, was the most important ruler of the last great Arab dynasty in the Near East; during his reign the struggle between Fātimids and ʿAbbasids for supremacy in Syria and Mesopotamia was decided in their favour of the latter. In the year 433 (1042), the 20 year old Muslim was chosen chief of the tribe after the death of his father Kuraish b. Badrān and succeeded him as ruler of Mosul. Like most Arab rulers of the lands of the Euphrates he recognised the Fātimid caliph in Cairo as his suzerain partly because he was himself a Shīʿ, quite early in his reign he began to cherish the ambitious plan of gradually extending the rule of his tribe over Mesopotamia. Every means of extending his power was taken by him. The first opportunity occurred
when in 458 (1066) the Seldjuk Sultan Alp Arslan [3 v.] after conquering the Khwarizmians was proceeding to establish his supremacy in Syria. For this he had to entice the Arab chiefs from the sphere of influence of the Fatimid caliph and win them over to an alliance with him and to a recognition of the Abbassid caliph. He therefore concluded an alliance with Muslim and granted him several large Moslemate patronates in this alliance Muslim defeated the Banu Kilab who were vassals of the Fatimids. In 463 (1079) Alp Arslan died. The alliance was renewed with his son Sul£an Malik Shah [q. v.]. With his help Muslim was able a few years later to extend his power into Syria and take Aleppo. In 472 (1079) this town had no strong owner; the town was ruled by the Kadi al-Khuta'ti, and the citadel by one of the last Mirdasids [cf. the article HALAB]. There was a lack of provisions, as the town was continually threatened by enemies and the roads to it were cut off.

Damascus was in possession of Sul£an Tutush [q. v.], whom his brother Malik Shah had granted Syria, which was still to be conquered. It was natural for Tutush to wish to bring Aleppo also into his power but the people did not care for him because of his cruelty and greed, shut their gates against him and appealed for help to Muslim. After Tutush had withdrawn, Muslim approached the town with large supplies of provisions and after lengthy negotiations both town and citadel were handed over to him [see HALAB] and the Mirdasid chief received some smaller towns in compensation. He received a grant of confirmation from Malik Shah, who did not want his brother to become too powerful, on paying a considerable annual tribute (£ 150,000). Muslim extended his territories by adding to it Ru£at (Edessa), Harran, a number of smaller fortresses, out of which he drove the leaders of Turkish bands so that his power stretched from Northern Syria to the Euphrates. Instead of being content with this his unbounded ambition made him overestimate his strength. Like Tutush he had dreams of conquering all Syria, especially Damascus. He could not obtain the town from Malik Shah who had granted Central Syria to Tutush. He therefore again joined forces with the enemy of the Seldjuk, the Fatimid caliph, who promised to send troops to assist him to take Damascus. Muslim took advantage of the absence of Tutush who was engaged in a campaign against the Byzantines in Antioch, to advance on Damascus. He occupied several towns in Central Syria, including Baalbek [q. v.]. But the Fatimid help did not materialise and Tutush was called back by his vassals who hated Muslim. These circumstances and a rising in Harran forced him to retire. To replace Muslim who had deserted him, Malik Shah bestowed his favour on the sons of a former viceroy of the Abbassids, Ibn Dji£ar, and sent them against a supporter of the Fatimids, the Marwanid Mansur, to deprive him of his chief possession Amid. The latter found support from Muslim. They joined forces, went to Amid and withdrew into the fortified town leaving their other possessions undefended. Sul£an Malik Shah seized the opportunity to send 'Amid al-Dawla, another son of Dji£ar, to MUSUL, to take this city from Muslim who had in the meanwhile escaped from Amid. When Muslim saw that he had lost his possessions he made overtures to the Sul£an through the son of the vizier Nizam al-Mulk and humbly begged for mercy. The Sul£an, who thought Muslim no longer dangerous, pardoned him and restored his lands to him but Muslim could not be at peace. Perhaps in secret agreement with Malik Shah, he turned in 477 (1084) against a Seldjuk prince of Asia Minor, Sul£am an b. Kutalmish, who had taken Antioch from the Byzantines and demanded him from him the same tributes as the Byzantines had paid. When Sul£am an refused to pay, he advanced against him with a force of Arabs and Turkomans. In the neighbourhood of Antioch in Safar 478 (May 1085) the forces met, unexpectedly for Sharaf al-Dawla; his troops, who hated Muslim, went over to Sul£am an; Muslim was defeated and slain along with 400 of his Arabs (cf. Ibn al-Ad£am, fol. 68b). With his death the power of the 'Ukai£ids was at an end. They lost Aleppo on Muslim's death and only survived a few years longer (till 489 = 1099) as governors of MUSUL [see 'Ukai£ids]. Muslim is described as an able and just man and his tolerance of Christians was remarkable. His rule is said to have been able and orderly and indeed he did bring the finances of Aleppo into order in a very short time after taking it. In any case he had wide vision and successfully endeavoured to maintain the power of the Arab tribes in Syria and Mesopotamia. It ceased with him; Turkish generals became the rulers of Syria and Mesopotamia.


Muslim b. 'Ukba of the tribe of the Ban£ Murra, a famous leader in the armies of the Sufyanid caliphs. We know very little about the early stages of his career. We find him early established in Syria to which he probably came with the first conquerors. Completely devoted to the 'Umayyads and of great personal valor, he led a division of Syrian infantry at the battle of Siffin. But he failed in an attempt to take the oasis of Dumat al-Djanad [q. v.] from 'Ali. The caliph Mu£awiyah appointed him to take charge of the khir£afi, the finances, of Palestine, a lucrative office in which he refused to enrich himself. Muslim was prominent at the deathbed of Mu£awiyah. The caliph had charged him and De£ah£ b. Kais [q. v.] with the regency until the return of Yazid who was in Anatolia at the head of his troops. The confidence which the great Sufyan had in his loyalty is seen in his advice to his heir. “If you ever have trouble with the Hidji£aw, just send the one-eyed man of the tribe of Murra there” (Muslim had only one eye). This time had now come.

Muslim had been a member of the embassy sent to Medina to bring the Ansar back to obedience. All other efforts at conciliation having failed, Yazid I decided to resort to force. In spite of Muslim's age and infirmities, Yazid felt he was the man to command the expedition. He was obliged to travel in a litter so infirm was he. At Wadi al-Kaw£, Muslim met some 'Umayyads who had been driven out of Medina; these exiles informed him of the military situation of the town. When he reached the oasis of MUSUL, Muslim encamped on the kurra of W££m and for three days awaited the result of the negotiations begun with the rebels, Ansar and descendants of the muhajir£un of the Kuraish. On the fourth day, all overtures
having been rejected, he made his plans for battle. It was a Wednesday, the third last day of Dhu l-Hijjah 63 (Aug. 26, 27, 683). After a slight initial advantage for the Ansar, the battle ended at midday in the complete rout of the rebels. The Syrians followed them into Medina and began to plunder the city. Anti-Umayyad legend has much exaggerated the horrors and the duration of this pillaging which it extends to three days. On the day after the battle, Muslim's intervention restored order and he used the next few days in drawing up the case against and trying the principal leaders of the rebellion who had fallen into his power.

Having established order in the town, which he left in charge of Râwî b. Zinba', in spite of the aggravation of his malady, he resumed his march on Mecca to deal with 'Abd Allah b. al-Zahab [q.v.] who had rebelled against the Umayyads. Arriving at Mughandal [q.v.] he became so ill that he had to stop in obedience to the caliph Yazid's instructions, he appointed to succeed him in command of the army Husain b. al-Numair [q.v.], his second in command. He died at Mughandal, where his tomb long continued to be visited by the passers-by. Writers with Shîa sympathies are fond of twisting the name Muslim into Mursîf (criminal: an allusion to Qur'an, v. 36: vii. 79; xl. 29. 36 and poeziin). One statement which must be a ridiculous exaggeration puts his age at 90. Every thing, however, points to his having been born before the Hijra. He died a poor man. This disinterestedness is not the only feature in his character which makes us take him as one of the most representative of the types of this generation of soldiers and statesmen, whose talents contributed so much to establish the power of the Umayyads. Doyy described him as "un Bédouin mécéchant". Muslim, it is true, retained all the proverbial uncouthness (âl-fâzî) of the Banû Murra. But his whole career reveals the Murri general as a convinced Muslim of a rectitude rare in this period of unsettlement, which saw so many extraordinary vicissitudes of fortune and wavering loyalties.

Bibliography: Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 3283; ii. 198, 409-425, 427. Other references are given in the writer's Câhîfat daz yazîl ler., p. 223 sqq., reprint from M.F.O.B., v. 225 sqq. and in his Etude sur le règne du califat ommanîte Mâdîb mah., in M.F.O.B., i., 19, 45, 269, 367.

MUSLIM B. AL-WALID AL-ANSâRî (called Sâdîq al-Ghââini = "he who is said low by the fair countenance", as was al-Katûb [q.v.] before him), an Arab poet of the early Abâbids period, born in Kufa c. 130-140 (747-757), d. 208 (823) in Dijûrdân. His father, a murid [q.v.] of the Anşâr [q.v.], was a weaver. Nothing is known of the poet's education. He probably got his literary training not from particular teachers or from books but in the busy life of the Mesopotamian cities, the intellectual life of which had risen to a still higher level with the advent of the Abâbids. Like most of his contemporaries he earned his living as a poet by writing panegyics and was acquainted with many statesmen and emirs. Among them were the general Ya'qûb b. Mayzûl al-Shâhâflî (see Dîvân, N. 1, 6, 10, 16, 49), 'Abd b. Yazîl al-Muhallabi (N. 20), Mansûr b. Ya'qûb al-Hâmîyar (N. 31) and many others. He gradually won the favour of the influential Barmakids (at N. 17, 40, 45) and of the caliph Harûn al-Rashîd (N. 14, 41, 57); according to one story, he received his nickname from the latter on account of a verse of his (N. 3, 35; cf. also N. 3, 9). In even mention of the Abâbids in an ode (N. 57, 30). The fall of the Barmakids about 293 did not affect his career: he dedicated some of his odes to al-A'mîn (N. 7, 28, 30) but his principal patron in later times was al-Mâ'mûn's vizier Faḍî b. Sahîl [q.v.]. Through his intervention he received from al-Mâ'mûn an official post (probably gâhid b. al-bardî) in Dijûrdân. He remained faithful to Faḍî b. Sahîl until his death in 202 (818), and out of grief for him he wrote no more. There is a story told by his râwî according to which he destroyed a considerable part of his poems before his death.

As regards the matter and style of his poems, they were on quite traditional ground. In addition to his old-fashioned odes and elegies are especially interesting in this respect; in polemics with the otherwise little known p. Ibn al-Kanbar on the merits of the Anşâr and Kurâsh', he revived the coarse and bitter tone of the polemics of an al-Parâzî [q.v.], or an al-Tirmîdî [q.v.] on a similar subject. The two hundred years of development of Arabic poetry were naturally not without influence on him; in his nasaibs we frequently find the style of 'Umar b. Abî Râfî' or 'Abî 'Abbâs b. al-Ahnaf [see K. AL-AHNAF], Muslim's contemporaries. His drinking-songs deserve special mention. Although Noldke only very rarely finds in them "the natural effusion of Bacchantic joy as so frequently in Abû Nuwâs [q.v.]", Arab critics are of another opinion. These two poets are to them practically the same in this respect and we must confess they are right.

His drinking-songs are not only of great value for the descriptions of society and social life in the cities but from the point of view of poetry they are among the best of Muslim's work. If we must, as regards subject matter, number Muslim among the imitators of the old poets, in style he belongs to a more modern period. The historian of Arabic literature frequently mentions him as the first to introduce the "new style", al-halâfî, with its tropes and figures. This is however not quite such a simple point; the "new style" arose only gradually in Arabic poetry, although Muslim with his contemporaries, Rashîr b. Burd [q.v.], Abî Nuwâs etc., was one of the first who definitely struck out on the new path. The younger generation, especially Abî Tamâmî [q.v.], drove this new style to banality.

Muslim was on terms of friendship or enmity with many contemporary poets, e.g. Abû Nuwâs: Abû l-‘Atîyahya [q.v.], al-‘Abbâs b. al-Ahnaf (who maliciously called him Sâ‘îl al-Ghîlîn or Ša‘îl al-Kâz; see Dîvân, N. 44), Abû l-‘Shîr [q.v.], al-Husain al-Khâlî etc. His literary influence was not inconsiderable: Dîvîl [q.v.] was his pupil whom did not prevent him exchanging satires with Muslim). Abî Tamâmî was particularly fond of studying his poems. His Dîvân has been transmitted in very unsatisfactory fashion and was collected in alphabetical order by al-Sûbî [q.v.], but this edition has not come down to us (there are a few traces of it in the Kitâb al-‘Aghâlî); another story speaks of the collection made by the philologist al-Mubarrad. The only known European manuscript (Leiden)
on which de Goege's edition is based, contains;
only a portion of his poems (including a few
sonnets; see Barbier de Meynard, op. cit.,
7: 17 sq.); it represents an unknown edition and
is of little importance for the criticism of the text.

**Bibliography:** Ducan Poetae Abū-l-Walid
Musta'ım Abū-l-Walid Al-Mi'mar i synonymice Carv-
Kaᅀ灿, ed. de Goege. Leyden 1875 (un-
favourably without an index of rhyme); the
Canon edition of 1325 (Maţba'at Madrasat Wali-
dar Ābbās al-Awsal, 8°, p. 97) also called
Taba al-lūm, repeats de Goege's text in an
alphabetical arrangement; the Bombay lithograph
of 1603 (1886) is not accessible to me (see Re-
cher, op. cit: it claims to give a better text than
the Leyden edition; see Sarkis, op. cit.). Most
of the sources are given by de Goege in
his edition (p. 228—310); the most important
is of course the Kitāb al-Akhbār (p. 225—271).

Of others we may note: Ibn Kutaiba, Kitāb al-
Alm, ed. de Goege, p. 528—553, passim (s.
index); Ibn al-Mu'tazz, Tabākāt al-Shāhādah
al-mu'addahin (MS. Escorial, No. 279), fol. 157—
157; al-Marrubī, al-Muwaṣṣelah, Cairo 1343
(Maţba'at al-salafiyya), s. index. — Modern
literature: Th. Noelle, review of de Goege's
715; Brockelmann, G. G. A., l., 77, No. 7 (with
misprint in date of death: 803 for 823); M.
Barbare de Meynard, On the arabic du Ilm-
egide de l'église (Actes du Vème Congrès des
Orientalistes, section IV, Paris 1899, p. 1—21);
Ch. Hurt, Littérature arabe, Paris 1912, p. 73—
74 (with the same error as in Brockelmann):
Djiriże Zaidān, Ta'rikh Abū-l-Luğha al-
aqagib, u., Cairo 1912, p. 66; A. F. Riffi,
'Al-mu'annân, ii., Cairo 1927, p. 374—392;
J. E. Sarkis, Dictionnaire encyclopédique de biblio-
graphie arabe, Cairo 1930, col. 1746—1747;
O. Rescher, Abriss der arabischen Litteratur-
egeschichte, Lieferung IV, Stambul 1929, p. 12—15,
(ION. KRATSFLOSKY)

**MUSNAĐ**. [see Hadźicz, iv.]

**AL-MUSTAÐD**. [see Allamî, Abū Muhammad al-
Alâ al-Din, Abū Muhammad al-
Hasan. Abbaṣîd caliph, born on
23rd Sha'bân 536 (March 23, 1142), son of al-
Mustanṣijd and an Armenian slave named Gaḥda. 
After his father's death on 6th Rabi' II 566
(Dec. 20, 1170) al-Mustanṣijd succeeded him and at
the beginning of the following year was formally
recognised as caliph in Egypt also, which passed
into the hands of the Ayyūbids at this time [see
the article ṬAṬĪMES, ii. 96]. The assassins of
al-Mustanṣijd soon quarrelled among themselves.
Abū al-Dīn [q. v.] whom al-Mustanṣijd had
been forced to make vizier was dismissed by 587 (1171—
1172) and the instigation of the enm Kaimaz. In
Dhu al-Ka'da 570 (May 1175) the latter was about
to attack the treasurer Zahr ābīn b. al-
Aṯīr, but the latter fled to the caliph whereupon Kaimaz
began to besiege the palace of the latter. Al-Mustanṣijd
appealed to the people to help him: the house of
Kaimaz was pillaged and he himself fled but died
soon afterwards and Abū al-Dīn again became
vizier. Al-Mustanṣijd already had quarrelled with
Shīmā, lord of Khišīštān. In 569 (1173—1174)
a war broke out between the latter's nephew Ibn Shānḳā and al-Mustanṣijd; Ibn Shānḳā was soon
taken prisoner and put to death. The insignificant
al-Mustanṣijd died on the 2nd Dhu 'l-Ka'da or, ac-
cording to another statement, at the end of Shawwāl
575 (end of March 1180).

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Ḳāhir, ed. Tornberg,
ax. 237 sqq.; Ibn al-Takāfi, al-Fīḳḥī, ed. Dieren-
bourg, p. 428—433; Muhammad b. Šākir,
Fawātıl-Wajāfī, i. 137 sqq.; Ibn Ḳhālid, al-
Ḍar, iii. 525 sqq.; Šamī Allāh Mustawfī-
Ḳazwīnī, Ta'rīḫī Gūṣ̄ā, ed. Browne, i. 367—
369; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalif'en, ii. 337—363.
Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire
des Seljouquides, ii. 304; Le Strange, Baghdad
during the Abbasid Caliphate, p. 87, 195, 260,
280. (K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

**MUSTAḌJĀB-KHĀN BĀḤDŪR (NAṢĪB),**
the son of the celebrated Rohān leader Ḥāfiz al-Mulk Ḥāfiz Ḥaḍīt vh Khan (1707—
1774) and author of a biography of his
father, which he wrote in Persian under the
title Gulistiání-Raḥmat. Ḥāfiz Ḥaḍīt vh Khan,
who was an Afghan of the tribe of Yūsūf-Zāi by descent,
had been since 1748 a chief in Rohīkhand (Katreh)
and throughout his life waged a bitter warfare with the Mahāstā. He fell in 1774 in a fight at
Mārānṭīr Kháta where he was fighting against the
combined forces of the Naẕwā of Oudh Ṣabī'ī
al-Mulk and the English. Warren Hastings in
acting on the Naẕwā with English troops became the subject of a judicial investigation.
Mustanṣijd  al-Khān's book describes Ḥāfiz Ḥaḍīt
Khan as a fine representative of Afghan chivalry and
contains much of value for studying the relations
between the individual Afghan tribes.

**Bibliography:** I do not know of any
publication of the original text of the Gulistiání-
Raḥmat. There is an abbreviated English
translation by Ch. Elliott, The Life of Ḥāfiz vol-
nowk, Ḥāfiz Ḥaḍīt vh Khan, written by his son
the Naẕwā Muṣṭaḍīāf Khan Ḥaḍīt and entrusted
to Gulistiání-Raḥmat, London 1831; H.
Hamilton, The East-India Gazetteer, London
1828, ii. 458; Imperial Gazetteer of India,
London 1908, xx. 135 and xx. 307 sqq.
(E. BERTHELS)

**MUSTAṬFĀ I,** the fifteenth Ottoman
Ṣūlīn, was born in the year 1000 (1591) as
son of Muḥammad III. He owed his life to the
relaxation of the Ṣūlīn authorising the killing of
all the brothers of a new Ṣūlīn and was called
to succeed his brother  Ahmad I at the latter's
death on November 22, 1617. But his weakminded-
ness — which is said to have him made escape
death on account of superstitious fear of Ahmad—
made him absolutely incapable of ruling. Ahmad's
son  Oṭhmān, who felt himself entitled to the
succession, had little difficulty in procuring Muṣṭa}while's deposition in a meeting of the Imperial Vīzīr,
by the kāẓīm, the muṣṭafī and the kā'im-
mašākīn, the grand-vizier  Khaṭīb Pahe [q. v.] being
absent. This happened on February 26, 1618.

Unexpectedly Muṣṭaṭfā I was again called to
the throne when, on May 19, 1622, the rebellion of
the Janissaries broke out against  Oṭhmān II He
was taken by force from his seclusion in the harem
and the Janissaries forced the ʿulūmī to acknowledge
him as sultan. The next day  Oṭhmān was
killed and until June the grand-vizier  Dāwūd
Pahe, the man responsible for the rebellion,
remained in power. Then he was deposed by the
ṣūlīn. The real masters were the Janissaries and
Sipāhs; several grand-viziers were nominated and
deposed again at their pleasure. The Sipāḥi
party began, after some time, to exact vengeance for 'Oğhaman and in January 1623, when Guruımı Muhammad Pasja [q. v.] was grand-vizier, Davud Pasja was killed. Soon the Janissary party came again to influence under the grand-vizier Mehmed Pasja (Feb. 3). The latter succeeded in maintaining himself until August 20; then the general feeling amongst the 'ulama and the people, combined with the steadily growing opposition in the provinces against the tyranny of the military in the capital, as manifested by the action of Saif al-Din Oghlu in Tripolis and still more by the revolt of Abaza Pasja [q. v.] in Erzurum, brought about Mere Hüsam’s deposition. The new grand-vizier, Kemâneşh Ali Pasja, together with the muftî, deposed the sultan on Sept. 10, 1623 and called Ahmad’s son Murât to the throne.

During all his reign Mustafa had continued to give signs of his complete mental aberration; he died in 1638 and was buried in the Aya Sofia. The only important international act that took place during his reign was the peace concluded with Poland in February 1623.

Bibliography: The Turkish sources for this period are the historical works of Na’îma, Hâdidji Khalîfî (Felekîmi), Peçevî, Hasan Bey Zade and Tüği. Contemporary reports in in the Memoirs of the English envoy Sir Thomas Roe. Further the general historical works of von Hammer, Zincken and Joqga.

J. H. Kramers

MUŞTAFA II, the twenty-second Ottoman sultan, was a son of Muhammad IV. Born in 1624, he succeeded to his uncle Ahmad II on February 6, 1695, at a time when the empire was at war with Austria, Poland, Russia and Venice. The new sultan in a remarkable kâtib-i sherif proclaimed a Holy War and carried out, against the decision of the Divân, his desire to take part in the campaign against Austria. Before his departure a mutiny of the Janissaries had cost him the grand vizier Defterdar Selim Pasja his life (April 24, 1693) and the campaign was led by the new grand vizier Esmâil Muhammad Pasja [q. v.]. The Turkish army operated not without success in the region of Temesvár. Taking Hissa, Lagon and Spahia, the Venetians had been beaten in February near Chios and were beaten again in September. In October Azof was delivered from the Russian siege. Next year the sultan and his army were again successful in raising the siege of Temesvár, but no part of the lost territory could be recovered from the Austrians. That year, however, the Russian took Azof. The campaign of 1696 is memorable for the heavy defeat inflicted on the Turks near Zenta on the Theiss (Sept. 11), where Esmâil Muhammad lost his life, while the sultan, who had already crossed the river, had to fly to Temesvár. The imperial party fell into the hands of the Austrians. From Temesvár Mustafa nominated Amâdja Zade Hüsam [q. v.], of the Kopru family, his grand vizier. Under this very able statesman peace was at last concluded. In 1698 the grand vizier went to the frontier, while the sultan stayed at Adrianople, but the peace negotiations were pursued more earnestly than the war. In October of that year began the peace negotiations at Karlowitz (Turk. Karlofta, see CARLOWITZ) on the Danube, where on February 26, 1699 peace was concluded with Austria, Poland and Venice. With Russia only an armistice was concluded to be followed in 1700 by a definite peace. The English and Dutch ministers took part in the negotiations as intermediaries. The peace treaty meant the loss of Hungary and Transylvania, with the evacuation of the district of Temesvár; Polaund recovered Kamianets while Venice had to cede Lepanto and some small towns in Morea. With Russia the Dnieper became the frontier.

The peace enabled the grand vizier to bring order into the affairs of state, which had suffered by the long and disastrous war. The Keis Efendi Rami and the mufti Feizullah, who had great influence with the sultan, were his collaborators. Some interior troubles were easily appeased; only in 1701 a campaign in ‚Iraq was needed to take Bâṣra from the hands of a local party that had submitted to Persia. Fortresses were put in a better state of defence and a new Kânînâ-name was issued for the fleet. Hüsam Pasja resigned his office in Sept. 1702 and died soon afterwards. His deposition was partly the work of the mufti Feizullah, who made the sultan appoint in his place Dalatban Muhammad Pasja. When the latter showed himself of too warlike a disposition and caused at the same time unrest in the capital by favouring the claims of the Tatar Khan, the influence of the mufti caused his deposition and execution (Jan. 1703). Rami [q. v.] became grand-vizier. Rami’s measures to enforce the authority of the central government were salutary but made him many enemies: moreover the Janissaries were not contented with a grand-vizier who was not a military man. The general unrest was increased by the permanent residence of sultan Mustafa in Adrianople. All these circumstances brought about in July 1705 a Janissary revolt in Constantinople, directed at first against Rami Pasja and against the mufti. The latter’s deposition was obtained without much difficulty, but the rebellion continued under the leadership and organisation of a certain Hasan Agha. A deputation of the rebels to Adrianople was imprisoned and treated in an insolent way. Too late the sultan promised to come himself to Constantinople; the ‘ulama were constrained to give a fataw authorising the sultan’s deposition. In August 1703 a rebel army went on its way to Adrianople, after having agreed on Mustafa’s brother Ahmad as successor to the throne. When Mustafa saw himself at last abandoned by his own Janissaries he resigned on August 21. He died soon afterwards on Dec. 31, 1703 and was buried in the Aya Sofia. He is rightly considered as a wise and good ruler, as is proved by his powerful choice of able statesmen. He wrote poems under the tâlkâtât of Mefînî and 1 kgâli. Under him the imperial fêyyan appeared for the first time on the Ottoman coins.

Bibliography: The chief source is the Taʾrīḫ of Râshîd, besides an anonymous historical work, used by von Hammer and only mentioned in a note by Babinger, G. O. W., p. 247 and 248. Useful information also in the history of the Crimea by Mehmed Kuğû (G. O. W., p. 235) and Saiyid Mehmed Kijî (G. O. W., p. 281). The fêyyân of the grand-vizier Rami Pasja (not mentioned in G. O. W.) has importance as containing contemporary documents. Further the general histories of von Hammer, Zincken and Joqga.

J. H. Kramers
MUSTAFÄ III. the twenty-sixth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was one of the younger sons of Ahmad III and was born on 11th February, 1412 = January 28, 1717 (Sübûât-ı Gümählî, i. 80). When he succeeded to the throne, after 'Othmân III's death on October 30, 1757, his much more popular brother and heir to the throne, Muhammed, had recently died, in December 1756. Turkey enjoyed at that time, since the peace of Belgrad of 1739, a period of peace with her neighbours. Since December 1756 the very able Râghib Paşa [q. v.] was grand vizier and remained the real administrator of the empire until his death in 1763. Râghib had removed from the capital all those who might have counteracted his influence, taking at the same time wise financial measures and endeavouring to keep the military forces in good condition. The sultan meanwhile, who was of a vivid and active temperament, busied himself, like his predecessor, with regulations concerning the clothes of his non-Muslim subjects and the appearance in public of Muhammadan women; at this time there was also taken up again the never realized plan of linking the gulf of Iznil with the Black Sea [see ŞARBANDJ]. The Seven Years' War in Europe (1756—1763) had not remained without influence on the policy of the Porte; after long hesitation Turkey agreed at last to conclude a treaty of friendship with Prussia (March 29, 1761), Râghib himself was inclined to conclude even an alliance, but the sultan and the influential 'ulama were peacefully minded.

After Râghib's death Mustâfa began to reign himself and different grand viziers succeeded one another at short intervals. From 1765 to 1768 the grand vizier, on the throne held by Muḥsin Zâde Muhammad Paşa, under whom the disastrous war with Russia broke out. Difficulties with Russia had already commenced in 1762, when Russia had supported the ruler of Georgia against the Turkish Paşa of Akhî-khâ (Cal'drî); here, as well as in Montenegro, Russian emissaries worked in secret against the Turkish rule. Moreover the Khân of the Crimea repeatedly complained about Russian military measures on his northern frontier, while the party of the Confederates in Poland urgently appealed for the intervention of the Porte against the aggression of Catherine's government on Polish liberty. In these circumstances the Porte had no more interest in seeking the alliance of Prussia, where, in 1764, Ahmad Rasmi Efendi had gone as envoy, of which embassy he afterwards wrote his work, Şevf-i-ırâm. The sultan himself was decidedly anti-Russian, but the diplomacy of the Russian minister Obreskoff and the pacification of the 'ulama delayed the war, until, in August 1768, Mustâfa obtained from the then mufti Wali al-Dîn a fatâwa authorizing the war with Russia. War was declared only on October 6, after the dismissal of the grand vizier Muḥsin Zâde, who had advised delay until the spring. Obreskoff was imprisoned in Yedi Kule.

The war began in January with destructive raids of the Crimean Tatars in southern Russia under the newly appointed Khân Kîrîm Girây; at that time de Tott was an eye-witness with the Tartar army. In March 1769 the then grand-vizier Muhammad at Emin Paşa left Constantinople with the Holy Banners, an occasion which was with outburst of Muhammadan fanaticism against the Austrian internuncio and his party, who had come to witness the procession. While the grand vizier went to the Dobruja, the Russians made an attack on Chotin (Turk. Khočin), which they were able to take only in August. In the concluded the grand-vizier had been deposed and executed, this place was taken by Moldowandji Ali Paşa, who had encounters with the Russians on both sides of the Dniepr. Other Russian armies took Jassy and Bucarest and advanced into Transcaucasia. The year 1770 was still more disastrous for Turkey. The Russians reached, through Rumania, the Danube and in the autumn they took Kîlîn, Bender and Braila, in the immediate neighbourhood of the Turkish general headquarters in Baba Dağlı. In the same year a Russian fleet appeared in the Mediterranean; several towns in Morea were conquered and evacuated again, but the heaviest blow was the burning of the Turkish fleet in the bay of Çesme (July 1770) Moldowandji Ali—already dispossessed of his grand vizierate—was sent to strengthen, with de Tott, the defences of the Dar-danelles. But the Russian fleet had ceased to be a danger and the Danube campaign of the following spring also was rather favourable for the Turks. In the beginning of 1771 the military organisation had been improved. That year, however, the Russians forced the isthmus of Pereljop and conquered the entire Crimea. This was a definite loss for Turkey, and a great majority of the Tatars declared their allegiance to the Russian empress. The Turks were able, however, to remain in Ochâkow and Kibîrûn. In Constantinople meanwhile laborious diplomatic negotiations went on with the envoys of the European powers who offered to mediate, notably Austria and Prussia. With Austria an armistice was signed in July 1771 a secret 'treaty of subsidy' for diplomatic services, while the Porte disinterested herself completely in Polish affairs, going so far as to propose a partition of Poland. The result was an armistice, concluded in June 1772 at Giurgevo, followed by the peace congress of Focâni (August 1772), where Turkey's chief representative was the arrogant nişâbî 'Othmân Efendi. After the failure of the negotiations the armistice was prolonged and a new conference began at Bucarest in November. These negotiations were again broken off in March 1773, mainly from lack of agreement on the subject of the Turkish fortresses on the Black Sea; as to the Crimea, Turkey had already agreed to a formula such as was later adopted in the peace of Kûbûk Kânîrî. In Constantinople it was chiefly the 'ulama who had opposed the Russian peace conditions. The war in 1773 was not very eventful; the general headquarters had been transferred to Şümâna after Muḥsin Zâde had become grand vizier a second time (Dec. 1771). The Russians won a victory at Karasu in the Dobruja, but attacked Sulîstra and Warna in vain. Bairût was bombarded by Russian ships in connection with the rebellion of the Mamlûk Ali Bey [q. v.] in Egypt, who was supported by them. In the summer of 1773 sultan Mustâfa made known his desire to accompany the army against the Russians, but he was prevented from doing so by his illness and by his illness, to which he succumbed on December 24. In the succeeded by his brother 'Abd al-Ḥamîl. Mustâfa was buried in his own türbe, connected with the Lâleli Dîâmî, which he had begun to build in 1759 (Hâdiyat al-İlaâmî, i. 23).
Muṣṭafā III is praised in the Turkish sources as a good ruler. He had a special liking for religious disputations in his presence and was particularly interested in astrological calculations. He took an interest in the least important affairs and this prevented him from such a real statesmanlike insight as was much wanted in the later years of his reign. In his way he was an "enlightened despot". But even a more able ruler would probably have failed to save Turkey from her military inferiority against the Russian armies; measures of military organisation were taken with the aid of de Tott, but this could not prevent the desertion of the troops from assuming disastrous dimensions during certain episodes of the war. Besides the Lālī Dājjāmī, Muṣṭafā built the Ayazma Dājjāmī at Scutari for his mother; he caused a new suburb of Stambul to be built outside the Yeṭī Kāpu. His reign is further marked by the extremely severe earthquake that laid large parts of the capital in ruins in 1766.

**Bibliography:** The Tuḥrück of Wāṣūf [q.v.] is the chief historical source for Muṣṭafā's reign. Wāṣūf himself played a prominent part as secretary during the long-drawn-out peace negotiations with Russia. It is completed by the Tuḥrück of Enveri. The Ḫūkmār-nāme of Ḫiyāfī, son of Ḧākim Oğlu 'Alī Paşa, seems not to be preserved (G. O. W., p. 390). The well-known Ḩāmid Rasmī Efendi wrote a history of the war with Russia under the title Khiṣafāt al-Fāṭār (G. O. W., p. 310). The Tuḥrück of the learned grand vizier Rāghib Paşa (G. O. W., p. 285) give documents from the beginning of Muṣṭafā's reign. A contemporary western source is the Mémoires sur les Turcs et les Tartares of Baron Fr. de Tott, Maastricht 1785. Further the historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorg. (J. H. Kramers)

**MUṢṬAfĀ IV,** twenty-ninth sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was a son of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd I and was born on Şaḥādān 26, 1194/Sept. 19, 1775 (Mehmed Ṭhūreyyān, Şühlīl-i 'alāmānī, i. 51). When the anti-reform party, headed by the kaṭām-maṣām Muṣṭa Paşa and the mufṣi, and supported by the Janissaries and the auxiliary troops of the Yamaḳs had dethroned Selim III [q.v.] on May 29, 1807, Muṣṭa was proclaimed sultan. Immediately afterwards, the unpopular mizām-i ḩeṣāmī corps was dissolved and Kaṭām al-Oğlu, the leader of the Yamaḳs, was made commander of the Bospоrus fortresses. Turkey was at that time at war with Russia and England, but peace negotiations had already begun and, moreover, the foreign affairs of the empire were really governed by general European politics. A secret article annexed to the peace treaty of Tilsit (July 7, 1807) had in view — already at that time — a conditional partition of Turkey. Turkey's ally, France, tried to urge a peace with Russia and obtained a Russo-Turkish armistice at Slobo-ia (near Giangrasso), by the terms of which the Danube principalties were to be evacuated. When in the end Russia was unwilling to put into effect the terms of the armistice, relations with France became strained (departure of Sebastiani in April 1808) and new preparations for war followed, while overtures were made to England; the English admiral Codrington had already entered into negotiations with 'Alī Paşa of Yanina.

Meanwhile the kaṭām-maṣām and the mufṣi were the real rulers in Constantinople; the grand vizier Čelebī Muṣṭafā Paşa remained with the army in Adrianople and had no influence. The Janissaries and Yamaḳs, however, continued to be rebellious, measures had to be taken against them and the sultan himself went so far as to favour secret plans for restoring the mizām i ḩeṣāmī under another name. In December 1807 Müṣt Paşa was dismissed from the office of kaṭām-maṣām — on account of dis- sension with the mufṣi — and was succeeded by Ṣayyid Paşa. The latter, dismissed in his turn, fled to Bairaḳdār Muṣṭafā Paşa [q.v.], an acknowledged friend of the reform party, in Rusuḳ. From here began the action against the régime in the capital. Bairaḳdār went first to Adrianople and joined forces with the grand vizier in June 1808. They arrived in July before the gates of Constan- tineople at Dāwūd Paşa. Sultan Muṣṭafā came there on July 23 to accept their terms, which for the moment were only the destruction of the ruling party and of the Yamaḳs. On July 28 Bairaḳdār, after having seized the sultan's seal for the grand vizier, began to act on his own account. He went with his troops to the palace, where the sultan — who had left shortly before for an excursion — returned in haste. He had only the time to order the execution of Selim III but was deposed immediately afterwards by the intruders, who put his younger brother Maḥmūd on the throne. After having passed some months in confinement, he was killed by order of the new sultan on November 16, in the days of the general revolt against Bairaḳdār's régime, when the existence of the former sultan had become a real danger for Maḥmūd's position. Muṣṭafā was buried in the tuḥrück of his father 'Abd al-Ḥamīd I. near the Yeṭī Dājjāmī.


**MUṢṬAfĀ, name of several princes belonging to the Ottoman dynasty:**

1. Muṣṭafā Čelebī, eldest son of Bāyazīd I; the date of his birth is not recorded. He disappeared in the battle of Angora (July 1402). This Muṣṭafā is the first Ottoman prince to bear this name, which, like such other names as Bāyazīd and Muḥāmed, originated in mystical circles in Asia Minor in the xvirth century. According to the Byzantine sources, this Muṣṭafā is the same as the person called by the majority of the Turkish sources:

**Dozmē Muṣṭafā, who came forward in 1419 as pretender to the Ottoman throne against Muḥammad I. He was supported by Miḥtē of Wal-lachia and by the Ūṣmān Oğlu Djinād [q.v.]. Near Selanik they were beaten by Muḥammad I. Muṣṭafā took refuge in the town together with Djinād; the Byzantine commander refused to give them up to the sultan and sent them to Constan- tineople. In a treaty concluded with the emperor Manuel, the sultan promised to pay a yearly subsid to provide for the maintenance of the prisoners, while the emperor undertook to keep them in custody. This treaty was observed until Muhammad's...**
death; Mustafa was relegated to a monastery on the island of Lemnos. After Muhammad's death, however, he was released and the emperor supported him against Murad II [q.v.]. In a short time he was master of the Ottoman territories in Europe; the army sent against him under Bayazid II went over to his side at Sari Dede between Sivas and Adrianople. He was joined likewise by great feudal lords like the sons of Evrenos. He soon felt strong enough to break his alliance with the Greeks and expelled them from the recently taken Gallipoli.

After having resided some time in Adrianople, he went together with Djunaid to Asia Minor, where they met Murad's army in a battle near the bridge of Clubad. By the treacherous retreat of Djunaid, Mustafa was beaten and fled to Gallipoli and Adrianople; from here he tried to reach Wallachia, but was taken by Murad's troops and executed at Adrianople. All this happened in the first year of Murad II's reign (1421-1422).

Bibliography: Ducas and Chalcondylas relate the events before Muhammad's death; so does the chronicle of Neshri, but the other early Turkish chronicles know only of what happened in the beginning of Murad's reign. On coins struck by Mustafa: T. O. E. M., xv. 387; von Hammer, G. O. R., i.; Mehmed Zeki, Mustafî Şehzadeyî, Constantinople 1332, p. 45 sqq.

2. Mustafa, son of Muhammad I and younger brother of Murad II, was supported as pretender against the latter in 1423, while Murad besieged Constantinople. This Mustafa was about 13 years of age; he had fled to the Karanm Oghlu with his 11th Ilyas. From here he took Irap and marched against Brusa. Mustafa even went for some time to Constantinople, but Murad, raising the siege, returned to Brusa, where Mustafa was delivered to him by the treachery of Ilyas; he was executed by the sultan's orders.

Bibliography: The Byzantine writers Ducas and Chalcondylas; the old Turkish chronicles and after them the historians; von Hammer, G. O. R., i.; Mehmed Zeki, Mustafî Şehzadeyî, p. 53 sqq.

3. Mustafa, son of Sulaiman the Magnificent, was born in 921 (1515) [Mehmed Thureiya, Siddika Yoldaçoğlu, i. 79]. He had been made, in 1533, governor of Sarukhan in Magnisa; later he became governor of Konya; while Sulaiman's favourite son Muhammad was given Sarukhan. When Muhammad died in 1545, Sarukhan was given to Mustafa's younger half-brother Selim and he himself was placed in Amasia. This setting aside of the elder, more talented and more brilliant son was the work of Khurram Sultan (Roxelane), mother of Selim, and of her son-in-law, the grand vizier Rastam Pasha. Already some years before there had been signs of Sultan Sulaiman's lack of confidence in Mustafa's loyalty. When, in 1553, a new campaign had been planned against Persia, of which Rastam was to be the commander, Sulaiman decided at the last moment to accompany the army himself, being warned again against Mustafa through the intermediary of Selim's favourite Shamsi Agha. Selim joined him on the way and, when at Bregi near Konya, prince Mustafa came to pay homage to his father, he was killed by order of Sulaiman on October 6, 1553. His corpse was conveyed to Brusa and buried in the türbe of Murad II. This execution of an Ottoman prince is one of those events that made the deepest impression in the empire. It caused immediately the threatening of a Janissary revolt, which could only be appeased by the dismissal of the grand vizier Rustam Pasha.

It is said that his brother Djibhangir died soon after him of grief; a minor son of his was killed in Brusa shortly after his execution. Mustafa had also made himself believed as a patron of poets and scholars, amongst whom Surati is to be mentioned in the first place. Several poets lamented his death in elegies, in which Rustam and others were openly accused of having caused the murder; best known is the merešiye of the poet Yahya Bey. Mustafa wrote poetry under the takhalüs Müşfiil. There is further strong evidence for the probability that Mustafa wrote a history of his father's reign, a Sulaiman-name, under the pseudonym Ferdi (cf. G. O. W., p. 83).

Bibliography: The historical works of 'Ali, Solak Zade and Pecevit. The tragic death of the prince is also treated with more or less veracity in contemporary sources, as the Letters of Buseq; in later times von Hammer, G. O. R., iii.; 'Ali Djewad, Türkâhân hatî Şefiüleri: Şehzade Sulayman Mustafâ, Constantinople, n. d. (cf. Fr. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 498); Ahmad Râfî, Kadîlî Saruînât, i.; Constantinople 1413; Mehmed Zeki, Mustafî Şehzadeyî, Constantinople 1336, p. 223 sqq. (J. H. Klamaek)

MUŞTAFA KÂMİL PASHA, leader of the second nationalist movement in Egypt (on the first, see the articles 'ARAFI PASHA and KEDIVIE).

The son of an Egyptian engineer, he was born in Cairo on 1stRadjab 1291 (Aug. 14, 1874), studied at the Khedivial school of law there and after taking his examination went to study in Toulouse where in 1894 he took his "licence en droit". When still a student of 15 he began his political activity and entered into personal relations with the Kedive 'Abbas II [q.v.]. On his return from France he founded in 1894 the second Egyptian national party (al-Hizb al-Iskafî) with the object of inducing England by appeals to justice to abandon the occupation and restore the complete independence of Egypt. Later he also aimed at getting the Sûdân handed back to Egypt and tried to prepare the Egyptians by modern education for parliamentary government. As the representative of his party he spent each year a considerable time in Europe, especially France where he consort with politicians and journalists and conducted a vigorous propaganda for his object. All his life he was very friendly with the journalist Juliette Adam; he had dealings with Rochefort, Dramont, Col. Marchand, Pierre Loritz and in 1896 a correspondence with Gladstone. Later he visited Berlin, London, Vienna, Budapest, Geneva and Constantinople where he was highly thought of because he insisted on the Sûdân's suzerainty over Egypt; Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid II [q.v.] gave him in 1904 the title of Pasha. In Cairo he founded in 1898 a school for training the youth in nationalist ideas, and in 1899 started the newspaper al-Lûla (The Banner), which appeared early in 1900, had a great success and soon appeared also in English and French editions. From 1901 he published the nationalist quarterly Muhammed al-Lûla. In his speeches and articles he emphasised his aims with fiery eloquence; at the same time he expressed his approval of the building of the Turkish strategic Hijâz railway and his sympathy with the Japanese
in their war with Russia (1904—1905). Mustafa Kamil also regularly emphasised the privileged position of Muslims as belonging to the state religion and recognised the ulama as caliph and head of Islam and thus contributed to the pan-Islamic movement which began early in the twentieth century.

The ‘Entente Cordiale’ concluded on April 8, 1904 between England and France was a severe blow to him and the nationalist party; by it France, in return for a free hand in Morocco, dropped its objections to the English occupation of Egypt. The Egyptian nationalists thus lost all hope of open or secret support from the French government and were thrown upon their own resources. This situation caused Mustafa Kamil to redeem his energy and in vigorous speeches and writings against France and England, in travelling and negotiating with statesmen of different lands, he endeavoured to make Egypt’s point of view clear. As a result of the intensity of his agitation there was a breach between him and the Khedive ‘Abbas II (Oct. 1904); on the other hand, his following in Egypt rapidly increased and began to be troublesome to Lord Cromer who had so far treated the new nationalism created by Mustafa Kamil as a “quantity negligible”. The Dinka-wati (a village near Tanta in the Delta) affair gave the nationalists a great stimulus; on June 13, 1906, some Egyptian officers out shooting were said to have wounded an Egyptian woman and were attacked by felahin with clubs and one of the officers was killed. A special court set up by the felahin sentenced four felahin to death and 17 to prison or flogging and the sentence was carried out next day. The indignation in Egypt and Europe rose to great heights and even in the House of Commons the authorities were criticised. Mustafa Kamil hurried to London and discussed the matter with the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, whom he endeavoured to convince of the necessity of recalling Lord Cromer and giving greater freedom to Egyptians. On this occasion he mentioned as suitable representatives in a parliamentary system of government all those Egyptians who in the later political movement after the war played important parts. On his return to Egypt, through the press and mass meetings in which he urged Egyptians to unite against England, he gave a great stimulus to the nationalist movement and soon had the satisfaction of seeing Lord Cromer recalled — although he was not at all the only cause of this — and replaced by Sir Eldon Gorst. The latter adopted a milder tone with the Egyptians, was on good terms with the Khedive and endeavoured to support him with a newly founded party. Mustafa Pasha took this representative of England vigorously also, in Oct. 1907 put his national party on a broader basis and summoned it to a “national congress”, which met on Dec. 7 of the same year in Cairo; 1,017 delegates from all over Egypt appeared and after a speech by Mustafa Kamil which carried them away the latter was elected life-President of the party. This was however his swan-song — he had been ill since the summer of 1906; he died on Feb. 2, 1908 (8th Muharram 1326) at the age of 34 of a slow internal trouble (intestinal tuberculosis). The rumour spread that he had been poisoned at English instigation. His funeral was an impressive expression of the national grief.

Mustafa’s creations did not long survive him and his party, which produced no leader to equal him and was broken up by dissensions, gradually sank into insignificance. What he obtained no positive results by his agitation, he prepared the way for the third and greatest nationalist movement (under Sa‘d Zaghlul Pasha from Nov. 13, 1918). It is to his credit that he conducted his whole campaign without any appeal to force, which would have been quite useless against the British Empire, and without bloodshed.

Of his numerous writings only the more important can be mentioned; many of them were only printed after his death, some in the great (never completed) biography by his brother ‘Ali Bey Fakhmi Kamil, al-Mar’afa ‘l-Fahmiyya (1898 and 1909); Mi‘jm al-Istithal al-injiltisi (collection of speeches and essays, Cairo 1313); Difa‘ al-Miṣri fay Biladis, Cairo 1324 (1906); al Shami al-nuṣṣāhi (Cairo 1904, on the Russo-Japanese war); Lettres franco-egyptiennes (Cairo 1909; also in Arabic and English transl. His letters to Juliette Adam); Egyptians et Anglais, Paris 1906 (speech of July 4, 1895 in Toulouse); Le péril anglais, Paris 1893: What the Nationalist Party wants (Cairo 1907, speech of Oct 22, 1907).


AL-MUṢṬAFA’ I-L-DĪN ALLĀH. [See NIZAR B. AL-MUṢṬANṣIR.

MUṢṬAFA PASHA BAIRAKDĀR, Turkish grand vizzier in 1808, was the son of a wealthy Janissary at Rusuk, born about 1750. He distinguished himself in the war with Russia under Mustafa III, and acquired in these years the surname of bairakdar. After the war he lived on his estates near Rusuk, and acquired the semi-official position of a‘ŷān of Hizārgār and later of Rusuk. With other a‘ŷāns he took part in an action against the government at Adrianople, but became finally a reliable supporter of the govern-
ment. Having already received the honorary offices of ḥalqī ḥāšib and of mūr akhor, he was, in 1806, promoted to the rank of Paşa of Silistra and at the same time was appointed ṣeyhûnker on the Danube frontier against the advancing Russian army. This made him one of the most influential men in Rûm. He had become a zealous supporter of Selim III’s reform policy and, after that sultan’s deposition, it was to him that the enemies of the new reactionary government turned. In June 1808 he was joined by the disaffected ḥākim-żâlim of the grand vizierate in Constantinople, Tâyûr Paşa; from Rusuč they went to Adrianople, where they joined forces with the grand vizier Şebeli Muṣṭafâ Paşa. So the entire Rumelian army marched against the capital, where they dictated their will to sultan Muṣṭafâ IV (July 23). On July 26 Bairakdâr (or “Alemdar as he was called officially”) was appointed commander-in-chief and on July 28, after having taken by force the sultan’s seal from the weak grand vizier, he marched with his troops to the palace of the sultan, under the pretext of bringing back the holy standard of the prophet. At first he was allowed only to enter the first court of the seraglio, while sultan Muṣṭafâ—who had been absent—returned in haste from the seaside. As Bairakdâr had made known his intention of restoring Selim III to the throne, Muṣṭafâ had just time to have his predecessor killed. But immediately afterwards he was himself deposed and Bairakdâr now recognized Mahmûd II [q.v.] as sultan.

After this began the short personal regime of Bairakdâr Muṣṭafâ Paşa as grand vizier. He had a number of the supporters of the former sultan executed, arranged a magnificent funeral for Selim III and began to form a corps of troops called this time niẓâmlâ ṭasâker. At the same time he summoned a great imperial conference in the capital, to which all the high-placed officials of the empire were invited. Many of them answered the appeal and subscribed to the extensive programme of reforms which the grand vizier laid before them in a solemn meeting in the first days of October and which was also approved by of a fatwa of the muftî. But the precipitation with which the new measures were taken in hand and the tactless procedure in the abolition of long established abuses, made him ever more unpopular. The influential ‘ulama were also alienated by the exaggerated reforming zeal. His only support were his Rumelian troops and a small number of friends, such as Begli Efendi and Râmiz Paşa, together with Ḥâfiz Paşa of Karamân who had remained in the capital after the imperial conference. Matters came to a head on November 14, 1808, in the last days of Ramadân 1222, by a rebellion of the Janissaries. The night following that day they surrounded the grand vizier’s residence and set the quarter on fire. Bairakdâr, surprised by the fire, saw no way of escape; he hid himself in a tower of his palace, where his body was found three days afterwards, after the fire was quenched. The rumour had spread that Bairakdâr had escaped, which had caused much uncertainty.

The grand vizier was buried in the fortress of Vela Kule, where his bones were dug up in 1915 during railway works; they were transported to the mosque of Zeyneb Sultan.


(See Köprülü.)

Muṣṭafâ Paşa Bushâltî, the last hereditary waṣîr of Scutari (hence often called Bushâltî), the son of the celebrated Kara Mahmûd Paşa Bushâltî [q.v.], succeeded his uncle İbrahim Paşa about 1810 and received the rank of waṣîr in 1812. In 1820 the sandjak of Berat and in 1824 those of Ohrid and Elbasan were put under his government and he received the title of Serifsâker. Nevertheless, like his father he aimed at greater independence and when Mahmûd III’s reforms threatened to deprive him of his hereditary rights and privileges, he became strongly hostile to the Sultan and maintained friendly relations with the Serbian prince Miloš, the discontented Bosnians (cf. i., p. 737) and the Egyptian Mahâmed ʿAli (cf. J. Deny, Sommario des architectes turques du Caire, p. 264 and 553). He therefore maintained quite a passive attitude on the Russo-Turkish war (1828) and, towards the end of it, in May 1829, did he appear with his Albanians on the Danube (Vidin, Rahovo), then went on to Sofia and Philippopolis, but without taking any active part in the fighting.

On the conclusion of peace the Porte (beg. of 1831) demanded of Muṣṭafâ Paşa that he should hand over the districts previously held by him (Dukakan, Debar, Elbasan, Ohrid and Tugovicë) to the grand vizier Reshid Mehzîd Paşa (on him cf. Sidjill-i ‘othmânî, ii. 391) and carry through certain reforms in Scutari itself Muṣṭafâ Paşa resisted and with the financial and moral support of prince Miloš, led an army in the middle of March 1831 against the grand vizier. He was joined by the other Pashas of northern Albania and old Serbia who objected to reforms. The rebels had at first certain successes including the occupation of Sofia but they were completely routed at Prilep by the regular troops led by the grand-vizier (beginning of May). Muṣṭafâ Paşa hurried back to Scutari via Skopje and Prizren and shut himself up in the fortress. When he surrendered on Nov. 10, 1831 after six months’ siege, he was pardoned on Metternich’s intercession and taken to Constantinople.

Fifteen years later he again held various governorships, chiefly in Anatolia (from 1846), then to the Herzegovina (1853) and lastly in Medina where he died on May 27, 1860.


(See Köprülü.)
same Bosnian locality from which came the grand vizier Sokollu [q.v.], and began his service in the imperial army. He rose in rank under the grand vizier Ahmad (1533–1555), but was not in favour with the latter’s successor Rustam Paşa, who made him in 1556 ḩālī to prince Selim with the object of running him. The outcome of this nomination was the contrary of what was expected; Mustafa became the chief originator of the intrigues by which Selim came into conflict with his brother Bayazid and which ended with Bayazid’s execution in Persia [cf. Selim II]. After these events Rustam Paşa managed to relegate the intriguer in administrative functions to different parts of the empire; for eight years he was ṭūlī in Damascus. Nor was the grand vizier Sokollu favourably disposed to Mustafa, but in the beginning of 1569 Sultan Selim II called him back from ṭūlī al-ṣūd in the capital. Very soon afterwards Sokollu appointed him ṭūlī in the Yamān; Mustafa went to Cairo to take charge of his command, but here he became involved in serious disputes with the ṭūlī Sultan Paşa on the equipment of his army. The end was that Sultan Selim was appointed in Mustafa’s stead and the latter had to return to Constantinople. Sultan Selim’s protection saved him from death and in the beginning of the following year he was appointed again ṭūlī of the army destined for the conquest of the island of Cyprus. Lala Muṣṭafā Paşa led this formidable campaign with complete success; Nicéria was taken in 1570, when Famagusta surrendered in August 1571. With the surrender of this town is connected the brutal and cruel execution of the Venetian commander Bragadino. After his return he became a serious candidate for the grand vizierate, should Sokollu disappear from the scene. His only rival was Sīnān Paşa. When in 1577 the war with Persia broke out [cf. Murād III] both were appointed ṭūlīs, but, on account of Sīnān’s arrogant character, the latter’s appointment had to be withdrawn. In April Lala Muṣṭafā began his campaign in Georgia, fought the memorable victory of Ṣafira (August 1578) and took Thīn besides a number of other towns. These military glories did not bring him to the ambition of his life. After Sokollu’s assassination, Rustam’s son-in-law Ahmad Paşa had been made grand vizier and, on the latter’s death in May 1580, it was Sīnān [q.v.] who got the sultan’s seat. Lala Muṣṭafā died in October of the same year and was buried in the courtyard of the mosque at Aḥṣīb. Apart from the appositionally important events in which he played a prominent part, Lala Muṣṭafā Paşa has a particular importance in Ottoman historiography because the historian Aḥīṣ [q.v.] had been attached to his person as scribe since the beginning of his career. Therefore his able, but intriguing and reckless character is known better than that of many other Turkish state-men or generals. By his marriage with the grand-daughter of the last Māmūl Sultan Kānṣā Ḥūri he was a very wealthy man, who, notwithstanding his reputed avarice, founded several mosques (as in Erzerum) and many buildings of public utility in the different places where he resided as governor.

**Bibliography:** The chief Turkish source is, as has been said, Aḥīṣ, not only in his Kānū‘ al-Aḥkām, but also in a treatise entitled Nāḥi‘a al-Māhrūb, describing the war between Selim and Bāyāzīd (MS. unknown; cf. Bahinger, G.O.W., p. 132) and in his Nusrat-nāme, which gives a description of the Georgian campaign. Other sources are the works of Pećewi and Şahk Zade. Western contemporary sources are the Diary of Gerlač, the Letters of Busbeke and, especially for the conquest of Cyprus, the Itahan historical descriptions.

**Muṣṭafā Pasha Rashīd.** [See Rashīd, Musta‘āhāb. [See Shahtā]**

**Muṣṭa‘idd Khān, Muḥammad Sāilo, born about 1601 (1620), was brought up as an adopted son by Muḥammad Bāghkāwār Khān, whom he faithfully assisted in various capacities after the death of his patron he passed into the service of Awrangzēb. In the reign of Shāh ‘Alam Bāhūlā Shāh I (1118—1124 = 1707—1712), he became the secretary of ‘Ināyat Allāh Khān, son of Muḥammad Shukr Allāh, the minister of Bāhūlā Shāh, and by his desir Muṣṭa‘idd Khān composed the history of the reign of Awrangzēb, entitled Muṣṭa‘ār ‘Alāmātī. Part i. is a mere abridgment of Muḥammad Kāzm’s history of the first ten years of the emperor’s reign; part ii. contains the history of the last forty years of ‘Alamgīr’s reign (edited in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1870—1871). He died at the age of seventy-five at Delhi in 1136 (1725).**

**Bibliography:** Khāl Khān, Munarrā‘-al-Luṭbū, ii. 211; Muṣṭa‘ār ‘Alāmātī, p. 255—256. 407, 462; Ouseley, Critical Essay, p. 42; Rieu, Cat. Br. Mus., p. 270; Ethé, Introd. Otto, Cat., No. 365, and Elliot-Dawson, History of India, vi. 181. (M. Hidayet Hosain, Al-Musta‘ānī bi ‘l-‘Ārā, Abu l-Anbā’-ah Ahmad b. Muḥammad, an ‘Abbāsīd caliph. His father was a son of the caliph al-Muṭaṣir, his mother a slave-girl named Muḥkārī from Slav origin. After the death in Rabi‘ II 1248 (June 862) of al-Muṭaṣir the prætorian appointed his cousin Ahmad caliph under the name al-Muṣṭān. The choice aroused discontent in Sāmārā and unrest broke out among those who supported al-Muṭazz [q.v.] which was only put down after much bloodshed by the Turkish soldiers. When al-Muṣṭān was recognised as caliph he confirmed the governor of Baghhdād, Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir [q.v.], in office. He bought all the property of al-Muṭazz and his brother al-Mu‘ayyad and then had them arrested. The Turks wanted to put them to death but they were protected by the vizier Ahmad b. Ḫu‰ul who soon afterwards fell into disgrace and was banished to Crete. In 249 (865) trouble broke out as a result of a defeat of the army by the Byzantines; the rebels were however scattered by the vizier Uṭāmish and the two Turkish generals Ḥu‰ul and Ḳaḥţa Junior. Uṭāmish was soon afterwards murdered at the suggestion of the latter. As the caliph no longer felt safe in Sāmārā he went to Baghhdād in Muharrar 251 (Feb. 865) Al-Muṭazz was then taken by his supporters out of his prison in Sāmārā and a war broke out which ended in Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 252 (Jan. 866) in the abduction of al-Muṣṭān [cf. Baghhdād]. By the arrangement made the latter was to live in Medina in future; but he was detained in Wāṣṭ and murdered in Shawwal 252 (Oct. 866) at the age of 33. See also the article Muḥammad b. Ṭābir Allāh b. Ṭāhir.**

**Bibliography:** Ibn Ḳutabah, Kitāb al-Ma‘ārif, ed. Wūtkenfeld, p. 200; Ya‘qūb, ed. Houssma, ii. 603—610; Ţabarî, iii. 150 sqq.;
Throughout his reign the actual power was entirely in the hands of al-Afjal [q.v.]. At first some successes were gained in Syria; Fāniya (Apanea) made a voluntary submission in 459, and Tyr as was recovered from a rebel governor in 490. A project of alliance with the Sāljuq of Aleppo failed after the defeat of the Egyptian army by the Crusaders in 490 (Aug. 3, 1097); and the Howārésī was entirely in the hands of Zāhir, and his successor Abū ʿAlī ʿAlī al-Mulk Baghādādī began to suffer from a chronic famine, and neither food nor money could be raised for the troops. When the Buʿyid emir b. Abī ʿAlī al-Mulk (approached [see Muʿtiz al-ʿĀlimī]) the caliph had to declare him self ready to recognize the Buʿyids as the legitimate rulers of all the provinces conquered by them, and in ʿAmmār i 334 (Dec. 945) Ahmad entered Baghādād i was given by the caliph the title of honor Marz al-Dawwār and the fullest power in all secular matters. But the new ruler suspected that the caliph was in communication with the enemies of the Buʿyids, so he had him blinded (on 22nd Rūmān i 334 = Jan. 29 or March 946) and deposed. Al-Mustakfi died in Rāʾ i 335 (Sept.-Oct. 949).


AL-MUSTAʿLĪ BI LLAḤ ABU ʿL-ʿĀSIM AHMAD bin al-Mustanṣir, ninth Fatimid Caliph, born 20th Muharram, 467 (Sept. 16, 1074) (so in all the best sources and in al-Mustanṣir's letter to Ahmad b. ʿAli al-Jalālī, quoted in Idīs, vi. 152), the youngest son of his father. At this time it was generally assumed in the Ismāʿīlī organization that the eldest son, Nizār (born 437), would, in accordance with custom, succeed his father in the imamate, although no formal investiture with the šībāt al-ʿālīd appears to have been made. The influence of the all-powerful wazir Badr al-Ḥajlamī, however, and of his son al-Ḥajlamī, was thrown into the scale in favour of Abu ʿl-ʿĀsim and al-Mustanṣir's consent obtained to the marriage of Abu ʿl-ʿĀsim with Sitt al-Mulk, the daughter of Badr (the statement in al-Fārīkī [ap. Ibn al-Kalāmī, ed. Amedroz, p. 128] that he was the son of Badr's daughter is evidently a misunderstanding). According to the tradition of the Mustašīlian Ismāʿīlīs [see Boḥrāk] Abu ʿl-ʿĀsim was invested with the succession at the time of this marriage; in another version (Ibn Muyassar, p. 66 sqq.) al-Mustanṣir confirmed his nomination of Abu ʿl-ʿĀsim to his own sister, who divulged it after his death. On the death of al-Mustanṣir on 18th Dhu ʿl-Hidayā, 487 (Jan. 10, 1094), the Shīʾite Ilād al-Ḥaḍar, al-Afjal secured the accession of al-Mustanṣir without serious difficulty. The subsequent revolt of Nizar [see Maʿr. b. al-Mustanṣir] at Alexandria failed owing to the opposition of the army, and al-Mustanṣir's succession was generally recognized, except by the Ismāʿīlīs of Persia [see al-Ḥasan b. al-SABKH].

...
to murder the heir-apparent when he entered his father's apartment. Al-Mustansir, however, heard of the plot and had the instigator and his son arrested. A few years after his accession to the throne, the Fātimids also fell within his reign although the 'Abbasids were only officially recognised as caliphs of Egypt under his successor al-Mustaṣid. In 562 (1166—
1167), Shīma, Lord of Khūzestān, invaded the Irāk and demanded from the caliph the grant of a portion of the Lower Euphrates territory as a feef. The caliph however sent an army against him. Shīma's nephew, Kifīd, was routed and Shīma returned home. Al-Mustansir died on 9th Rābi' II
566 (Dec. 20, 1179) when he was very ill, his phy-sean arranged with his chamberlain Aqād al-
bīn [q.v.]. The emir Abu Kā仿 al-Kaināz to give him a bath to hasten his end. The caliph refused to agree; he was nevertheless shut up in the bath until he died.

Yāhar, p. 522 sqq.; Hamd Allāh Mustawfī- al-Kazwīnī, Turāzik-i Gūzida, ed. Browne, i. 363—
367; Weil, Gesch. d. Chafifīn, iii. 307—336;
Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire
des dynasties, ii. 233, 289—293.

(K. V. Zettersten)

Al-Mustansir bi ʿLāh, Abu Ḥayr al-
Mansūr b. al-ʿAzīz, ʿAbd Allāh calīf: like
his father whom he succeeded on the 14th Rājāb
623 (July 11, 1226), he is described as a just and
devout man and was generally liked although he
played a great part in politics. He acquired herīb
by a legacy in 630 (1232—1233) and eight years
later his lands were increased by the acquisition
of the town of Ayn which he bought from its
previous owner. About this time the Mongols
began to threaten the lands of ʿĪṣām, Cingiz-Khān
[q.v.] had died in Rāmāḍān 624 (Aug. 1227) but
his sons continued his campaigns of conquest. In
635 (1237—1238) the Mongols were defeated by
the caliph's troops; the strongest defender of
ʿĪṣām however was ʿĀdil al-Dīn, Shah of Khurāsān
[q.v.]. Al-Mustansir died on 20th Dhī al-Muḥarrar 1 or 10th Dhī al-Muḥarrar 2 640 (Nov. 15 or Dec. 5, 1242). According to Ibn Khaldūn however, he did not
die till the following year. The al-Mustansīlāyī
university founded by him in Baghādād bears his
name.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg,
xii. 299; Ibn al-Tājkāh, al-Fākhrī, ed. Deren-
bourg, p. 445—446; Ibn Khaldūn, al-Yāhar, iii.
535 sq.; Hamd Allāh Mustawfī-Kazwīnī, Turāzik-i Gūzida, ed. Browne, i. 370 sg.; Weil, Gesch. d. Chafifīn, iii. 453—469; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbāsid Caliphate. p. 194 sq., 266
sqq. 337 sqq. (K. V. Zettersten)

Al-Mustansir bi ʿLāh, Abu ʿAbd Allāh Mājad b. Aḥmad al-ʿAzīz, eighth Fātimid Calīf, born 16th Dhī al-Muḥarrar 2, 420 (July 2, 1029)
(according to Idrīsī, on 16th Rāmāḍān = Sept. 29), succeeded his father al-Safwī [q.v.] 15th Shābīn
427 (June 13, 1036), and died 18th Dhī l-Ḥijja
487 (Jan. 10, 1094), after the longest recorded reign of any Muslim ruler and one which, besides
being marked by the most violent fluctuations of
fortune, was of critical importance in the history
of the Fātimid Ismāʿīlī movement.

Internal history. During the childhood of
Al-Mustansir the authority remained at first in the
strong hands of his father's wazir Abu ʿAlāʾ al-
Dījamārī. On his death (7th Rāmāḍān 430 =
March 28, 1040) it was seen that the evil genius
of Al-Mustansir's reign, his mother, who was a
Sūdānī slave, and her former master, the Jewish
merchant Abū Saʿīd al-Tūsītārī. When Abū Saʿīd
was assassinated in 439 (1047), after an outbreak
of rioting between the Turkish and Berber troops,
the place as the queen-mother's agent was taken
by his brother Abū Nāṣr Hārūn (see however the
documents published by Mann [Biбли..]) and the
kātib Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan al-Yāzūrī, who
was not only accepted also the wazīrat (7th Muḥarram
442 = June 1, 1050) and held it for eight years
[ef. AL-YAZURI]. Meanwhile there was considerable
unrest and perhaps also economic unsettlement in
the country. If a statement in al-Maqrīzī:
82 (99); ed. Wiet, ii. 4 [67]) is to be believed, the
Khurāsān of the Egyptian provinces amounted only
to one million dinārs in the time of al-Yāzūrī;
but this may have been exceptional, though it is
plain from other sources that the government had
already been forced to the familiar expedient of
confiscations and indemnities. The Delta was
disturbed by Arab risings, the most serious of
which, that of the Banū Kūra, was put down only
with great difficulty by Nāṣir al-Dawla (see below)
with the Ṭayı and other Arab troops at Kōm Sharīk in
443 (1051) (cf. Ibn al-Ṣaḍārah, p. 42 sg.; Ibn al-
Aṭīr, ix. 396 sg. and for the date Ibn al-Kalānī, p. 85). At the capital there
an increasing state of tension between the
Turkish and Berber troops and the enormous
bodies of Sūdānī slaves raised by the Caliph's
mother (cf. Maqrīzī, i. 94 [Ed. Wiet, ii. 43] and
p. 335; detailed but probably unreliable may be
also in Naṣīr al-Dīn ibn Kaviānī, p. 66). In striking
contrast to this is the magnificence of the
court and prosperity of Muḥarībūs as described
by Naṣīrī Khusrāw [q.v.]. There can be little
doubt that the source of much of this prosperity,
apart from the manufacture and supply of luxuries
to the court, is already to be sought in the
commercial relations between Egypt and the Indian
Ocean on the one hand (cf. Naṣīrī Khusrāw's
account of Aḥdāb) and Constaninople on the
other. The general insecurity deepened after the
execution of al-Yāzūrī, who was the last wazir
to attempt to control the situation. He was followed
by a rapid succession of puppeteers in office, many
of whom, despite the pompous titles duly recorded
by Ibn al-Ṣaḍārah, held the position for no more
than a few days at a time.

The Fātimid Caliphate was now destined to
fall in a few shattering years through the same
gnosis as the 'Abbasid Caliphate at Baghādād
had suffered in the early part of the previous
century. The breakdown of the civil administration
and subsequent exhaustion of the treasury gave a
free hand to the military, and the sinister policy
of the Caliph's mother brought matters speedily to
a head. In a pitched battle at Kōm al-Rīth (close
to Cairo) in 454 (1062) (sometimes confused with
the previous battle at Kōm Sharīk) the Turkish
and Berber troops led by Naṣīr al-Dawla Ibn
Hamdān, a descendant of the Hamānids of Mīzān,
defeated and drove the Sūdānīs into the Saʿīd, but
struggle continued for some years and the fronts
were not finally routed and driven out until 459
(1067); thereafter they were confined to the Saʿīd,
Additions and Corrections

p. 701², l. 48. To be added: In an early period Turkish has also known the form mudur (from Sanscrit mudra, mong. motor, cf. W. Bang and A. von Gabain, Turk. Turfan-Texte, v. 53).

p. 701², l. 66. To be added: Signature was something of a privilege. Of the surviving engravers of Istanbul two only possessed it: Yunśli, the son of a famous father of that name, and ˙Ashik. The personal seals in Latin characters, made up to this day (1933), are, with a few exceptions, barbarous.

The ethnographic museum at Ankara possesses a curious collection of metal seals provenient from the slaižas of the now dissolved tarıka of the Bektashis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGLE</th>
<th>Zeitschrift oder Darstellung, Verlag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abh.</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abb.</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr. Fr.</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr. Fr. RC</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anz. Wi.</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anth.</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKW</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Fr. B</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAH</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGA</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIE</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIFAO</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOS</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTLV</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOR</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOW</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. I. Ph.</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAl</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOP</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Am. O S</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Anthr. I</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASB</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPHS</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAS</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRGS</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSF O</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCA</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDPV</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSFO</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGG</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMM</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGGW</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEgypt</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIFAO</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MdL</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitt. DOG</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitt. VAG</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitt. VAG</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAF</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Zeitschriften in Geschichte, Wissenschaften, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which suffered severely from their plundering and devastations. Nâṣîr al-Dawla in turn quarrelled with the Turks, and, defeated in battle by a force commanded by al-Mustansîr in person (461 = 1068—1069), appealed to the Saljûq Alp Arslân (q.v.). Without waiting for his help, however, he regarded circumstantial stories and the Dîrâsî as the aid of the Arabs and Lâwânî Berbers, reduced al-Mustansîr (it is said) to the state of a pensioner on a hundred dinârs a month, assumed the title of Sultân al-Dawla, and attempted, but unsuccessfully, to restore the 'Abbâsid âhâka. In Radjâb 465 (March 1073) he and all his house were killed by the rival Turkish faction, led by İdâneq, under whom the Caliph fared little better. Meanwhile the constant anarchy and remorseless plundering of the country by the troops brought agriculture to a standstill (although the Nile floods seem to have been uniformly good). The result was a famine which lasted from 459 to 464 (1067—1072) and became progressively more severe. During these years the country was a prey to the utmost misery; the royal city and palaces were looted, and Fustâṭ was twice plundered and even burned by Nâṣîr al-Dawla. Large numbers of the population, including even the Caliph's own family, sought refuge in Syria and 'Irâq (for the depopulation and shrinkage of Fustâṭ cf. Makrî, i. 51; Wit. i. 12; on the fate of the royal library see also Olga Pinto, Le Bibliothèque degli Arabi, Rome 1928, p. 25—26). The Sunni historians dwell on this famine with some complicity, regarding it as the retribution for the impious attack of al-Bâṣṣârî on the 'Abbâsid Caliphate (see below), and circumspect stories and the extreme destitution to which al-Mustansîr himself was reduced. That these must be accepted with some reserve is clear from such passages as Ibn Taghribîrdî, ii/ii. 186, 19—20.

At length in 465 (1073) al-Mustansîr, taking courage of despair, secretly invited the governor of Ākâk, the Armenian general Badr al-Djumâlî, to assume supreme control in Egypt. Badr accepted the commission, on condition of bringing his own troops with him, and sailing from Ākâk in the winter, reached Cairo on 25th Djumâlî I, 466 (Jan. 29, 1074). His rapid and energetic movements took the Turks by surprise, and he put to death the whole body of their leaders, together with a large number of Egyptian nobles and officials. For his further military and administrative measures, by which he restored order and relative prosperity in Egypt (the total revenue of Egypt and its remaining Syrian possessions, which in 466 had amounted to 2,800,000 dinârs, rose by 483 to 3,100,000 dinârs: Makrî, i. 100; ed. Wit. ii. 68; cf. Abû Sâlih, fol. 7b—9r) see the article BADR AL-DJUMÂLÎ. The alliance between general and caliph was cemented by the marriage of Badr's daughter to al-Mustansîr's youngest son Alâdîn, the future Caliph al-Mustâsîr (q.v.). The Fâtimid Caliphate was saved but, like its 'Abbâsid rival, at the cost of abandoning its temporal authority to a series of military commanders, entitled nurbâ al-qawâlîn, from whose control it never afterwards succeeded in emancipating itself.

Al-Mustansîr is described in contemporary sources as upright and amiable in character, just and equitable in his dealings, and true to his rule. His personality is entirely obscured by the successive waizars and generals who kept him virtually a prisoner. The statements of the later anti-Fâtimid writers must, of course, be entirely discounted; the Fâtimid sources, on the other hand, praise his sagacity and infallibility ('illum) as Imâm.

External relations. The empire to which al-Mustansîr succeeded was the most powerful Muslim state of its time. It extended from Iârîqiyâ and Sicily to Mecca and Central Syria, and maintained an active propagandist organization in Iârîq, Persia and Khorâsân (see the following section). Within a few years of his accession its territories were still further expanded by Anûsîjâqân's conquest of Sha'bân 429 (May 1038) [cf. the articles FâTIMIDS and ISLÀH] and extension of his authority even across the Euphrates, on the one hand, and on the other by the conquests of 'Alî al-Salâhi in the Yanâm, after establishing himself at Masîr in the same year (cf. SALÂHI; also H. F. al-Hamânî, in Journal of the Royal Central-Asian Society, 1931 p. 505 sqq., and in F. R. A. S., 1932, p. 126 sqq.). After the deaths of Anûsîjâqân and the waizâr al-Djâmdârî, who in spite of their rivalry zealously maintained the interest of the dynasty, the power and prestige of the Egyptian court steadily declined. The Arab tribes in Syria, though defeated in the field, remained unsubdued, and the Caliph had to be content with the little more than nominal allegiance of the Mirdâsîs (q.v.) at Aleppo. At Damascus, the rivalries between the Berber and Turkish troops and the hostility of the citizens reduced the governors to impotence. The disturbed state of Syria was the more disastrous that it made it impossible for the Fâtimid government to give effective support to the amir al-Bâṣṣârî (q.v.; see the list of war material and subventions sent from Egypt: Ibn Taghribîrdî, p. 177) in his attempt to oppose the advancing Saljûq power, with the result that his occupation of Baghdad and proclamation of al-Mustansîr in 459 (1058—1059) was speedily brought to an end. The subsequent military and economic disorders in Egypt allowed a free hand to the Turkmen (Qâhz) bands, who had appeared in Northern Syria as early as 447 (1055), though it was not until 463 (1071) that the first Saljûq armies entered Northern Syria and the Qâhz bands under Aṭâq (q.v.) occupied Palestine and began to harass Damascus. In many of the other towns and districts of Syria the authority was seized by local chiefs, such as the 'âdâb Ibn 'Amîr (q.v.; also G. Wit., in Mém. Henri Rassam, p. 279 sqq.) at Târâbulus and Ibn Abî Aṭâî at Tyre, though both of these acknowledged the spiritual authority of the Fâtimid Caliph (cf. also the account of the foundation of the castle of Saḥkhd by Hâsân b. Mîsam al-Kalbî in 466 (1073—1074), quoted from Sibt b. al-Djâwâr in Ibn Taghribîrdî, p. 253). The menace of the Saljûqids became most substantial after the arrival of Tutush (q.v.) in 470 (1077—1078), but the latter never actually organized a full campaign against the Fâtimids. On the contrary, the offensive was taken by Badr, who succeeded in restoring Egyptian control on the coast as far as Tyre, Sidon and Diabîlî in 482 (1089), but not in recovering the interior of Palestine and Damascus (lost in 468), in spite of a certain revulsion of feeling in Syria in favour of the Fâtimids. It is difficult to know how much weight to lay on the story (Ibn Taghribîrdî,

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
p. 272—273) that Tutush at one time proposed to ally himself in marriage with Badr.

The success of the Saljūqids also affected the position of the Fāṭimid rulers in the Arab world. In 462 (1069) the Abāsādī Caliph was acknowledged in the Holy Cities, and after a brief return to the Fāṭimid obedience between 467 and 473 the Hidjaz passed definitely to the Abāsād cause. In the Yaman, the ṣulāḥiyya in the interior and the Zaraftids in the important commercial centre of Ṣadān maintained the suzerainty of the Fāṭimids, the latter until the Abūlābī conquest by Turānshāh in 569 (1173) (cf. the art. al-Ṣalāḥīyā).

Meanwhile the Fāṭimid empire had been similarly shorn of its possessions in the West. About 435 (1043—1044) al-Muʿizz b. Bādis [q. v.], the Zirid lieutenant of the Fāṭimid Caliph in Kāṭawān, began a series of repressive measures against the Shīʿites of Iḥrīya; in 440 he seems to have made the first overt gesture of independence, and in 444 superseded the Fāṭimid coinage; but it was not until 443 (1051) that he formally renounced the Fāṭimid suzerainty and obtained an investiture from the Abūlābī. According to the traditional account (already fully traduced in Ibn al-Nawawī), the wāzir al-Yāẓūrī in revenge launched against him the nomad bands of the Banū Ḥillāt [q. v.]; the tribes mentioned in the Egyptian sources are Zugla, Ṣiyāh, al-ʿAjūdānī, and ʿAdīyūd, who had been a cause of much trouble to the government in the Ṣadd and were now given a free hand to plunder the territories of the Zirids [cf. TUNISIA, vol. iv. 85 ff.]. As Wustenfeld has already indicated (p. 234 n.), the story as it stands is open to serious objections, and there can be little doubt that it has been amplified by popular legend. The westward movement of the Hilāl tribes began as early as 440, and there is no reason to reject the account of Ibn ʿIdhārī that it was al-Muʿizz himself who invited the Arab tribes, then in Barda, to enter Iḥrīya as his ḍiyūd (since he was not on good terms with the Ṣaḥāba), and that they, having set out in response to his invitation, began to plunder on their own account and already before the close of 443 had inflicted a severe defeat on his troops. The two parties were not, however, mutually exclusive and may be reconciled by supposing that the Banū Ḥillāt were transported in the first instance to Barda (the governor of whom had thrown in his lot with al-Muʿizz), and that their advance into Iḥrīya was facilitated, for opposite reasons, by both al-Muʿizz and the wāzir (cf. also Ibn al-ʿAthīr, ix. 387—388). During the first years of his reign, the son and successor of al-Muʿizz, Tamīnī (453—501 = 1061—1107), temporarily returned to the Fāṭimid allegiance (Ibn ʿAbdī, p. 138 n. 1), but with the conquest of Sicily by the Normans in 463 (1070), Barja became the western limit of the Fāṭimid state.

The diplomatic relations of al-Muṣtaṣfir with non-Muslim states covered a wide field. In 429 (1038) the existing treaty with the Byzantine Emperor was renewed and relativelycordial relations established. If Nasīr-ī Khuraswan (ed. Kaviani, p. 67) is to be trusted, the Egyptian government was in communication in 439 (1047) also with the Georgians, the Dalamites, the Khākhān of Turkestan and even the rūdān of Dihīr, all of whom shared with Egypt a common hostility to the Suljūqids and the Ghurānids. The friendly relations with Constantiopolis, however, were broken off in 446 (1054), when the Empress Theodora demanded an offensive alliance against the Saljūqids. Egyptian troops were despatched on an unsuccessful expedition against al-Lādiqīya, the Empress retaliated by opening negotiations with the Saljūqids, and al-Muṣtaṣfir seized the treasures of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (al-Kunāmā). This breach with Constantinople had important consequences for the future of Egypt, since to it may perhaps be ascribed the opening up of direct commercial relations with the Italian trading cities, though documentary evidence on the point is lacking (cf. Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i. 103, n. 1).

Religious Conditions. The wide expansion of the Fāṭimid power under al-Muṣtaṣfir is reflected also in the religious situation. Propaganda on behalf of the Fāṭimids is synonymous with the dissemination of the official state religion of the Fāṭimids, the Ismāʿīlī-Shiʿite faith. Not only in Egypt and other lands in actual subjection to the Fāṭimid authority, but in all quarters of the Islamic world, we learn of missionaries (dāʿī), who, during the long reign of al-Muṣtaṣfir struggled, in part with great success, to secure recognition of his claim to be the religious Imām. In the East, in Persia, and especially in Shirāz, at the court of the Buyid prince Abū Kalīd (q. v.), we may trace the activities at least since 429 (1037—1038) of the dāʿī Abū ʿIyāb Hībat Allah b. Mūsā al-Muʿayyad fi Din Allah [see al-Muʿayyad], doubtless the most prominent personality of his time in the Ismāʿīlī daʿwa. He endeavoured to win over the court and the Dalamite troops to the Fāṭimid cause, but was forced to leave his post in 439 (1047—1048) as the result of pro-Abūlābī policies. In the first part of his autobiography (see Bībī al-Muʿayyad) gives a detailed account of his activity, and in particular publishes his correspondence with an unnamed Sunnī from Khūṣāsa, in which he explains the religious and political principles of his mission. To what an extent the power of the Fāṭimids and the success of their emissaries in Iṣrāk and Persia was feared at Baghādād is shown by the fact that several times and latterly in 444 (1052), there was published a document, to which the Ayyūbids also subscribed, with the object of declaring false the claim of the Fāṭimids to descend from ʿAlī. At the same time the Fāṭimid cause gained also new ground in the Yaman. After the political power of the Fāṭimids had been reduced there to a minimum in the course of the fourth century, it now acquired in the Sulāḥiyy al-ʿAlī b. Muhammad a powerful supporter. He and his successors regarded themselves not only as political but also as religious representatives of the Fāṭimid Imām in the Yaman. The voluminous correspondence between the Sulāḥiyy rulers and al-Muṣtaṣfir, which is still preserved, collected in a separate work (Kitāb al-Sulāḥiyya wa l-Tamkīf wa l-Kabīb bi-Masālik al-Mustansir bi llāh, MS. Sch. Ost, St.; many of these letters are also reproduced in Idrīs, vol. vii. [see Bībī]), deals, along with political questions, in the first place with the position of the daʿwa in the Yaman and in the Fāṭimid state.

In Egypt itself, soon after the accession of al-Muṣtaṣfir, the doctrines of the moderate official Ismāʿīlīya were threatened by the appearance of extremists related to the Druzes [q. v.]. A pretender, al-Sikkīn, together with his associate al-ʿAnī, gave himself out as the returned Calif al-Hākim, but
was promptly unmasked (Idris, vi. 296) Al-Ma'ayyad, who came to Cairo in 439 and won the goodwill of Mustansir, was entrusted with the leadership of the religious mission as da'i' al-Dâ'î (it should be remarked, however, that al-Ya'zârî during his wazâ'a, held the title of al-Mustârshîd). Ibn al-Sa'irî, p. 40). In the reopened seminary in Cairo, where the da'i' of the various countries received instruction, he gave his lectures and gathered into his hands the strings of the whole da'wa. He appears to have exercised a special influence over the development of the da'wa in the Yaman, as the future Yamanite da'i' Lamak b. Malik was numbered amongst his pupils. From Persia the newly-converted Isâ-rî Khânswah [q. v.] came to Egypt, and joined his master in Baghdad. At the same time al-Ma'ayyad, so called by Mahâth, the da'i' Almâd b. Ibrahim al-Nasîhî, and the author of the Kitâb al-Majâlis al-Mustârshîyûn (lectures in which the imâmate of al-Mustansîr is demonstrated with the aid of the Isâ-rî ta'â'il), which are ascribed by the Fâtimids to Badr al-Djâmil. — For the Fâtimid propaganda in Transoxania see also Barthold, Turkestan, i. G. M. S., p. 304—305.


— F. Wustenfeld, Gesch. der Fat. Caliphen, p. 277—271; S. Lane-Poole, Hist. of Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 136—161; J. Mann, The Jews in Egypt and Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs, Oxford 1920—1922, ii. 75—85; ii. 79—80, 376—377; and the articles quoted above. With the names are Giauq and P. Kears).

MUSTâRSHîD (Al-Mustârshîd) the name of one of the groups into which the Arab genealogists divide the population of Arabia. The first is the 'arab 'arâb, the original Arabs of pure stock; they numbered nine (some say seven) tribes which are regarded as the descendants of Aram b. Sâm b. Nûh [q. v.] and the first settlers in Arabia: 'Abâ, Thammûl, Umayyân, 'Abâl, Tasmî, Dîjâdî, Isârî, Djâmil and Qalam. These are extinct except for a few remnants incorporated in other tribes. The second group comprises the mutsârshîb [q. v.] who are not pure blooded Arabs. They are regarded as descendants of Kahtân (the Yâkûn of the list of nations in Gen. x. 25 sqq.) and live in southern Arabia. The third group is called mustârshîb; this name is also applied to tribes who were not originally Arabs; they trace their descent from Ma'add b. 'Adnân, a descendant of Isâlî [q. v.]. All the north Arabian tribes are included among the mustârshîb, so that the Banū Kurash to which Muhamedi belonged is one of them; his genealogy is in this way traced back to Abraham and he thus thought he could prove his connection with the Biblical prophets. The old term mustârshîb, for tribes not originally of Arab descent, obtained a new meaning after the conquest of Spain. It was applied to the Christian Spaniards who adopted Islam; the term mustârshîb was corrupted to Mutasrshid [q. v.].

**Bibliography:** Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, i., 433; de, Studi di Storia Orientale, i. 306; v. Caussin de Perceval, Ensauf sur l'Histoire des Aravës, i. 6 sqq.; C. Ritter, Aràbien, i. 57; al-Suyûtî, Mûsîrîn, 1st Naw'; Tâhî al-Arâbî, i. 371; cf. Lane, Lex., s. v.

(ILESE LICHTENSTADTER)

**AL-MUSTARSHID** bi 'l-Lah, Abu Mansûr al-Faqqû, 5 Abû bâsîd caliph, born in 486 (1003—1004), son of al-Mustârshîh and a slave-girl. Al-Mustarshid, who was proclaimed his father's successor after the latter's death on 16th Rabi' II 512 (Aug. 6, 1118), was the first caliph since the occupation of Baghdad by the Franks, who were not content with spiritual supremacy but also endeavoured to revive the caliph's authority in temporal matters. The Sâldjân sultan had died before al-Mustarshid (Dhu l-Hiddâja 511 = April 1118) and his son Mahmûd [q. v.] was appointed his successor. His uncle Sandzîr and his brother Mas'ûd ibn Sâlîh both rebelled against him, however, and the turbulent Mazyadî Dulkasî, who not content with raising trouble in the 'Irâq and had also quarrelled with the caliph. The latter defeated him in 517 (1123) and after al-Mustarshid had repelled a regular attack on the capital he was able to adopt a more independent attitude to the Sâldjân. But as his increasing power aroused the suspicions of the governor of Baghdad, the latter in Rabi' 2 (July—Aug. 1126) went to Sultan Mahmûd and asked him to put an end to the caliph's powers. Mahmûd agreed and attacked the capital. The al-Mustarshid sent an army against the Sâlîhî in order to save the town. The attempt failed however; towards the end of the year Mahmûd entered Baghdad and al-Mustarshid could not hold out indefinitely but had to make peace, whereupon the sultan appointed 'Imâd al-Din Zangi governor of Baghdad and all the 'Irâq. But in Djamâdi II 521 (July 1127) the latter was given the governorship of al-Mawâl and after Mahmûd's death (525 = 1131) the succession was again disputed. In 526 Dulkasî and Zangi undertook a campaign against Baghdad but were defeated by the caliph at the
end of Rađab (June 1132) and in the same year Masōd [q. v.] had to give him complete control of Baghdad and the surrounding country. After some time he attacked the sultan but was taken prisoner in Kurnaşūn 549 (Jan. 1135) and murdered in Dhu-l-Ka‘da of the same year (Aug. 1135) [cf. the art. DUBAI, S. SADAKA].


**MUSTAŠHAR** (a.), cōuncillor, Turkish pronunciation mustəšər, meaning "general secretary to a ministry" or "under-secretary of state". The word which means literally "one who is consulted" comes from the same root as müṣğūr [q. v.] which properly means "he who gives advice". Şāmī Bey regards the word mustəšər as a synonym of the old Turkish final. — The office was called mustəšər or more simply mustəšərī.

Like the title müṣğūr, that of mustəšərī was created by Mahmūd II. There were at first two mustəšərī in the grand-vizierate, one for foreign and the other for home affairs. The latter was later replaced by a Minister of the Interior who had in his turn a mustəšərī. The number of mustəšərī gradually increased but some less important departments had müṣğūrī "assistant, deputy" (in 1296 for example there were müṣğūrī in the finance and police departments). The office has been retained under the present republic and each ministry or wakf has its mustəšərī; that of national defence has three (for army, navy and air force).

The chief judge of Istanbul used to have a mustəšərī. According to Luṭfī Efendi, the post of mustəšərī of the Navy was created in 1253 [v., p. 91] and that of mustəšərī of the sadirgūn or of the two qāṣīrāt in 1262 (viit., p. 127). On the honorary grades of mustəšərī cf. the same author, vi., p. 66; cf. also p. 103, line 8 from below.

Mustəšərī is also the name given to the "councilor" of Turkish or foreign embassies or legations. The title of mustəšərī was also borne by the ambassador himself, sent by the Sultan of Morocco to Stamboul in 1197, is inexplicable to us (cf. Djewdet Pasha, edition 1309, ii. 251; cf. Recueil de Mémoires Orientaux de l’Éc. des Langues Orientales à Paris, 1905, p. 6).

As to the term muḥāwirī, a synonym of the preceding and from the same root, it is applied to technical advisers, whether foreigners or not; ḫāqān muḥāwirī "legal adviser".

Bibliography: Cf. the various Ottoman calendars. The historians Ahmed Djewdet and Luṭfī, following their predecessors, give no details of the administrative organisation.

**AL-MUSTA‘SIM BI’LLAH, AL-AHMAD ‘ALIY AL-‘ABBAṢID** caliph of Baghdad, born in 609 (1212/3). After the death of his father in Djuṣmād I or II 640 (Nov./Dec. 1242) he was raised to the caliph’s throne but he had neither the talent nor the strength to avert the catastrophe threatening from the Mongols; he allowed himself to be guided by bad councillors who were not agreed among themselves but working against one another. In 683 (1255/6) the Mongol Khān Ḥulāḡū [q. v.] demanded that the Muslim rulers should make war on the Ismā‘īls. The caliph did not trouble about this and in Rabī‘ I 655 (March/April 1257) a Mongol embassy came to Baghdad and demanded that al-Musta‘sim should raise the defences of the city and appear in person before Ḥulāḡū for further negotiations or send a deputy. As the caliph refused to meet these demands, Ḥulāḡū threatened him with war. After another message in which al-Musta‘sim tried to intimidate Ḥulāḡū, the latter set out against the ancient city of the caliphs. On the way he met another embassy, offering him an annual tribute but this effort to appease the cruel foe was useless and by Muhammad 656 (Jan. 1258) the Mongols were at the gates of Baghdad. Preparations for the siege advanced rapidly and after all attempts to resume negotiations had failed against the relentless Ḥulāḡū, al-Musta‘sim had to surrender on 4th Safer (10th Feb.) and the city was sacked. Ten days later Ḥulāḡū had the caliph with some of his relations put to death [cf. the art. BAGHDAD].


**MUSTAWFĪ, an official in charge of government accounts.** Under the Turkish systems, e.g. under the Ghażnavids and Sadżāds, the title was borne by a foreigner who was at the head of the diwan concerned with keeping the tally of public income and expenditure. Under the Niẓām al-Mulk the office of the mustawfī was second only to that of the vizier (Bundarlī, ed. Houtsma, p. 100) and appears to have corresponded to the diwan al-asīmān or diwan al-azīmān, the "Bureau of (Financial) Control" of the ‘Abbāsids (Tabari, iii. 523), although the Sadżāds also had a diwan of this name tenable by the mustawfī himself (Bundarlī, p. 58). The qualities requisite in him were such as to fit him for the vizierate itself (ibid., p. 166), and indeed there were duties which were common to the two offices so that the same man could act as the niẓām in both (ibid., p. 129, last line). The vizierate might be refused by a powerful mustawfī holding all the reins of government in his hands and reluctant to expose himself to the dangers inherent in the nominally more exalted office (ibid., p. 136, 141). But no officer was safe from a capricious or greedy monarch and the mustawfī Saṭī al-Dīn suffered death and the confiscation of a large part of his property at the hands of Sulfān Mas‘ūd‘ī (ibid., p. 171). It is probable that the actual head of the State mustawfī was mustawfī ‘almamlaka or something similar (ibid., p. 31), the ordinary mustawfī, or accountant, holding a subordinate position (ibid., p. 31, 3).
MUSTAWFI — MU'TA

Under the Mongols the title was given to the superintendents of provincial finances (e.g. Hamd Allah Mustawfi and his great-grandfather; cf. E. G. Browne, *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, iii. 87), and under the Assassins, Keyhān and Kādjar, the mustawfi *āt-dāimālikht filled the office of a secretary of state in charge of the public treasury accounts while the ordinary mustawfi was one of the lesser officers of the court (R. du Mans, *Estat de la Perse en 1666*, ed. Schefer, Paris 1890, p. 26, 178 sq.; A. Olearius, *Voyages and Travels*, London 1669, p. 274; Sir J. Malcolm, *History of Persia*, London 1815, ii. 437; R. G. Watson, *History of Persia*, London 1866, p. 16 sq.). Mustawfi *īt-ā-
dāimālikht might however, under the latest Kādjarā, be a title personal to a particular individual, who might be the Minister of the Interior (as in 1890) or even Prime Minister (as in 1910).

In Egypt, under the Fāṭimids and Mamluks, the mustawfi might be the head of a dīwān (as of the dīwān al-dā'īq) or hold a less exalted, but still important, position as financial controller in such matters as the ḫāṣīla, or military fiefs (cf. Makrizī, *Khībat, Balaq 1270, ii. 193, middle and p. 227, under mawṣū-l-dā'īq). The ordinary mustawfi was in fact official of the status of a clerk employed under a ḥād, or overseer, in land-survey or crop-estimation or else in a government office such as the depot of the government grain monopoly (op. cit., ed. Wiet, ii., ch. 32, p. 23—25).

**Bibliography:** In addition to works cited in the article, see Quatremère, *Hist. des Sultan* mamelouks de Makrizi, i./1, p. 202 sq.; Mirzā Muḥammad Ḫārāz, Maḥdānamu dī Jūwāni, Tārīḵī Qāhān-gūziqā (in G M S), i/xi. (2).

(R. LEVY)

MUSTAWFI [see ḤAMD ALLĀH.]

AL-MUSTAẒHIR BI LĪLĀH, ABD L-'ABĪB AHMAD B. AL-MUKTADĪ, ḤABBĀSīL QALIPI. After the death of his father in Muḥarram 487 (Feb. 1094) the young al-Mustaʿẓhir succeeded him; about this time the power of the Saljuqs was beginning to be weakened by internal dissensions (cf. SARKHIYAR). The Almoravids had already appeared on the scene in al-Muktaḍari’s reign, were able to take advantage of the situation and fighting this dangerous sect soon became one of the most important tasks of the sulṭāns and caliphs. The Crusades also began at this time. In Shāhān 492 (July 1099) Jerusalem was taken and in the following years numerous fugitives reached Baghādā who urged Sulṭān Muḥammad to take part in the struggle. He therefore sent an army under the emir Mawdūd against the Crusaders in 505 (1111/12). Al-Mustaʿẓhir, who is hardly ever mentioned in the political history of this period, died on 16 Rabī 1 512 (Aug. 6, 1118) at the age of 41.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEDT)

MUSULMAN [See MUSLIM.]

MUṬA, a town in the centre of a fertile plain in the land east of Jordan, east of the southern end of the Dead Sea, about two hours’ journey south of Kerak, celebrated for the defeat of the Muslims there in Djumādil II of the year 8. According to the Arabic account, the reason why Muḥammad sent 3,000 men to this region was that an envoy whom he had sent to the king (presumably the imperial commandant) of Būṣrah had been murdered by a Ghassānid, but the real reason seems to have been that he wished to bring the (Christian or pagan) Arabs living there under his control. If the story is correct that he chose three leaders for the expedition, Zaʿd b. Ḥārīṣa (?v.) and if he left his cousin Ḥādīfs b. Abī Tālib (?v.) and if he also felt the poet ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāh (q.v.) he must have fully recognised the hazardous nature of the enterprise; but the tendency of the stories to describe the dangers of the expedition and the overwhelming nature of the opposing force as very great in order to put the unfortunate result of the battle in a better light is quite evident. Ibn Ḥāṣān b. Ḥārīṣ b. Muḥammad (q.v.) to the stories above mentioned fell in succession. When the Muslims arrived on the scene the Muslims found that they had been tricked and learned that no less than 100,000 Byzantine soldiers and Beduins — a much exaggerated figure which Ibn Ḥāṣān doubles — had assembled in Maʿāb, Musil (Arabia Petraea, i. 29) locates this Maʿāb, which according to Tabari, i. 2108, was not a town but a camp (jūṣāf), at Ḵādījān, a place near a spring with traces of an old Roman camp. But Abū ʿI-Fāḍil identifies it with al-Rabba which he describes as a village on the site of the former capital of the district, c. 489 sqq. Its Leo I, *Gesta Byzantium in Comitis*, 1895, p. 70 sqq. with photographs; Musil, *op. cit.*, p. 370 sqq., 381). According to the Arab story, it was the emperor Heinrich himself who assembled this great army in Maʿāb, which is of course not true. When the Muslims heard this, we are told, they lost courage and wanted to wait until the Prophet could send them reinforcements but Abū ʿI-Fāḍil b. Rawāḥa was able to fill them with such enthusiasm for a possible martyr’s death that they needed no army. According to Ibn Ḥāṣān, the latter met them at a village belonging to Balaq called Masḥārīf, but this must be a misunderstanding as this term means the Syrian fortresses on the edge of the desert. At the sight of the great force of the enemy, they withdrew to the south but fighting began at the village of Muṭa and they were routed. When the three leaders named by Muḥammad had fallen in the order indicated, they wanted Ḥārīṣ b. ʿAṣqān to take command but he gave it to Khālid b. al-Walīd who succeeded in saving the rest of the force: this was the first occasion on which his military talents benefited the Muslims; how he did it, we do not know as the stratagem related by Wāṣīd, p. 312 is not to be taken seriously. Besides the Muslim account, we have a Byzantine one, the earliest in the history of the Prophet, by the historian Theophanes, whose version bears the stamp of veracity. According to him Muḥammad sent four chiefs to the land east of Jordan against the Christian Arabs there. They went to a village named Muṣhean, which de Goeje, *Memoire sur la conquête de la Syrie*, p. 6 sqq., takes
to be a copyist's error for Mašāb, while Musil, op. cit., p. 153, identifies it with Khūbir al-Maḥma which lies in a broad depression, in order to fall upon the Arabs on a feastday (ṣuqā yū tis idhān al-ṣibaʿa aṣwān, which seems to indicate a heathen rather than a Christian population) but the exāwīt Theodoros there learned of their plans and rapidly collecting the garrisons of the fortresses, fell upon the Muslims at Muṭa and defeated them. Three of the leaders and most of the force were killed and the Muslims was who called the "sword of God", alone succeeded in escaping. The tombs of the martyrs fell there to be pointed out at Muṭa, where a mausoleum was built over them.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hīšām, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 791 sqq.; Tabārī, ed. de Goeje, i. 1610 sqq.; Wāṣīrī, transl. Wellhausen; Ibn Saʿd, ed. Sahāch, ii. 92 sqq.; cf. iii. ii. 82, 14; iv. 22 sqq.; Caecani, Annali dell'Islam, ii. 80-88; Maḥdī, B. G. A., iv. 327; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, i. 335; Lammens, Le Berceau de l'Islam, p. 176; Yaḥṣūb, B. G. A., v. 326; Maḥdāṣa, B. G. A., iii. 178; Yaḥṣūb, Muḥqam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 677; Ibn `Iṣaqq, ed. Reinaud and de Shane, p. 247; Musil, Arabia Petraea. i. 136; Porțūnic, De geogr. Verhältnisse Syriens u. Palatinat nach Will, de Tyrus, Das Land der Bibel, 1927, i. 73. (F. Buhl)

**MUTA (A.), temporary marriage (according to the Arab lexicographers "marriage of pleasure"), a marriage which is contracted for a fixed period on rewarding the woman.**

I. **Before Islam.** According to Ammiānus Marcellinus, iv. 4, 4, temporary marriage was in use among the Arabs already in the fourth century A. D.; but this can hardly be a reference to muṭaʾ as the woman brings a lance and tent to the man and can leave him if she likes after the period has elapsed. It is also doubtful if there is a distinct muṭaʾ character in the marriage of Hīšām with Salama bint ʿAmr, whom he married during a temporary stay in Yathrib and left with her family there after the birth of her child (Caecani, i. 111, §92). From the passage Agālān, xvi. 63 (mattāʾ ʿālīka l-talāa) as well as from Muslim traditions it may be concluded that muṭaʾ was known in the Ḫāhiliya. If we remember that the same kind of temporary marriage as the maṭbaʿa was known in Erythraea (Conti Rossini, Principi di diritto consuetudinario, Rome 1916, p. 185, 249) it seems to me certain that muṭaʾ is an old Arabian institution. (Temporary marriage is also found among other peoples: cf. Wilken, p. 21 sqq.; Westermarck, History of Human Marriage, London 1925, iii. 267 sqq.; cf. also the v. 2544-2547辈子 in Egypt, to which Grünfeld, p. 327 calls attention; in a demotic document there is a reference to such a marriage for five months: cf. Mitter-Wilken, Grundzüge der Papyruskunde, 1917, i. p. 203 sqq.).

II. In the Kurʾān there is undoubtedly a reference to this form of marriage in the Medina sūra iv. 28, although the orthodox explanation of this passage as early as the first century refers it to the ordinary nikāḥ; after giving a list of the classes of women with whom marriage is forbidden, it goes on: "And further you are permitted to seek out wives with your wealth, in modest conduct but not in fornication; but give them their reward (ματίαν; maṭiba) in keeping with your promise". After ḥimātul-tam, Ṣaʿd b. Kaʿb and Ibn ʿAbbas read the

words ḥā adūlam mutamman "for a definite period" (Tabārī, Tafāṣṣ, v. 9), a reading which naturally has not found its way into Sunni circles but is often added in Ṣaḥābī books.

III. The traditions are contradictory on the question of muṭaʾ. According to some, it was in use in the time of the Prophet and he was even said to have practised it (mattāʾahu: Tabārī, Annals, i. 1775, 1776; cf. Caecani, ii. 478, N°. 17 and 19). In return for a robe or a handful of dates one could take an unmarried woman (nūyām) for a period of cohabitation (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 157; Tirmāzī, N°. 1677). Especially when a man came to a strange town he could marry a woman there for the period of his stay so that she could look after him (Tirmāzī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28).

On the other hand, according to one tradition related by ʿAli, it was forbidden by the Prophet on the day (or in the year) of Khaibar (Buḫkārī, Muslim, bāb 38; Dīwān, bāb 28, Nikāḥ, bāb 31; Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 31-34: Nasāʿī, Nikāḥ, bāb 71 ["on the day of Hunain" must here be a mistake for Khaibar]; Saʿīd, bāb 31; Ibn Māṭṣa, Nikāḥ, bāb 44; Tirmāzī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28; Aḥmad, bāb 6; Mālik, Nikāḥ, tr. 41; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 103, 142; Taḫṣīṣ, N°. 111; Zaid, Muḥqam, N°. 718).

According to other traditions, he is said to have permitted it for a short time on particular occasions. In this connection we have a group of traditions which goes back to Sabra b. Maʿbūd; the various accounts of this, some long, some short, which supplement one another, are in part given without date (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 20, 26; Nasāʿī, Nikāḥ, bāb 71; Aḥmad b. Ḫaṭib, Nikāḥ, bāb 13; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 404, 405, in part referred to the conquest of Mecca (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 21, 24, 25, 27, 28; Dārīmī, Nikāḥ, bāb 16; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 404 sq.). Their substance is as follows: The Prophet permitted muṭaʾ; Sabra therefore went with a companion to a woman and each offered her his cloak. She chose the younger with the shalibier cloak and slept three nights with him: therupon the Prophet forbade it. According to the stories associated with the farewell pilgrimage, the woman wished muṭaʾ only for a fixed period so that ten days or nights was agreed upon, but the Prophet forbade it after the first night, saying: "Whoever of you has married a woman for a period, shall give her what he promised and ask nothing of it back and he shall separate from her; for God has forbidden this up to the day of re-correction". (For the conclusion cf. also the fragments of this in Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 23, 59). According to a second group of traditions which goes back to Dārīmī b. ʿAbd Allāh and Salama b. al-Akbawī, the Prophet prohibited muṭaʾ for three days on a campaign (Buḫkārī, Nikāḥ, bāb 71; Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 14, 15; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, iv. 47, 51; according to Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 19 and Aḥmad b. Hanbal, iv. 55, this was in the year of Awtā, i.e. shortly after the capture of Mecca). In Buḫkārī we have at the end: "The partnership of the two parties lasted three nights: and if they agreed to extend it, they did so, and if they wished to separate, they did so". A prohibition is given only in two versions in the group.
According to other traditions, mut'a was first forbidden by the caliph 'Omar at the end of his caliphate (Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥaṣan, 106–11; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 304, 380 and iii. 325, 356, 363, where there is a reference made to the two kinds of mut'a, i.e. tanāmüta* on the pilgrimage and mut'at an-nabī*). 'Omar threatened the punishment of stoning so that he regarded mut'a as fornication (Ibn Māḍījk, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 44: Mālik, Ṣaḥīḥ, tr. 42: Ṣa'īd b. ʻAbī Ḥamīd; Šaybānī, N. 1792). Cf. the angry exclamation of Ibn Ṭāhūr when he was asked about mut'a: "By Allah, we were not immodest in the time of the Prophet of Allah nor fornicators" (Abūzd b. Ḥanbal, ii. 95, 104).

What then is at the bottom of these contradictory traditions? While Wellhausen regards mut'a as simply prostitution and not an old Arabian custom, Castanì points out that the traditions agree in connecting mut'a with an entrance of the Prophet into Mecca and sometimes even with the hadji. It and that a three days' duration is a feature of the mut'a; taking account of other considerations, he concludes that mut'a in the pagan period was a religious prostitution on the occasion of the Meccan festival. However tempting this explanation may be, there is a complete lack of evidence for any religious prostitution in Mecca. With Wilken and Robertison Smith, we must rather regard mut'a as the survival into Islam of an old Arabian custom. The Prophet gives this custom sanction in the Qur'an and also practised it himself. The traditions, if examined carefully, only mention two cases of prohibition by the Prophet: Ḥaibar and Mecca. As both these are later than the above Qur'ānic passage (years 3–5, according to Nöldeke-Schwally, i. 158) this prohibition would be quite possible. But since on the other hand the caliph 'Omar prohibited mut'a, which there is no reason to doubt, we might regard the tradition of prohibition as representing later views, which, as is often the case, are put back to the time of the Prophet.

IV. Attitude of the fuqahā’. Ibn ʻAbās (d. 68) was an aident champion of mut'a (Buḫkārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 31; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, tr. 18; Šaybānī, N. 1792; Rāzī, Muṣaffa al-Qāhīb, Cairo 1324, ill. 195). In Mecca and the Yaman, according to Ibn Ṭaḥūr (Bidāya, Cairo 1339, ill. 54), he also had followers; but before his death he is said to have been revived (Tirmīzī, Muṣaffa, bāb 28: Rāzī, loc. cit.). In later times, people still spoke desirously of a marriage by a fawāda of Ibn ʻAbās. In the second half of the first century in Mecca, fawāda were still given permitting mut'a (Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, tr. 29). The Qur'an commentators Muḥammad (d. 100), Saʻīd b. Ḍuḥayr (d. 95), and al-Suddī (d. 127) also referred the above verse of the Qur'ān to mut'a. Suddī says that it is a marriage for a fixed period and that it isشبه. They permit mut'a, as also does the will in the company of two witnesses; that after the expiry of this period the man has no longer any claim on the woman and that the two parties cannot inherit from one another (Ṭabarī, Taṣfiṣr., v. 8). With the second century, the contrary view begins to predominate; although individuals like Amr b. ʻAmr (d. 126), Ibn Džarajī (d. 150) and the Zaide sect of the Ḥijrūdīya permit mut'a (Ibn Ṭuṣlīḥ, loc. cit.; Ṭabarī, Taṣfiṣr., v. 8, 9). The second century, the contrary view begins to predominate; although individuals like 'Amr b. ʻAmr (d. 126), Ibn Dżarajī (d. 150) and the Zaide sect of the Ḥijrūdīya permit mut'a (Ibn Ṭuṣlīḥ, loc. cit.; van Arendonk, Ophomt etc.; Leyden 151, p. 72, note 9), al-Ṭawrī (d. 161), Ibn al-Muhārīk (d. 181) (Tirmīzī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 28) and all the Sunnī schools of law as well as the Zaidīs (al-Ṭuṣlīḥ, 'Id-Ṭabī‘, Taṣfiṣr., Berlin 151, Glaser 74, fol. 539) consider mut'a forbidden. Its recognition was now limited to the Shī‘ah. And if the caliph Ma‘müd tried to introduce mut'a again, this was certainly due to his Shī‘ tendencies (Ibn Ḥallūkān, Wafayāt, ii. 218).

At the same time, we still have in the second century the opinions of a period of transition. According to Zuṣīr (d. 158), the marriage concluded under the form of mut'a was valid as a marriage but its limitation in time was invalid (Sa‘ākhī, Mabīţ, v. 153; cf. also Buḫkārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 4). According to al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-Luḥ‘ūr (d. 204), the mut’a was valid if the partners could not survive the time fixed, e.g. 100 years or more (Sa‘ākhī, loc. cit.).

But in spite of their refusal to recognise mut’a, the Sunnīs made concessions by which mut’a gained a footing in another form. It became the practice not to insert a definite period in the contract; any agreement made outside the contract was not affected by the law. Al-ʻAbārī (Mamākha al-Tawārīkh, ed. Lees, ii. 208 seqq.) although only the contrary is recorded in the Muṣaffa and Madschum (v. 46).

A good exposition of the two opposite points of view is given from the Sunnī side by Ṭabarī (d. 587), Badrī al-Sanūsī, Cairo 1327, ii. 272–274 and in Rāzī, op. cit., iii. 193–195 and from the Shī‘ah side by ʻAlam al-Ḥusn al-Murtadā, Ḥiṣnīr, Teheran 1315, p. 60–65. The Sunnīs refer the verse above mentioned from the Qur’ān to regular marriage and declare the adfūr to be mahār, while the Shī‘ahs base their view on this verse and consider the traditions of prohibition not to be abrogatory and do not consider ‘Omar authoritative for a prohibition. The Imāmīs even go so far as to say: "The believer is only perfect when he has experienced a mut’a" (al-Ḥurr al-ʻArabī, loc. cit.).

V. The teachings of the Imāmīs.

1. Formal. Mut’a is an irrevocable (ṣawū‘) contract which, like every contract, comes into existence through ḥālaq and ḥālaq. It may be concluded with the words nikāḥ, ṣawū‘ or tanāmüta*; but must always contain a precise statement of the period (ṣa‘īl) and a definite recompense (adfūr or mahār). This recompense may be the dowry usual in other marriages or a handful of corn, a dhārāmah or such like. The permission may vary from a day to months or even years. Witnesses are not necessary; nor need it be concluded before the ḥadi, if the partners are capable of using the formulae correctly. If the mahār is not given, the contract is invalid. If the period is not given, according to some it is a regular marriage if the word tanāmüta* was not used at the end of the ceremony; in the latter case the contract is again invalid.

2. The two partners must naturally fulfill the usual conditions for the conclusion of an agreement. The woman must further be unmarried
and chaste (‘affa) and if possible ought to know about mu’a, i.e. be a Shī‘i, and can only contract a temporary marriage with a Muslim. According to Ibrahim, (d. 812) and al-Musafī (d. 413), mu’a with an unbeliever is forbidden, even with a member of the possessors of a scripture (‘idābīyya). The navaqisb (extreme Khāridjīs) are included among the unbelievers. According to most Imāmīs (and Tā‘ī also) however, mu’a with a Christian or Jewish woman is permitted but mukā’ah with a mahfū‘iyya. Mu’a with a slave-girl is only allowed with the consent of her master. Usually the woman contracts the marriage without a wā‘il; only a virgin (bikr), according to some, requires her father’s consent (Abu l-Salih, d. 82; Ibn Bībīyā, d. 381; Ibn al-Ba‘rīdī, d. 481; cf. Ḥilmī, ii. 92). The man may in this way take other wives in addition to his four legal wives, especially on journeys. He must not, however, take two sisters at the same time, not even during the ‘idda.

3. The mu’a ends on the expiry of the period agreed upon. It cannot be prolonged by arrangement between the two parties; a new temporary marriage with a new ma‘ir must rather be contracted at the end of the period. Divorce is impossible; according to some, however, Ḥān and ẓihār are permitted.

4. There is no obligation on the man to provide food and home for the woman. The two partners cannot divorce one from another; but according to some, inheritance may be provided for in the contract. The ‘idda after the expiry of the mu’a is two periods or 45 days, i.e. the ‘idda of a slave-girl. There is, however, disagreement whether on the man’s death the period of waiting is the usual one for a wife or that for a slave. The children go with the father.

VI. Modern practice. Although these ‘Shī‘ views have a certain amount of moral support, the mu’a in many cases can only be described as legalized prostitution. It is true that in Persia such marriages are made for very long periods, e.g. 50 years, but in Persia, when on a journey, temporally marriages in any place where he is stopping for some time and in the towns and caravanserais mollahs and other brokers offer a wife to each new arrival. To make this business more profitable, the ‘idda period is evaded by concluding a second temporary marriage with the same man after the expiry of the first, for in the case of such a marriage the ‘idda is not necessary. This marriage and a woman of this kind is called in Persia ‘afq (lit. ‘form’ i.e. of the contract). Cf. Olearius [1637], Muscovite. pers. Revy, Schleswig 1858, p. 609; Chardin [1673], Voyages, Paris 1851, ii. 222–223, 225–227; Polak, Persien, Leipzig 1865, ii. 207 sqq.; E. G. Browne, A year amongst the Persians, Cambridge 1927, p. 505 sqq.; H. Norden, Persien, Leipzig 1939, p. 148, 167; and the romance of the traveller James Morier, The adventures of Hejia Bahā of Isphahan, 1824, part iii., chap. 6–8.

The constantly quoted story (first in Wilken, p. 19) of Alex. Hamilton (A new account of the East India. Edinburgh 1727, i. 51) that at the beginning of the xvith century temporary marriages were publicly negotiated in Souan (= San‘ā‘) in South Arabia and concluded before the khāf, is a very improbable one: for Hamilton knew only the coast-towns from his own observation and wrote his account of his travels later from memory. He seems to be confusing them with conditions in Persian towns, and he makes mistakes on other matters.

In Mecca, in modern as well as ancient times (for the middle ages cf. Lišān al-Arab, tav-mu‘ād bi-tawādī bi-Makka minhu), temporary marriages were concluded among the Sa`ūdīs but nothing is said of this in the marriage contract or this would make it invalid; everything necessary is arranged previously by word of mouth. On the conclusion of the contract, the man utters the tafla’ formula with a time limit. Such agreements are as a rule kept (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 156; d., Versp. Geschichten, vi. 150). The same artifice is used in such cases as Šaftī indicated long ago (cf. above).
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AL-MUṬAḌĪD BI ʿLLĀH, ABU ʿL-ʿĂBEKS AHMAD B. TĀHĪA, ʿABBĀSĪ CL√PH, son of al-Muʿawwāf, co-regent with the caliph al-Muʾtamīd [q.v.], and a Greek slave named Dirar. Al-Muʾtaḍīd was already the real ruler in the two last years of al-Muʿawwāf’s life and after the death of al-Muʾtamīd in Radjāb 279 (Oct. 892) he ascended the throne. The new caliph who had inherited his father’s gifts as a ruler and was distinguished alike for his economy and military ability is one of the greatest of the ʿAbbāsids in spite of his strictness and cruelty. On the accession of al-Muʾtaḍīd the Ṭūlūnī Khāmīrārwāh [q.v.], wearied of the long war, concluded peace and gave the caliph his daughter in marriage. While the Khārījīs in Mesopotamia were weakened by internal dissensions, al-Muʾtaḍīd in 280 (893–894) undertook an expedition against the rebel Rāʾūn Shāḥīţān and brought them to obedience. In the next two years the allies of the Khārījī chief Hārūn b. ʿAbd Allāh were defeated and in 283 (896) the latter fell into the hands of Ḥusain b. Hādīmān, and was sent to Baghdād where the caliph had him crucified. The influence of the Ḥanīfīs now began to increase in Baghdād. The Dulāfīs [q.v.] who had given the caliphs much trouble were soon finally conquered. After al-Hārūn b. ʿAbd aṯ-Ṭāḥī called Abu Ḥālāl had been defeated and slain in Ḍhub ʿl-Ḥiḍājā 284 (Jan. 898) near Isfāhān, al-Muʾtaḍīd had the other Dulāfīs imprisoned and the family now disappears from history. The Sāmānīs increased their power at the expense of the Ṣaffārīs and the ʿAlīs. In 287 (900) the Ṣaffārī ʿAmīr b. aṯ-Ṭāḥī [q.v.] was captured and brought to Baghdād. In the same year the ʿAlīd Muhammad b. Zād, lord of Ṭabarīsān, occupied Dūrād which marched against Ḵūrāsān but was defeated by the Sāmānīs. But in the year 289 (903) Harūn and died of his wounds while Ibn Hārūn took possession of Dūrād and ʿṬabarīsān in the name of the Sāmānīs. About the same time the governor of Armenia and ʿĀjarbāḏjān Muhammad b. Ḍabīb al-Ṣāḥī endeavoured in combination with his freedman Ṭawṣīf to conquer Egypt. The latter however was taken prisoner by the caliph’s troops and as the most influential men in Tarsus had promised their help, al-Muʾtaḍīd had them arrested and the fleet there burned. Muhammad was however allowed to retain his post but died soon after wards of the plague. The Ḵᵛāṭābān [q.v.] now appeared on the scene and in the same year the Karmāshān leader al-Ṭajmāḥī [q.v.] inflicted a complete defeat on the caliph’s troops. Al-Muʾtaḍīd died in Baghdād on 22 Rabīʿ II, 289 (April 5, 902) at the age of 40 or 47. According to some he was poisoned. — Cf. also the art. ʿISMĀʿĪL B. RULIUṬ. Bibliography: Ṭabārī (ed. de Goeje), ii. 2131 sqq.; Ṭārī (ed. de Goeje), see index; Masʿūdī, Maḥānī (ed. Paris), viii. 112–213; ix. 47, 52; Kūṭāb al-Aḥkām, see Guldī, Tables alphabétiques; Ibn al-Aṯīr (ed. Torny), vii. 234 sqq.; Ibn al-Ṭāhī, al-Ṭāḥī (ed. Derenbourg), p. 348–356; Muhammad b. Ḍabīb b. Ḍabīb al-Ṭawṣīf al-Ṭawṣīfī, i. 45 sq.; Ibn Khālidī al-Ṭabīb, ii. 346 sqq.; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, i. 433, 460, 476 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate, its Rise, Decline, and Fall, new ed., index; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, see index; A. Muller, Der Islam, i. 531.

(K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

AL-MUṬAḌĪD BI ʿLLĀH, ABU ʿAMīR ʿĀBEKS B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABBEKS, the most important and most powerful sovereign of the ʿAbbāsid dynasty [q.v.], who reigned over the little kingdom formed by his father Abu Ḥāʾīlīs Muhammad b. ʿAbbād, with Seville [q.v.] as his capital, at the time of the break up of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain and the rise of the reyes de taifas (mutūd al-ʿlāʾīfīf): in the course of a reign of nearly 30 years (433–460 A.H. = 1042–1069 A.D.), he very considerably increased his territory by making himself the champion of the Spanish Arabs against the Berbers in Spain whose numbers, already very large in the tenth century, had been much increased since the period of the Ṭāhirī dictators. ʿAmīr ʿĀbeeks was the most gifted of the late-μuṯaḏiḏs; he was then 26, following the usual practice of the period, assumed the title of ʿṣāḥīb, and a little later the taʿṣāf of al-Muʾtaḍīd bi ʿllāh by which he is best known. Gifted with real political ability, he was not long in revealing his character, that of an autocratic ruler, ambitious and cruel and little scrupulous in the means which he used to achieve his ends. As soon as he came to the throne he continued the war begun by his father against the petty Berber ruler of Córdova [q.v.], Maḥūmād b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Bāzīfī, then against the latter’s son and successor Ṣāḥī ʿAbd Allāh. At the same time, al-Muʾtaḍīd was extending his kingdom in the west between Seville and the Atlantic Ocean. It was with this object that he attacked and defeated successively Ibn Taʿfīr, lord (ṣāḥīb) of Mertola, and Maḥūmād b. Yāḥīya al-Ṭāḥīṣūbī, lord of Niebla (Ar. Lābīd) [q.v.] who in spite of his Arab descent had had the audacity to ally himself with the Berber chiefs. In face of these successes of the king of Seville, the other muṭūd al-ʿlāʾīfīfī who distrusted ʿAmīr ʿĀbeeks formed a kind of confederation which entered the princes of Badajoz [q.v.], Algeciras [q.v.], Granada [q.v.] and Malaga [q.v.]. This soon became a war between the ʿAbbāsid of Seville and the ʿAlīṣūbī of Badajoz al-Muʾṣaffar [q.v.]; it was to last for many years in spite of the efforts at mediation by the Dājrūrīd ruler of Cordova which only achieved their end in 951. Down to this year, while harassing the frontiers of the kingdom of Badajoz, al-Muʾtaḍīd displayed other activities; in succession he defeated Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Bāzīfī, lord of Huelva [q.v.] and of Saltes [q.v.] (whose son was the famous geographer), the Ṣāḥīb Maḥūmād, lords of Silves [q.v.], and Muhammad b. Ṣāḥīb Ibn Hārūn, lord of Santa María de Algarve [q.v.], and annexed their territories. To justify these annexations, al-Muʾtaḍīd used a very crude pretext; he alleged that he had found the unfortunate Hīṣām II, who had really died in obscurity a few years before, and would go on till he had restored to him his former empire subdued and
pacified in its integrity. In order not to be exposed to the cruelty of the king of Seville, the majority of the petty Berber chiefs settled in the mountains of the south of Andalusia acquired in this make-believe and paid homage to the 'Abbâdîd and to the Commander of the Faithful miraculously restored to aid the cause of al-Muta'âd but at the same time cautiously concealed by him. It was labour lost for them. One day the 'Abbâdîd invited to his palace in Seville all these petty chiefs with their suites and put them to death by asphyxiating them in baths the openings in which he walled up. In this way he took Arcos [q.v.], the capital of the principality of the Banû Khîzûrân, Moron [q.v.] defended by the Banû Dâmmâr, and Ronda [q.v.], capital of the Banû Ifrîn (1053). This aroused the wrath of the most powerful Berber ruler in Spain, Bîdîs b. Ḥabbûs the Zîrid [q.v.] who ruled in Granada and who alone seemed able to resist al-Muta'âd. The latter however found that fortune favoured him in this war and a little later took Algeciras from the Hammadûd al-Kâsim b. Hammadûd. He next tried to seize Cordova and sent an expedition against it in charge of his son Ismâ'îl; the latter tried to profit by the occasion to rebel and create for himself a kingdom with Algeciras as capital. This rash plan cost him his life, which his father took with his own hand, just as before him 'Abd al-Rahmân III and al-Mansûr b. Abî 'Amîr had inflicted the supreme penalty on their unworthy sons. This was the beginning of the political career of al-Muta'âd's other son Muhammad al-Mu'tâmîd [q.v.] who was to succeed him on his death; by his father's orders he went with an army to support the Arabs of Malaga, who had rebelled against the tyrannical ruler of Bîdîs, the despotic Berber of Granada. But the latter routed the Sevillian army and al-Mu'tâmîd in sorry state reached Ronda from which he sought and received the pardon of his terrible father. The latter had long before repudiated the fiction of the pseudo-Hîgâm which he no longer needed but which was kept up by foreign monarchs and the most feared of the Spanish rulers. He had no enemies but the Berbers, Muslims like himself but much further removed from his social ideal of a Spaniard than his Christian neighbours in the north. In another land he might have been called "Bereroktonos". But the bitterness of his hatred cast a shadow over his last days: it was not without fear that he followed events in the western Maghrib, hither to the fief of Muslim Spain; at least in the sub-Mediterranean zone. The irresistible advance of the Almoravids [q.v.] following Yusuf b. Tâshfin through all Morocco would not find the straits of Gibraltar an insurmountable obstacle for long. Al-Muta'âd realised this very well. Death at least prevented him from seeing his kingdom, entirely built up by his own energy and bold initiative, pass in a few weeks into the hands of invaders, brethren of these Berbers of Spain whom he had detested and in part destroyed.


MUTAFARRIKA (A.), name of a corps of guards, who were especially attached to the person of the Ottoman Sultan in the ancient court. The name is also applied to a member of the guard. Their occupations were similar to those of the Carvâg [q.v.], not of military character, nor for court service only, but they were used for more or less important public or political missions. Like the Carvâg, the Mutafarrîka were a mounted guard. In later times there were two classes, the godsîl, or zadînîl Mutafarrîka, and the fieldless. Their chief was the Mutafarrîka Aghâî. In course of time their number constantly increased; at the end of the xvith century the maximum was fixed at 120 (G.O.R.2, ii. 890, after Râshîd), but in the beginning of the sixteenth century von Hammer gives the number 500 for the total. The Porte needed sometimes to lay stress on the importance of the office to make them acceptable as extraordinary envoys by foreign governments (G.O.R.2, iii. 929, after Râshîd).

Among those who have occupied this rank was the well-known first Turkish printer İbrahim Mutafarrîka.

Although different explanations of the title mutofarriqî are given, the most probable interpretation is, that these functionaries were not given a special duty but formed originally a corps used for "different matters". This is still the use of the word in modern Turkish.


AL-MUTAKABBIR. [See AIBN, ii.]

MUTAKALLIM. [See KÂTIM]

MUTAKARIB, name of the fifteenth mette in Arabic prosody; it contains four feet to the hemistich. There are two arâd and six dâr: fâlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn

1st 'arâd:

fâlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn

fâlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn

fâlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn

fâlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn

fâlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn

fâlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn fa'âlûn

Outside of the dâr, the foot fa'âlûn often loses its f and becomes fa'âlûn; used as the first 'arâd, it further undergoes the following changes: fa'âlûn and (fa'âlûn) fa'âlûn. According to al-Khalîl, the foot which precedes the dâr cannot suffer any change. The tâdûn arâd of the first line of a piece of verse may become (fa'âlûn) fa'âlûn and (fa'âlûn) fa'âlûn. (MOH. BEN CHENER)

MUTAKâWIS, term in prosody; cf. the art. KÂFIYA.
MUT'AMAD KHAN, MUHAMMAD SHARIF, was born in an obscure family in Persia, but coming to India, he attained high honours in the reigns of Djiählung and Shāh Djiählun. He received in the third year of Djiählung a military command and the title of Mut'amad Khān (the trustworthly Lord). Subsequently he joined prince Shāh Djiählun in his campaign in the Deccan as a ḥārrāq (paymaster). On his return to court, in the 17th year of Djiählung's reign, he was entrusted with the duty of writing the Emperor's memoirs. He attained a higher rank in the service of Shāh Djiählun and was appointed annābsh (adjutant-general) in the 10th year of the new reign. He died in 1049 (1639). He is the author of a history called Ikhāl Nūmāi Djiählungī, in three volumes: 1. the history of Akbar's ancestors: 2. Akbar's reign (MSS. in the India Office Library and in the Biblioteca Indiae, Calcutta 1865 and in Lucknow, A. H. 1286).

Bibliography: Mārij al-Umdād, iii. 431; Tāzki Djiählungī, p. 552; F.R. A.S., N. S., iii. 459; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, v. 278, 279; The India Museum, i. 255; Elton, Cat. of the India Office Library, p. 121 and Morley, Catalogue, p. 120.

(M. Hidayat Hosain)

Al-Mu'tamid ʿAlaʾ ʿAlāʾ, Abū ʿAbdāl-Láh Aḥmad b. Dīfāʾ, ʿAbbasīd caliph, son of Al-Mutawakkil and a slave girl named Fīṭyān from Kūfa. He ascended the throne on the deposition of al-Mu'tadil in Rajab 256 (June 870). He had no ability as a ruler, but relied on the vizier, Ubaid Allah b. Yahāyā b. Khākān and left most of the affairs of government in the hands of his brother Aḥmad Aḥmad b. Mu'awwaf. In 257/871 he was deposed by his son Dīfāʾ (July 875) who designated his son Dīfāʾ al-Mu'awwaf as his successor and governor of the western provinces and Al-Mu'awwaf as his successor and governor of the east. The able Al-Mu'awwaf soon became the real ruler and gradually restored order in the empire again while the caliph himself exercised no influence. Already in the reign of al-Mu'tadil a dangerous rising had broken out among the Zandjī, the negro slaves in the lower Euphrates valley, but it was not till 270 (883) that its leader 'Alī b. Muḥammad [q. v.] was conquered by al-Mu'awwaf. Some time after the accession of al-Mu'tamid - according to the usual statement in 259 (875) - the dynasty of the Ṭabīrīs was overthrown by Yā'qūb b. al-Laith [q. v.] and soon afterwards the Sāmānids appeared in Transoxania. On the death of Yā'qūb in 265 (879) his brother 'Amr [q. v.] submitted to the caliph and received the eastern provinces as a fief. About the same time Aḥmad b. Ṭahān [q. v.] made himself independent in Egypt and after his death (270 = 884) his son Khumārāwāh waged a desperate struggle against the ʿAbbasīd caliphate. In al-Mu'awwaf and the surrounding country the Khārījīs continued their destructive career, but were finally subdued. Peace was also often disturbed by ʿAlīd rebels and there was also the war with the Byzantines. The Fāuliqan who had stood by the Muslims faithfully were repeatedly defeated by the emperor Basil and in 265 (876) the latter retook the fortress of Lu'lu' near Tabrūz which Al-Mu'awwaf had taken. It was not till 270 (885) that the Muslims were able to inflict a complete defeat on the Byzantines. The war was however continued. After the death of Al-Mu'awwaf in 278 (891) the caliph had to proclaim the latter's son al-Mu'tamid [q. v.] as his successor instead of Dīfāʾ al-Mu'awwaf. In the following year Dīfāʾ left Sāmārā and moved the capital to Baghdad again. Here he died in Rajab 279 (Oct. 892) at the age of 48 or 50. According to some he was poisoned by al-Mu'tamid.


Al-Mu'tamid ʿAlaʾ ʿAlāʾ, the last of the dynasty which the third and last member of the dynasty of the ʿAbbadīs [q. v.] of Seville in the 11th century is best known; his real name was MUHAMMAD ibn ʿABBAD AL-MU'TAMID [q. v.]. Although of the ʿAbbadīs, he was received as successor to his predecessor, Ibn Hashim, and this town was taken by assault as was Santa Maria d'Algarve soon after (Ar. Shantamarīyul al-giwar, now Faro [q. v.]) which was held by Muhammad b. Sa'd ibn Hārūn [q. v.] (445 = 1054). The young Al-Mu'tamid, probably having been in power for a short time, took advantage of the secession of the Seville nobles and captured the city. His elder brother Ismail having been put to death in 455 (1065); cf. Al-Mu'tamid. Muhammad Al-Mu'tamid became heir-presumptive to the throne of Seville. A little later, the army which he led to the help of the Arabs of Malaga, who had rebelled against the tyranny of Badiya b. Ḥalīb, the Berber ruler of Granada of the Zirid [q. v.] dynasty, was routed by the latter and Al-Mu'tamid had to take refuge in Ronda [q. v.] which his father, at first very angry at his failure, finally sent him to his forgiveness. When the powerful ruler of Seville died in 461 (1069), his son succeeded to a considerably extended kingdom which included the greater part of the southwest of the Iberian peninsula.

A whole series of more or less romantic episodes is ascribed to the reign and life of Al-Mu'tamid. If we may believe several authors of the Muslim west, an individual called Ibn ʿAmīr, vizier and poet, exerted a very considerable influence during the greater part of the career of this prince from his governorship of Silves. Al-Mu'tamid's relations with a young slave girl al-Rumānā, gifted with considerable poetic talent, has also been the subject of much literary embellishment. It is also the name of the young woman Tumānād, that Al-Mu'tamid is said to have adopted her which comes from the same root. She became his favourite wife and presented him with several sons. As to Ibn ʿAmīr, exiled by Al-Mu'tamid, he was recalled on the accession of his patron to Seville from which he went at his own request.
to be governor of Silves before being appointed grand vizier.

In the second year of his reign, al-Mu'tamid was able to annex to his kingdom the principality of Cordova [q.v.], over which the Dajwarids had been ruling, in spite of the efforts of the king of Toledo, al-Ma'mún [q.v.]. The young prince 'Abdād was appointed governor of the old capital of the Umayyads. But at the instigation of the king of Toledo, an adventurer named Ibn 'Kāshā was able in 478 (1085) to take Cordova by surprise and put to death the young 'Abdād prince and his general Muhammad b. Martín. Al-Ma'mún took possession of the throne of the powerful kingdom. Aghmat celebrated several days for the occasion. Ibn Rashīf, who had accompanied Ibn 'Kāshā, was also killed. His death was mourned by the Christians as a setback in their efforts. Ibn Rashīf was succeeded by Ibn Bakr as vizier, a post which he held for another four years.

Al-Mu'tamid began the work of conquering Granada and taking advantage of the internal strife of the Christian princes. In 480 (1087) he sent an expedition against Seville under Ibn 'Abdād, governor of Carmona, which made him a hero in the eyes of the Christian princes. Ibn 'Abdād was able to hold the town of Cuenca, but he was forced to retreat after a siege of several days. Al-Mu'tamid then decided to send him an embassy consisting of the vizier Ibn Bakr b. Zaidīn and the kādī of Badajoz. Cordova and Granada. An agreement having been reached, not without difficulty. Yusuf b. Tāshīf crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and on the 22nd Radjab 479 (Oct. 23, 1086) inflicted on the Christian troops the disastrous defeat of Zallākā [q.v.] not far from Badajoz. We need not recall here how Yusuf b. Tāshīf recalled to Africa, could not follow up his victory as the Muslim rulers of Spain had hoped, who through the influence exercised by the Spanish fākhīs on the Almoravid, soon lost all prestige in his eyes. After his departure the Christians began again to harass Muslim citizens in their lands, to such an extent that Al-Mu'tamid had this time to go in person to Yusuf b. Tāshīf in Morocco to ask him to cross the Straits once more with his troops. Yusuf consented and landed at Algeciras in the following spring. 482 (1090). He laid siege to the fortress of Alcánta but without taking it; then stimulated by popular feeling and the advice of the fākhīs, he came to the conclusion that it would be more advantageous for him to wage the dhikād in Spain on his own account and proceeded to dethrone and dispossess the princes who had sought his intervention. With this object he sent an army to invade the kingdom of Seville under Sir b. Abi Bakr, who at the end of 1090 took Tarifa, then Cordova which was decided on, sent him an embassy consisting of the vizier Ibn Bakr b. Zaidīn, the wāli of Badajoz, and the kādī of Seville. Cordova and Granada, which was captured in spite of a heroic sortie by Al-Mu'tamid. The latter was taken prisoner by the Almoravid and sent with his wives and children first to Tangier, then to Meknes and a few months later to Aqṣām [q.v.], near Marrakesh. There he led a miserable existence for several years until his death at the age of 55 in 487 (1095).

The sad end of Al-Mu'tamid touched all his biographers, who are particularly numerous and competent in his natural gifts, poetry, talent, generosity and chivalrous spirit. He is one of the most representative types of the enlightened Spanish Muslims of the Middle Ages, patrons of letters.
al-MUTAMID — al-MUTANABBI

and scholarship, liberal and tolerant, but living in an atmosphere of luxury and ease little compatible with the care of a kingdom with frontiers open to envious neighbours on all sides. Not so great a ruler as his father al-Mutâjid, al-Mutâmid is however a much more attractive figure, perhaps just on account of his misfortunes. He is entitled to a place among the great figures of Spanish Islam, alongside of ‘Abd al-Rahmân I, al-Hakam II, al-Mansûr b. Abî ‘Amir and at a later date Isâ al-Dîn b. al-Khaṭîb.


MUTAMMIM b. NUWAIRA, a poet, contemporary with the Prophet. He was the brother of Mâlik b. Nuwaïra [q. v.], chief of the Banû Yabrî, a large clan of the Banû Tamîm. Mutammmim owes his fame to the elegies in which he lamented the tragic death of his brother Mâlik and these poems have made the latter’s name immortal. The Arabs said that the compositions of these elegies, overflowing with emotion, they regarded their author as the type of brotherly devotion.

Mutammmim does not seem to have played any prominent part before the Hîdhâr. He was eclipsed by the striking personality of his brother, to whose qualities he never hesitated to pay homage. He is represented as having been of unprepossessing appearance, one-eyed and short in stature. The Bakri chief al-Hawfâzî sang a lament of which Mutammmim treated him during his captivity. Falling in his turn into the hands of the Banû Taghîbî, Mutammmim was delivered by a stratagem devised by his brother. He seems to have adopted Islâm at the same time as his brother. Like the latter, he is numbered among the “Companions” although we never find him in direct relations with the Prophet. He escaped from the disaster in which Mâlik was overwhelmed; a few fragments of his poems suggest he did not write elegies exclusively.

But after the death of Mâlik he devoted himself to celebrating his memory and demanding vengeance for his death. Refused by the Caliph Abû Bakr, he thought he might have more success on the accession of Omar. He hurried to Madîna where he was very well received by Omar. The latter listened with delight to his elegies, regretted that he himself had not the gift of poetry so that he might worthily celebrate his brother. Zaid, who had fallen in the wars of al-Yâmama, but he refused to reverse Abû Bakr’s decision and limited himself to dismissing Khâlid b. al-Walîd, a step which probably owed something to the poetical exhortations of Mutammmim.

After this, tradition says that the poet became almost blind through weeping, and that he wandered over the many routes of Arabia, uttering his complaints everywhere. He found himself abandoned by his wives who became tired of his incurable sadness and wandering life. He left two sons, Bûwîd and Ibrîhîm, also poets. He survived Omar if, as Ibn Khallîkîn says (ed. Wustenfeld, Nö. 792), he is really the author of an elegy on the death of this caliph.


Al-MUTANABBI, “he who professes to be a prophet,” the surname by which the Arab poet Abû l-Tayyîb Abû l-Hakâm al-Mutânabbi is usually known (cf. in Ibn Khallîkîn, Hâwâazi [Cairo 1310], t. 36, two genealogies, which do not agree, going back to his great-grandfather). Abû l-Tayyîb was born in Kûfà in 303 (915) in the Kinda quarter whence the ethnic al-Kindî sometimes given him. His family in very humble circumstances claimed descent from the Yamami clan of the Dîjî and he himself all his life was convinced of the superiority of the Arabs of the south over those of the north (cf. al-Wâshîhî, Sharh Dirâs al-Mutanabbi, ed. Dieterici, p. 49; al-‘Iyâsî, al-Ur‘uf al-‘Iyâbî, p. 29 [these two works will be quoted as ‘Iyârî, and ‘Iyâbî]). The boy received his early education in his native town and soon distinguished himself by his intelligence, his prodigious memory and his precocity as a poet. He now passed under Shî‘i influences, perhaps Zandî (cf. ‘Abd al-Kâdîr al-Baghdâdî, Akhlaqîn, i. 352, 353) which affected the development of his philosophy, a subject to which we shall return. Circumstances were however to accelerate the speed of Abu ‘l-Tâyîyî’s religious development. Towards the end of 312 (924), undoubtedly under pressure from the Karâjmants [q. v.] who had just taken and sacked Kûfà, Abu ‘l-Tâyîyî and his family made a first stay of two years (cf. al-Samî‘î, Amârî, 306 n. 24; al-Bûfî, al-Sâbb al-munmârî, i. 6) in Samâwà, the region lying between the Sawâd of Kûfà in the east and Palmjirîn in the west. The Banû Kalb which led a nomadic life in these desert steppes had been much influenced by the Karâjmant dî‘ârîs. It is possible that the young poet at this time came into contact with some of these heretics. It is however not very probable,
in view of his youth, that this first contact had any definite effect upon him. On the other hand, this stay among the Beduins certainly gave Abu l-Tayyib that profound knowledge of the Arabic language of which he was later so very proud.

On returning to Kufa, at the beginning of 315 (927), Abu l-Tayyib seems to have decided to devote himself entirely to poetry. At this time he most admired the great panegyrists of the preceding century, Abū Tammām and al-Buhtūrī [q.v.]. Like them and like the majority of his contemporaries, he sees in poetry a sure means of attaining wealth and power. He at once attached himself to a certain Abu l-Fayj, of Kufa, to whom he dedicated a short poem (Wāḥ., p. 17—21; Yāz., p. 10—11). Perhaps a convert to Karmatianism, in any case a complete agnostic — the praises which he allows to be offered him show this — this individual seems to have exercised a considerable influence on the religious and philosophical development of al-Mutanabbi (cf. also Ḍahāna, i. 352 below).

Prepared by the Shī‘a atmosphere in which he had passed his childhood and by the relations he had had with the Karmatians in Samawah, Abu l-Tayyib in contact with this patron cast off religious dogmas which he regarded as spiritual instruments of oppression. He then adopted a more pessimistic philosophy, echoes of which are found throughout his work. The world is made up of seductions which death destroys (cf. Wāḥ., p. 39, l. 8—13; p. 162, l. 12—13; Yāz., p. 23 and 97); stupidity and evil alone triumph there (cf. Wāḥ., p. 161, l. 8—10; Yāz., p. 97); the Arabs — representatives of a superior race in his eyes — are overwhelmed in it by cowardly and barbarous foreigners (cf. Wāḥ., p. 148, l. 1—5; p. 166, l. 2—6; Yāz., p. 87, l. 96). In his view with which he was out of harmony, the consciousness of his talent, which Abu l-Tayyib had, developed rapidly; his vanity increased to a degree which is almost inconceivable (cf. Wāḥ., p. 60; Yāz., p. 34). His Arab particularism, as with all anti-Shū‘bīs [cf. Shī‘a], incited him to attack foreign oppressors (Wāḥ., p. 58, l. 30—31; Yāz., p. 33).

This is why, by a contradiction from which he is hardly ever free, al-Mutanabbi covered all his life long his power and power which he scorned in his heart, while he stands out from the mass of his contemporaries by his rigid melancholy and austerity (cf. al-Badi‘ī, op. cit., l. 78—81).

At first however, Abu l-Tayyib thought only of conquering the world by his poetic gifts, and to find a more favourable field for his activity he left Kufa towards the end of 316 (928), probably as a result of the town being again sacked by the Karmatians. He was naturally attracted to Baghšād (cf. al-Badi‘ī, op. cit., l. 82—83) and there became the panegyrist of a companion of his, Mansūr, and the Best Friend of the Karmatian Ali Alā‘ (cf. Wāḥ., p. 6—7; Yāz., p. 3—4). From there he went to Syria. For two years he led the life of a wandering troubadour of the period (cf. Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 256). It is impossible to follow him in his wanderings for his Divān, our only guide, does not present his poems in a satisfactory chronological order. Some pieces of the period are addressed to Beduin chiefs of the region of Manbij [q.v.] (cf. Wāḥ., p. 24—25, 38—39, 60—67; Yāz., l. 12—13, 22—23, 28—29); others are dedicated to men of letters of Tripolis (Wāḥ., p. 88—89; Yāz., p. 19—20); al-Lādhi‘īya (latakia) (cf. Wāḥ., p. 116—135; Yāz., p. 66—78). The poems of this period are hurriedly written and mediocre in quality, but his real genius are already apparent. With the exception of al-mawṣī‘a (lament) and some impromptu pieces they are all hastad on neo-classical lines. The influence of Abu Tammām and al-Buhtūrī preponderates.

In the course of this period of experiment, Abu l-Tayyib was irritated at not finding his merit recognised. Gradually he looks forward to his dreams of domination being realised by violence (cf. Wāḥ., p. 138, l. 3—7; Yāz., p. 79). Finally he abandoned the work of a paid panegyrist and turning to Rā‘idī, he began revolutionary propaganda, the nature of which has long been misunderstood. According to Oriental writers (al-Badi‘ī, op. cit., l. 35—30; Ibn al-Anbārī, Nikhāl al-Albābī, p. 369), Abu l-Tayyib proclaimed himself a prophet in al-Samawah, was taken prisoner by Ibn Ibrāhīm [q.v.] troops and then received his epithet of al-Mutanabbi. Kratschkowski (Mutanaibbī i Abu l‘Ab, St. Petersburg 1909, p. 9—11) does justice to these traditions, without however taking full account of some clear allusions in the Divān.

The latter contains pieces which prove that the rebellion was led by al-Mutanabbi (cf. Wāḥ., p. 49—58; Yāz., p. 28—33; 50). This rising, as usual at this period, must have been as political as well as religious. The rising began in al-Lādhi‘īya and then extended to the western borders of Samawah where the Banū Kalb constituted an element always ready to rebel. Without adhering to Karmatianism, al-Mutanabbi exploited its principles which found only too ready an echo among the marauding Beduins (cf. Wāḥ., p. 57, l. 22—23; Yāz., p. 32; allusion to the massacre of the Karmatians in ‘Amar). In 317 (930) the ambiguity of the utterances of the rebel, the opportunism of his doctrines and his conception of the imāmate on Karmatian lines, may have caused some misunderstanding of his preaching, since at this time any agitator was regarded as a Karmatian. After some initial successes, al-Mutanabbi and his Beduins were defeated; he was captured and imprisoned at Ḥims (towards the end of 322 = 933). After a trial and two years’ imprisonment (Divān, Paris MS., No. 4092, fol. 168), Abu l-Tayyib was condemned to retrace his errors and set free. From this adventure he gained only the epithet of al-Mutanabbi and the conviction that poetry alone would lead him to the realisation of his ambitious dreams.

The poems composed by Abu l-Tayyib immediately before and during his rebellion are distinguished by spontaneity of inspiration, by the liberty which the poet takes with poetic forms, by the vigour of the style, which has a much more personal character than in his first manner.

As soon as al-Mutanabbi had returned to his profession of panegyrist, he naturally resumed his wandering life (beginning of 325 = 937). For several years he led a precarious existence and had to be content to sing the praises of citizens and minor officials of Antioch, Damascus, Aleppo etc. who paid him very badly (cf. Wāḥ., p. 93—206; Yāz., p. 51—131; Vākū, Iṣra‘īl, v. 203). Little by little however, his fame grew. At the beginning of 328 (939), we find him becoming court poet to the emir Badr al-Kharshānī (the Badr b. ‘Anmar of the Divān), governor of Damascus for the amir al-unārī Ibn Kā‘īr [q.v.],
who had just taken possession of Syria. Of Arab origin, Badr was regarded by al-Mutanabbi as the Maecenas for whom he had been waiting so long. The panegyrics and occasional poems which are dedicated to this emissary reveal a sincere admiration for him and possess a sustained inspiration (cf. Wāḥ., p. 206—245; Yāz., p. 152—163). These pieces and those that precede them, after Abu l-Tayyib's return, seem to indicate the fact that the poet called the third manner of the poet. With the exception of a poem on hunting in the style of Abū Nuwās [q. v.] (cf. Wāḥ., p. 201—202; Yāz., p. 128—129) and a number of impromptu poems of no particular interest, al-Mutanabbi wrote only ḫajīdas during this period. He would seem then to have returned to his first manner, if the work of this period did not show considerable progress in form.

The friendship between Badr and al-Mutanabbi lasted only about a year and a half and as a result of intrigues of jealous rivals (cf. Wāḥ., p. 253; ibid., p. 169), Abu l-Tayyib feeling no longer safe, sought refuge in a further but called the third manner of the poet. With the exception of a poem on hunting in the style of Abū Nuwās [q. v.] (cf. Wāḥ., p. 201—245; Yāz., p. 152—169) and a number of impromptu poems of no particular interest, al-Mutanabbi wrote only ḫajīdas during this period. He would seem then to have returned to his first manner, if the work of this period did not show considerable progress in form.

From Damascus, Abu l-Tayyib went to Egypt to al-Fustāṭ [q. v.] where he obtained the patronage of the Buyyid prince Kāfūr [q. v.]. Al-Mutanabbi's career now reveals the necessities to which poets in the fourth (seventh) century had to submit. Deprived of moral and material independence Abu l-Tayyib was forced to sing the praises of a patron for whom in his heart he felt only contempt. The panegyrics which he devoted to him barely conceal his regret at losing the favour of Saif al-Dawla. They are somewhat forced and contain points against Kāfūr (cf. al-Bāḍī', op. cit., i. 125—126).

The poet perhaps only agreed to celebrate this patron because the latter had promised him the governorship of Sa'idā (Sidon) (cf. ibid., i. 115). When he saw that these promises were not being fulfilled, he tried to gain the favor of the Buyyid governor, Abū Shudja' Fādīk (ibid., i. 131—132), but the latter dying in 350 (960) and relations with Kāfūr still being strained, al-Mutanabbi had once more to decide to fly. On the day of the feast of sacrifice of this year, after writing a satire on Kāfūr, he left al-Fustāṭ secretly and crossing Arabia after great trials (cf. al-Bāḍī', op. cit., i. 139—140), he reached the ʿIrāq, spent some time in Kūf, then settled in Baghdaḍ. He perhaps thought of attaching himself to the famous Buṭrīd vizier al-Muhallabi who had gathered a very brilliant court around him. He had however to abandon hope of this in face of the hostility to him evinced by poets and scholars established at the court of al-Muhallabi, such as Ibn al-Hadhājād [q. v.] and Abu l-Farajī al-Iṣfahānī, author of the Kitāb al-Aḫānī. During his stay here, as he had already begun to do in Egypt (cf. Ibn al-Farajī, Taʾrīkh al-Andalus, No. 452), al-Mutanabbi gave lectures in which he expounded to a group of friends the work he had done till that date (cf. Dhahabi, Taʾrīkh al-ʿIlm, Paris, No. 1584, col. 265a).

The year 353 (964) was spent in this fashion. The poet perhaps also visited Kūf about this time (cf. F. Gabrieli, Vita di al-Mutanabbi, p. 60, note 4).

At the beginning of 354 (965) in any case, he left the ʿIrāq and went via al-Awāz to Arraḍān [q. v.] in Susiana where he received the patronage of the Buṭrīd vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd [q. v.]. Al-Mutanabbi devoted some panegyrics to him (cf. Wāḥ., p. 740—741; Yāz., p. 564—565), then he left him to go to Šahrāz in Fars where he rejoined the Buṭrīd Sulṭān ʿAdūd al-Dawla [q. v.] who had expressed a desire to have him at his court.
addressing to the Būyid Sulṭan several panegyrics which are among his best work, Abu ’l-Tayyib left Shirāz for reasons not clearly known, perhaps simply out of nostalgia (cf. Wāḥīdī, p. 766, line 1–3; Yez, p. 539). He was returning by short stages from Persia to Bagdad when he was attacked by marauding Beduins near Dair al-’Ākūl [q. v.] at the end of Ramaḍān 354 (Aug. 955). He and his son were killed in the fighting and all his baggage, including the autograph MSS. of his Diwān, was scattered (cf. al-Badī’ī, op. cit., i. 227–239).

Even in his lifetime, al-Mutanabbi had been so sure of his powers that he defended his work in its entirety against the attacks of detractors no less eager to run him down. Among the latter however, the majority only criticised him as a poet because they objected to his character as a man. The criticism was therefore not distinguished by impartiality and only reflects the opinions of a coterie.

It required the death of Abu ’l-Tayyib to produce a third class of admirers who were more clear-sighted than the first and sufficiently impartial not to fall into the exaggerations of the second (cf. al-Dhūrqānī, al-Wasīṭa, p. 11–12, 45–46). It was the opinion of this new category that prevailed and when Mutanabbi’s contemporaries had all disappeared or led public life, and had succeeded decelerately favourable to Sāf al-Dawla’s bard (except al-’Askārī [q. v.] and Ibn Khalīlūn). From the fifth (eleventh) century the name of al-Mutanabbi became a synonym for “great poet”. His literary influence became one of the most considerable ever exercised on Arabic poetry. Annotated by Ibn Dīnārī [q. v.] and later by Abu ’l-’Alī [q. v.], by al-Wāḥīdī, al-Maghribī, al-Ukbarī and Ibn Sītā [q. v.], to mention only the most eminent, the Diwān of Abu ’l-Tayyib throughout the middle ages and in modern times has been made accessible to scholars and literary men from Persia to Spain by learned men, often more zealous than intelligent. Space does not permit us to estimate what later poetry owes to al-Mutanabbi. We are content to point out that in different ways all Arab panegyrists have been influenced by Abu ’l-Tayyib. At the present day he is still one of the most read in North Africa; Syria and Egypt also hold him in very high esteem and many critics have devoted studies full of praise to him. It seems however that in the last named country al-Mutanabbi attracts at least as much by the boldness of his philosophy and the arbour of his pro-Arab feelings as by his purely literary qualities.


MUTARADIF, term in prosody; cf. the art. KAFAYA.

MUTARAKIB, term in prosody; cf. the art. KAFAYA.

MUṬARJIRI, Abu ’l-Fath Nāṣīr b. ʿAbd al-Sāliḥ b. ʿAbd al-Salih b. ʿAlī al-Muṭarrīzī, grammarian, a.dīb and jurist, was born in Khwārizm in Raṣūlim 535 (1144). He was a pupil of al-Mawīkhi b. Ahmād known as ʿAbd Allāh Khwārizmī. As he was born in the same province and in the year in which al-Zamakhshārī died, he was called Khalifat al-Zamakhshārī; al-Suyūṭī’s assumption that he was a pupil of Zamakhshārī was deduced from this epithet and is of course wrong. Al-Muṭarrīzī was an adherent of the Mu’tazila. As a jurist of the Hanafī school he enjoyed particular prestige and his work al-Maṣjid li-l-Maṣḥa, a dictionary, arranged alphabetically, of terms used in tradition and of the legal terms of the jurists of the Hanafi school, was regarded by the scholars of this madhab with the same respect as the Ghārib al-Fihḍ al-Ẓāhirī of al-Azhārī by the Shāfī‘īs. For his son he compiled a lexicon of synonyms entitled al-Ḥaqq il-mā‘ūn wuṣūra faṣal al-Kinā‘ī, which the latter was to study after he had learned the Khurān by heart. It is a kind of text-book giving a comprehensive survey of the subject. In al-Muṭarrīzī’s opinion the existing works on this subject were either too big or not full enough. The work deals only with “good and usual” words, omitting the “bad and unusual” ones. Modern and ancient linguistic usage are distinguished and verses often quoted in illustration. His al-Maṣḥa fi-l-Nawḥ, which deals with the grammar of the Arabic language, was also written for his son. It was much used by students and often commented upon. Super-commentaries were added to the commentaries; one of the latter was even translated into Turkish. Al-Muṭarrīzī was also an expositor and prepared a commentary on the Maṣṣāḥat of Ḥarrī. He also was a poet, among his efforts being a poem in which he set himself to use nothing but synonyms.

In 601 (1204) he was in Bagdad where he had
disputations with the scholars of that city. In Djamâd I of 610 (1213) he died in his native town.

Bibliography: W. Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis der Handschriften... Berlin, No. 6046/7, 6968; Brockelmann, G.A.L., i. 293; Haüydu Khalîfa, ed. Flugel, i. 329, 354; ii. 33; v. 552, 648; vi. 62, 87; Suyûti, Bughyat al-Wâlî fi Tâhirât al-Ishânîn wa-l-Nûhat, Cairo 1326. Yâkîn, Irshâd al-Dîn wa-l-Mùjîf 11-As-âd, ed. Mâr-

(MUSEUMSTADTER)

MU'TASIRIF. [See SANÀI]

AL-MU'TAŠIM. [See SÂNÀI]

AL-MU'TASIM, MUYHAMMAD bin Mây-üs, second ruler of the dynasty of Fârûqids [q.v.] of the kingdom of Almeria [q.v.], reigned from 433 to 484 (1051—1094). Gifted like his contemporary Al-Mu'tamid [q.v.] of Sevilla with a certain amount of poetic talent, he made his capital during his long reign one of the great centres of culture in the Peninsula. But like the other maulik al-fasâ'îd of Spain, he was for the most of his time at war with one or other of his neighbours. He was without doubt implicated in the conspiracy fomented by the Jews Yâsîf against his master Badis, king of Granada [cf. il. 170]. Later his forces took part with those of Yâsîf b. Tâshîn in the famous battle of Zallâka [q.v.]. Like the other Muslim rulers of Spain he felt in the following year the weight of the Almoravid sultan's arm. After unsuccessfui besieging the fortress of Aledo and meeting Yâsîf to act harshly against Al-Mu'tamid, whom he hated personally, he realised on his death-bed that his capital would be besieged by the Almoravids as Seville had been. This is why he advised his son and successor Ahyâd Mû'az al-Dawla to seek an asylum with the lords of
Boege (q. v.). Almeria was taken very soon after by the Almoravids. Bibliography: Ibn Bassām, al-Dhokhira; Ibn al-Kayhāb, Ḥāfa and Pīman; Ibn al-Abdār, al-Mustah fi al-siyāra, ed. Dozy, p. 172, 174; Abd al-Wahid al-Marrakushi, al-Muqadba, ed. Dozy, transl. Fagnan; Ibn Idrīsh, al-Bayān al-muqaddas, in, ed. Lévi-Provençal; Doyz, Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne, new ed., iii. do., Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature des Arabes d'Espagne, vol. i. (memoir on the Tughrilid). (E. Lévi-Provençal) al-MUTAWAKKIL Alassāh, Abu 'l-Fadl, b. Imaam al-Kabir, Muhammad, an Aabārī'd Caliph, born in Shavwal 206 (Feb.-March 822), son of al-Mu'tamid and the caliph al-Mutawakkil, and the slayer of Kibla' al-Mun'tashir. He ascended the throne in Dhu l-Hijja 232 (Aug. 854) on the death of his brother al-Walih. His old opponent, the vizier Ibn al-Zayyāt, soon fell a victim to the cruelty of the new caliph and a similar fate befell the Turkish general Ṭāhir, although the latter along with Wāṣif had helped him to the throne. The caliph dreaded his influence and had him thrown into prison where he died of thirst (Ḥumadād 1142 = Dec. 854-Jan. 855). From the religious point of view al-Mutawakkil was thoroughly orthodox. Soon after his accession he forbade any dispute about the Kūrān. Those who had been arrested because they would not recognize the teachings of the Mutazilah were released and in 235 (859-860) he revived and intensified the regulations for special dress for Jews and Christians which went back to the caliph Ṭāhir. The synagogues and churches recently built in Baghdaad were taken down and the Mu'tazilah chief šāh Ahmad b. Alu Du'ād (q. v.) with his sons dismissed and the office of chief šāh given to the Soonī Yābīš b. Aktham. The 'Alids also fell under his ban. In 236 (859-860) he had the main-soleum of al-Husain in Kebelī de-royed and pilgrimage to this place forbidden. The provinces were frequently ravaged by rebels and foreign foes. In Ḥanṣabīdīn in 234 (850-851) Muhammad b. Alu al-Lādīl retaliated; he had earlier been taken prisoner and brought to Samarrā but had escaped; he established himself in the strong town of Matānd. The caliph's troops could do nothing against him until Boghā al-Ḥarabī (q. v.) took command. After a long siege the latter offered him a pardon; but when Ibn al-Ḥarābī tried to escape he was seized and brought to Samarrā, where he soon died in prison. When al-Mutawakkil attempted to treat semi-independent Armanīa like a conquered province, a dangerous rising broke out there in 237 (851-852), which was suppressed in the following year, but only with difficulty, by Boghā al-Kabīr. About the same time (238), the Byzantines landed in Egypt and plundered Dammatta and in Asia Minor the war went on in the traditional fashion against the Byzantines. When the Paulician sect was persecuted by the emperors Theodora they went over to the Shihīms in masses. The Byzantines, however, succeeded in taking many prisoners. Those who would not become converted were massacred; but when al-Mutawakkil who had moved his residence in Dhu l-Hijja (Aug.-Sept. 857) to Damascus but left it after only two months, sent Boghā with the Turkish cavalry against the Byzantines, the fortune of war turned. Boghā fought with success against the enemy and in the following year the emperor Michael himself was defeated at Samosata. In 246 (860-861) the Muslim generals took a considerable number of prisoners; but no permanent change in the situation was produced. In Syria also trouble broke out. Two governors in succession were driven out of Ḥoms and only with the help of the troops from Damascus and al-Ramlā the order restored (241 = 855-856). About the same time al-Mutawakkil sent an army under command of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kurri against the rebel Ṭabgha. The latter were completely defeated but their leader Ṭabgha was pardoned. In the reign of al-Mutawakkil the dynasty of the Kūrānic (q. v.) was established in Byzantium. To keep the people of Egypt in order, he sent for the governor of Khurasan, Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭabgha (q. v.), and when the turbulent praetorians made trouble he built a new residence at Ḥanṣabīdīn in 245 (859-860) outside of Samarrā, which was swallowed up enormous sums. Poets and scholars were rewarded with princely munificence by this caliph. The extravagance, capriciousness and cruelty of the caliph, however, made him hated, and finally he quarreled with the commander of the Turkish bodyguard. In Dhu l-Hijja 235 (July 859) he had arranged that his eldest son Muhammad al-Muntāsir should succeed him and the two other sons Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Mu'tazz and Ibrāhīm al-Mu'ayyad were each to receive a governorship with a claim to the throne after al-Muntāsir. He began to favour al-Mu'tazz however, and thus aroused al-Muntāsir's discontent. The latter conpired with a few others of the same sentiments and al-Shawwāl 247 (Dec. 861) al-Mutawakkil was murdered (s. Al-Fath b. Muqādha) Bibliography: Ibn Kūtām, Kitāb al-Ma'rūf, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 200; Ta'ābūn ed Horma, ii. 591—602; Bahāshīf, ed. ed. Goethe, see index: Tabārī, ed. ed. Goethe, 1136 sqq.; Ma'ūdh, Muṣāfī, ed. Paris, viii. 189-289: iv. 46, 51, 71; Allāh al-Ash'ī, see Gudri. Table alphabétiques; Ibn al-Athir ed. Tornberg, p. 21 sqq.; Ibn al-Ṭīfākā, al-Fiṣkāt, ed. Dieburg, p. 325-327; Muhammad b. Shākir. Fā'ūla, al-Wāṣiwāt, ii. 103 sqq.; Ibn Ḥālid, al-Harīf, iii. 273 sqq.; Weil, Gesch. des Califats, p. 347-372; Müller, Der Islam im Morg.-n. und Abend.-land, ii. 523 sqq., 538 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate, its Rise, Decline and Fall, p. 526 sqq.; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 54 sqq., 78, 141, 355 sqq. [K. V. Zellmann] MUTAWĀTĪR (A.), part, act. vi. from berw, "what came successively." It is used as a technical term in two senses: a. In the theory of cognition it is applied to historical knowledge (khbar), if the latter is generally acknowledged; e. g. the knowledge that there is a city called Makka and that there has existed a king called Alexander. Definitions of the term show slight differences. According to al-Dārājī knowledge is mutawātir, when it is supplied by so many persons that either their number or their trustworthiness exclude doubt of its truth (Tadhīf, ed. Flugel, p. 210. cf. Spengler, Dictionary of Tekhmal Terms, p. 1471). According to Ahi Haf, 'Umar al-Ṣaff († 537 = 1142) reports are mutawātir when handed down without deviation by persons who cannot be supposed to have plotted a lie. Taftāzānī in his
commentary (p. 33 sq.) mentions two objections. The first is, that Jews and Christians accept as mutawwir reports that are rejected by Muslims. To this objection Tafżālī replies that the possibility that these reports should be mutawwir, is excluded. The second objection is, that the reports of every single reporter (ṣaḥīḥ, q. v.) represent an opinion only and that an accumulation of opinions cannot be said to afford certainty. To this Tafżālī replies that often plurality has a power of which singleness is devoid, e.g. a cord made of hair.

For the place of this source of knowledge within the theory of cognition, cf. the Supplement, s. v. 'ilm.

2. In prosody the term is applied to a rhyme in which one moving letter intervenes between the quiescents.


MUṬAWWIR, Mecca pilgrims’ guide.
The word literally means one who leads the ṣayf (q. v.). The task of the muṭawwir is however by no means limited to assisting pilgrims from foreign lands who entrust themselves to their guidance, to go through the ceremonies required at the circumambulation of the Kaʿba. On the contrary they act as guides at the ṣayf also and at all other ceremonies which are prescribed or only recommended for the ḥajj or umra (q. v.). The muṭawwirs also cater very completely for the physical welfare of the pilgrims. As soon as the pilgrims arrive in Ḍijdā, their agents are ready on the arrival of the steamers to provide all the services they require from disembarkment to departure for Mecca. In Mecca the muṭawwirs or members of their families and servants take charge of the pilgrims. During the whole of their stay they provide the pilgrims with lodging, service, food, purchases (necessary and unnecessary), attend them if they fall ill and in case of death take charge of what they leave behind them.

The muṭawwirs of course do not do all this for nothing. They are appropriately paid for their trouble and see that, if the pilgrim is rich, their friends and relations also make something out of him. Of the money which they themselves receive, they have to hand over a considerable part in the form of fees, presents etc. to the ʿulamāʾ of the gild and to the treasury, — another reason for getting as much as possible out of those entrusted to their care. It is therefore no wonder that many pilgrims have complained bitterly about the coven- tuousness of these particularly prominent representatives of the Meccan pilgrim industry. Literally the fees or guides have been fixed by a legal enactment of the Ḥajjāz government (O. M., xi. [1932], 249).

Reference has already been made to the fact that the muṭawwirs are organised in gilds; they are divided up into separate groups who sometimes have the right to exploit the pilgrims from a definite area only (e. g. Lower Egypt). All these groups together form the gild with a chief (ṣāḥib) officially designated at their head. The gild is also very exclusi- ve. "Wild" (i.e. independent) guides (jarrār) have to be content with the scanty pickings left over for them by the organised muṭawwirs.


(R. PARET)

AL-MUṬAZILA is the name of the great theological school which created the speculative dogmatics of Islam. The meaning of the name is clear from al-ʿAbābī, Murādī, vii. 22: the Muṭaṣīlīs are those who profess the doctrine of ʿIṣlāḥ, i.e. the doctrine of the muṣāṣṣa ṣain ʿaṣṣāṣāt, or the state intermediate between belief and scepticism, the fundamental doctrine of the school (see below).

A tradition which emanates from the ʿabd al-ḥāṣifī derives the name Muṭaṣīlī from a schism which took place in the circle of al-Ḥasan b. Ṭātabāi, after laying down their own peculiar dogmatics of the muṣāṣṣa ṣain ʿaṣṣāṣāt, Wāṣāl b. Aṣāf and Aṣmāb. ʿUbaid b. Ṭabābī said to have separated (i faṣūla) from al-Ḥasan’s circle to found an independent school or rather to have been expelled from it by the latter. These traditions are not entirely without historical foundation but the interpretation of the name deduced from them is certainly wrong. The Muṭaṣīlīs were proud of their name, which they certainly would not have been if it had been a nickname invented by their enemies. We have here, as the variety of versions also shows, a tendentious invention of the abn al-ʿalāmna wa l-ṣanāfol ṣaṣāʾnīs to rehabilitate al-Ḥasan and brand the Muṭaṣīlīs as heretics.

Origins and political history. There are quite definite indications that the Muṭaṣīlīs was of political origin and that it arose under the same constellation as the Shīʿi and Khārijī movements. The accession of ʿAbī ʿAlī al-Ṣādiq (Dhu l-Ḥijjah 35) is the great watershed in the currents of the history of Islam. It is well known that several notable Companions of the Prophet refused to pay ʿAbī ʿAlī the homage which he demanded or offered it reluctantly. The most frequently mentioned were Ṭaḥlah and al-Zubair but the names of many others have been preserved: Sāda b. Ṭabābī, ʿAbī Wāṣāl, ʿAbī ʿAlī al-Ṣādiq b. Muḥammad b. Maslama, Ṣaḥmā b. Zaid, Ṣabāḥ b. Suʿād and Zaid b. Ṭātabāi (al-Ṭabarī, i. 3072). Of these Ṭaḥlah and al-Zubair openly rebelled against al-Ṣādiq, the majority remained neutral. The Medinees in general followed the example of the latter and in Bāṣra al-ʿAbābī b. Kaṣr with 6,000 Tamimīs and a group of Azīdīs under ʿAbī b. Ṣamīlī also stood aside from the quarrel (al-Ṭabarī, i. 3169, 3178). In
speaking of the latter the text uses the verb *īfzāl* which still has its proper sense of “to separate from”, but which is already on the way to become a political term meaning “to take up a neutral attitude in the quarrel between ‘Ali and his adversaries”. It is always the case that the strands of Al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s relations with the caliphate of ‘Ali and the later separate parties in the caliphate of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (Kitab al-‘Intifār, p. 5) a party to which he may be attributed on the accession of ‘Ali separated and followed ‘Abd al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Omar, Muhammad b. Maslama and Usama b. Zaid. These, separated (*īfzāl*) from ‘Ali and refused either to fight against him or to take his side although they had paid homage to him and had received him favourably; they were called *al-Mutanīla* and are the ancestors of all the later Mu’tazila”. The Mu’tazila as a theological school must therefore have been preceded by a political Mu’tazila, which determined its structure.

This hypothesis seems to be confirmed if we analyze carefully what is recorded of the founders of the theological school. According to a unanimous tradition, this school originated with two natives of Basra, Wāṣi‘ b. Aḥzā (q.v.) and ‘Amr b. ‘Abd al-Baṣīr (q.v.). The period of their activity covers practically the reign of the caliph Hishām and his Umayyad successors, i.e. the years 105-131 (723-48). We have a good deal of quite early information about them, not always free from lacunae, but sufficient to enable us to grasp the leading ideas in their theological work (see Bibli.). It is clear from all these traditions that the doctrine of *īfzāl* formed the starting point for the creation of the school, that Wāṣi‘ was the first to formulate it and that he later won over the minority part of the Mu’tazila. This is how Al-Khayyāt records the origin of the idea of *īfzāl*. Muslims were agreed that he who committed a grave sin deserved the name of *fāʾisik* and of *gāfīr*, but opinions varied as to the character of the individual who received these epithets. The Kūrādīs said he was an infidel. The Murāḍīs said he was a believer in spite of his *fāʾisik* and his *gāfīr*; al-Hasan al-Baṣri and his circle described him as a hypocrite (*munẓāfīsik*). Wāṣi‘ demonstrates that the description given in the Kūrān of a believer and an infidel cannot be applied to a believer who has committed a grave sin. There is therefore always an in-between stage between the two. Now it is impossible to regard him as a hypocrite as al-Hasan wants to do, for a hypocrite must pass as a believer until his hypocrisy is brought to light. The only possible course then is to put the *fāʾisik* in a special category of those who are in an intermediate state (manzilat bāna ḫ-manzilatātum). These same ideas are found in the conversation by which Wāṣi‘ is said to have won ‘Amr over to the doctrine of *īfzāl* (al-Sayyid al-Murtadā, Anṣārī, i. 114 sq. = Ibn al-Murtadā, al-Mutanīla, p. 22 sq.; source probably al-Khayyāt). There are political problems concealed behind these speculations. The doctrine of *īfzāl* bāna ḫ-manzilatātum is not the result of interest in pure speculation, but arose out of an clearly defined opinion on the individuals who took part in the quarrels that raged round the caliphate of ‘Ali. It is striking how much space is occupied by the question of ‘Ali, of Ṭalḥa, of al-Zubair and of ‘Aṣīra in the rather scanty information which we possess regarding the theology of Wāṣi‘ and ‘Amr; we cannot doubt that here they were dealing with a central problem. Wāṣi‘ and ‘Amr took neither side in the dispute (Kitab al-‘Intifār, p. 97—98). According to them, ‘Ali, Ṭalḥa, al-Zubair and ‘Aṣīra were originally true and pious believers. But the war which broke out among them divided them into two parties who could not both be right; one of these parties committed a sin which they could not know. We must therefore leave their cause to Him who knows it but in their relations with one another we cannot regard them as true believers in the strict sense of the word. As a result if one of these individuals bears witness against another of the opposite party, we cannot accept this evidence; relatively to the one, the other is *fāʾisik* and vice-versa (cf. also Baghdādī, Kitab al-Farāb, p. 100). If we may believe the *al-ḥadīth*, ‘Amr showed himself more severe than Wāṣi‘; he is said to have refused to accept the deposition made by any member of these parties against any member of the community on any matter whatever (Zutiyyī Baghdādī, xii. 178; al-Baghdādī, Kitab al-Farāb, p. 100); for he declared guilty (*īfzāl*) for it, both the parties engaged in the battle of the Camel. It is therefore not surprising that Wāṣi‘ and ‘Amr have sometimes been confused with the Kūrādīs (verse of Ḫāṣ b. Suwaid al-Da‘awī, al-Dā‘awī, Bayān, i. 13).

However, the opinion of the leaders of the Mu’tazila on ‘Ali is based on quite a different foundation. To understand the position correctly it is important to note that 1. Wāṣi‘ and the whole Mu’tazila were definitely enemies of the Umayyads and that 2. Wāṣi‘ adopted a somewhat ambiguous attitude regarding Othman and his murderers; he did not acknowledge them as caliphs. This tacitly implies a declaration in favour of the ‘Alids, the first actors in the drama played at Mecca in the year 35. Indeed Wāṣi‘ was on somewhat intimate terms with the ‘Alids of Medina (Ibn al-Murtadā, al-Mutanīla, p. 20); the Zaidīya revere him as one of their leaders, and Zaidī theology is essentially based on that of Wāṣi‘. This is true not only of the speculative theology; there is agreement also on political doctrines. The Zaidīs do not say that the first caliphs Abū Bakr and ‘Omar were usurpers as the extreme Shi‘īs do. Wāṣi‘ and with him the whole Mu’tazila regards the caliphs of ‘Umar as ‘Alids (commentary of Ibn Abī Ḥadīd on Nāḥiyy al-Balagha, Caro 1329, i. 3; he left undecided the question of knowing who had the superior claim, Abū Bakr, ‘Omar or ‘Ali, but he credited ‘Ali with a superior claim to Othman. This attitude, a little complicated as regards ‘Ali, and therefore prudent towards the extreme Shi‘īs, at the same time unrevealedly hostile to the Umayyads, can in my opinion only be interpreted in one way. All these apparently dissimilar lines converge on a common centre: the ‘Abḥāsīd movement. It is precisely Wāṣi‘s attitude which we must regard as characteristic of the partisans of the ‘Abhāsīd. The latter regarding themselves as the true ‘abḥāsīd, it was evidently in their interest to lower somewhat the preponderating position attributed to ‘Ali by the extreme Shi‘īs in order themselves to profit by the prestige enjoyed by the family of the Prophet; but on the other hand, they had every reason not to cut the links with the Shi‘īs who were indispensable as allies to them. It is obvious that in these circumstances it was particularly important for them to win over the relatively moderate Zaidī faction to their cause. In a general
way the teaching of Wāsīl on al-manzila can only be perfectly understood if we see in it the theoretical crystallisation of the political programme of the 'Abbasids before their accession to power. Everything leads us to believe that the theology of Wāsīl and of the early Mu'tazila represents the official theology of the 'Abbasid movement. This gives an unforced explanation of the fact that it was the official doctrine of the 'Abbasid court for at least a century. It seems even probable that Wāsīl and his disciples took direct part in the 'Abbasid propaganda. In his ḥudūdī, mentioned below Ṣafwān al-Anṣārī tells us that Wāsīl had emissaries (dīwān) in all parts of the Muslim world. Ṣafwān describes after them as a host of believers and ascetics, who were distinguished from other men in physiognomy and dress; they were the supporters (awrād) of God in all lands and centres in which his commandments were made manifest and in which the art of disputation (with the enemies of the faith) flourished. The period of this activity coincides exactly with that of the most intense 'Abbasid propaganda, in which all the forces working for the ruin of the Umayyads were cooperating; it is impossible not to believe there was a connection between the two. That Wāsīl did actually extend his propaganda very far to the west is proved by the fact that there existed long after the fall of the Umayyads a Wāsīl community at Tabari (Yāmūn, i. 815) numbering about 3,000 members who had allied themselves with the Bāds. They had rebelled against Mansūr under 'Īdrīs b. 'Abd Allāh al-Hassnī (al-Shahrastānī, p. 311; on these happenings see Tabari, iii. 561); they were therefore reckoned among the enemies of the first 'Abbasid caliphs. It is interesting to note that the connection between Wāsīl and the Khāridjīs, supposed by Ḥishāk b. Suwaid al-'Adawī to exist (see above) was here an actuality.

The quarrels of Wāsīl and his followers with Dījām b. Ṣafwān [q. v.] form a difficult problem which has not yet been solved. On the one hand, Dījām's theology left distinct traces on that of the Mu'tazila: the doctrine of the created spirit which was later to become fundamental in the Mu'tazila thesis was probably formulated by Dījām and in the doctrine of the divine attributes there are coincidences on both sides which cannot be accidental. On the other hand, there are many serious differences which are probably practical and political in their nature. Dījām professed in the most extreme form the doctrine of predetermination (qab). All the actions of man are involuntary. Wāsīl maintained the opposite thesis of free will. Now once again we have political problems hidden behind these theological controversies; the Umayyads in general preferred the dogma of predetermination while the opposition accepted the dogma of free will in its widest interpretation in Damascus. Ghulān al-Dimashqī, who figures among the fathers of the Mu'tazila ( Ibn al-Mu'tadād, al-Mu'tazila, p. 15—17), was put to death by the caliph Hishām for holding the doctrine of free will (al-Tabari, ii. 1733).

Once the hypothesis of a definite connection between the Mu'tazila and the 'Abbasids is admitted, the question of the relations between the Mu'tazila founded by Wāsīl and the early Mu'tazila of the period of 'Ali presents itself in a new aspect. It will be admitted that there is a striking resemblance between the attitude of these former companions of the Prophet and that of the 'Abbasids. It is true that 'Abd Allāh b. al-'Adwān entered the service of 'Ali after the death of Othmān but his real sentiments were somewhat ambiguous; he was a great friend of Othmān but a rather lukewarm partisan of 'Ali and after the latter's death he placed himself at the service of the Umayyads. His descendants did not remain at Medina, probably because the 'Abids were their rivals there; after a stay in Damascus, his son went to Humayma near 'Adhārūh and here a formal rapprochement took place in 58 between the 'Abbasids and the 'Alids (Wellhausen, Das arabisch-christlich, p. 312 ff.). Before this event, we may regard the 'Abbasid as a kind of Mu'tazila in the old sense of the word. With 'Amr b. 'Uthmān a new element enters the Mu'tazila as founded by Wāsīl. 'Amr originally was one of the āhī al-hadīth: brought up in the circle of al-Hasan al-Baṣrī, he transmitted a large number of hadīths from his master and he is remembered as one of the muhādātīn. His conversion to the doctrine of fitāḥī brought about a rupture between him and these circles; but with him is a considerable section of the Khāridjīs of the āhī al-hadīth joined the Mu'tazila, thus reinforcing the more politically inclined Khāridjīs, of which Wāsīl was the champion. Khāridjī and mu'tazīlī were soon to become synonymous terms. 'Amr seems to have been decidedly anti-'Alid (see above), in any case he preferred Abū Bakr to 'Ali (Ibn Abī Hadīd on Nahāj al-Bāṣrī, ch. 3). This attitude implies a certain predilection for Othmān, which is foreign to Wāsīl: indeed, a section of the old Baṣrīs, among them al-Dhūqīs, is said to have belonged to the party called al-ʿOthmāniyya. 'Amr's point of view was of great importance for the development of the Mu'tazila. After their final triumph, the 'Abbasids immediately dissolved the alliance with the Shīʾa, which had only been a political instrument for them. As regards the extreme Shī'a, the Rawāfīd, the Mu'tazila unreservedly followed the direction of their new masters; but it is fairly evident that some of them did not decide to break so abruptly with the moderate Shīʾa. It resulted in a schism. One section remained faithful to the alliance with the moderate Shīʾa: this section was later to form a special Mu'tazīlī school in Bağhda'd. But the Mu'tazīlīs of Baṣra with 'Amr at their head seem to have attached themselves without protest to the 'Abbasid cause. 'Amr even became the intimate friend of Mansūr and so to speak his spiritual father. In the west, the Mu'tazīlīs allied with the Khāridjīs rebelled against the 'Abbasids (see above).

Let us sum up the characteristic features of the Mu'tazila at the beginning of the 'Abbasid period. The Mu'tazila was: 1. in general devoted to the cause of the 'Abbasid caliphs, only a section being opposed to them; 2. decidedly hostile to the extreme Shīʾa, the Rāfīḍa; 3. hostile to the Dījāmiyya, by which however it was a little influenced; 4. kadari in uniting several of the old factions of this name; 5. in serious disagreement with the āhī al-hadīth, who soon declared it heretical. This position had a decisive influence in determining the structure of the Mu'tazīlī theology. The beginnings of this theology go back to Wāsīl and 'Amr and are connected with the fight against the Rāfīḍa. The extreme Shīʾa had quite early assimilated a great number of
non-Muslim beliefs; we need not doubt that Manichaeanism played a part in them; in any case certain gnostic and dualist ideas had a way into Islam through the intermediary of these Shi'is. These tendencies, very marked in Kufa, were also represented at Basra; in the house of an Ardi who was a sunni or Buddhist, Wasi and 'Amr had frequent meetings with 'Abd al-Karim b. Abi 'l-'Awdja and Salih b. 'Abd al-Muwaffiq, who professed dualist doctrines (al-thanawiya); we should probably understand by this Manichean view) and the poet Bashshar b. Huri [q. v.], (Kitab al-Adhamat, iii. 24). A serious schism broke up this curious madh'is. This event decided the whole future of the Mu'tazila. Henceforth the fight against suna- da and thanawiya is a cardinal point in the programme of the Mu'tazila. Wasi himself composed a refutation of Manicheanism which al-Balili (c. 300 A.H.) was still able to peruse (al-Mu'tazilih, p. 21). But they also found themselves compelled to combat these heresies in a positive fashion; to the doctrine of fire professed by Bashshar they offered a theology of earth, so to speak, a theology based on the natural philosophy of the time. The poems of Saffvan al-Ansari (al-Djahiz, Kitab al-Bayan, i. 16—19) afford us a specimen of this theology: here we have one of the fundamental documents for the history of Mu'tazili dogmatism. It is not yet clear whence came the philosophy put at the service of theology but its general character is apparent; it is the philosophy of the alchemists, physicists of late antiquity, a kind of summa of the scientific principles which seem to have been accepted everywhere in Asiatic Hellenism. Saffvan perhaps gives us a hint as to the circles from which it came to the Mu'tazila, when he tells us that Bashshar called Wasi and his friends Da'ijamis; this is in any case worth noting. In a general way those who handed on this natural philosophy seem to have been the school called Dabrij by Muslims. The Mu'tazila fought these Dabrij with a vigour which reveals the dependence on this heretical philosophy of which they were conscious. The true founder of the dogmatic system of the Mu'tazila was Abu 'l-Hudhail Mu'ammad b. al-Hudhail al-'Allaf [q. v.]. Abu 'l-Hudhail, his friends and pupils, continued on a large scale the polemic against Manicheaeism, a polemic which is certainly not unconnected with the persecution begun by the 'AbdulSaidis against the open or secret adherents of this religion. On the other hand, he fought the Rafa'a most vigorously, then represented by the very remarkable theologian Hisham b. al-Hakam [q. v.]; and it was through his disputes with the latter that he was led to study the books of the philosophers, which furnished him with a system of dogmatism, a little bold, but full of fertile new ideas. Besides al-Hudhail and his pupils, there was a crowd of important theologians at Basra: Mu'ammar, an independent mind whose ideas have not yet been sufficiently analysed; Hisham b. 'Amr al-Fuwatji and al-Ash'ami, advocates of Abu 'l-Hudhail and several others. Among the pupils of Abu 'l-Hudhail mention must first be made of Ibrahim b. Sajir al-Nazam [q. v.]. These theologians gave Mu'tazila dogmatism its essential character. This theology is: 1. apologetic: it aims at defending the revelation of the Prophet; as a result it is 2. strictly Kur'anic: the sacred book is the only source of the theological denominations (asma';) and of the precepts of religion (ahkam); it is 3. polemical: it vigorously invaded the domains of other religions and other Muslim parties to fight them on their own ground; it is 4. speculative: it has recourse to philosophical means to refute their adversaries and formulate its dogmas; consequently it is 5. intellectualist: it envisages the problem of religion under the purely intellectual aspect. Nothing could then be less justifiable than to regard the Mu'tazila as philosophers, free thinkers or liberals. On the contrary, they are the theologians of the strictest school; their ideal is dogmatic orthodoxy; philosophy for them is only an ancilla faedi; they are nothing less than tolerant. What they created was Muslim scholasticism.

Parallel to the school of Basra, a Mu'tazila school was founded in Baghda by Bashr b. al-Mutamir (q. v.; d. 210 = 825—826). This school was pro-'Alid ('Ali preferable to Abu Bakr), and Bashr was persecuted by Harun al-Rashid. But under Ma'mun (q. v.; 198—218 = 853—855), a decidedly pro-'Alid caliph, the school of Bashr gained a preponderating influence mainly through the theologians Thumama b. Ashras (d. 210 = 825—826) and Ibn Abi Du'd (d. in 210 = 854—55). This school particularly attacked those who upheld the doctrine of the uncreated Kur'an [q. v.]. This attack however had disastrous consequences for the Mu'tazila. Abandoned by the caliph al-Mutawakkil (232—247) who adopted the doctrine of the uncreated Kur'an, it rapidly fell from its influential position and soon found itself surrounded by implacable enemies. In the second half of the third century, Ibn al-Rawandi, a partisan of the Baghda school, made a stir when he left the Mu'tazila for the most advanced Rafa'a; a man of violent temperament, he criticised the Mu'tazila in a scathing way which did it much damage. Towards the end of the third century, the Karmatian movement came on the scene, reinforcing the extreme Rafa'a and causing trouble in every secular and spiritual sphere. In the struggle against the Karmatians it is no longer the Mu'tazila who appear at the head of the defenders of orthodoxy but the ahk al-hadith. In the year 302, Abu al-Rafa broke with the Mu'tazila of Basra, of which he had been a convinced supporter, to introduce speculative dogmatism among the ahk al-hadith, who were soon to give its character to Sunni theology.

Among the Mu'tazila theologians of the third century we may mention the following. At Basra the tradition of Abu 'l-Hudhail al-'Allaf was propagated by a flouri-sing school represented by Yu'suf b. 'Abd Allah al-Shahham, Abu 'Ali al-Ash'ari and others. Abu 'Abd b. Sulaiman was the pupil of Hisham al-Fuwatji. Ibrahim b. Isma'il known as Ibn 'Umay (d. 218) was the pupil of al-'Asam. The school of al-Nazam developed certain special doctrines which the later Mu'tazila rejected (Fadl al-Hadathali and Ahmad b. Hili, Kitab al-Ihtisar, p. 222—223); but among the disciples of al-Nazam we may find al-Is'af [q. v.]. In the second half of the century, the most important Basra theologian was undoubtedly Abu 'Ali Muhammad b. Abu al-Walab al-Djubbah [q. v.]. In Baghda we find in addition to the theologians already mentioned 'Umar b. Subaih al-Murdar, contemporary of Bashr b. al-Mutamir; then "the two Djafars": Dja'far b. Mubashshir (d. 234) and Dja'far
b. Harb (d. 236), at a later date Muhammad b. Shaddād al-Mis‘amār Zurkān (d. in 278) and Abu l-Husain ‘Abd al-Rahim b. Muhammad al-Khayyāt, the great authority on the history of the Mu‘tazila (d. at the end of the century). On the Mu‘tazila of Syria we are not well informed; and only a little better on that of Egypt. The first Mu‘tazilī here was Ibn ‘Ulaya (cf. above) who had disputations with al-Shāfi‘ī; with him Ḥāfṣ al-Fard came to Cairo; this last represented the official theology in Cairo during the miḥna of al-Waḥībī. Ḥāfṣ was declared a heretic by al-Khaṭīb (Kitāb al-Inā’ār, p. 133-134). — In Spain the Mu‘tazila teachings was disseminated by Abu Bakr Faraj al-Kurjubi who had visited the east and studied there with al-Dājīqābī; it was therefore al-Dājīqābī — at bottom al-Nazāmīyā — that was known in Spain; very soon the Mu‘tazila seems to have become undistinguishable from the Bāṭiniyā (Assu Palacios, Abenacerara y su escuela, Madrid 1914, p. 21—22).

The fourth century saw the ‘Sīra flourishing and ‘Abādshīd power disappearing; the favour of several Būyād governors now to some degree made good the loss of prestige which had been suffered by the Mu‘tazila. The schools continued their work, and the Mu‘tazila spread to the east. At Basra, al-Da‘ūdī had left a large number of disciples but his school was soon surpassed by that of his son Abū Ḥāshim [q.v.]; representatives of the latter were among others Abū ‘Alī ‘Alā‘ al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī al-Baṣrī (d. 369); Abu l-Husain al-Aṣrāfī (Abād b. ‘Uyūsuf b. Yaḳūb) al-Tanūkhī (d. 377), a member of the well known al-Tanūkhī family; Abū ‘Īsāḥī b. Ḥusayn b. ‘A‘īyāsah al-Baṣrī and his pupil the Kāḍī ‘Abd al-Da‘ūdī b. Abū Ḥāshim al-Hamadānī. The latter, the most remarkable of the Bāṭa’ī theologians of the period, migrated in 360 to Rāy where he founded an influential school and died in 415. In Bāghdād the school of Abū Bakr Abū Ḥāshim b. ‘Alī al-Muḥāshidī (d. 320) dominated the whole century. A very celebrated Baghdādi, Abu l-Kāsim Abu ‘Alī al-Baṣrī b. Abū Ḥāshim al-Sa‘īdī al-Kaṭbī, a pupil of al-Khaṭībī, founded a school at Aṣṣaf, where he died in 371; and among his pupils we find al-Muḥāshidī Abu l-Ḥasān. We also find the Mu‘tazila in ‘Isfahān, where Abū Bakr Muhammad b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Zubaynī of the school of Abu l-Hudūḥī had introduced Mu‘tazila doctrines; at Kūsmīn (school of Abū Ḥāshim), Gūzān, Nishāpūr and in several towns of Kūrsūr. During the fifth century it was the theology of ‘Abd al-Da‘ūdī which dominated at Basra; one of his pupils, Abū ‘Alī‘Abd al-Ḥasān b. Abū Ḥāshim b. Mattawāh, handed down the great work on dogmatics of his master, al-Muḥīţ b. ‘I-Ta‘līfī; another theologian, Abū Ḥāshim Ṣa‘īd b. Muhammad al-Naṣabūrī (d. in 460), compiled a resume of the questions disputed in the schools of Basra and Baghdād. Several theologians of Baghdād are known; some of them must have belonged to the Zaidīya and generally speaking the Baghdād school becomes more and more merged in the Zaidīya. The last great theologian of the Mu‘tazila was al-Zamān kh shārī [q.v.] (d. in 538) but the schools continued to exist long after him, especially in the east. It was probably the invasion of the Mongols that put an end to them; the Mu‘tazila has however survived to our day in the Zaidīya.

It was not speculative dogmatism alone that formed the subject of Mu‘tazila activity. Their part in the history of the exegesis of the Qur’ān is a very considerable one; it was they who introduced the strictly grammatical method. There is a very close connection between them and the philological school of Bāṣan, the representatives of which in general taught Mu‘tazila doctrines (e.g. al-‘Aṣma‘ī). The exegetical works of the Mu‘tazila, for the most part now lost, were utilised to a large extent by their adversaries, e.g. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī. — All questions of ḥukm were vigorously discussed in the Mu‘tazila schools; the influence of the Mu‘tazila on the ma‘ṣūla al-mu‘tahāhī has still to be examined. — Lastly the science of hadītīh certainly received various stimuli from the Mu‘tazila criticism of the ahl al-ḥadīth. 

Mu‘tazila. Mu‘tazila theology is summed up under five principles (mu‘ṣūl) or fundamental doctrines which one must accept in their integrity to be recognised as a Mu‘tazili (al-Mas‘ūdī, Mu‘tazī, vi. 22). As these were probably in origin the principal points in the programme of Mu‘tazili propaganda, these muṣūl later became a kind of framework of speculative dogmatism.

1. Aṣīl al-ta‘ṣlīhīd: the strictest profession of monothelism (against any kind of dualism); denial of all resemblance between Allāh and his creatures (against the anthropomorphisms of the muḥaddithīn on the one hand and those of the Rāfī‘ī and Manīchaeans on the other); the divine attributes (against the Dāhima); integral affirmation of the Prophet but distinction between a natural theology and a revealed theology. Problems discussed here: 1. The nature of God and his attributes: a. omnipresence: God is in all places, in the sense that he directs everything (Abu l-Hudhailī al-Da‘ībī); he is not in any place (general thesis): b. perceptibility: he is not perceived by the senses (thesis generally adopted) — he is perceived by the heart (Abu l-Hudhailī) — he has a hidden nūḥiya which will be perceived in another world with the help of a sixth sense which God will then create (Ḥāfṣ al-Fard and other; thesis declared heretical); c. the attributes (eternal; names of the essence): identical with the essence (Abu l-Hudhailī; thesis generally adopted) — inherent in the essence through nāṣūl (al-Mū‘ammar) — through al-nūhī (Abu Ḥāshim) expressing positive aspects (Abu l-Hudhailī and generally) — negative (knowledge: negation of ignorance: not in any place).

2. The structure of the created world: a. starting-point anthropology treated in a positive way (exact definition of religious duties) and negative (refutation of qarnawiyya): man is the empirical phenomenon which we see, the body (qarnīm) which is composed of a certain number of indivisible entities (atoms) and which supports the accidents: life, the senses, colours etc.; nafs is mu‘nā and distinct from rūḥ (Abu l-Hudhailī) — man is composed of body (badan) and rūḥ (identical with nafs) which are mutually interpenetrant (mu‘tāla‘āt); the colours, senses, sensations, forms and spirits form different categories of ajwā‘āhar (not
he does not: general thesis; b. theodicy: could God prevent evil? yes, for he possesses a store of hidden grace which would be sufficient to destroy evil completely at once: Bigbr al-Mutanisr and several Baghdadi theologians — no, for he always does what is best and wisest for his creation: general thesis. 2. Huma power: created by God: physical evils, diseases etc. are not subject to the human will; man’s actions are movements; distinction between a:sal al-kalibb and a:sal-djazi: problem of towailid stated by Abu ’l-Hudhir and particularly discussed in the school of Baghdad; the effects of an action are attributed to him who performs it, and even after his death he remains responsible for it.

III. Asl al-wad’ wa ’l-cudb (or asl-mar’ wa ’l-askim): practical theology. Problems here discussed: a. belief and unbelief: belief consists in all the acts of obedience, obligatory or supererogatory: sins (mubr): are divided into grave (kabib) and petty (tebbal): the following are kabir: 3. the evil: he who is not a Muslim obeys God if he does something which God has commanded in the Qur’an (or la yuradu l犹h bih): Abu ’l-Hudhir and his school; 3. the creation things: are eternal, and if things are created it: put into existence after having been non-existent; several solutions of the problem: “thing” is only what exists and before the reaction the thing was not thing which implies that divine knowledge is born with the things (Djahmi thesis adopted by Hjdmn al-Fuwati) — before the creation things were posited (ghabib: as non-existent in God’s eternal knowledge but without the accidents which characterise them in existence (al-Shahids and others) — with these accidents (al-Khaliq, al-Kabibi and several theologians of Baghdad (school of wad): God created all things at one time, one in the other and these things are manifested in the created world one after the other (al-Nazz:); c. are the objects of divine knowledge and power limited? Yes (Abu ’l-Hudhir) — no (the others): d. divine power does not extend to the accidents (Mu’ammars) — to the phenomena resulting spontaneously from human action (tawallid, see under asl al-wad’): 4. Revelation: prophecy: a prophet is mstlim, i.e. free from grave sins; b. the Kur’an: created; God creates the word in a substratum (mawd ab-mustlim: the Prophet; the hush etc.). The Kur’an is miraculous in composition and style — denied by al-Nazzam; distinction (which goes back to Wasi) between mubkh, the precepts of the Kur’an which are clear and without ambiguity and mutakhab, the precepts which are not immediately clear and evident: distinction between nashih and masnab.

II. Asl al-wad’: God is just; all that he does aims at what is best for his creation (afiya): he does not desire evil and does not ordain it (amr and iri: identical). He has nothing to do with man’s evil deeds: all human actions result from man’s free will: man has a khub and an istifa kabla 1:82; man will be rewarded for his good deeds and punished for his evil ones. Problems discussed here: 1. Divine power: a. can God commit an injustice? No: al-Nazzam — yes, but
caliph, son of al-Mutawakkil and a slave-girl named Kabiha. After al-Mustanin had been forced to abdicate, al-Mu'tazz was proclaimed caliph on 4th Muharram 252 (Jan. 25, 866). When he wanted to get rid of the two Turkish generals Wasif and Bogha the younger, they got wind of his intentions and went back to Samaara. On the other hand, he succeeded in putting his brother and successor designate al-Mu'ayyid to death and throwing the third brother Abu Ahmad into prison. In the following year Wasif was killed by the troops when they mutinied for their pay and he attempted to appease them. After the death in Dhu 'l-Ka'ada 255 (Nov. 1869) of the governor Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah [q.v.], trouble broke out in Baghda and in the following year Bogha was murdered at the caliph's instigation. As the latter could not pay the troops they mutinied. Al-Mu'tazz applied to his mother who possessed immense wealth, but she refused to help him and at the end of Radjab 255 (July 869) the cruel and faithless caliph was deposed. He was put in a subterranean dungeon where he died of starvation in 3 days at the age of 24. In his reign the dynasty of the Fatimids was founded and Ya'qub b. Laith [q.v.] was defeated as governor of Sidjistan. The Kharijists sacked al-Mawri and in Asia Minor the Muslims were defeated by the Byzantines. Cf. also the articles AL-MUTAWAKKIL, AL-MUSTANIN, and AL-MUTAZAR.


MUTHALLATH, also MUTHALLATHA, pl. muthallahat; triangle; it forms the first category of plane surfaces bounded by straight lines (al-ma'tat al-mu'tatibat al-mu'tatbat) (cf. al-Kharizmi, Mafath, p. 206). Following Euclid's Elements, i., "0924—29, the Arab mathematicians classify triangles from two points of view: either according to the sides (al-far'i, pl. afar'id) into equilateral (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'tatibat) or scalene (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'tatbat) triangle, or according to the angles (al-far'i, pl. afar'id), into right-angled (al-mu'tatibat al-far'i) and acute-angled (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'atbat al-far'i), obtuse-angled (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'atbat al-far'i), and scalene (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'atbat al-far'i), or according to the angles (al-far'i, pl. afar'id), into right-angled (al-mu'tatibat al-far'i, pl. afar'id, 8 of the 89), and acute-angled (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'atbat al-far'i), obtuse-angled (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'atbat al-far'i), and scalene (al-mu'tatibat al-mu'atbat al-far'i). In the equilateral triangle the base is called al-khala, the apex al-da', the sides al-di'um (see above), in the right-angled triangle the hypotenuse is called al-ka'ira, i.e. "diameter" (because the hypotenuse represents the diameter of the circle described around the right-angled triangle); for the two sides the term al-di'um is generally used. Muthallath al-mu'tatibat as a technical term
means trigonometry (cf. Dozy, Supplement, i. 163).

MUTHALLATH (always with the feminine ending) is a technical term in astrology. Astrology divides the zodiacal circle (μνήμη [q.v.]) into four muthallathāt (Gr. τρίγωνα, Lat. trigonia, tripetron), each of which includes three signs 120° apart. These “are situated together in the trigonal plane” (παθήτης, Gr. τρίγωνα, tripetron tritropis); the word patheth itself is frequently found as a synonym of muthallathā who comes from the same root (ṭī-l-ṭāh) (cf. Dozy, op. cit., p. 162).

In star nomenclature Kiriakos Muthallath is the constellation of the (northern) Triangle (in Eunostoteles Δεσσαυρον, in Ptolemy, Τρίγωνα) which is joined in the east by Perseus, in the north by Andromeda, in the west by Pisces and in the south by Aries. According to Ptolemy (Almogest) and al-Sufli (ed. Schjellerup, p. 123 sq.), it consists of three stars of the third magnitude and one of the fifth. The star at the apex (a Trianguli) is an asterobase star and is called Rā's al-Muthallath. The latter name is found in Libros del saber de astronomia del rey D. Alfonso X de Castilla in the corrupted form “alosedales.”


AL-MUTI. [See ALLAH, i.]

AL-MUTI (lit. “the one who is asked of Al-Fauḥ), an “Abhāṣid caliph, son of al-Muktadir [q.v.], the first Caliph of his name. His reign marks a very unfortunate period in the history of the “Abhāṣids. The caliph himself had not the slightest authority; the power was in the hands of Muʾizz al-Dawla and after his death in 356 (967) in those of his son Bakhṭiyār. The “Bahṣids were growing more and more powerful and the “Sāmānids also declined to recognise al-Muti as the legitimate suzerain. The “Hamdānids were weakened by their wars with the “Buṣyids and the “Bahṣids. In “Baghdād the “Sumnids and “Shīʿis were fighting one another, and several “Shīʿi usages were introduced by the “Buṣyids who had the “Alid sympathies. At last the weak and sickly caliph was forced by the Turks to abdicate in favour of his son “Abd al-Karim al-Tāṣi (13th Dec. 197a 363 = Augst 5, 974). Al-Muti died in Mubarram 364 (September–October 974) in Damir al-ʿAkbūr. (A. J. WENSCUCK)


AL-MUTLAQ (A.), part, pass. IV from ṭā-l-ṭāh, “to tie the loose (fadd) of an animal, so as to let it free” (cf. Muslīm, Ḳīḥād, trad. 46. Al-Dawūd, Ḳīḥād, bāb 100). The term is also applied to the loosening of the bowstring (Bukhārī, Ḥṣāab, b. 170), of the garments, the hair etc. Thence the common meaning absolute, as opposed to restricted (mukāyad), and further the accusative muthallath “absolutely”. The use of the term is so widely diffused, that a few examples only can be given.

In grammar the term mafʿal mutlaq denotes the absolute object (cognate accusative), i.e. the objectivatised verb of the sentence, such as “a sitting” in the sentence: he sat a sitting.

In dogmatics the term is applied to existence. So that al-wuṣūḏ al-mutlaq denotes Allāh, as opposed to His creation, which does not possess existence in the deepest sense.

In ontology the term is also applied to existence (wuṣūḏ) in connection with the question of the nature of the latter. Here al-wuṣūḏ al-mutlaq is opposed to al-wuṣūḏ al-muṭlaqīl il-l-muṣaffāt. See the art. MANTIK, supra p. 259b.

In other surroundings the term has the meaning “general” as opposed to ḥāṣ; cf. the definition in Ḥāṣṣanī’s Ṭarifāt: Mutlaq denotes the one without specification. Cf. further the Dictionary of the Technical Terms.

On the meaning of raw mutlaq in pro(sedy, cf. Freytag, Darstellungen d. arabischen Werkschatz, Bonn 1830, p. 311.


AL-MUTTAḲ (lit. “the one who is asked of Al-Fauḥ), an “Abhāṣid caliph, son of al-Muktadir [q.v.] and a slave-girl named Khaledi. In Rahlʾ I 329 (Dec. 940) he succeeded his brother al-Raʾīsī [q.v.]; by this time the caliphate had sunk so low that five days passed after the death of al-Raʾīsī before steps were taken to choose his successor. Al-Muttaḳ at once confirmed the Amir al-ʿUmārī, Bedjken [q.v.] in office; after his death however, the Turks and Daulakhis in the army began to quarrel with one another. AbuʾAbd Allāh al-Bardī [see AL-BARDI] seized the capital but could only hold it a few weeks. He was driven out by the Daulah chief Kūrṭegov who however was soon overthrown by Ibn Rāʾīk [q.v.]. When AbuʾAbd Allāh sent his brother AbuʾHusān with an army against Baghdad, the caliph and Ibn Rāʾīk escaped to al-Mawṣil to the “Hamdānids (Ibn Hurgronje II 330 = Feb. – March 942). After the assassination of Ibn Rāʾīk the Hamdānī AbuʾMuhammad al-Ḥasan was appointed Amir al-ʿUmarī and received the hono(rific title of Nāṣīr al-Dawla. The occu-
pation of Baghdad offered him no difficulty: the Turkish general Tuzun rebelled a little later and Nāṣir al-Dawla had to evacuate the capital which was entered by Tuzun in Ramaḍān 331 (June 943) as Amīn al-Murrā. Al-Muttaḳi soon found himself forced to seek the protection of the Ḥamdīmūs again and at the beginning of the following year (autumn 943) he fled to al-Mawṣil. Then he settled in al-Raḳḳa but when Tuzun made peace with Nāṣir al-Dawla, al-Muttaḳi appealed for help to the Khishūṭūlīd of Egypt; the latter came to al-Raḳḳa in Jaḍīd 332 (March 944); the negotiations however were unsuccessful and finally the caliph put his trust in Tuzun, who after abandoning his loyalty by the most sacred oaths had him blinded (Saḥa 333 = Oct. 944). Al-Muttaḳi was then declared to have been deposed. He died in Shāfībān 357 (July 965).


**AL-MUTTAḳI AL-HINDI,** a author of several works in Arabic, whose real name was 'Āli b. Ḥusayn al-Dīn 'Abd al-Mulik b. Kān Khā Ḥuṣainī al-Kāmilī, was born at Burhānpūr in Gujāṛā of a respectable family of Dāwānpūr. He first joined the Chisti order, as a disciple of 'Abd al-Karim b. Shāhī Bādān at Burhānpūr and afterwards went to Multān where he read with Ḥusain al-Dīn al-Muttaḳi, after whom he is called al-Muttaḳi. He spent the remaining portion of his Indian life at Aḥmādābād during the reign of Mubāhrūr Shāh, but left India for Mecca after Humayūn defeated Bahādur Shāh in 941 (1534). He spent his last days in Mecca where he lived for thirty years more, during which he read Ibn Ḥaḍār al-Akāfī and others and entered the Ḥadithi and Shībāli orders. His high spiritual life and learning led many people to become his murīd (spiritual disciple). He died a highly respected saint and scholar in Mecca 975 (1567) at the age of ninety. He is the author of the following works:

1. al-Burhān fi 'Alāmāt Maḥdī āṣīr al-Ẓānim, an account of the Mahdi and of his coming at the end of the world;
2. al-Burhān al-gaḍī fi Mawṣilat al-Wall;</p>

**MUWASHSHAH** (HEPFEING), an ode or poem intended to be sung, is so called by comparison with the solghā, which is a double belt ornamented with pearls and rubies or a band of leather studded with pearls which a woman wears across her body from the shoulder to the opposite hip, thus going round the body. The muwāshšāḥ is composed of two parts one of which contains complete lines and the other hemistiches.

The muwāshšāḥ, which belongs to the "seven kinds or branches" (junūn) considered to be post-classical, is composed according to the rules of the pure syntax.

The muwāshšāḥ is divided into "stanzas", the technical name of which is not exactly settled; they are usually called ṣūrah or ṣawāf. In its most perfect form, it usually begins with one or two lines, a sort of prelude to the actual poem; this prelude is called maṭlāb, ṣawāf or ṣīra; we
also sometimes find the *tasrif*; if it is a distich, the first hemistiches of each verse rhyme together and the second hemistiches also. If A be the rhyme of the first hemistich and B that of the second, the *madhhab* or *ghusn* is of the following form:

- 2 lines: A — B
- 1 line: A — B

After the *madhhab* or *ghusn* come the stanzas proper called: *djuw* or *bait*.

The *djuw* or *bait* contains two parts: the first consisting of a varying number of hemistiches with the same or alternate rhymes, which however are never those of the *madhhab* or *ghusn*. This first part is called *dawr* or *simt*. The second part which is exactly like the *madhhab* or *ghusn*, both as regards number of lines and rhymes, is called *kafta* or *kaft*. The stanza therefore presents the following form:

First type: C — C — A — B
Second type: C — D — C — D

The rhyme or rhymes of the *dawr* or *simt* vary from one stanza to another; but those of the *kafta* are always the same as those of the *madhhab* or *ghusn*. The *kafta* is a sort of refrain which does not fail to make an impression on the listeners by the repetition of the same sounds and rhythms.

These are the most usual models of the muwashshah; but the poets, not being bound by hard and inflexible rules, have, each according to his temperament, exercised their imagination considerably in this genre.

Thus Ibn Sina al-Mulk composed a poem in which the first foot of each hemistich is *falsan* and has the same rhyme as the hemistich of which it forms part. This is the scheme:

- *madhhab* or *ghusn*: A — A — A
- *dawr* or *simt*: B — A — A
- *kafta*: A — A

The blind poet of Tudela shortened the hemistiches which gives a more lively rhythm:

- A — A
- B — B
- C — C
- A — B
- C — C

It would be wearisome to give all the forms of stanzas which are found in the muwashshah. From the point of view of metre, very great variety is found. Martin Hartmann recognised 146 which may go back to the 16 classical metres.

Three other types which are found do not seem to be derived from any well defined form:

- **mas'ā'attu** new type
- **mutas'ā'attu** type approaching the *kaftan* or *kaft*. A type which might be connected with *djuw*.

From the historical point of view, Freytag thinks that has now disappeared. There is certainly no doubt that the pre-Islamic poets composed poems similar to the muwashshah; these are known as *muwammad*; we find here again the word *simt* applied to the longest part of the stanza or couplet of the muwashshah.

The *muwammad* began with an opening line with *tasrif*; then came four hemistiches rhyming together on a different rhyme from the first line; next came a fifth hemistich rhyming with the first and completing the stanza. A new stanza followed with four hemistiches not rhyming with those of the first stanza; it ended with a hemistich rhyming with the opening line. Here is the scheme:

- A — A — A — B
- C — C — A

Imru 'l-Ḳais is said to have composed a piece of this nature but it does not seem to be genuine.

The inventor of the muwashshah is said to have been Muḥammad b. Muʿāṭa, a poet at the court of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muhammad al-Marwání who ruled in Spain (275–300 = 888–913). He was followed by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, author of *al-Iḥd al-faṣīḥ*. Their muwashshāh are however believed to be lost.

The first to shine in this genre was ʿUbādat al-Kazzāz, a poet of Muḥammad b. Ṣumāḥ, prince of Almeria. Al-ʿAšām al-Raṭayawī records that he heard ʿAbū Bakr b. Zuhr say: "All the composers of muwashshāh are simply children beside ʿUbādat al-Kazzāz". In the opinion of all men of letters no contemporary writer could rival ʿUbādat al-Kazzāz in the days of the *madhhab al-falṣafī*.

After him comes Abū Ḥādi Allāh Irbāʾ Raʾshah, poet of the court of Maʿmūn b. Dhuʾl-Nūn, prince of Toledo. In the time of the Almoravid dynasty there flourished a group of poets among whom may be mentioned the blind poet of Tudela, Ibn ʿAbād, ʿAbū Bakr b. al-ʿAdam, ʿAbū Bakr b. Badja.

In the time of the Almohads the most famous
composers of muwashshah were Muhammad b. Abü Faḍl and Ibn Ḥaṭīyān. At a later period we have ʿAbd al-Ḥasān b. Sulaymān, a poet of Seville and of Ceuta, Ibn Ḥalaf al-Iṣṭanbūlī (of Algiers), Ibn Ḥūzār of Bougie, the vizier and celebrated man of letters, Līsān al-Dīn b. al-Ḵāṭib.

Eastern poets have followed those of Spain. One of them, Ibn Ṣanāʿī al-Mulk al-Miṣrī (551=1088), laid the foundation of their art.

As to the subjects of the muwashshāʾ they are the same as those of the traditional ḍabāʾiḍīs: but as they are composed with the definite object of being sung with the accompaniment of stringed instruments they are usually love-poems.

On the musical origins of the muwashshāʾ see the article TIK.


AL-MUẒAFFAR, the homonym ḡābīb by which is meant the second of the ʿĀmirīd diktators of Muslim Spain is best known, the celebrated al-Maṣūmi [q.v.]. ABU MARWĀK Abū al-Maṣūmi Abū Ṣayfān Abū al-Maṣūrī. He was invested with the office of ḡābīb by the caliph Hishām II, on the death of his father, on 28th Ramadaḍ 392 (Aug. 10, 1002) and ruled as absolute master the territory of al-Andalus until his death of angina as he was setting out on an expedition against Castille on 16th Safar 399 (Oct. 20, 1008).

The relatively short period of the ʿĀmirīdate of Abū al-Maṣūk al-Muṭaffar was until quite recently almost unknown for lack of documents and in his

Histoire, Doyi had to pass it over in almost silence in view of its importance in the history of the early 11th century in Spain. I have been able in the course of recent years to fill this gap, thanks to the discovery of accounts of the ʿĀmirīdate of al-Muṭaffar in the Līkhāʾiḥa of Ibn Bassām and the Bayān of Ibn ʿĪḍāḥi and the unpublished chapter devoted to him by Ibn al-Ḵāṭib in his Fnūl al-Ṭūn. The result is the discovery that the septuagenary Abū al-Malkī was for Muslim Spain a period of peace and prosperity, a regular golden age, just on the eve of the first upheavals which preceded the collapse of the ʿAlīyād caliphate; the chroniclers compare this period to the first week of a marriage (sāḥi al-wuṣūr) cf. Dozy, Suppl. Diet. Ar., i. 626—627.

Al-Maṣūrī had actually left his son and successor an empire not only completely pacified and solidly organised but also enjoying an economic pro-pretory hitherto unprecedented. Abū al-Malkī aimed at following scrupulously the line of conduct laid down for him in father's last wishes: to preserve and justify the popularity of the ʿĀmirīd regime by peace at home and the continual harassing of the Christian foe beyond the marches (ẓanāqī). Every year of Muṭaffar's rule was therefore marked by a summer expedition (qāfūn) or a winter one (ṣaḥfī); in 393 (1003) he led his armies against Catalonia (bīlaḏ al-Ḥarām), laid waste the country round Barcelona and destroyed 35 strongholds before returning to Cordova; in 395 (1005) an expedition was led against Castille by the ḡābīb; in the following year his objective was the town of Pampeluna [q.v.], which he seems to have approached but not reached; in 397 (1007) took place, against Catalonia, the expedition known as the "victorious" (ẓāfīṭ al-nasr). Abū al-Malkī forced his way into Clunia and carried off a vast booty. This triumph earned for him the nominal suzerain the title of "Victor" (al-Muṭaffar) which henceforth replaced his previous ḡābīb of Sail al-Dawla. In the course of the winter of 398 (1007—1008) there was an expedition which ended in the capture of a castle of San Martin which has not been identified. The last expedition undertaken by him as mentioned above came to nothing because of the early death of Abū al-Maṣūmī father to the way to wage war on the infidel.

At home al-Muṭaffar maintained intact the strong administrative organisation which dated from the reign of Abū al-Raḥmān III [cf. Umayyads, i.] which al-Maṣūmī had maintained intact, while removing from it the representatives of the Arab aristocracy. On his accession to office, he won the good grace of the Cordovans by reducing taxes by a sixth. He was easily able to dispose of several conspiracies against him. He left to his brother Abū al-Raḥmān Sanche a heritage which the latter might easily have preserved if he had not at once exasperated his subjects against him by displaying a hateful partiality and attempting to arrogate to himself the caliphate completely.

MUZAFFAR AL-DIN, fifth Shāh of Persia of the Kadjar [q.v.] dynasty, was born on March 25, 1853. He was Shāh Nasir al-Din’s second son, the eldest son Zill al-Sulṭān being of lower birth by his mother. As crown prince Muẓaffar al-Din had been some time governor of Azerbaijan (a description of him as crown prince in Curzon, Persia and the Persian Question, i. 141). After his father’s assassination Muẓaffar al-Din was enthroned on June 8, 1896. With this new reign the rivalry between England and Russia for commercial and political influence in Persia became ever more apparent. The sympathy of the high officials, which was divided between the two powers, and the economic and military strength of the country was since long too weak to enable Persia to follow an independent policy. Under the relatively strong rule of Nasir al-Din popular discontent with the increasing misery had been suppressed; the new Shāh, however, though well-intentioned, did not possess the character of a strong ruler and, besides, did nothing to check the extravagancy of the court. His financial difficulties made Persia the debtor of Russia; in 1898, 1900, and 1901 considerable loans were given in Russia, guaranteed by the signatures of the custom receipts, the collecting of the custom duties being administered by Belgian officials. A good deal of the borrowed money was used for the expensive journeys to Europe undertaken by the Shāh in 1900, 1902 and 1905. In the meantime, the condition of the people became more and more miserable; headed by some influential merchants and some high ecclesiastics they protested against the heavy taxes and the tariffs as fixed in the commercial agreements with Russia and England of 1903. The growing discontent took several forms; some wished to call in the Turkish Sulṭān as Caliph and at other times there were outbursts against the Bābis in Yazd and Isfahān. Besides there were special grievances against several high officials, amongst them the chief Persian inspector of taxes. In December 1905 a popular movement took place in Teherān, with the aim of obtaining the deposition of the then grand vizier ‘Ain al-Dawla (since 1903). An ever increasing number of merchants, mulla’s and citizens took refuge (bazi) in the shrine of Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīm. At last the Shāh promised ‘Ain al-Dawla’s dismissal and some reforms, but in the course of the following year none of these promises were fulfilled. So in 1906 the discontentment reached again a culminating point, directed this time by some more or less secret patriotic associations. In July large crowds of the people of the capital went with the mullas to Kum, to take refuge in the sanctuary there; at the same time the British Legation accorded asylum to a considerable number of merchants and citizens. The results were that on July 30 ‘Ain al-Dawla was dismissed and that on August 5, all the demands of the protesting people were granted, including a constitution. The ecclesiastical leaders returned from Kum. There followed some friction with the government about the elections and other matters, but at last, on October 7, 1906, the first Persian Majles or National Assembly was opened by the Shāh. The new Majles had to face immediately some difficult problems and showed from the beginning its determination not to be a mere toy in the hands of the court party. Progress was hampered, however, by dissensions amongst clerical and non-clerical members of the popular party, while there were disturbances, in Tabrīz, owing to the tyranny of the crown prince Muḥammad ‘Ali. The Constitution (Kānūni-i ʿAlî; q. v.) was ratified by the Shāh only on December 30, 1906. Muẓaffar al-Din himself died on January 8, 1907 after a long illness, leaving his country to the eventful reign of Muḥammad ‘Ali Shāh.


J. H. KRAMERS

MUZAFFARIDS, a Persian dynasty. Their ancestors came from Arabia and had settled in Khurāsān at the time of the Muslim conquest, where they lived for several centuries. On the approach of the Mongols, the emir Ghiyāth al-Dīn Hūdūdī, with his three sons ‘Abī Bakr, Muḥammad and Māsūr, retired to Yazd. The two first named entered the service of the Atābeg of Yazd, ‘Ālī al-Dawla, and when Hūdūdī’s [q.v.] march on Baghdad, ‘Abī Bakr followed him with 300 horse. After the capture of Baghdad he was sent with an army to the Egyptian frontier. Here he fell in an encounter with the Arab tribe of Khaufaḏīa whereupon his brother Muḥammad succeeded him as a vassal of the Atābeg of Yazd while Māsūr remained with his father in the little town of Maḥbūb near Yazd. Māsūr had three sons, Mūḏīr al-Dīn Muḥammad, Zain al-Dīn ‘Alī and Shāfī al-Dīn Muẓaffar, the latter of whom became the ancestor of the dynasty of the Muẓaffarids. Appointed governor of Maḥbūb by ‘Yūṣuf Shāh, ‘Ālī al-Dawla’s son and successor, he cleared the hills of the robber bands from Shīrāz and when ‘Yūṣuf Shāh, who had put to death the envoy of the Ilghān Arghūn had to take to flight and went to Sīstān, Muḥammad followed him but left him on the way and went to Kumān where he was kindly received by ‘Utbūn al-Dīn Ṣarghāmatuš Kara Ḵūṭā (68 onwards) and presented to Arghūn who took him into his service. He was also on good terms with Arghūn’s successors Gaiḥkūb and Ṭahrānī. The latter appointed him amīr-i kāzīra “commander of a thousand”, and after the accession of Uljiyīt (703—1304) he was given custody of the roads from Ardshān to Kumān-shāh and from Herāt and Marw to Aḏarḵūn. Muẓaffar died on 13th Dhu’l-Qa’dā 713 (March 1, 1314). He was succeeded by his 13-year-old son Muḥārīr al-Dīn Muḥammad who is described as brave and devout but at the same time cruel, bloodthirsty and treacherous. He continued to live at the court of Uljiyīt; on the latter’s death in Shirāwāl 716 (Dec. 1316) and the accession of his son ‘Abī Sa’dī he returned to Maḥbūb. Along with the lord of the southern coast of Persia, the emir Kaḵkh surround the Malām Shāh Indīj, he very soon fell upon the Atābeg of Yazd, Ḥāfdīḏ Shāh, and succeeded in taking
the town from him (718 or 719 = 1318 or 1319). A short time after this event the people of Si-tān, the Nikāhārs, arose in rebellion; Muhammad attacked them and their leader Nawrūz was defeated and slain. The rebels however gathered together again and Muhammad had to fight no less than 21 battles before they were finally suppressed. After the death of Abū Sa'īd (730 = 1335-1336), complete chaos began and pretenders arose in different parts of the wide empire. The emir Abū Ḫaṣā b. Muḥammad Ẓāhīr Ḥāsīn endeavored to take the town of Yazd but was driven back. After some time Muḥammad took this province from the Mongol governor in Kirmān, Malik Khūth al-Dīn. In the end however, Abū Ḫaṣā succeeded in taking Shirāz and had the khutba read and coins struck in his name. In Sāḥar 748 (May—June 1347) he set out to subjugate Kirmān and laid waste Shirāz, but returned when he heard that Muḥammad was ready to offer vigorous resistance to his advance. One of the victims of Abū Ḫaṣā then undertook a campaign against Kirmān but was defeated, where-upon Abū Ḫaṣā put himself at the head of a new army and marched on Kirmān to take vengeance on Muḥammad. But this effort also failed: Abū Ḫaṣā was completely defeated and had to take to flight. In 751 (1350–1351) he went to Yazd and began to besiege the town but, returned, having achieved nothing. In spite of all his failures however, Abū Ḫaṣā never lost heart. In the following year he sent a new army under the emir Abī Ḫaṣā to Kirmān and when the latter met Muḥammad on the plain of Pand Dūghāt in Ltimmād 753 (June—July 1352) a battle resulted. Dīkās was defeated. Muḥammad followed up his victory, went to Šīrāz and laid siege to it. On the 3rd Shawwal 754 (Nov. 1, 1353), the governor had to surrender and Abū Ḫaṣā fled to Isfahān. In the following year Muḥammad took the oath of homage to the Šīrāzī caliph in Egypt. Isfahān was now besieged. But as Muḥammad had also to deal with other rebels the siege was somewhat prolonged. Resistance was in the end overcome and the town had to surrender. At the same time Abī Ḫaṣā fell into his hands and was at once executed (21st Ltimmād 757 or 758 = May 22, 1356 or May 11, 1357). After Muḥammad had defeated all his enemies and become undisputed lord of Fārs and the ʿIrāq, an envoy appeared from the ruler of the Golden Horde, Dānī Beg Kābān b. ʿUzbek Kābān, who announced that the Khān had taken Tahrīz and wanted to appoint Muḥammad jāzīzul “Marshal”. Muḥammad gave the envoy an arrogant and unfriendly answer; but when he heard soon afterwards that Dānī Beg had returned home and left the emir Abī Ḫaṣā in Tahrīz he decided to take the town. Soon afterwards the news of Dānī Beg’s death arrived; Muḥammad at once set out and met Abī Ḫaṣā at Muyāna in Alḥobarbādīn. The latter was defeated and Muḥammad entered Tahrīz. But as a large army was approaching from Baghāl he dared not risk remaining but decided to begin to retreat. In Ḥamadān 759 (Aug. 1358) he was surprised and taken prisoner by his own son Saʿīd Ḥūsūn b. Ḥāsīn who believed himself suppressed and ill-treated by his father; in combat some other relations. Muḥammad was blinded and kept in prison for several years until his death at the end of Rāzī I 765 (Jan. 1364) at the age of 65. He was succeeded, by ẒĀHĪR ḤĀSĪN who shortly before his death appointed his son ZAIN AL-ʿĀBĪDĪN ʿAlī his successor in Shirāz and gave his brother ʿĪMĀD AL-DĪN AḤMĀD b. Muḥammad the governorship of Kirmān. As soon as ZAIN AL-ʿĀBĪDĪN had begun to reign his cousin ẒĀHĪR ʿĪYĀḤ b. Sharaf al-Dīn Muẓaffār set out from Isfahān to attack him. Fortunately however, the threatened war was averted by a friendly agreement; but ẒĀHĪR ʿĪYĀḤ could not stay long in Isfahān; he was driven out by the turbulent and feckless inhabitants and fled to Yazd whereupon ZAIN AL-ʿĀBĪDĪN appointed his maternal uncle Muẓaffār-i Kāshī governor of Isfahān. In 787 (1385–1386) an envoy from TĪMŪR arrived in Kirmān bringing assurances of his peaceful and friendly intentions and Sulṭān Aḥmād hastened to offer his humble homage to the powerful conqueror. In shawwal 789 (Oct.—Nov. 1387) it was reported that TĪMŪR had invaded the ʿIrāq and that Muẓaffār-i Kāshī had given him the keys of the towns and fortresses whereupon ZAIN AL-ʿĀBĪDĪN left Shirāz and went to Baghdad while ẒĀHĪR ʿĪYĀḤ endeavored to procure suitable gifts to pacify TĪMŪR and ordered that a sufficient sum should be paid out to maintain his army. But when TĪMŪR’s officials appeared in Isfahān to take the money, they were attacked and killed by the citizens. In consequence the Mongols carried out a dreadful massacre among the people of Isfahān, in which 200,000 were said to have perished. TĪMŪR then went to Fārs and confirmed Sulṭān Aḥmād as lord of Fārs, the ʿIrāq and Kirmān, whereupon he returned to Samarqand. When ZAIN AL-ʿĀBĪDĪN had left Shirāz, he met his cousin ZAIN AL-MANṣūR b. Sharaf al-Dīn Muẓaffār at Shūstār and was at first welcomed, then suddenly attacked and imprisoned. ZAIN AL-MANṣūR was now able to occupy Shirāz without opposition, while ẒĀHĪR ʿĪYĀḤ returned to Yazd. After the former had established himself securely in Shirāz, ZAIN AL-ʿĀBĪDĪN was released by his jailers and brought to Isfahān where the people welcomed him. In the meanwhile he had been persuaded by ẒĀHĪR ʿĪYĀḤ to combine with Sulṭān Aḥmād to take vengeance on ZAIN AL-MANṣūR. The latter failed however, the allies were defeated and ZAIN AL-MANṣūR seized the whole of the ʿIrāq. When ZAIN AL-ʿĀBĪDĪN wanted to escape to Khurāsān, he was treacherously seized by the governor of al-Ray and brought to ZAIN AL-MANṣūR who at once had him blinded. The latter then tried to form a coalition against TĪMŪR. In 795 (1392) however, TĪMŪR left his winter quarters in Māzdāndān and marched on Shūstār. After storming Katāf- Sefīd which was considered impregnable he marched on ZAIN AL-MANṣūR’s capital and a battle was fought near Shirāz. Although ZAIN AL-MANṣūR’s chief emir abandoned him with most of his troops, the battle lasted till far into the night. The undismayed Muẓaffārīs fought with desperate courage, but finally fell in the melee, after fighting his way to TĪMŪR and giving him two cuts with his sword, which however the strong helmet of the Mongol leader averted. ZAIN AL-MANṣūR’s relations then submitted; nevertheless TĪMŪR a week later (Rāzī 795 = May 1393) had all the Muẓaffārīs executed.

MUZZAFA "MUZZAFA"

A term in rhetoric (badi') which means the association of two things in the relation of condition (shart) and result (jaza') and then employing the same combination for two other things in the same conditions. Here is an example from the Divan of al-Buhûri (Cairo 1329, p. 317):

Ishâ 'hura'abat yaman jaz'afat dimâhâ'â
Ishâ 'hura'abat yaman jaz'afat dimâhâ'â

"When they (the horsemen) are one day fighting and their blood flows in profusion, they remember then bombs of kinship and their tears flow abundantly." The poet associates fighting with recalling bonds of kinship in the two parts of the conditional statement, then he completes the first by adding their blood flows in profusion and the second by saying their tears flow abundantly.


(MOH. BENCHENÊER)

AL-MUZDAWIDJA, a place roughly halfway between Minhâ and Arafat where the pilgrims returning from Arafat spend the night between the 9th and 10th Ibra 'al-Hijrâ, after performing the two evening salât. On the next morning they set off before sunrise and climb up through the valley of Muhassir to Minhâ. Other names for this place are al-Madjâf al-'Arûm, from Sûra ii. 194 and Djamâ' (cf. Lailat Djamâ': Ibî Sad, ii. 129, 6); but Djamâ', according to another statement, comprises the whole stretch between Arafat and Minhâ, both included, so that Yawm Djamâ' (Kisâ' al-Mûsa, vi. 30, 11) is explained as the day of Arafat and Yi'âm Djamam as the days of Minhâ. The rites associated with the night of Muzdawidja go back to the old pagan period, which the Arabs themselves recognize when they introduce the kindling of the sacred fire in this night and say that guarding of the departure for Minhâ is a privilege of the family of Adwân.

The sacred place in Muzdawidja was the hill of Kuzâ [q.v.]. Even after Muhammad in deliberate contrast to the pagan practice had declared all Muzdawidja to be musâ'mik [cf. al-Humayd, 1, 6], this hill retained its ancient sanctity. According to Arazki, there was a thick round tower upon it on which the Muzdawidja fire was kindled; in the time of Hârûn al-Rashid it was a fire of wood; later it was illuminated with wax-candles. In the Muslim period a mosque was built about 400 yards from the tower, of which Arazki gives a detailed description while Muhammad speaks of a place of prayer, a public fountain and a minaret. Burton also mentions a high isolated tower at Muzdawidja but the illumination in the night of Muzdawidja now takes place on the mosque.


(MOH. BENCHENÊER)
AL-MUZZAMMIL, title of sūra lxviii., taken from the first verse: "O thou wrapped up", viz. Muhammad, who wrapped himself up in his garment or was wrapped up by others. For explanations of the allusion cf. Sale's note as well as the commentaries on the Qur'ān. Variants of al-muzzammi, which stands for al-muttaammi, are al-muzzamal, al-muṣammil (Baidawi).


N

AL-NABA', title of sūra lxxviii., taken from the opening verses: "Concerning what do the unbelievers ask questions of one another: Concerning the great news". According to the commentaries the great news alluded to is the resurrection, the subject of lively discussions among the Meccans.


NABATAEANS, an Arab people who lived in ancient times in Arabia Petraea. — As early as the seventh century B. C. the Nabataeans are mentioned by Assurbanipal (Keilinschr. Bibl., ii. 216 sqq.). Whether the Nebayoth of the Old Testament are to be identified with them is uncertain (against the identification: Noldeke in Schenkel's Bibellexicon, s. v. Nabatae; for it amongst others: Musli, ArabiaDeserta, New York 1927, p. 492). The Nabataeans were never completely subjected either by the Assyrians, or the Medes, Persians or the Macedonian kings (Diodor. ii. 48). In 313 B. C. Antigonus sent two expeditions against them without success. They were then a nomadic people of shepherds and traders, with a few natural fortresses like Petra, Boṣra, Salghād, al-Hījir which served as depots for their arms and riches. Living sound the Dead Sea they exploited from time to time the remunerative asphalt deposits on its eastern shore.

The Nabataeans were often on friendly terms with their neighbours; e.g. with the Jews under the Maccabees and especially with the Salamians (Arab. Sulaim; cf. Yāḳūt, Maḏ'jam, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 594, s. v. Birma), with whom according to Stephanos' Byzantios and the testimony of the Nabataean inscriptions, they were in close alliance (cf. Sulaim in Maṣṣūr and B. Moizit, Salamit, in Pauly-Wissowa's Reallexiz., vol. i. A. col. 1824 sq.). The capital of the kingdom, called Nabata, in the inscriptions, was Petra on the Dibajal Hārm, according to Noldeke (ZDMG, xxxv. 255 sq.) Hebrew Sela', Arab. Ḥṣn Sal' in the Wādi Musā in the hills of al-Shārār (Yāḳūt, Maḏ'jam, iii. 117, 13; Mushtariḥ, p. 252, 2), while Musil (Arabia Petraea, ii. 337, note 2, p. 318) identifies this with Kṣrār es-Sel'. The ruins reveal a peculiar mixture of Nabataean and Hellenistic architecture while they have yielded remarkably few Nabataean inscriptions (on these see Dalman, Petra und seine Felshheidetumer, 1908; do., Neu Petra-Forschungen, 1912; Bachmann, Watzinger, Wiegand, Petra, 1921; A. W. Kennedy, Petra, its History and Monuments, 1925).

The Nabataean kingdom comprised the lands of southern and eastern Palestine as well as Idumaea and Petraea, from 88 B. C. also Ḥawrān; twice (85 B. C. and c. 34—62 A. D., perhaps also in the interval, cf. Mommsen, Rom. Gesch., v. 476, note 3), Damascus also belonged to it [cf. i., p. 903]. In the southwest it stretched over the ancient Midian as far as the coast of the Red Sea where ʻObodat I founded the town of Hawāra (Steph. Byz., s. v. ʻAkre, probably =Δωνηα ηπωμ, now perhaps al-Ḥawrā?), in the interior as far as al-ʻUla (Oedoc) and al-Ḥijr [q.v.] on the frontier of the Hādramaut. The Nabataeans also penetrated into the name of Arabia in the eastern Nile delta as an inscription from Tell el-Sughaft is in the Wādi Tūmilat shows (Clermont-Ganneau, Les Nabatiens en Égypte, in Recueil d'Arch. Or., viii. [1924], p. 229—257). A number of their kings can be dated with approximate exactness: ʻHārījat (Aretas) I 169 B. C., ʻHārījat II c. 110—96, 'Obodat (Obodas) I c. 90, Ṭabbāb (Rablos) I c. 87, Ṣēlēh (Maḏ'jam) c. 86—62, 'Obodat II c. 62—47?, Malık (Maḏ'jam) I c. 47—30, 'Obodat II (III?) before 25 — c. 9 B. C., Ṣēlēh IV Ḥājem-anmum (Maḏ'jam) c. 9 A. D. — 40 A. D., Malık II 40—70/71, Ṭabbāb II 70/71—106 A. D. [Maḏ'jam III, 106 A. D.]; cf. Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil, viii. 247). The real founder of their power is said to have been king Eriṭimos, who is probably the same as Ḥārījat III whose reign fell in the period of decline of the Seleucid empire (E. Taubner, in Klio, x. 251—253).

As "allies", the Nabataeans were able to maintain to some extent their independence of the Romans. At a very early date, like the Palmyrans, they attained through their trade the position of monopolists in Neearer Asia. At the beginning of the Roman empire they dropped their nomadic life and became peacefully settled. Just as in the east they have left their inscriptions particularly on the trade-routes followed by their caravans, e. g. from Petra to Damascus and Tadmor, to Forat at the mouth of the Euphrates, to Gerha (Arab. al-Djarā'ī near al-Katif), to the Sinai peninsula and Egypt and to Gaza, so we find in the Roman empire epigraphic traces of Nabataean merchants as far as Upper Egypt (Dendera), in Miletus, Rome and Puteoli. In 166 A. D. the emperor Trajan conquered Petra and made the most important part of the Nabataean kingdom the Roman Province Arabia. The remainder of the territory left to the Nabataeans in the desert suffered economic ruin about 200 A. D. when the Palmyrans gradually obtained control of the remunerative carrying trade.
The king, who was assisted by a vizier, the highest official (Greek ἱστατός), with the title "brother", had under him a number of shaikhs (شايخ) of the separate tribes (ذئب); we also find the titles eparchos and strategos. The high social position of women is noteworthy; they could possess property independently and dispose of it as they liked (Noldeke in Euting, Nabat. Inschr., p. 79 sq.); the coins often bear portraits of the queens (Kammerer, Pétra et la Nabatéenne, Paris 1929, p. 377; Brit. Mus. Cat. of Greek Coins: Arabia etc., London 1922, Plates I and II).

Our only source for Nabataean 1a w is their epitaphs, the threats of punishment in which are based on a formula of the Greek law of property and contract which elsewhere is only found in tomb-inscriptions in Asia Minor (cf. Keil, Hermes, xiii. [1908], p. 567—74).

As nomads, simple in their customs and rarely owning slaves, the Nabataeans, as a trading people, had a great respect for wealth. The mention in inscriptions of physicians, wise men and poets, shows a certain level of intellectual culture. Whether circumcision was practised amongst them is uncertain (Kammerer, op. cit., p. 375 sq.).

The Nabataean pantheon is known to us mainly from tomb and votive inscriptions. The principal god was Dusār [cf. LXX 'I-SHAR], the principal goddess Allāt [cf. AL-LAT]; the goddesses Manījū (= Aram. Māndāwāt; cf. MANAT), Kašā, Mutābula and Ḥubal (q.v.) are also mentioned. Their kings were perhaps worshipped as gods after their deaths (cf. J. S. S., ii. 354).

As Noldeke was the first to emphasise, the Nabataeans were pure Arabs as their names show, but in written intercourse they used Aramaic, the usual written and business language of Neater Asia. Many aramaisms thus entered their language in the north of the country (like ܐܪܒܐ, ܢܛܢܐ, ܡܐܒܐ, ܐܒܢܐ). Arab writers therefore even used the term "Nabataean" for "Aramaic"; in the southern Higra (al-Hidj) on the other hand, the Nabataean Arabic retained its greatest purity; the Arabic script developed out of the Nabataean cursive at the close of the ancient period (cf. ARABIA, d.).

In the Muslim period the Arabs called those inhabitants of Syria and of the Ḳrāk, who were neither shepherds nor soldiers, "Nabataeans" (Ibn al-Kalb in Yākuti, Maqqām, iii. 344), a term also applied in a somewhat contemptuous tone to the Aramaic-speaking peasants (Noldeke, in Z.D.M.G., xxv. 124). When then we find "Nabataeans" (Nabīṭ, Naḥīṭ etc.) mentioned in Maṣṣāḥa as well as on the Djiḏān, in Syria, on the Khāłḥūr and in the Ḳrāk, in Ṭamān and Bahrayn, the name is not to be taken in the ethnographical sense (Noldeke, op. cit., p. 125). As the grammarians of the Ḳrāk paid special attention to the "Nabataean" language of the Aramaic country people, by "Nabataeans" was frequently meant the inhabitants of the Ḳrāk and especially of the Ḳāṭīṭ (Noldeke, op. cit., p. 127).

The inhabitants of the district of Ḥisāma in the most northern part of the Ḳūra, once the Djuḥdham (q.v.), now the Hawawin (q.v.), are regarded as the descendants of the Nabataeans (cf. ARABIA, a.).

annâyân refers to the heathen is quite clear from Sûra iii. 19, where they are contrasted with those who have received the sacred writers. Sûra ii. 73 refers to the annâyân min Allâh al-‘îsâ; the reference is most probably (with Wellhausen, Sîrâz, iv. 13, note 2) to originally pagan Arabs who had adopted Judaism. The derivation of mûnî from Hebrew mûnît 'hâ-sîn therefore fits all the Kur'ânic passages, while that most generally adopted from Hebrew 'âm hâ-qâri' 'people of the country', a term for Jews who did not know the Jewish law, would at best fit only Sûra ii. 73, but even for this passage is not absolutely essential.

The post-Kur'ânic ideas about the prophethood of Muhammad are discussed in the article Muhammãd (cf. also Tor Andræ, Die Person Mohammeds in Lehr- und Glaube seiner Gegenwart, Stockholm 1815). The accounts of the other prophets which found a way into Islam in the post-Kur'ânic period are collected in the works on the Kitiş al-Anbâyî. These, however, are not confined to the prophets proper who appear in the Kur'ân by name or anonymously, and to other figures of Jewish and Christian Biblical and post-Biblical tradition, but deal also with the history of such personalities as Dûrdû and Bulâkû to whom there is not the slightest reference in the Kur'ân.


(N. Hofovitz)

Nâbî, Yenüf, an Ottoman poet. Yenüf Nâbî came from Urfa (Rûhû, hence Ruhâbi, not Râhâni as one often finds). From there he came in the reign of Muhammad IV to Stambul and became a favourite of the grandvizier Kara Muṣṭâfâ. He held a post as külys, made the pilgrimage after Kara Muṣṭâfâ's death and later settled in Aleppo. When the governor there, Muhammad Baḥţâdî [q. v.], became grandvizier, he took Nâbî to Stambul and gave him the post of superintendent of the department of the Anatolian chief accountant (Anadolu muḥârike-i deport), Later he gave up this office for another and died about 90 on 3rd Nâbî 1124 (April 10, 1712).

He was buried in Skutari in the Karâdi Ahmed cemetery, but in the Moskînî monastery, the description on his tombstone is given by Sa'd al-Dîn Nîzîh, Mâṣâr âlîkhâbî, Stambul 1932, p. 11.

Nâbî wrote several historical works in a florid style which was considered classical in his time and even later, such as an account of the conquest of Kameniec in Podolia (1683 = 1672) called Tağrîk-i Weûzî-i Kâmînî, Fethûnî-i Kâmînî or simply Tağrîk-i Kâmînî. He also wrote in prose and verse a description of his pilgrimage to the holy places (1689 = 1678; the work was written only in 1903 = 1882) entitled Tağfât al-Harâmîn. His very popular Dîvân with supplement earned him the title of ‘king of poets’. In his Khârîj-i qârl, usually called Khârîjîye, he gives his son Abu ‘l-Khârîjîye moral admonitions and advice. His letters (Manzûhîyât) were at one time highly esteemed and are of some historical value. He continued Wâsî’s Siyar in a Dîvân-i Siyar-i Wâsî. Printed works: Dîvân, Bûîêt 1257 and Stambul 1292; Dîvân-i Siyar-i Wâsî, Bûîêt 1248; Khârîjîye in: Consell de Nâbî Efendî à son fils Abu ‘l-Khârîjîye, publiés en ture avec la traduction française et des notes par M. Pavet de Courteille, Paris 1857;

Târîkî Kâmînî, Stambul 1828; Sûrât-i Hâdîsî-i Tâfîhîye, s.l. (= Stambul, about 1870), deals with questions of pedagogics; Tağfât, Stambul 1828; Tağfât al-Harâmîn, s.l. [Stambul] 1265.

For further information see F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 237—239.


Nâbî Yûnuș. [See NAWAWI]

Nâbîdh (i.), a comprehensive designation for intoxicating drinks, several kinds of which were produced in early Arabia, such as mîr (from barley), bitî (from honey: Bûkûrtî, Morâdiskî, bab 60; Âshribî, bab 44; Âdu, bab 80; or from spelt: Âlbîn b. Hanîbî, iv. 402), fi-i-qârî (from different kinds of dates: Bûkûrtî, Âshribî, bab 3, 21).

Grapes being scarce in Arabia, it is said that in al-Mudîna ‘wine’ was usually prepared from kinds of dates, exceptionally from grapes (Bûkûrtî, Âshribî, bab 2, 3; Muslim, Miskûb, trad. 3, 6).

This may be true. Yet even these traditions betray a tendency connected with the general prohibition of wine included in that of intoxicating drinks. Generally speaking fi-i-qârî favours the affirmative answer and is consequently anxious to point out that the khânîr which was prohibited by Muhammad included nûbîdh.

The question was difficult in so far as these kinds of drinks were intoxicating to degrees which were born of the severe laws. Its appearance e.g. from the copious traditions in which ‘Aîsî’s words are interpreted as indicating that nûbîdh was prepared for Muhammad and at what time the beverage was done away with (cf. Khânîr), as well as the traditions in which the prohibition of certain vessels (kantam, mansî, hâmîr, etc.) was abrogated and all kinds of vessels declared allowed, provided the drinks prepared in them were not intoxicating (Muslim, Lâhîţeh, trad. 166; Âshribî, trad. 63—65, 67—75 etc.). A series of traditions which could be adduced by the Hanîfîs in favour of their view, according to which nûbîdh is not included in the prohibition of wine, is to be found in al-Nasî’s collectio, Âshribî, bab 48. Cf. further the art. Khânîr.

Side-by-side with milk and honey nûbîdh was also the beverage that was offered to the pilgrims in Mecca. The institution, al-Mâ’âsî (also the name of the building, close to Zamzam, where the distribution took place) was an official house in which the Alhadsis (Âlbîn b. Hanîbî, Musîned, i. 272; Muslim, Âdîdîs, trad. 347; Abu Dâwûd, Manâzîs, bab 90). The descriptions by Ibn Sa’d († 230 = 845) and al-Azraî († 244 = 858) give the impression of referring to the present state of things; in the time of al-Mu’âmmâd († about 1000 A. D.) the institution had already passed into desuetude.

For details, cf. the work of Gaudreay-Demombry.
NABĪDH — NĀBIGHA AL-DHUBYĀNĪ

Bibliography: cf. the Bibliography of the article KHAM; further: Fa'ā媒体报道, Calcutta 1251 (1835), vi. 607; Santillana, Il "Muḥ-

(A. J. Wensinck)

NĀBIGHA AL-DHUBYĀNĪ, a famous poet of the pre-Muḥammadan period. His real name was Ziyād b. Mu’āwiya and he belonged to the tribe of Dhubyān. He probably flourished in the second half of the century which preceded Muḥammad and died shortly before the beginning of Iṣām. Causin de Perceval (Histoire des Arabes, 2nd ed., ii. 502) puts the date of his birth in 555 A.D. and Father Cheikho (Poètes arabes chrétiens, p. 640) dates his death in 604 A.D. These dates however can only be conjectural.

The surname Nābihī has been variously interpreted by Arab writers. According to some, our poet was so called because in one of his verses he uses the verb nābihīya: "She stopped among the nations Kain b. Ḥyar and they felt the terrors of our attacks". But this verse is apocryphal and the process recalls that used to justify the etymologies of Muḥādhbih and of Mutamānnūs (q.v.). According to others, he was so called because he did not write poetry until he reached manhood or more simply because in Nābihī poetry "flowers from the spring".

We know nothing about his family; his noble birth asserted by the Kitāb al-ʿAghāni (ix. 162) and Ibn Ḫudna (ed. de Goede, p. 74) is doubtful and we know nothing definite about his childhood and youth.

At some date which is impossible to ascertain definitely, Nābihī was admitted to the court of the Lakhmid princes [cf. LAKHM] of al-Ḥira, vassals of Persia; in the reigns of the kings al-Mundhir II and al-Mundhir IV in particular this Christian semi-
Persian, semi-Arab city had become an important literary centre and the focus of a brilliant culture.

Our poet sang the praises of two sovereigns and received gifts from them but his fortunes reached their zenith in the reign of Nu’āmān Abū Kābilis whose boon companion and favourite singer he became. The poet lived on intimate terms with the king in the lap of luxury and opulence. Such favour could not fail to excite the envy and jealousy of the other courtiers: hence his enemies, notably Murra b. Ḫudna, resorted to break the king’s attachment to him. The trick attempted by his enemies was a crude one and the king was not deceived by it: the attack on the poet failed.

Far from being discouraged, Murra patiently awaited another opportunity to avenge himself: this soon appeared. According to the Kitāb al-ʿAghāni, Nābihī, who had free access to the palace of Nu’āmān, one day unexpectedly entered the apartments of queen Mutadājīrīd, famous for her beauty. Taken by surprise, she dropped her veil, showing to the delighted eyes of the poet "a part of her statue-like body". By the time she could replace it, it was too late. Struck to the heart, Nābihī composed in honour of this "beauty" his famous poem which begins with the lines: "So and leave Mayya in all haste..." (Derenbourg, iii. xxi. p. 505, n. 4). Unfortunately Nūmān did not find it prudent enough to recite it to his enemy Murra who hastened to report it to Nūmān. The latter in his anger decided on the poet’s ruin.

According to another tradition, one evening when Nābihī was seated beside the queen in company of the king and another poet, Munakkhāl al-Yaḵbūrī, Nūmān asked Nābihī to describe Mutadājīrīd to him. Nābihī at once obeyed and recited the poem which he had composed shortly before. Munakkhāl, who was said to be the queen’s lover, exclaimed: "Sir, this description is that of an eye-witness"; and the poet’s days were now numbered. Warned by his friend, the chamberlain Ḥisām, the poet hurriedly fled and sought refuge with the princes of Ghassān.

These stories, on the whole little probable, seem to have been invented to explain Nābihī’s disgrace. In his book Fi ʿl-ʿAdab al-Jāḥīṣī (Cairo 1927, p. 332), Tābī Ḫusain disputes their authenticity and acutely points out that nothing in poem viii.: "It has reached me, mayest thou avoid the censure etc." supports these stories. He supposes on the other hand, relying on this ʿaṣīdī, that the princes of Ghassān won the good graces of Nābihī at one time or other by their largesse and the poet showed his gratitude by singing their praises; this having come to the ears of Nūmān, the latter took umbrage and decided on the ruin of his favourite.

Nābihī was by no means unknown to the Ghassānids, phylarchs of Byzantium and rivals of al-Ḥira. He had been very well received by the princes al-Ḥāḥīh b. Šimār and Āl-Ḥāḥīh al-ʿAqhar. The former at the poet’s request had released a large number of the Banū Asad taken prisoner at the battle of Ḥalma; the latter, also at Nābihī’s request, had released a number of the Banū Asad and his father ʿAbū Jārā after the battle of ʿAin Uḥbāt. This leads us to say a word about Nābihī’s political activities.

The poet in the course of the wars of his tribe never lost interest in his fellow tribesmen and their allies; we have mentioned his interventions on their behalf with the Ghassānids; during the celebrated war of Dāḥī between ʿAbs and Dhubyān, it was his constant care to maintain the alliances contracted with the Banū Asad and Banū Tamīm. In the reign of the Ghassānīd Nūmān b. Ḥāḥīh Abū Karīb, he had once more to intercede on behalf of the Banū Dhubyān defeated in the battle of ʿĀḥ Ukb; later, in view of his devotion to his patron and his love for his own tribe, he appealed to Nūmān to abandon his war on the Banū Dhubyān allied with the Banū Ḥann. As a result of refusing to listen to him, the king was defeated.

At the court of Ghassān, Nābihī was overwhelmed with favours by ʿArīb b. Ḥāḥīh and later by his successor Nūmān. He celebrates the former’s generosity in a ʿaṣīdī full of gratitude (Derenbourg, iii.) and his elegy on the death of Nūmān (Derenbourg, xxiv.) is characterized by deep emotion.
In spite of his luxurious life, Nābīgha felt his heart and his thoughts turning towards al-Hira and its king. Therefore on the death of Nu'mān b. Ḥairīth Abu Karib he decided to return to al-Hira to attempt to regain the favour of the son of al-Mundhir.

Leaving that Nu'mān was ill, he set out accompanied by two Fazaris, Martyr b. Zabān and Sajīr b. 'Amr, friends of the prince; when they arrived at al-Hira, Nu'mān had recovered. Hearing of the arrival of his two friends, he had a tent of leather pitched for them and sent them a woman singer to entertain them. He himself often came to visit them. One evening at a party the singer sang Nābīgha’s poem “O abode of Malay” (Dīwān, I.), the prince delighted exclaimed: “That is an excellent poem”. The Fazaris thereupon seized the opportunity to intercede on behalf of Nābīgha and the generous prince forgave the poet. A little later Nu'mān was put to death by order of the Sāsānian king Kīṣrā Parwīz for having refused to give him one of his relatives as a wife. Nābīgha lamented his patron and retired to his tribe. We do not know when he died.

Before giving an estimate of Nābīgha as a poet, we have still to discuss his religion. Derenbourg makes him a monotheist, and in support of his opinion quotes a number of verses in which the poet speaks of God, of the feast of palms, of the cross of Zawrā. On the other hand, Cheikho thinks he was a Christian. We find, he says (Christianisme et la littérature chrétienne en Arabie avant l’Islam, Bârlût 1923, p. 426—439), in the poems of Nābīgha evidence of his belief in God, of his religion and piety, but the arguments are not numerous or of great cogency: a vague mention of God, of David and his son Solomon, of priests present at the obsequies of Mundhir, of the cross of Zawrā. As a matter of fact, Nābīgha was a pagan and there is nothing Christian in his poems. The allusions in his poems, even if we accept them as authentic, are in reality only rather faded memories of the Christian ceremonies and religious ideas current in the peninsula at this period. As to the word Allāh, it is undoubtedly the result of a substitution for al-Lāt [§v.] made at a later date by some Muslim party.

Nābīgha al-Dhubyānī holds a high position among the poets of ancient Arabia; he is unanimously placed “in the first rank of poets”.

In our opinion he possesses in a high degree the two qualities which make a great poet: sensitiveness and imagination. To sincerity of feeling, he adds splendour of imagery and freshness of expression. In him ideas and words, feeling and turn of phrase, matter and form are in perfect harmony. His satires are often bitter, ironical and scathing.

He is also an artist who skilfully uses all resources, all effects and all figures. His verse is compact, solid and uniform and readily impresses itself on the memory with the idea which it expresses. Of course it is not without its faults: we find a few weaknesses and examples of lack of care.

Ṭahā Husain (al-S̄īr al-Ḥāmil, Cairo 1926) has recently raised the question once more of the authenticity of the poems of Nābīgha and other pre-Islamic poets. Rejecting all that has been handed down about it he regards the old poetry as apocryphal. The discussion of this question however, as can readily be understood, lies outside the scope of this article.
in 129 B.C. destroyed Shechem and its temple. At a later date this always turbulent people was equally hostile to the Romans, which caused Vespasian to attack them on Garizim when a large number were slain. Christianity gradually spread in the country and Neapolis became a bishopric. The result was that the Samaritans now turned their arms against the Christians and treated them with great cruelty. After a deadly raid by them, the Byzantine emperor Zeno (474–491) had them driven from Garizim and built a church there. They wrought still greater havoc in the time of Justinian who punished them with great severity and destroyed their synagogues while he rebuilt the churches. This finally broke their spirit; many of them fled to Persia while others became Christians. Their part had been played by the time when Nablus with many other towns fell into the hands of the Muslims.

The notices of the Arab authors about the town are very scanty. They know that it was inhabited by Samaritans [cf. Al-Sakhawi] and some add that, according to the Jews, there are found nowhere else, but it should be noted that Baladhuri (ed. de Goeje, p. 138) speaks of Samaritans in Falasifa and Urduun. Ya'qubi mentions (p. 328), Nablus a town near two sacred hills with a population of Jews, foreigners and Samaritans. Below the town is a subterranean city, cut out of the rock. Mukaddasi says "Nablus lies in a valley between two hills, is rich in olive-trees and a stream flows through it. The houses are of stone and there are mills there; the mosque in the centre has a beautiful paved courtyard". In the Crusading period Nablus is mentioned as unfortified. On Jan. 23, 1120, an assembly of prelates and secular notables was held here, the object of which was thereby to renew the morals of the Christians. Idrit mentions the well of Jacob where Christ had the conversation with the woman of Samaria; a fine church had then been built on the spot. The Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela (1160–1173) records that there were no Jews in Nablus, but about 100 Kutaens (Samaritans) who offered burned offerings on the altar on Garizim at the passover and on other feast-days. His contemporary 'Ali al-Harawi says the Samaritans are very numerous. He, as does Ya'qubi, always writes Garizim as Kazizim, a corruption which we already have in the "Agurzen" of the pilgrim of Bordeaux. A terrible earthquake in 1202 added to the miseries inflicted on the town by the continual war between Franks and Muslims. Under the great Mamluk Sulaiman ibn-Qalawun (q.v.) it finally passed into possession of the Muslims. Ya'qubi remarks on the wealth of water and fertility of the district; here, he says, is the hill on which according to the Jews, Abraham wanted to sacrifice Isaac (not Ishmael as the Muslims say). When praying the Samaritans turn towards Garizim. Dimashki says that Nablus is like a palace surrounded by gardens; he mentions the pilgrimages of the Samaritans to Garizim where they sacrificed lambs. The Muslims had a fine mosque in the town, where the Qur'an was recited day and night. According to Khalil al-Zahrâi (d. 872=1467), the area included 300 villages.

The people of Nablus retained their unfriendly character and fondness for rebellion so that the town was less visited by pilgrims. Only the modern period has brought order and a better security, but even now the dislike of the Samaritans to strangers as spectators during their passover sacrifices may give rise to trouble.

**Bibliography:** Sellin, in Z.D.P.V., xliii. 2295 sq.; i. 205 sqq., 265 sqq. (on the excavations in the ancient Shechem); Holscher, idib., xxxii. 98 sqq.; R. Hartmann, idib., xxviii. 175; F. Thomsen, Lecta sancta, p. 93, 108 sq.; Robinson, Palastina, iii. 23 sqq., 33 sqq., 112 sqq.; W. Deissmann, Biblical Researches, i. 390 sqq.; Ya'qubi, in B.G.A., vii. 22; Iltahâb, i. 58; Mukaddasi, idib., iii. 174; Idriti, ibid., viii. 122 (text, p. 4); Le Strange, Palatines under the Muslims, p. 512; Sir George Adam Smith, Historical Geography of the Holyland, index, etc. Nablus; The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, ed. A. Ascher, 1840, i. 66–68; Ya'qub, Miv'qâl, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 724; Dimashki, ed. Mehrten, p. 200; Rohricht, Gesch. des Königtums Jerusalem, p. 146, 205, 411, 684 and passim; Propst, Die geogra. Verhältnisse Syrens und Palastinas nach Wilhelm von Tyrus, i. 55 sq. (FR. Buhl)

AL-NÂBLUSI. [See AND AL-CHÂNÁNI.]

Nâdhîr (A., plural nâdhîr; Sura liii. 57), used as a noun agentis from nâdhâr, iv., with the meaning of *warner*; sometimes also as an infinitive, e.g. Sûra lxvii. 17. The plural nâdhîr is also found in the sense of an infinitive, e.g. Sûra lxvii. 6. The term occurs frequently in the Qur'an; it is even said to be synonymous with râhid; its opposite is bâghîr, mulbâghîr. Nâdhîr as well as bâghîr are applied to the prophets, the former when they are represented as warers, the latter as announcers of good tidings (cf. Sûra xvii. 106; xxvi. 58; xxxii. 44; xlviii. 8: nûbâhâthun wa-nâdhâthun). As an epithet it is used especially in connection with Noah, the great warer before the Deluge, and with Muhammad himself who thereby meant a founder of a second Noah (Sûra xxvi. 115; i. 51; lxii. 2 with Sûra xxix. 49; xxxv. 21; xxxviii. 70; lxvii. 26). Sometimes Muhammed emphasizes his being only a warer (Sûra xlvii. 8), or his being the first warer who was sent to his people (Sûra xxviii. 46; xxxiv. 43).

The term is found in hadîth apart from the common use, known from the Kur'an, in the curious expression nâdhâr 'ayyân (Buâhî, K.âb, bâb 26; I'tlâm, bâb 2; Muslim, F. âdâlî, trad. 16) with which Muhammad denotes himself. The tradition runs as follows: "Myself and my mission are like a man who went to some people saying: I have seen the army (of the enemy) with my eyes and I am the naked warer". Several anecdotic stories are told by the commentators in explanation of this expression. It is also said by some of them, that in early Arabia a man who saw an approaching danger, stripped himself of his clothes and wound them around his head in order to warn his tribespeople. — The meaning Nazirite which in several dictionaries is given to the term nadhîr in the first place does not occur in the Kur'an, nor in hadîth, nor in Lîyan al-ârâb nor in Tâdî al-ârâb; it is, however, used in translations of the Bible.

**Bibliography:** Liyan al-ârâb, vii. 54 sqq.; Tâdî al-ârâb, iii. 561 sqq.; Ibn al-Âthîr, Nîâyâ, iv. 136; Kâstâlînî, ix. 305; Nawawî's commentary on Muslim's Sahîh, Cairo 1283, v. 71.

(A. J. WENSECKE)

Nâdhîr, v. o. w., was taken over into Islam from the pre-Muhammadan Arabs and underwent modification by the new religion. The idea of dedication is associated with the root n-dâh which is also found in South Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic and to some extent in Assyrian. An animal could
be the object of dedication among the Arabs. For example, they dedicated by *nadh*r certain of their sheep etc., for the ‘*ʿitāra* feast in Ḳaʿīb (Lūḥān al-ʿʿArab and Ḍjāhārī, s.v.): the dedication which was expressed in solemn formulae signified that the animals were removed from the mundane sphere and placed in the sacred one.

As a rule, a sacrifice was dedicated in order to obtain good fortune in a particular respect. The promise to dedicate an animal when the herd had reached the number of a hundred (Aq. *cit.*.) had an effect on the prosperity of the animals because the word anticipated the fact. According to the story, Ḥādīd al-Muḥallīb similarly dedicated a son to be slain beside the Kaʿba if he should have ten sons and they grew up (Ibn Ḥишām, p. 97 *ff.*) but for his *nadh*r 100 camels were substituted. — A childless woman could also vow if she had a son to dedicate him to the sanctuary (ʿ. *cit.*, p. 76: perhaps this story is a literary borrowing).

According to the *khiṭāl* of Māmuṁ biḥnt Karīm, her father vowed to sacrifice 50 sheep if he had a son (Ṭabarī, viii, 67; Ibn Ḥishām, bāb 19; Ibn Māḏīna, Kāṭbāt, bāb 18). If a child was sick, its mother could dedicate it by a vow as ʿ*ūmar* (from ʿ*ūmar*) if it recovered (Aznākī, p. 123 *ff.*). Escape from every difficulty was sought by a *nadh*r. During a battle a camel used to be dedicated as a sacrifice (Ṭaʿālīd-Wellhausen, p. 39). The traveller in the desert: used to make a vow on account of the danger (see the verse in Lane and Līlān al-ʿʿArab, s.v.): In distress at sea one promised offerings to God or a saint or vowed to do something oneself, such as fasting (Sūra k. 2: 233; xxix. 65: Abū Dāwūd, Amāna, bāb 20; see also Goldīhzer, Mīrū. *cit.*., p. 311). During a drought Ṭāmār vowed to taste neither *samāna* nor milk nor meat till the rain fell (Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, i. 2575 *ff.*).

Even if a sacrifice were promised, the vow also affected the person concerned, as we see from the fact that he had his hair shorn not only on the *ḥādīd* but also, for example, when sacrificing after a journey (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 15. 749; Ṭaʿālīd-Wellhausen, p. 324, 351, 429 *ff.*; Bukhārī, Nafṣī, bāb 125); for the cutting of the hair ended, as in the case of the Israeeleite Nazirite, the state of consecration. The vow therefore had always more or less the character of a self-dedication. This aspect was often quite prominent. Ordinary sacred duties such as participation in the *ḥādhīd* were assumed as a consecration by *nadh*r (Sūra xxii. 39) at which special obligations were assumed e.g. to go to the sanctuary on foot, or barefooted (Bukhārī, Ḍjāl *ṣaʿīd, bāb 27); Timūrīd, al-*Nadhîr* wa i-Aimān, bāb 17). The sacred condition of *ṭīkāf* was assumed as a *nadh*r: thus before his conversion Ṭāmār vowed to make a nightly *ṭīkāf* in the Meccan sanctuary (Bukhārī, Muḥāṣṣī, bāb 54; Amāna, bāb 29). Such a vow to separate oneself from everyday life in some special way was very frequent among the ancient Arabs: for Labīd (p. 17, 17) compares an antelope buck alone among the bushes to one fulfilling his vow (baḥī i-ʿ*ūmar*).

This isolation had the definite object of spiritual concentration and strengthening the soul and thereby influencing the deity. Abstinence was therefore practised in consecration for great deeds, especially in war. The Arabs touched no perfume, married no wine and avoided all pleasures when they were seeking vengeance, until they attained it (Hamāsa, p. 447, v. 3 schol.): avoidance of wine (Ḥamāsa, p. 237, v. 4 *qfr.); and women (Nafsī, p. 161: 2nd ed., p. 154) is specially mentioned. These abstentions like the ḥādīd rites and the *ṭīkāf* are also the objects of *nadh*r. The form of this vow is for example *wine and women, and *ṭīkāf* to me until I have slain 100 *ʿAads*" (ʿAqīla, viii, 67; vii., p. 65).

A definite term may be fixed, such as drinking no wine for 30 days in order to obtain vengeance (Kais b. al-Ḥaṭṭān, ed. Kowalski, iv. 28). Forms of abstinence are not to eat meat, not to wash the head, so that the ḍaʿāba is not removed (ʿ. *cit.*., ix. 149; 2nd ed., p. 141; xii. 69; 2nd ed., p. 66; Ibn Ḥishām, p. 543, 980: Ḥāfiẓīn Gncleri, ed. Wellhausen, N. v., 189), not to anoint oneself (Ṭaʿālīd-Wellhausen, p. 201). Refraining from meat, wine, ointment, washing and sexual intercourse are mentioned together (ʿAqīla, vii. 99: 2nd ed., p. 97; viii. 68; 2nd ed., p. 66; Ibn Ḥishām, p. 543: Ṭaʿālīd-Wellhausen, p. 75, 94). There is also evidence of complete fasting (Ṭaʿālīd-Wellhausen, p. 105, 302). The abstentions, the offering and the deed to be done form the content of the *nadh*r. It is said: nafsītum ʿaḥa nafṣātum nafsītum (Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, i. 2572 *ff.*).

A wish has been fulfilled a vow of gratitude may also be taken (Ṭaʿālīd, p. 290).

The consecration placed the person making the vow in connection with the divine powers, the *nadh*r was an ʿ*ad* (Sūra ix. 76; xxxii. 27: xviii. 10), whereby he pledged himself. A neglect of the *nadh*r was a sin against the deity (Ibn al-Kaṣ, p. 51, 10). The sacred obligation of living made this a *nadh*r (or synonymous) *nāḥf*, which one should fulfill (Ṣaʿīd), instead of wandering aimlessly (Sūra xxxii. 25; Ṭaʿālīd, p. 126; Labīd, p. 41, 1; Kumait, Ḥāfīzīn Gncleri, ed. Horovitz, p. 4, 48). The importance of the binding pledge gradually becomes more prominent (cf. Līlān al-ʿʿArab, where nafsīra is explained by ʿaṣīra, ironically Amāna, Ḥāfīzīn Gncleri, p. 7, 8); the emphasis on the material dedication gradually became less. The abstentions mentioned receive their emphasis on the one hand from works meritorious to the deity, on the other from the unpleasant deprivations, by which the person taking the vow disciplines himself. Both points of view are seen in the examples quoted. The releasing of slaves or divorcing of wives often form the subject of a kind of vow by which a man pledges himself under certain conditions. A man may also vow to sacrifice all his camels if he is lying (Hamāsa, p. 667, v. 3). The strict obligation inherent in the *nadh*r makes it closely related to the oath [see ʿKasān].

One can also bind one's family by a vow. A mother swears not to comb her hair or to seek shade until her son or daughter fulfills her wish (ʿAqīla, xviii. 205; 2nd ed., p. 205; Ibn Ḥishām, p. 319; ii. 99). The strength of this kind of "conjunction" is based on the relationship between the two partners. If a dying man vows that his tribe shall pay 50 to avenge him, this binds the tribe (Hamāsa, p. 442 *ff.*). There thus arose in Islam the problem of how far unfilled vows had to be fulfilled by the descendants (Muslim, *Adhur* trad. 1; Bukhārī, Ḥāfiẓīn Gncleri, bāb 19; cf. Goldīhzer, Ḥāfīzīn Gncleri, p. 80).
In Islam the vow and the oath are treated together. In the Kūrān it is prescribed that unconsidered expressions (šahā) in an oath may be broken and expiated (Sūra 2. 225; 9. 58). The context shows that the reference is to vows of abstinence, especially relating to food and women. Sūra ii. 226—227 in continuation says that those who bind themselves by ṭā'ūn not to touch a woman should either break the vow after 4 months or pronounce the formula of divorce. The breach of the oath then requires the kaffāra. The šahā formula is absolutely forbidden (Sūra lviii. 1—5; cf. xxxii. 4); it is a great sin in the eyes of the law, while the ṭā'ūn is not a sin (see Juynboll, Handbuch, p. 284 sqq.; Sachau, Muh. Recht, p. 13, 68 sqq.). The "release from the oath" promised in Sūra lixvi. 2 refers to a vow of continence. The same kaffāra holds for a broken vow as for an oath. It is probable in this case that we have Jewish influence (cf. Mihna, N'dārāmt) but the principle of releasing oneself from a vow by doing something else is certainly also originally Arab. But with Islam comes the view that nādir are useless because they cannot influence God (Bahkhūri, Ainān, bāb 26; Kudrā, bāb 6; Muslim, Nādir, trad. 2). Thus we find ħādīths which urge the fulfillment of vows as well as those that forbid them. Following hints in the ħādīths, we find a systematic division into vows of piety (nādir al-tabarrur), which are intended to acquire merit by a pious deed (fi'āla), and vows by oaths which, since they are conditioned, serve to incite, prevent or strengthen. The latter are called nādir al-luḍād yakārd. They are deprecated but must be treated like oaths. Their matter must not be sinful; according to some, such a vow is invalid, according to others, it is valid but must be broken. Their matter must not already be an individual duty (wāqīya 'a'id). The person taking the vow must, like him taking an oath, be mukallaf and be acting of his own free-will.


AL-NADĪM, ABU 'L-FARAJI MUḤAMMAD b. ABI YA'KūB ISHĀQ AL-WĀRAQĪ AL-NADĪM AL-BAGHDĀDI, Arabic bibliographer, compiled the Fīkhrist in 377 (987—988). Little is known about his life. According to a statement which goes back to Ibn al-Nadīmir (d. 643 = 1245) Dhalīr l-Turīkh Baghdādi (see Flugel's edition, p. xii, note 2), he died in 385, according to another statement (see Ibn Abdal-Askalānī, Liʾān al-Miṣrūn, v. 72) probably 388 (cf. the figure is damaged in the Haizarābād editions). Both dates are in contradiction to the fact that in the Fīkhrist events of 392 (p. 287, 6) and "after 400" (p. 160, 11) are mentioned, unless these are additions by another hand. A clue to the date of his birth is given from his account (p. 237, 6) of a meeting with a learned man in the year 340; this suggests 325 as the latest date for his birth. Nothing is known of his family. There is no reason to connect him with Abu Ḥakīm al-Mawṣūlī al-Nadīm (d. 255—289) or with Yahyā b. al-Nadīm, a pupil of al-Balāḍūrī (d. 279 = 892). His father was a bookseller (wāqarrād) (p. 303, 24, 318, 6, 351, 14). Whether the epithet al-Nadīm "table companion", i.e. member of the circle of a caliph or other great man, refers to the father or to a remoter ancestor is unknown. It is not impossible that it refers to the author of the Fīkhrist himself; against this however is the fact that he is usually quoted as Ibn al-Nadīm. That Baghdād, if not his birthplace, was at least his place of abode is evident from passages, like p. 337, 26, 349, 17 (see below) and the frequent mention of Baghdādīs among his acquaintances (p. 132, 6, 219, 25, 236, 12; 126, 2). He several times mentions a stay in Mōsul (p. 86, 25, 160, 21, 190, 21, 265, 23; cf. also p. 283, 9). We know nothing of other journeys by al-Nadīm (Dīr al-Rūm, p. 349; 56, 41, 12; is the name of the Latin quarter in Baghdād as V. v. Rosen has shown). His teachers and authorities also point to Baghdād. He most frequently quotes the authority of the grammarians al-S̄āfī (d. 368) (all the quotations can be found in the latter's Ablūkār al-Qawqayn al-Baghdādi). Personal relations are indicated by p. 56, 12 and the mention of his sons (p. 31, 23, 45, 11, 62, 23). Al-Nadīm also studied under Ibn al-Munāqaḍī (p. 144, 11). He gives traditions heard from Muḥammad b. Yusuf al-Naḳīt (p. 24, 12, 25, 8). He also gives traditions from Abu ’l-Farajī al-Isbāḥānī (p. 141, 17 = Kūhāb al-Aghānī, i. 5 sq.) and from Abu ’l-Fāțih al-Naḥwī (p. 145, 25) celebrated on account of his parts. He also mentions as his teacher Abu Sulaimān al-Manṣūfī (p. 241, 14) whom we know from Abu Hāfīz’s Muhāqqaqī. He was friendly also with the logician Ibn al-Dīmrāt (p. 244, 6, 245, 12) and with the Christian philosopher Ibn al-Khārīmān (p. 244, 12) and with Yahyā b. ’Adī (p. 264, 6). This circle of friends is very much in keeping with al-Nadīm’s friendly nature, the breadth of his intellectual interests, his intelligent interest in other religions and his tolerance, which finds expression in Maḥbūba’s 5 and 9 of his work. That he was a Shī’a and Mu’tazili did not escape his biographers (cf. Goldziher, in Z. D. M. G. xxxvi. 278 sqq.); thus he uses khalīfa and ūnmī in the sense of Shī’i and Sunni respectively, calls the Sunni traditionists al-Hādūyqīs (p. 234, 12), claims many of their leaders for the Zaidīya (p. 178, 20, 29), says that al-Shāfī’ī was a man of decidedly Shī’i outlook (p. 209, 13) and praises al-Wāṣlī (p. 98, 20) as a Shī’i. Shī’īs were numerous among his pupils (p. 139, 25, 154, 25) and acquaintances (p. 178, 6, 190, 21, 197, 11, 198), Al-Nadīm like his father was a bookseller. This is nowhere expressly stated but is evident from the whole plan of his work in which he faithfully records not only scientific literature but also the numerous dīwāns of contemporary poets and the vast mass of anonymous light literature, love stories, fairy tales and books of adventure, indeed even works of a popular nature neglected alike by scholars and bibliophiles, books on good manners, cookery books, books on poison, books dealing with hunting and sport, down to collections of fables, books on magic and on prophecy, in brief everything that was on the Baghdād book market in the fourth
(teeth) century. That he was a bookseller is also indicated by the frequent particulars about the size of the books dealt with (cf. especially, p. 159, 19), about copies in the hand of famous scholars, about the demand for books (p. 70, 5; 77; 14; 79, 23) and about the book trade (p. 271, 5; 359, 20). He several times mentions other booksellers (p. 264, 2; 299, 4; 355, 12).

The Fihrist exists in two recensions (on the manuscripts, see Z.D.M.G., lxxxiv. 111 sqq. and the literature there given; these may now be added a fragment in Tonk and a private manuscript in Medina). Both were made in the year 777 (987). The longer contains ten maṣāḥfāt, of which the first six deal with the literature of Islam (1. Kurʾān, 2. grammar, 3. history etc., 4. poetry, 5. dogmati, 6. law), while the last four deal with non-Islamic literature (7. philosophy and "ancient sciences", 8. light literature, 9. history of religion, 10. alchemy). The shorter version contains only the four last maṣāḥfāt of the longer one, i.e. the Arabic translations from the Greek, Syriac, Persian and Sanskrit and the other literature based on these models. It is mentioned by Ḥādījī Khālīfa (Stambul, ii. 211) under the title Fāw' al-ʿīrām. The two recensions have in common an introductory section on the various forms of writing. — A survey of the contents of the Fihrist follows the preface (see also Flügel, in Z. D. M. G., xii. 190 sqq.). The arrangement there given is strictly adhered to in the book. The special quality of the book and its value lies in the fact that it gives the Arabic literature of the first four centuries in a bibliographical arrangement while the bibliographical method is the only one used in other contemporary sources. Al-Nadīm, it is true, as rule treats of his subjects in bibliographical sketches but it is the list of works of the author that is the main thing. Sometimes, a branch of literature is treated purely bibliographically under its various branches (e.g. the literature of Kurʾānic exegesis, P. 33; 20-37; 11; also p. 87, 88, 170, 171). This arrangement was necessary with the anonymous literature, especially in the eight maṣāḥfā (p. 305 sqq.). A further step towards treatment from the point of view of the literary historian is found in the brief introductions and surveys (e.g. on the pre-Othmānic recensions of the Kurʾān, p. 26 sqq., on the beginnings of Arabic grammar, p. 30 sqq.). In the last four maṣāḥfāt, such sections (e.g. on the origins of philosophy, of medicine, of alchemy, the beginning of the translated literature, the origin of the "1,000 tales") are so extensive that they have the character of a regular history of literature to a much greater degree than the more bibliographical first six maṣāḥfāt. The ninth maṣāḥfāt occupies a special position; it is a treatise on the history of religion in which the bibliographical element is not at all prominent. — The sources used by al-Nadīm are mainly of a literary nature. He prefers to use works in copies from the hand of reliable copyists. He comparatively rarely quotes personal authority. — Although a younger contemporary of al-Nadīm's, al-Wazīr al-Maghribī (d. 418 = 1027), prepared an improved edition of the work, it seems at first to have had only slight influence. The earliest author to make considerable use of the first maṣāḥfāt (in al-Maghribī's edition) was Ẓākī (d. 626 = 1229) (see Bergsträsser, in Z.S., ii. 185). He claims to have consulted a copy in al-Nadīm's own hand, as does the lexicographer al-Saghānī, d. 659 (1252) (see Khānānī al-Adab, iii. 83 pu). Ibn al-Ḳīfī (d. 624 = 1226) and Ibn Ṭūlūn (d. 668 = 1269) copied much from the Fihrist. In later times it is only occasionally quoted, e.g. by al-Dhahabī (d. 748 = 1347) and Ibn Ḥadjar al-ʿAṣkālānī (d. 852 = 1448) and lastly by Ḥādījī Khālīfa (d. 1067 = 1656) and al-Khāfajī (d. 960 = 1561).— Al-Nadīm also wrote a Kitāb al-ʿawṣāf wa l-Tāṣbīḥāt (Fihrist, p. 12, 4) which has not come down to us.


NADIM, AḤMAD, an Ottoman poet, born in Stambul, the son of a judge named Muḥammad Bey who had come from Merzifun. His grandfather (according to Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 30) was a military judge named Muṣafā. Aḥmad Raḵīf mentions as his great-grandfather ʿAḥmad ibn ʿAḥmad as-Saqī. His grandfather was a poet named Muḥammad Paša [q. v.] and also a military judge. The genealogy given by Aḥmad Raḵīf is however wrong because he confesses Karaman Muḥammad Paša [q. v.] with Rūm Muḥammad Paša. The statement that Aḥmad Nadīm is descended from Djalal al-Din is therefore simply the result of confusion. Little is known of his life. He was a nūderī, later on intimate terms with Aḥmad III and his grand vizier Dāmād Ibrāhīm Paša [q. v.]. He probably got his labāb al-Nadīm from this friendship. Latterly he held the office of librarian in the library founded by his patron Dāmād Ibrāhīm Paša. On hearing of the end of Ibrāhīm Paša and the deposition of the sultan, Nadīm lost his life at the beginning of October 1370 (Rabīʿ I, 1143) in a horrible way; while escaping from the mob leaving the grand vizier's palace he fell from the roof and was killed. He was buried in Ayās Paša in Peres beside the historian Fīdżī Hüllū Muḥammad Agha.

Aḥmad Nadīm is regarded as one of the greatest of Ottoman poets, who is still appreciated for his pure language, free from foreign additions. Many literary historians have discussed his merits as a poet (cf. the specimens collected by Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 30 sqq.). His collected poems (Fīdżī; printed Bülāk, n. d.; a more recent critical edition with introductions by Aḥmad Raḵīf Bey and Muḥammad Fuʾād Bey appeared in 1338—1340 in Stambul; there are manuscripts of the
NADIR SHAH, king of Persia (1447—1666 = 1736—1747).

Origins. Nadir b. Imam-kuli b. Nadir-kuli belonged to the Khiiklu clan of the Turkoman tribe of the Afghans, of which a section had settled in northern Khurasan, and was born on the 28th Muḥarram 1100 (Oct. 22, 1688) at Kūbān. Entering the service of Tahmāsp II, he was called Tahmāsp-kuli Khān but after his coronation his original name was improved to Nadir, "the rare one". At an early date Nadir distinguished himself in the incessant fighting with the Turkomans of Nāṣīr, the Čimšīzāq Kinds of Khābšān (Ḳūzān), the Ozbecks, the Tartars of Marv and even against his Afghan fellow tribesmen. The little nucleus around Nadir consisted of his Afghān relatives, some Kinds of the Abār and Ashwārd, and 300—400 families of Džāyūr Turkomans with their chief Tahmāsp-kuli Wakīl. Fighting in Khūrāsān. During the Afghan invasion of Persia, Mashhad was occupied by Malik Mahmūd, a son of the Sīstān family. Nadir fought against Malik Mahmūd at first on his own initiative. When the Šafawīd Tahmāsp II, driven from his other lands, arrived in Khūrāsān, Nadir very cleverly supplanted the commander-in-chief Fath al-Khān Kāḏjār and on 16th Rabi‘ I (Dec. 22) captured Mashhad with the help of treachery. Henceforth it became his headquarters. There were already signs of a breach between Nadir and Tahmāsp II at this time.

The Shāh urged Nadir to set out against his enemies the Ghilzā’ Afghan but Nadir wished first of all to dispose of the nearer enemy, the Abdāl Afghāns of Herāt, but the campaigns of 1728 (against the Abdāl and the Turkomans) had no success. Nadir however was able to extend the sphere of his activities; he ousted from Astarābād and Māzandārān the governors appointed by Tahmāsp and came into conflict with the Russians and the Ghilzā’ Afghāns. The Abdāl. In the meanwhile trouble had broken out in Herāt between Allāh-yār Khān and Dhu ‘l-Fikār Khān. Nadir re-established Allāh-yār Khān but transplanted many tribes to Khūrāsān (1141 = 1724).

The Ghilzā’i. At this time Arsal Ghilzā’i laid siege to Sīmān while his general Sayyād had gone to Bistam. On the 6th Rabi‘ I (Nov. 27, 1729), Nadir defeated the Afghans on the banks of the river Mihmāndāst. This victory he followed up by others.

Nadir in S.W. Persia. Tahmāsp appealed to Nadir to complete the deliverance of the country. Leaving Shāhīz and crossing Lūrīstān, Nadir arrived in Būrdjānī where the Shāh sent him a crown set with precious stones and a commission (šah-nimā) as wall of all Khūrāsān along with Māzandārān, Yazd, Kirmān and Sīstān (cf. also ‘Alī Ḥāzin, p. 189). Tahmāsp also gave his sister Gwaharshād to Nadir and betrothed his other sister Fāṭima-sultān to Ridž-kuli Mirzā.

The Ottomans who then occupied the whole of western Persia and the greater part of Transcaucasia were reluctant to leave Persia. Nadir occupied Nihawānd, defeated the Turks at Malākūy, retook Hamadān and on the 27th Muḥarram 1143 (Aug. 13, 1730) Tabriz was retaken.

Nadir returns to the east. Nadir learned in Tabriz that Dhu ‘l-Fikār Abulī had driving Allāh-yār Khān from Herāt was fighting Nadir's brother Ibrahim Khān under the walls of Maḥbūb. Nadir at once set out for Khūrāsān, crossing the border of the Yomut Turkomans and towards the end of Rabi‘ II (Nov. 1730) was at Maḥbūb where he reviewed 50,000 families of the tribes transplanted from other provinces.

On the 4th Shawwāl (Apr. 12, 1731) Nadir was 3 farsakhā from Herāt. In the month of August the Abdāl restored Nadir's candidate Allāh-yār Khān but the latter regaining contact with his tribe now rebelled. It was not till Ramādān 1, 1144 (Feb. 27, 1732) that Herāt was taken.

Failure of Tahmāsp II. Taking advantage of the absence of his commander-in-chief, the Shāh resumed the initiative in the military operations and in Dżumādā 1145 (end of Dec. 1730) set out against Herāt on 17th Dżumādā I where the return of Nadir the Ottomans on Jan. 10, 1732 signed a preliminary treaty at Baghādād by which the Persians retained only the lands south of the Araxes. Later on Jan. 21—Feb. 1, 1732 the Shāh's representatives signed at Rasht a treaty with the Russians by which the latter bound themselves to evacuate the lands south of Sālīyān (on the Kur) while the return of İskāh and Darband was made dependent on the reconquest of Transcaucasia by the Persians.

Deposition of Tahmāsp II. Nadir was indignant at the peace with the Turks signed after a defeat. Setting aside the Shāh's authority, Nadir Shāh denounced the treaty and appointed his own governors everywhere. Tahmāsp was deported to Khūrāsān and his son 'Abbas III, an infant in the cradle, proclaimed king on the 17th Rabi‘ I 1145 (July 7, 1732).

First campaign against the Ottomans. Having punished the Bahkhitārīs and the Kurs, Nadir occupied Zohab and besieged Baghādād (Jan. 1733). Abūnā Pāsha made the negotiations drag on until the army commanded by Topal Ožmān Pāsha had time to come to Mesopotamia. On 6th Safar 1146 (July 19, 1733) Nadir Shāh lost the battle fought on the Tigris and returned to Hamadān via Bahrāz and Mandalīn (Mandālīn).

Arriving there on 22nd Safar (Aug. 4) Nadir set out again for Zohab on the 22nd Rabi‘ II (Oct. 2) and then attacked Memiš Pāsha who had occupied the pass of Aghdarbānd (1st Dżumādā II = Nov. 9, 1733). Then Topal Ožmān Pāsha with the bulk of his army intervened in the battle but lost it and had his head cut off. The Ottomans hastened to abandon Aghdarbānd. By the 15th Radjab (Dec. 22) Nadir was already on his way.
to Persia via Baghsay (Ba-kusaye), Bayat, Bayan and Shushiar.

Mahmud Baluc. The reason of this hurried move was the rebellion raised by Mahmud Khan Balu in S.W. Persia. Mahmud Khan was quickly driven from the pass of Shust-an and on 27th Shaban (Feb. 1, 1734) Nadir recaptured Shiraz.

Campaign in Transcaucasia. In Isfahan Nadir received the Turkish ambassador Abd al-Karim Efendi and informed him that the retrocession of Transcaucasia was a sine qua non of peace. On the other hand, prince S. D. Golitsine was received at Isfahan on May 20-31, 1734 and thereafter by Nadir's order accompanied him everywhere (his itinerary in Leich-Schnese). On the 12th Muharram 1147 (June 17, 1734) Nadir left Isfahan for Aghtaban and as the Turks did not reply, Nadir began by attacking the Daghestanian chief (Ghaz-t-Kumuk). Surkhay was the post which had appointed governor of Shirwan. Tahmasp Kuli Djalavir defeated the Daghestanians near Duzai-ban (in the district of Kabala) while Nadir cut off the retreat penetrated into the heart of the extremely difficult region of Ghazt-Kumuk. In spite of the exploits of the Abdali the success gained in Daghestan was only partial for Surkhay had escaped to the north.

On 6th Lijumaid II (Nov. 3, 1734) Nadir was before the walls of Gandja, which was defended by Ali Tasha. The siege necessitated considerable works and prince Golitsine procured Russian engineers for Nadir. On March 21, 1735 a treaty was signed at Gandja by which Russia and Persia became practically allies.

On 1st Muharram 1148 (May 26, 1735) Nadir went first to Kars but the encounter with Abd Allah Pasha Kopruluzade took place near Erivan on the plain of Baghaward; on 26th Muharram 1148 (June 17, 1735) the Ottomans were defeated. Gandja thereby upon capitulated on the 17th Safar (July 8) and Tiflis on 22nd Rabii I (Aug. 12).

Nadir returns to Daghestan. Via Tiflis [q.v.], from which 6,000 families were transferred to Khorassan, Nadir attacked the Lergi of Dapor and Tala (north of the Alazan) The Khan of the Crimea Kaplan Giray, who had in the meantime advanced as far as Darband and had placed his nominees everywhere, withdrew to the Crimea and Nadir endeavoured to pacify Daghestan but Surkhay still evaded capture.

Nadir proclaimed king. On 13th Ramaadan (Jan. 27, 1736) Nadir came to Mughan [q.v.] where in the meanwhile the governors and notables of the province had assembled. It was explained to them that Nadir, having liberated Persia, wished to retire to Khorassan and that the delegates were free to put the government in the hands of Tahmasp II or Abbass III "who were alive". Nadir finally accepted the crown but on condition that the Persians abandoned the Shia practices introduced by Isma'ili which were "contrary to the beliefs of Nadir's ancestors". The Persians were to form a fifth orthodox madshub, placed under the patronage of the Imam Djafar Sadiq. A document to this effect was sealed by the assembly. The five clauses of the treaty to be proposed to Turkey were next drawn up: 1. the Turks were to recognise the new Djafari rite; 2. the latter was to be given a place of prayer (naksh) at Mecca; 3. Persia was to send an amir al-hajj every year through Syria; 4. prisoners should be exchanged and 5. ambassadors were to be exchanged after mutual approval of the appointments. The formal coronation of Nadir took place on Thursday, 24th Shawwal 1148.

Kandahar. This principality in which Husain Khan, brother of Mahmud, still asserted himself remained the only black spot on the horizon. Leaving Isfahan on 2nd Shawwal (Feb. 3, 1737), Nadir was before Kandahar before Nawruz 1149 (March 1737) and had a new town built on the site of his camp (Surkha-Shir) which was called Nadirabad.

Kandahar capitulated on the 2nd Dhu-l-Ka'da 1150 (March 23, 1738). The citadel was dismantled. Expedition into India. So far Nadir's military expeditions had been dictated by a desire to reestablish the old frontiers of the Safawid empire. The expedition to India was provoked solely by the attraction of ill-guarded provinces and by the desire to replenish the treasury exhausted by repeated campaigns. Djazir was occupied on the 22nd Safar 1151 (June 11, 1738), Kaul on 12th Rabii' I (June 30), Djalalabad on 8th Djuumada II (Sept. 17). From the neighbourhood of the latter town, the prince Rida-Kuli was sent back to Persia to act as regent; he and his brother Nasir Allah were given crowns.

Going via Saratoba Nadir avoided the Khairan Pass and took prisoner Nasir-Khan, governor of Peshawar. On 15th Ramaadan (Dec. 27) Nadir left this town. He next took Lahore and reappointed the local governor Zakhariya Khan (a Khorasanian). (Nasir-Khan also was restored to his post). Leaving Lahore on 26th Shawwal (Feb. 6, 1739) Nadir learned that Muhammad Shah had reached Kandahar and was in a place between the jungle and the river. He succeeded in cutting Muhammad Shah off from his capital and hastened to attack the reinforcements which Sa'adat-Khan (a Khorasanian) was bringing from the province of Oush. Thus began the decisive battle of 15th Dhu-l-Ka'da 1151 (Feb. 24, 1739) in which the commander-in-chief Khan Davran was mortally wounded and Sa'adat-Khan captured. Nadir and Muhammad Shah entered the capital where Nadir's name was inserted in the Khutba and coins struck in his name. On the 15th Dhu-l-Hijja (March 26, 1739) a rumour spread that Nadir had been assassinated and the populace massacred 3,000-7,000 of his soldiers. Next morning Nadir went to the mosque and gave the signal for the massacre of the inhabitants. On 26th Dhu-l-Hijja (April 6) Nasir Allah Mirza was married to a Mughal princess. On 3rd Safar 1152 (May 12, 1739) a great council was held in Delhi in the course of which Nadir replaced the crown on the head of Muhammad Shah but the latter had in return to cede to Nadir all the provinces north of the Indus. The amount levied by Nadir cannot be estimated. According to Anandram, who was attached to the vizier's office, it amounted to 6,000,000 rupees in specie and 500,000,000 in jewels and precious stones, including the Khoi Nuri diamond and the Peacock throne. Large sums were distributed among the soldiers and the people of Persia exempted from taxation for three years. Nadir left Delhi and reached Kabul on 1st Ramaadan (Dec. 12). Now took place one of the most remarkable of his expeditions. He suddenly turned back to reduce the land of Sind Khuday-yr Khan 'Abbas (a native of Siwi, cf. Malcolm, op. cit., ii. 59) and going via Bangash, Larkana and Shahdadpur penetrated into the desert south of
the Indus and took Khudâ-yâr prisoner; he had shut himself up in Umârâkot (north of Thar and Pûnak in the province of Bombay). Having organised his Indian possessions in three provinces Nadir returned to Nadîr-alâd (via Swî and Shâh) on 7th Safar (May 5, 1740).

Nâdîr in Turkestan. Nadir returned to Herât on 10th Râbi'i I (June 5) and after a fortnight devoted to festivities set out for Bâlkh which he reached on 7th Djamâda I (July 31). Arriving before Bûkhâra on 10th Djamâda II (Sept. 22), Nadir treated Khan Abu l-Fâlid kindly and renewed his investiture by crowning him with his own hands. The Oxus was proclaimed the frontier and the Khan had to supply Nadir with 20,000 Oxâbegs and Turkmans, which indirectly left in the hands of the conqueror the control of the internal affairs of Bûkhârâ.

On the 16th Radjab (Oct. 7), Nadir had set out for Khwârizm. The fleet followed the army. The Khan Il-fars of Hazârasp retired to his fortress of Khanakh which surrendered on 24th Shabîn after bombardment. Finally Khâwa, the capital of the kingdom, also capitulated. By 4th Shawwâl (Dec. 23) Nadir had returned to Cârdjâb and entered Masghâd at the end of Shawwâl.

Nâdîr sets out again for Transcaucasia. While in India, Nadir had learned of the death of his brother Ishrâhîm Khân who had been killed by the Lâzg rebels of Dîrâ and Tala. To punish them, Nadir left Masghâd and on his way learned that the Abdâl troops who had been sent in advance had already ravaged Dîrâ, Djawâkh (?) and Aqûtîr, but the pacification of Daghestan was by no means complete.

An incident that followed marks the turning-point in the career of Nâdîr Shâh. On the 28th Safar (May 15, 1741) near Kâfâ-yâi Awlâdâ (Mazâmandârân) an unknown man concealed in the brushwood was shot at Nadir, wounding him slightly. Connecting this with events in Daghestan Mahdî Khân says that the crime was committed by a slave of the son of Dîlâwar Khân Tâfânî [?] but suspicion very soon turned upon the prince Rîshâ-Kuli who had besides not behaved well during his regency. He was sent for the time to Tîhrân while Nadir continued his march via Kazâmîn, Karâdjaâshâb, Îbâda and Khalaâ.

In June 1741, for the third time, Nadir entered Daghestan and remained there a year and a half. The shâmâl of Târbâh, the sâmî of the Karâ-Khatân and Surkhâbâi Khân of the Ghâzi Kûmân came over to Nadir but new difficulties kept cropping up. Relations with Russia became somewhat strained for the Russian representatives suspected Nadir of designs on the northern Caucasus. As a precaution the Russians in May 1742 concentrated 42,000 men at Kizlar (S. Butbow, i. 220). Cares were undermining the health and character of Nadir. At the beginning of Dec. 1742 when the camp was at Baslû the heir to the throne Rîshâ-Kuli, denounced by the author of the attempt on Nadir in Mazâmandârân, was blinded after a form of trial. Nadir himself was thoroughly upset by this incident. Rebellion was now threatening everywhere (in Khwârizm and in Bâlkh).

Third campaign against the Turks. In Dhu 'l-Kåfî I 1742, the Turkish ambassador brought from Constantinople a letter from the Sulîmân refusing to recognise the fifth maddâkh. Nadir then reminded the Sulîmân that the whole of Persian territory had not been regained from Turkey and added that he would soon take the field to make his own terms.

Nadir left Daghîstân on the 16th Dhu 'l-Hijdja (Feb. 7, 1742) and came to Kûrkûk (14th Djamâda II = Aug. 5, 1742) which capitulated as did Irijlî. On the 26th Radjab (Oct. 5) Nadir arrived near Mawjûl but the siege of this fortress was unsuccessful and on 2nd Ramaḍân (Oct. 20) he retreated to Kûrkûk and Khânaqân. Friendly relations were established with Ahmad Pâsha of Bûkhârâ. Nadir with his wives made the pilgrimage to the Shîh and Sunni sanctuaries of Mesopotamia and on the 24th Shawwâl 1156 (Dec. 12, 1743) summoned a great assembly of ecclesiastics at Nadjîf. The document drawn up by Mahdî Khân summing up the discussions confirmed the renunciation by the Persians of the heresy of Shâh Ismâîl, while the "ulama" of Mesopotamia and Transcaucasia recognised the claims of Dja'far al-Šâdîq and declared the special features (furû'âr) of the Persian beliefs compatible with Islam. The Sunni theologian 'Abd Allâh b. Husain al-Suwardi, Kâtib al-Imadîdî, al-Šâfîya li'ittifâq al-Firâq al-Islâmîya, Cairo 1324, also gives a very interesting summary of this dispute; cf. Ritter, Islam, xv., 1926, i. 106 and the detailed account by Prof. A. E. Schmidt, Is'târî sanâtîk-e-shîhtebâk otnošeniyî in the 'Irâd al-Djumân (Barthold Festschrift, Taškent 1927, p. 69-107).

Rebellions. The strange abandonment of the campaign in Mesopotamia is to be explained by the new risings in the east. Much more exciting was the rising in Fîrs led by the beglerbegi Taşî Khân, a great favourite of Nadir. He was ultimately captured and castrated. In Astarabâd the Kâdrîrs rose against the oppression of the governor's son (Janway, Hist. Account, i. 192). Nadir had to send his nephew 'Ali Kuli to Khwârizm. Finally the Ottomans of Kars disseminated in A ráhbadîjân from the new pretender Šâfî Mirzâ (Muhammad 'Ali Râfsîndânî) and then refused to begin an exchange of prisoners.

Fourth Campaign against the Turks. In the meanwhile the Pûnti equipped a new army (150,000 horse and 40,000 janissaries) which advanced on Erzerum and Kars under the command of the former vizier Yegan Muhammad Pâsha while 'Abd Allâh Pâsha Pasha at the time was in Dîyârbâkîr and Mawjûl. On the 21st Radjab (Aug. 20) came the news of the victory won by Nasr Allâh Mirzâ of 'Abd Allâh Pâsha's army (near Mawjûl) and at the same time Yegan Muhammad Pâsha died leaving his army in complete disorder. Nadir again won a brilliant victory (on the very scene of his first victory in 1735) but then, quite unexpectedly, wrote to the Sulîmân saying he was abandoning the first two clauses of Mughân. Personal fatigue may explain why Nadir could not exploit his success.

On Sept. 4, 1746, peace was signed with the Turkish envoys and on 10th Muhaarrâm 1160 (Jan. 22, 1747) the Shâh's representatives (Moûtâfâ Khân Shâmlû and the historian Mahdî Khân) set out for Constantinople with the shûl-nâmâ. Nadir denounced his famous religious clauses in favour of the Sulîmân, "the Khalîfa of the people of Islam and the glory of the Turkmân race". By the treaty the frontier was restored to 1724 of the time of Murad IV [cf. Târîkî] but in a platonist fashion, Nadir expressed the wish to receive one
of the provinces which had belonged to the
"Turkoman Sultanate". On the 10th Muḥarram, Nādir left for Kirmān marking his route by piles of skulls erected everywhere. After the Nawrūz, Nādir returned to Mashhad and devoted himself to "spilling the blood of the innocents". His conduct was now clearly abnormal. In an epilogue to his history written after the death of Nādir, Mahdi Khān records the denunciations, executions, and extortions carried out by the agents of the treasury and the ruin of the country, which had however begun before the Indian expedition (Ottor, Residentes rustic, Hanway, i. 230). The Shiʿī opposition must also have been intensified in view of the frankly Sunni turn which Nādir's "Khurāsānī" policy had taken. The rising in Sīstān, which brought matters to a head, was provoked by the activities of the tax collectors who were demanding a contribution of 300,000 tumans from the province. ʿAlī Kuli Mīrzā, nephew of Nādir, put himself at the head of the rebels. Even Tabāmasp Kuli Khān Djalāyar, the most faithful propos of the throne, wanted to proclaim one of Nādir's sons as king. The troubles spread to Khurāsān and the Kurds of Khabūshān raided the royal stables at Rādkān. Nādir marched on them but on the eve of 11th Djumdād II 1160 (June 20, 1147) he was assassinated in his camp near Fathābād by the Kāḏār and Afsārī chiefs in conspiracy with the bodyguard. Father Bazīn was a witness of the disorder which broke out in the camp after the assassination. On the 27th Djumdād II (July 5, 1152) ʿAlī Kuli Mīrzā came from Herāt and was proclaimed king. All the royal princes were massacred.

The treasure amassed by Nādir was soon scattered to the winds, the country, utterly exhausted, was in the throes of crisis. Nādir's attempts to compose religious difficulties had failed completely, but Persian territory and its periphery were cleared of enemies. But for Nādir Shāh, Persia would probably not exist, even in its present bounds.
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Indian sources: Elliot-Dowson, The History of India, 1877, viii., W. Irvine, Later Mughals (1719–1739), 1922, cf. also the letter from Nādir announcing his victory in India, Br. Mus., Egerton 1004, fol. 115–125; Nūmān al-Dīn Sīyālḵūṭī, Sāḥīb-nāma-yī Nādirī (a poem on the invasion of India, written in 1162), Br. Mus., Add. 26295 (fol. 1–130); letter from Père Saïgnes (c. i); Tamburi Artin (c. i); king Irakli (c. i).


Georgian and Caucasian sources: Essai sur les troubles actuels de Perse et de Géorgie, 1754, p. 88 and passim; Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, tii., p. 120–136 (Nādir's coming to Ṭīfš); id., p. 354–370; Boris Pataradze, Sraniyey Kavabts, arkhīvsk. kvesita., i., Tiflis 1866, p. 73–74; three firmāns of Nādir: Butkow, Materialla dita novej istorii Kavabts (1722–1803), St. Petersburg 1869, cf. detailed index; Kozubski, Bibliografia Dzhekhatarni, appended to the Annaire du Daghestan de 1905.

Russian sources: W. Bratisılı, Izvestiya
Contemporary European sources (the works which have not been accessible to me are marked *): Voyages de Bastide l'atique en Europe et en Asie (rhymed narrative in modern Greek ed. and transl. by Legrand) in Nouveaux mélanges orientaux, École des Langues Orientales, Paris 1886, p. 185—295. Vatce also wrote *Una storia di Shah Nâdir of which there is a synopsis in [Διάγραμμα Τουρκικής] Istoriià tis Roussias, 8°, Leipzig 1816, as an appendix to vol. ii, p. 3—22 (of no importance); Vouton, Verdadera e exacta Noticia de Thamans Kouli Khan the Empe ño de Gram Mogor, escrita na lingua Persiana en Delby en 21 IV. 1739 and mandado a Roma por Mons. Vouton, Lisbon 1740, transl. into English by L. Lackhorst, in Bull. of the School of Oriental Studies, iv., 1926, p. 225—245; "Le Margne, Vida de Thamans Kouli-Kan, Madrid 1741 (probably a translation); J. Spilman, A journey through Persia into Persia . . . . in 1739, is which is annexed a summary account [p. 51—60] of the rise of the famous Kouli Khan, L. 1742; *Anonymous, The compleat History of Thamus Kouli Khan, I (Persian Empire), II (Indostan), 1742; J. Fraser, The History of Nadir Shah, London 1742; [Le P. du Cerceau], Histoire de Thamos Kouli kan Sapgh de Perse, Amsterdam (Arksteé and Merkus) 1740, 2 vol.; [Barbier, Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymer], 1873, ii. 736, attributes this work to the Jesuit du Cerceau, author of the Histoire de la dernière révolution de Perse, Paris 1728, based on the narrative of Krusiński); *Anonymous, A genuine history of Nadir Cha. . . . with a particular account of his conquest of the Mogul's country, translated from the original Persian MS into Dutch by order of J. a. Scheltema, president of the Dutch factory at Batavia, and now done into English (this comes down to 1739) and differs from the preceding work); [A. de Claustrer, Histoire de Thamos Kouli kan, nouveau roi de Perse, on histoire de la dernière révolution de Perse arrivée en 1732, Paris 1742, republ. in 1758 (this compilation by the Lyons priest of Claustrer is quite different from the work of du Cerceau, cf. Barbier, o. l., ii. 736). The accounts of the Jesuit fathers are collected in vol. iv. of the Lettres édifiantes écrites des Missions Etrangères, new ed., Paris 1780 (the arrangement of this edition is different from that of the original edition): Relation historique des révolutions de Perse sous Thamus Kouli-kan, jusqu'à son exécution dans l'Inde, tirée de différentes lettres écrites de Perse par des Missionnaires jésuites, P. 169—330 (= 1st ed., vol. 25, p. 311); lettre du P. Sainieux (Chandernagor), Feb. 17, 1740, on the invasion by Nadir, P. 230—265 (= 1st ed., vol. 25, p. 402); Frère Bazin, Mémoires sur les dernières années du règne de Thamos Kouli Kan, p. 277—322 (= 1st ed., vol. 9, p. 14); do., Les révolutions qui suivirent la mort de Thamos Kouli-Kan, p. 322—353 (= 1st ed., vol. 9, p. 83); [Anonymous, Histoire de Thamos Kouli-Kan, roi de Perse, new ed. with supplement, Milan 1747 (reissue of Claustrer's work ?); Otter, Voyage en Turquie et en Perse (1734—1739), Paris 1748; La Mame-Clairac, Histoire de Persie depuis le commencement de ce siècle, 3 vol., Paris 1750; J. Hanway, A historical account of the British trade on the Caspian sea, 1753, s. index; do., The revolutions of Persia, London 1753, ii., p. 103, containing the history of the celebrated usurper Nadir Kouli from his birth in 1669 till his death in 1747; L. de Santa Cecilia, carimentano scalzo, Palatina, Persia, Mesopotamia, Rome 1753, ii, 152, 157, 161—162, 217; iii. 39; Col. Osgood, Abrégé historique des souverains de l'Indostan, 1772 (MS. of the Bibl. Nat., Fr. 24219).


General Kishmchev, Pokhodî Nadir Shaha v Herat, Kandahar, Indijski voytîja v Persii posle yego smerti, Tiflis 1889 (Nadir's campaigns from the soldier's point of view; cf. Zap., vi., 1892, p. 351); Sir Mortimer Durand, Nadir Shah, London 1908 (a novel, with several contemporary illustrations); do., Nadir Shah, in J. R. A. S., 1908, i. 286—298 (general sketch); Sa'di Nasiri, Ahbîrin yâdûgirî Nadîr-shah, Thiran, Madjalla-ji Sharâr, 1300, 31 pages (story in dramatic form). The career of Nadir Shah impressed the imaginations of the peoples whom he conquered. In addition to Indian and Persian panegyrics there is a poem in the Gurani dialect (spoken in Kürdîstan): on Nadir Shah and Topal 'Otbman Papsâ and a Daghastânian song collected in the district of Gbunîb: on the highlander's fight against Nadir (cf. Daghastanskiy sbornik, Makhat-Kea, 1927, iii. p. 51—53). In Europe of the xviii century it was seriously discussed whether Nadir Shah was an European adventurer: there are also several contemporary works in French, German and Portuguese, the subjects of which are the deeds real or imaginary of Nadir Shah like L'épopée de Thamos Kouli kan dans les cours de l'Europe by the Abbé Rochebrun, Cologne 1746 etc.

(V. Minorovsky)

Nadir (Nâzîr al-Sânt or Al-Nâzîr, Nûr al-Dîn) the bottom, the pole of the horizon (invisible) under the observer in the direction of the vertical, also the deepest (lowest) point in the sphere of heaven. The nadir is the opposite pole the zenith [w. v.].

The word nâzîr (from napat, "to see", "to observe") originally (and generally) means the
point diametrically opposite a point on the circumference of a circle or the surface of a sphere; we find 
muḥādaš as a synonym of nāziʿ in this general meaning [cf. also muqābala].

(Willy Harner)

NADIR (BAH. 'N), one of the two main Jewish tribes of Madina, settled in Vathib from Palestine at an unknown date, as a consequence of Roman pressure after the Jewish war. Al-Ya'kubi (ii. 49) says they were a section of the Qijihatim Arabs, converted to Judaism and first settled on Mount al-Nadǐr, whence their name; according to the Sīra (Jahayya (Cairo, iii. 2) they were a purely Jewish tribe, connected with the Jews of Khaibar. This seems the more probable, but a certain admixture of Arab blood is possible; like the other Jews of Madina they bore Arabic names, but kept aloof from the Arabs, spoke a peculiar dialect, and had enriched themselves with agriculture, money-lending, business in armour and jewels.

They were clients of the Aws, siding with them in their conflicts with the Khazzarides, and entering with them into the compact with Muḥammad known as the Constitution of Madina in 1 A. H. Their most important chief at this time was Ḫayayib b. Akhtab, whose daughter Safiya became Muhammad's wife in 7 A. H. For a list of Muhammad's worst enemies among the Banu Ḧanūfa see Ibn Ḥishām, Sīra, p. 351–352.

Their fortunes were half a day's march from Madina, and they owned land in Wādi Ḩārūn and Buwaira; their dwelling places were south of the city.

The Banu Nādir seem to have been in (commercial?) relations with ʿAbī Sufyān in before the battle of Uhud. In 4 A. H., in Rabi' I, owing to difficulties about the Banu Nādir's contribution to certain blood-money which was being collected from the whole Muslim community in Madina, Muḥammad, who had personally negotiated the matter with their chiefs, became convinced of their enmity towards himself and suspected them of intending to kill him. He decided to get rid of such dangerous neighbours, and ordered them through Muḥammad b. Maslama al-Awsī to leave the city within ten days, under penalty of death, allowing them to take with them all their movable goods, and to return each year to gather the produce of their palm-groves.

The tribe, having no hope of help from the Aws, agreed to leave, but ʿAbī ʿAlā b. Ḫayyāb al-Khazzarī, chief of the maʿnaṭiṣān, persuaded them to resist in their forresses, promising to send 2,000 men to their aid. Ḫayayib b. Akhtab, hoping the Banu Kairāja would also help them, prepared to resist, in the face of opposition from moderate elements in the tribe.

The siege lasted about a fortnight, help from the maʿnaṭiṣān was not forthcoming, and when the Muslims began to cut down their palms the Banu Nādir surrendered. Muḥammad's conditions were much harder than formerly; their immovable property was forfeited, and nothing left them but what they could take away on camels, arms alone excepted. After two days' bargaining the tribe departed with a caravan of 600 camels; some went to Syria, others to Khaibar.

The Banu Nādir's booty Muḥammad did not divide in the usual manner; the land was distributed among the muḥādašīn, so as to relieve the Anjūr of their maintenance: part of it the Prophet kept for himself.

Surʾāt al-Nādir (lxix.) was revealed upon the expulsion of the Banu l-Nādir.

From Khaibar the exiles planned with the Kurāsh the siege of Madina in Ḩud b. Ḧaḍżaḍ 5 A. H. The treasure of the Banu l-Nādir was captured by Muḥammad in Khaibar in 7 A. H.


AL-NADJAF (Masaghad 'Ali), a town and place of pilgrimage in the Irāk 6 miles west of al-Kūfā. It lies on the edge of the desert on a flat barren eminence from which the name al-Nadjaš has been transferred to it (A. Musil, The Middle Ephrathes, p. 33).

According to the usual tradition, the Imām al-Muʿminin ʿAlī b. Abī Tālib [v. q. v.] was buried near Kūfā, not far from the dam which protected the city from flooding by the Ephrathes at the place where the town of al-Nadjaš later arose (Ṭuḥaym, Muṣḥam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 760), also called Nadjaš al-Kūfā (Zamakhshāri, Lexicon geographical, ed. Salvador de Graue, p. 153). Under Umayyad rule the site of the grave near al-Kūfā had to be concealed. As a result it was later sought in different places, by many in al-Kūfā itself in a corner above the hāda of the mosque, by others again 2 farsaks from al-Kūfā (al-İṣchākhūrī, ed. de Goeje, B. G. A., i. 82 q.; Ibn Hawkal, ii., ii. 163). According to a third story, ʿAlī was buried in Madina near Fatima's grave (al-Muṣfi, Muṣḥam al-Dīkhab, ed. Barbier de Meynard, vii. 289), according to a fourth, at Kafr al-Imāma (Caetani, Annuale dell' Islam, x., 1926, p. 967 q.; A. H. 40, § 99). Perhaps then the sanctuary of al-Nadjaš is not the real burial-place but a tomb held in reverence in the pre-Islamic period. especially as the graves of Adam and Noah were also shown there (Ibn Batṭūta, Tāhja, ed. Defremy and Sangwintini, i. 416; G. Jacob in A. Noldeke, Das Heiligum al-Husayn zu Kerbelā, Berlin 1909, pp. 38, note 1). It was not till the time of the Ḥamālid of al-Mawṣil Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Mawṣilī [see also ALLĀH B. ḤAMDĀN] that a large ʿabba was built by him over ʿAlī's grave, adorned with precious carpets and curtains and a āda built there (Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 163). The ŠīṢi Bāyah ʿAdud al-Dawla [v. q. v.] in 369 (979–980) built a mausoleum, which was still in existence in the time of Ḥamād Allāh Mustawfā, and was buried there, as were his sons Sharaf and Bahāʾ al-Dawla. Al-Nadjaš was already a small town with a circumference of 2,500 paces (Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, viii. 518; Ḥamād Allāh Mustawfā, Nizāt al-Kulīb, ed. Le Strange, p. 32: in the year 366 = 976–977). Hasan b. al-Faḍl, who died about 414 (1023–24) built the defensive walls of Māṣḥiḥ 'Ali (Ibn al-Athīr, ix. 154). The Māṣḥiḥ was burned in 443 (1051–52) by the Buyūṭid populace of Baghdad but must have been soon rebuilt. The Sālīḥ sūlān Malīkhāsh and his vizier Nizām al-Mulk who were in Baghdad in 479 (1086–87) visited the sanctuaries of 'Ali and Husain (Ibn al-Athīr, x. 103). The Ḥākān Ghāzān (1295–1304),
according to Hamd Allah Mustawfi, built in al-
Nadjaf a Dār al-Siyādā and a dervish monastery
(khanqāh). The Mongol governor of Baghdad in
1263 led a canal from the Euphrates to al-Nadjaf
but it soon became silted up and was only cleared
out again in 1508 by order of Shāh Ismā'īl. This
canal was originally called Nahr al-Shāh (now
al-ı-šah) (Luqhat al-Arab, Baghdad, ii., 1930—
1931, p. 458). This Shī‘a Safawid himself made a
pilgrimage to the masjīd of Kerbela and al-
Nadjaf. Sulaimān the Magnificent visited the holy
places in 941 (1534—1535). A new canal made in
1793 also soon became silted up, as did the
Zer al-Shāhī and al-Ijāīriya canals, the latter of
which was made by order of ʻAbd al-Ḥamīd II.
In 1912 iron pipes were laid to bring water from
the Euphrates to al-Nadjaf (Luqhat al-Arab, ii.,
458 sq., 491). A considerable part of the ʻIrāq
with Baghdad, al-Nadjaf and Kerbela was tem-
porarily conquered by the Persians in 1627.
According to the Arab geographers, al-Hira lay
on the eminence of al-Nadjaf (al-Ya‘kūbī, Kīāb
Massignon thinks (M. I. F. A. O., xxviii., 28, note 1)
that al-Hira lay on the site of the present al-
Nadjaf, while Musil (The Middle Euphrates, p. 35,
note 26) places the centre of the ruins of al-Hira
S. E. of the tell of al-Kāñārde which lies
halfway between al-Kīfā and al-Khawarınāk. Ibn
Baṭṭūṭa entered Maṣḥād ʻAli which he visited in
726 (1326) through the Bāb al-Ḥaḍra gate which
led straight to the Maṣḥād. He describes the town
and sanctuary very fully. According to al-Ya‘kūbī
(loc. cit.), the ridge on which al-Nadjaf stands once
formed the shore of the sea which in ancient
times came up to those parts of the number of its
inhabitants and its architectural beauty, Ibn Baṭṭū
ta reckoned the town among the most important
in the ʻIrāq. It has now about 20,000 inhabitants
(Persians and Arabs), has a Shī‘a college and
celebrated cemetery in the Wātāl al-Salām. Near
al-Nadjaf were the monasteries of Dair Mār Fāthīyūn
(Yaḵūt, Muǧjam, ii., 693) and Dair Hind al-Kubrā
(Yaḵūt, ii., 709), also al-Ruḥba (5 hours S. W. of
the town; Yaḵūt, ii., 762; Musil, The Middle Euphrates,
in. 110, note 61) and Kašr Abī ʻl-Khasīb
(Yaḵūt, iv., 107). The lake of al-Nadjaf marked
on many older maps has long since completely
dried up (Nolde, Reise nach Inarerabien, p. 105).

Bibliography: Ibn al-Aṯīr, Kālibāt, ed. Tornberg,
index, vol. ii., p. 808 (Maṣḥād ʻAli), 817 (al-Nadjaf); al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, Indices, p. 284;
Abu l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, Kitāb al-Aṣḥāh, Bulāk 1320,
ii., 116—117, 138, 121, viii., 161, ix., 117; xi., 121;
xxi., 125—127, 135—137, 150—152, 154, 157, 159;
al-Maķdisī, B. G. A., ii., 130; Ibn al-Fakhrī, B. G. A.,
v., 163, 177, 187; Ibn Rusta, B. G. A.,
Yaḵūt, Muǧjam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv., 760; al-Bakrī, Muǧjam, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 164,
202, 352, 354, 356, 473; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Travels, ed.
Defrémery—Sanguinetti, i., 414—416; ʻAbd al Mālik Mustawfi al-Kawzānī,
Nīṣat al-Kuštā, ed. Longstreth, p. 9, 11,
165 sq., 207; Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung nach
Arabien und umliegenden Ländern, Copenhagen, 1778,
ii., 254—264 (inscription: 263); J. B. L. J.
Rousseau, Description du pachalk of Bagdad,
Paris 1809, p. 75—77; Nolde, Reise nach Inarerabien,
Brünschweig 1895, p. 103—111; M. v. Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmehr zum Persischen
Golf, Berlin 1909, ii., 137, 274, 281; G. Le
Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate,
Cambridge 1905 (repr. 1930), p. 76—78; A.
Noldeke, Das Heiligtum al-Husayn zu Kerbela,
Berlin 1909 (Türe. Bibl., ii.), passim; H.
Grothe, Geographische Charakterbilder aus der
asiatischen Türkî, Leipzig 1609, p. xiii
and table lxxxv.,—lxxxix. with illustr. 132—134, 137;
L. Massignon, Mission en Mésopotamie (1907—
1908), Cairo 1910, i., 50—51; ii., 88, note 1,
114, 138, note 3 (= M. I. F. A. O., xxviii.,
xxxi., G. L. Bell, Amurath zu Amorath, London
1711, p. 160, 162; St. H. Longrigg, Four Centuries
of Modern Iraq, Oxford 1925, index, p. 372
(Najf); A. Mussil, The Middle Euphrates,
New York 1927, p. 35, note 26 (= American
Geographical Society, Oriental Explorations and
Studies, No. 3).
(B. HONIGMANN)

BANU NADJAH, a dynasty of Abyssinian
Mamluks at Zābīd [q.v.] from 412 to 553
(1022—1158). When the last Ziyādī [q.v.] had
been put to death in the vizierate of the Abyssinian
Nadjaf by one of his Mamluk governors Nafis, the
other Nadjaf came forward to avenge him. After
desperate fighting, Nafis was slain and Nadjaf in
Dhu l-Ka‘da 412 (Feb. 1022) entered Zābīd where
he had the viceroy built alive into a wall in exact
revenge for the Ziyādī. As his rival Nafis had
already done, Nadjaf assumed the insignia of
royalty, struck his own coins and inserted his own
name in the ka‘ba after that of the ʻAbbasīd caliph.
The latter found himself too late to come to
aid of the under the title al-Mu‘āyad Nāṣir al-Dīn. His
kingdom extended over al-Thāma, while the highlands
beyond remained divided up among petty chiefs.
When among the latter the Sulāḥī [q.v.] came
to considerable power, their relationships with the
Banu Nadjaf decisively affected the history of the
latter. The first Sulāḥī ʻAli is said to have had
this first Nadjaf poisoned about 452 (1060) through
a slave girl sent him as a present. In the con-
fusion that followed, ʻAli occupied Zābīd itself and
Nadjaf’s sons fled to the island of Dahlak [q.v.].
While the eldest Mu‘ārik committed suicide, the
other two resolved to remain on their lands: Sa‘īd
al-Akhwāl and Abu l-Tāmī Diyyā‘ī, whose
lost work al-Mufadi fi Ahārār Zābīd was the
foundation for ʻUmāra’s work (in Kai, see Bibli.).
Sa‘īd made his preparations in a place of concealment
in Zābīd and had Diyyā‘ī come later; the
two then came out openly, fell upon and killed
ʻAli the Sulāḥī, who was soon forced to recognize
Mesten probably in (1082). Zābīd is now recognised
Sa‘īd as its lord; he had appealed less to the
Sunni against the Shī‘a than to the racial feeling
of the numerous Abyssinian soldier-slaves (and
rāja ṣumān minkum wa l-i‘līzā isbecause: Diyyā‘ī in
ʻUmāra, p. 63, 3—4). But Asmī‘ī, the widow of ʻAli the
Sulāḥī who was kept a prisoner in Zābīd,
persuaded her son al-Muκarram to relieve the town (475 = 1082—1083).
The Nadjaf again escaped to Dahlak. In 479 (1086)
Sa‘īd again returned as ruler but in 481 (1088) was put to death at the
instigation of the Sulāḥī queen al-Sayyida, the
wife of al-Muκarram. Diyyā‘ī escaped to India
with his vizier Khalaf b. Tāhir, said to have been
an Umayyad, returned to Zābīd disguised as an
Indian, plotted with his compatriots and easily
regained power in 482 (1098). With his death in 498 or 500 (1105—1106) disruption set in. He himself had had domestic difficulties. He executed the kadi Ibn Abi Akama who was an ancestor who had come to the country with the first Ziyadis; his former helper Khalaif had to seek refuge in flight. A certain degree of strain in his relations with his brother Sa'id is already evident from Danish's account and there were fierce family feuds among his descendants. His son Fatik I, the son of a girl bought in India, had to defend himself against his half-brothers Ihsahim and 'Abd al-Wadid and died young in 503 (1109—1110). The latter's infant son al-Mansur was set aside by his uncles, who were quarrelling with one another, and fled to Suyida, whose favourite Muqaffar b. Abi 'l-Barakat brought him back in 504 (1110—1111) as vassal of the Sultanis.

On account of the new ruler's minority, events repeated their course under the Ziyadis. The Mamlik Ants was Mansur's vizier and he even assumed royal honours. When he attained his majority Mansur disposed of him by murdering him with his own hand in 520 (1125) after inviting him to the palace. Mansur however was at once poisoned at the instigation of the next vizier Mann Alah. In the following year, the latter defeated under the walls of Zahid Nadjaž al-Dawla, whom the Fatimidus had sent as the Sultanis power was weakening to restore their suzerainty in the land. Mann Alah had made the boy Fatik II nominal king, the son of Mansur and a slave girl 'Ala'Am who had been purchased from Anis's estate. This woman (d. 545 = 1150) endeavoured with great skill to preserve the rights of her house against the encroachments of the viziers and played among the Nadjaž a part similar to that of Salyida among the Sultanis. In particular she equipped and led regular caravans of pilgrims and thus unconsciously furthered the rise of 'Ali b. Mahdi who was finally to drive her own family from power. Mann Alah in 524 (1130) was killed in his release through a plot of 'Alam's. His successors were the Mamlikus Ruraq, and then al-Mu'adh, Against the latter 'Alam endeavoured to throw him out of the palace, but his plot was good nor on good terms. In their quarrels the various parties several times brought the petty Arab princes who lived around it against Zahid. Ikhbal had Fatik II poisoned (531 = 1137). As he had no heirs, he was followed by his cousin Fatik III b. Muhammad b. Fatik I b. Danish. The government had been in the hands of Surat since 529 (1135). His career of indefatigable activity was ended in a mosque in Zahid on the 12th Radjab 551 (Sept. I, 1156) by an assassin, a 'Khiriduj'.

On 14th Radjab 554 (Aug. 2, 1159) he entered Zahid.

The Banu Ziyad and the Banu Nadjaž continually brought up shiploads of Abyssinian slaves to recruit their troops and thus continued that mixture of races, which already existed before Islam and is still very marked in the Yaman plains. These Mamlikus however became a great danger for the Ziyads and also for the Nadjaž themselves. Najiyaž had attempted to counteract them with a bodyguard of Turkhi-Oghuz [cf. QHIZ]. But they were not suited to the climate; in particular it was impossible to establish a colony of them there permanently as their children, if they did not die, remained weaklings. The Abyssinian admixture was still further increased by the many slave-girls, who, particularly when they became mothers, exerted some political influence. The enormous harems of the notables created the most complicated family relationships. For example the settlement of the estate of the vizier Ruaq became a notoriously difficult case in the law of inheritance which occupied the ablest vizars for years until finally a very aged Hadrarmut found a solution in accordance with the Sharis.

Bibliography: S. the article ZABID, esp. Kay; also: Ibn Khallikan, Wajay'i al-Dijin, Dulaq 1299, i. 153; Husain F. Hamdan, The Life and Times of Queen Suyidah Asra the Sultanid of the Yaman (J. C. A. S., xviii., 1931, p. 505—517); E. de Zambarr, Manuel de genclogie et de chronologies, Hanover 1927, 148. (R. STROTHMANN)

AL-NADJASHI, designation in Arabic of the king of Abyssinia. It is a loanword from Aethiopic 1292 "king, prince" etc. In Arabic it is sometimes used as a proper noun, sometimes as a nomen appellativum. The word is also genuine Arabic, but such as it has the meaning of driver of game. It does not occur in the Koran. In Hadith it is the designation of the king of Abyssinia, just as 'Abd al-Mu'min [q. v.] and al-Mu'awwakas [q. v.] are the designations of the rulers of Kūm, Fāris and Mīsīr. In their totality they represent the Great Powers which in the time of Muhammad surrounded the territory of Islam. On the fresco in the hall of the castle of Kusair 'Amra [cf. AMRA], dating from the middle of the 11th century A.D., al-Nadjashi appears as one of the four Great Powers, the place of the Mu'awwakas being taken by Roderick the Visigoth.

In the Sour the Nadjaž occupies a place of some importance; it is one of the three chief emirates of the two hijras' to Abyssinia, with Muhammad's letter persuading him to embrace Islam with his conversion from Christianity to Islam and with his equipping two ships in behalf of the return of the emigrants to Arabia, amongst whom was Um'm Ḥabība, who was to marry Muhammad (A.H. 7).

These traditions have been critically examined by Grimm, Caetani and Mrs. Vacca. Grimm denied the historical foundation of the traditions concerning Muhammad's letters to the Great Powers. Caetani submitted the question to an elaborate enquiry. Mrs. Vacca reduces the traditions to the following historical facts: a. the return of 'Abbār b. Abi 'r-Rubī from Abyssinia in 7 A.H., when Muhammad was besieging Khiribar; b. the expedition of 'Amr b. Umayya in A.H. 6 in order to reconduct the emigrants from Abyssinia to al-Madinah; c. vague traditions concerning the emigration from Makka to Abyssinia. To these groups several episodes agglomerate, viz. a. the story that Um'm Ḥabība, Abī Sulayf's daughter and widow of 'Uthmān b. Ḥaqq, was asked in marriage by Muhammad and provided with a marriage-gift of 400 dinars by the Nadjaž; to b. the story of Muhammad's letter to the Nadjaž, his embracing Islam and his becoming
the intermediary of the conversion of 'Amr b. al-'A.

In Hādith the Nadjāshi is also mentioned in connection with the story that his death in Ramadān 9 A.H. was proclaimed, without previous intimation, by Muhāmmad, who held in the musallā [q.v.] a funeral service in behalf of this fellow Muslim. As his proper name is given Aţāma or Aţhāma b. Abţār.

The title al-Nadjāshi is also given in Arabic literature to later kings of Abyssinia, as may be seen from this article.


(A. J. Wensinck)

**AL-NAJDJASHI, KAYS B. AMIR AL-ḪAṬĪBI, an Arab poet of the seventh century A.D., lived at first in Nadjān [q.v.] and quarrelled with 'Abd al-Rahmān, son of Hassān b. Ḥabīt [q.v.], because the latter had addressed in song a married female relative of Nadjāshi in Medina. After an exchange of lampoons with his opponent from his native place, he met him at the annual fair at Ḥuṣn 'al-Nadjāshī and again in Mecca when 'Abd al-Rahmān not only proved inferior as a poet but suffered bodily injury, so that his aged father had to interfere on his behalf. Nadjāshi had a second conflict with Ibn Mubīl, the poet of the Banū Ḩadād; he was so unbridled in his defence that the caliph 'Omar punished him with imprisonment after procuring an opinion on his verses from Hassān and al-Itrāja. After 'Othmān’s assassination, al-Nadjāshi appeared in Kīfī as one of 'Ali’s poets, and for the latter exchanged political lampoons with Mūṭiwayya’s poets at the battle of Sīffin. But his disorderly life lost him the favour of 'Ali and after a drinking-bout in Ramadān he was given the thrashing prescribed by law and put in the pillory. After a conflict with Kūfān notables, in which he expressed his wrath at this punishment in satirical verses, he was expelled by 'Ali and went over to Mūṭiwayya. He then went back to his native country Yaman and died in Lāḥēj in the year 40 (669), in which year he wrote a lament on the death of Hasan.


(C. Brockelmann)

**MIR 'ABD AL-ḠĀL NADJAT, a Persian poet, born about 1046 (1636—1637), the son of a Husaini Sā'idīr Mr Muhāmmad Mā'mūn of Isfahān. He is known of his life. Only this much is certain, that he, like many other Persian poets of this time, worked in the offices of different Persian dignitaries. For example he was a *mustasfi* [q.v.] with Sadīr Ḥabīb Allāh, later occupied the same office in Astarabād and ended his career in 1126 (1714) after being for many years *mustasfi* with the Safawī princes Shāh Sulaimān (1667—1694) and Shāh Sulṭān Husain (1694—1722). He owes his fame mainly to a long poem *Gul u-Kuhšt* ("Wrestling") which he finished in 1112 (1700—

1701) and which deals with the theme of the ān-dīrām [q.v.] still very popular in Persia. As the Persian athletes still form a special closed corporation they use a special language (a kind of slang) which is full of the technical terms of their art and is not intelligible to the outsider. Nadjat used these technical terms very skillfully in his poem which makes it very difficult for laymen to understand. This produced several commentaries on his work, of which those of Ārūz, Rātan Singh Zakhmī (printed Lucknow 1258) and Gobind-rām (11th. Morādābād 1884) are the best known. Of Nadjat’s contemporaries some did not approve of his peculiar style and thought his poem degraded the poet’s art with its vulgar expressions and low humour. As a matter of fact, Nadjat’s tone differs considerably from the traditional lofty style of Persian court poetry and approaches the language of the Persian middle classes; this makes his work of considerable importance for the history of the Persian language. Besides the poem, we only know of a collection of lyrics by Nadjat of which there are manuscripts in several libraries (see below).


(E. Bertihl)

**NADJĀTI BEY, properly влекатель (Nūh, also given, is not certain), the first great Turkish lyric poet of the pre-classical period, one of the founders of the classical Ottoman poetry. Born in Adrianople (Amasîn and Kastamûnî are also given), the son of a slave, obviously a Christian prisoner of war for which reason he is called 'Abd Allāh, the name given to every one, he was adopted by a well-to-do lady of Adrianople, received a good education and was trained by the poet Şahîli. In spite of the fact that his non-Turkish origin was generally known, he was regarded as their equal in every way by the Turks in keeping with their democratic ideas. He early came to Kastamûnî and there began his poetic career and soon gained a great reputation. Two poems are said here and there to bear traces of the Kastamūnî dialect. Coming to Constanti- nople, he at once gained the favour of Sultan Mehmed II by a ḫas re: winter; in 886 (1481)
he celebrated the accession of Bayazid II in a
kājda and was rewarded by an appointment as secretary in the Divvān. He gained such favour with the Sultan that he was appointed secretary to his eldest son Abd Allah and was given the title of bey when the prince went to Karaman as governor (mutessarif). After the prince’s early death (888 = 1483) Nadjati returned to Constantinople with an elegy on the death of the prince, which showed deep emotion. After a long interval, in which he wrote a great deal but was in con-tinual need, through the influence of Mu’ayyad-Zade [q. v.] he became nizāndī to Bayazid’s younger son Mahmud when the latter went to Sârîkhân in 910 (1504). Nadjati wrote his finest verse while on the staff of this prince; this was the happiest period of his life. Mahmud also died, prematurely in 913 (1507) in Manisa, the capital of Sârîkhân, and Nadjati again lost his patron. He returned with a beautiful elegy to Constantinople and finally retired from the service of the court on a modest pension. He took a house on the Wefā Maidan where many friends gathered round him, especially his pupils, the poet and tekeredži Edirneli Sehi and the poet Sun‘ī. Nadjati died on the 25th Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 914 (March 17, 1509). He was buried near his own house, at the monastery of Şâhîkh Wefâ and a tombstone was put up by Sehi for him.

He left a Divvān which he had collected on the advice of Mu’ayyad-Zade and dedicated to prince Mahmud. There is also attributed to him a mesneb, which is not otherwise known, entitled Musâzâro-i Gîl u-Khovr, also quoted as Lâlīa u-Maḏginûn and Mîlkh u-Mâh. Even more uncertain seems to be the existence of the mesneb mentioned by Sehi: Gîl u-Şâbâ. Nadjati is also mentioned as a translator of Persian works but his pupil Sehi says nothing of this. He is said to have translated for prince Mahmud the Kimyâ-i Fâhîd of Imam Ghâzîli (the Persian version of the Arabic Ḥyâ) and the Qâma‘ al-Hikâyât (properly Qâma‘î al-Hikâyât wa-Lawâmî al-Râkîyât) from the Persian of Damîl al-Dîn al-Awﬁ.

His Divvān which is still unprinted, gives Nadjati a very prominent place in Ottoman literature; the Divvān was regarded as a model for all Ottoman poets. Nadjati, whom İdris Bilîfî in his Hicret Bihîyet calls Khovr-evi-Şâbâ-ı Rûm and others Malik al-Şâbârâ and Tâ‘î-i Rûm (= the Piedmont of Asia Minor), was regarded as the best poet of Rûm. He does not, it is true, reach the heights that Nesîmî does but he surpasses all his predecessors, of whom Ahmed Pasha and Zâyi were the greatest, in origindity and creative power. Only Bâkî and Fûzûlî have surpassed him. The problem to be solved by Ahmed Pasha, Nadjati and Zâyi was to incorporate completely into Turkish the matter borrowed and translated from Persian literature, which was still felt to be foreign, to adapt Turkish to Perso-Arabic metres and to domesticate fully the Arabic and Persian vocabulary. This was a great achievement for the time. Nadjati brought about a great change in the literature as regards outlook, feeling and language. In him the age of Sultan Bayazid is most clearly reflected. Although he is not to be claimed as a very great poet, he was the king of the gild of poets of his time, who started a great literary movement. Nadjati combined a thorough knowledge of Persian

with a masterly command of Turkish. In the number of his ghazels he far surpasses Bâkî. His work as a poet of kaşdas was original and stimulating. He was specially celebrated for his skill in the use of the proverb.


(Th. Menzel)

NADJID. [See N.FYD.]

NADJA BEY. [See KAFIDJES.]
is an act of obedience (j'ud'; complete faith is the sum of all j'ud';. Faith may increase but never diminish, it can be completely lost only through unbelief. He who commits a heinous sin and dies impenitent is doomed to hell from which he will emerge however, unlike the complete in-fidei. Al-Nadji denied the punishment of the tomb (sukkab al-khab). probably as a result of his determination. — Al-Nadji like his master Bishr represents the reformed and modified Djamshiyah. The influence of Mu'tazila theology on this school is manifest; on the other hand, the Mu'tazila itself, especially that of Bagdad, seems to have received certain quite important stimuli from his school in spite of its opposition to it. Several of al-Nadji's doctrines are found at a later date in Al-As'aml. — The Nadjiyiyah flourished in Rany and Gurgan. It was divided into three schools: 1. the Burjighiyyah, the followers of Muslimadd b. Is' Is' Burjildd; 2. the Za'faraniyyah, the followers of a certain Abi 'Abd Allah b. Al-Za'farani; 3. the Mustadraka, a reforming party which taught paradoxical doctrines on the divine word.


(H. S. Nyberg)

Msc'Allim NADJI, properly 'Omer, an important Ottoman author, poet, critic and man of letters, who occupied a special and somewhat hybrid position in the history of the Turkish moderns and has given his name to a whole literary period. Born in 1266 (1850) in Constantinople, the third son of a master saddler 'Ali Agha (not Bey, as some literary historians say), he lost his father at the age of seven. The widow Fatme al-Zehri, who was descended from a nobility who had come to Constantinople from Rumelia, went to Varna to her brother, the Kalyobiyah Ahmad Agha. The latter in spite of his limited means, made it possible for 'Omer to be educated at the medrese and 'Omer's elder brother Sahl gave him considerable assistance. 'Omer devoted himself at first to calligraphy and for his lechery used the makhtas Khuluba. A certain Khodja Haji aroused in him a fondness for poetry and he took the makhtas Nadji for his poems (from a passage in the Makhtaval of 'Abd al-Girid). He also tried to obtain the title of hafiz, holding in the medrese a permanent influence on him. It was long before he decided to put off the turban and the jilbub. The spirit of the medrese and a certain intolerant fanaticism however never left him.

In 1284 (1867) Nadji received an appointment as second master in the Rusudye school in Varna. At an inspection the then mutanis of Varna, Kord Sad' Pasha (later Foreign Minister, President of the Council of State and several times an ambassador), made the acquaintance of the intelligent young teacher. He took him into his service as secretary, when he was moved to Tulca just before the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war in 1877; thence he was moved to Tinnovo and later to Osman Pasha. Nadji accompanied the much travelled Pasha on his moves and journeys. After a brief stay in Constantinople, he went to Veli Shehr Fenar (= Larissa in Thessaly) where Nadji made the acquaintance of the poet and Mawlawi 'Atwi Bey, who had a very good knowledge of Persian. Nadji who, as a result, went to the court and judge of investigation had here finally to lay aside the turban. When Sad' Pasha set out on a nine months' tour of inspection in Asia Minor, the Euphrates and Erzerum, Nadji again accompanied him. He recorded his impressions in the poem Siam'i charit, where he had abandoned himself with other congenial wits to a life of dissipation at TawP Pasha, both earlier and after his return to Constantinople. The transfer of the Pasha as wali of the Aegean islands to Chios, where Nadji acted as mujtahid saved him from this. Here he was able fully to develop his literary leanings. Already in 1292 he had published poems and articles in Varna in the Tuwa newspaper of which some were even reprinted by the Constantinople paper Baister, such as his Bir Mu'alla'min Sali'in al-Adabi' from Chios he began his association with Ahmad Midhat Efendi who was then editing the Tegjiyan'i Hafizat; from his contributions in poetry and prose, which appeared in the Tegjiyan over the pseudonym Ahmad Mal' and Mal' al-Kharabat, a close friendship arose which proved of decisive influence on his future career. When Sad' Pasha went as ambassador to Berlin, Nadji declined to go with him, which was much to be regretted in the interests of his literary development. He therefore resigned his post in the Foreign Ministry and devoted himself entirely to authorship. Midhat gave him the editorship of the newly formed literary section of the newspaper. At the suggestion of Midhat, whose son-in-law he had become, he learned French although he was now over 30. When he left the Tegjiyan for literary reasons, he undertook the editorship of the Sefat newspaper.

By his great literary and critical activity, he gained an influence which can hardly be estimated high enough on the intellectual life of Turkey in his time, not least through his position as lecturer on Turkish literature at the Mektebi Sul'tan in Galata Serai and in the law school. He became celebrated under the name Mus'in (teacher) of which he was particularly proud. In 1307 (1889) he was appointed by imperial order Turkish historiographer, Tarih-novis-ii-Ati Om'arn, as a reward for his historical poem Etegheri Ghit. But he did not live to do anything serious in this field except an introduction which survives in MS. He died on 27 March Ramaadjan 1310 (April 14, 1893), at the age of 43 from heart failure, and was buried in the garden of the turbe of Sultan Muhammed.

As a literary figure, Nadji revealed two aspects. On the one hand, he was a fanatical admirer of the old literature out of which he had developed and for which he endeavoured to revive the taste of his milieu by every means, by his modest poetic talent and considerable skill in versification; on the other hand, he seemed in sympathy with the moderns but in view of his convinced belief in the decadence of western culture he had little real understanding of them.

Nadji's services to Turkish prose are undeniable. Over 50 years ago he was already writing the prose of the future, a model, clear, simple, style in the
language of a master who could not be surpassed. Two years before Serêfî's celebrated Kûshî Shèlîr (1309) with its complicated prose, Nâdîj gave a classic specimen of simple prose, in his Ömerîn Cûlûyûlgû (1307) which was only properly appreciated and imitated at a much later date. In it we find the first suggestions of Turkish realism.

The forms not cultivated by the old writers, the story and the drama, he did not, it is true, entirely omit, but apart from autobiographical sketches and a translation from Zola, he wrote no stories and he was a failure as a dramatist. In theory, it seemed sufficient to him and his followers to put French stories of crime into the oret cûnu form in order to produce regular Turkish "dramas". Here also he approximated to the moderns but did not reach their level or ability.

As a poet and artist he is weak. He lacks favour and creative fancy. He lacks that depth of feeling which carries one away; with him everything is trivial and superficial, and he never feels or expresses anything deeply. His prose style is simple and easy, the sentences short, the mode of expression concise and clear.

His main importance lies in his wide influence as a teacher, which he exercised not so much in the actual classroom as through his whole literary activity.

As a critic he confines himself to externals and goes no further.

Nâdîj's prolific versatility is best shown by a list of his works. He wrote on many subjects and frequently lacked the time for adequate preparation.

Of his poetical works, the most celebrated is the collection Atebû-pûrê (1300, 2nd edition 1303), which contains 52 poems in the new western manner. The best in it are: Tecfehî, Keßûfî, Xûnî, Şâhî, Şâtwardîn ibî Wâdî, Tesarûn, Şâûrî, Aisîsî. — Next come two collections of ghazals in the old style: Şwârî, 1301 and Fûshûn; then three historical poems: Hamîyet yahûd Mûmîn bî Esh'arî, a description of heroic deeds in Iran in the time of the last kîng Abû 'Ali Abîlālî bî Şâûrî; Zât al-Nâyâbîn in the heroic conduct of Esmâ', daughter of Abî Bakr, at the siege of Mecca with regard to her son Abû 'Ali Abîlî b. Zûbarî; Gîdrî Eròfûgî Bey, ef. above: first printed after his death in Khâzâni Funûn, 1310, ii, No. 11, 12. On the Ëfûfî-i Şâhî-sînî-mênuîe written in conjunction with A. Miûhtar ef. 'Ali Emîrî, in T.E.O., v., No. 27, 1339, p. 131; other poetical works are: Tecfehî Fond or Türkî Fond, an imitation of Rûhî-i Bağûdâdî and Ziyâ Pashû; Tahtî yahûd 'Arûz, Numûnênî, Menûzêî-i Miûnîn Nâtîjî and a collection of fugitive pieces edited by Şâhîbî Wûfî after Nâtîjî's death: Yûsûfî-i Nâtîjî, 1314.

Of his prose works the best known and most important is Sinûbêl (1299 and 1307). The first part contains poems like Kûshî bîr Mêzeû, which is very important for the development of the Turkish prose, and translations from the French. The second part: Ömerîn Cûlûyûlgû gives in unaffected style intimate memories of his childhood up to the age of eight and has several times been translated: into German by A. Meezî, Aus Miûnîn Nâtîjîs Sinûbîl: Die Geschiche seines Kindheit, Berlin 1808; into Russian: Vl. Grod-levskîj, Ëttêzî Ómara. Afkökî, raflîchîcî oèrê, Moscow 1914; and into Czech: Jan Rypka, Oumarovo Dêttêcî až do jeho omelîho roku, in Òblî. Svêtlûv Knihore, Prag. — Memories of his student years were published in the Tèrûmûnîn-i Hâjîkât and entitled Medîrênî Ëttêrîtêrî, 1302; to the same year belongs Şâmînî-far Şâyîhît (Mûmînî-i Ebn 'l-Zîyâ, No. 41): also Yâzîdî Valûnumî, 1301 (letters and verses in simple language); Khûrû Fûrûhî (verses and sayings of Arab and Persian men of letters, 2 parts). — A strongly personal note marks his Demûamî (the title is chosen in allusion to Ekrem's Zênâmê), a criticism of Memmemî-i Zâtîrîs Tâhî's Tezêrî-i Ezhîh, but it is primarily directed against Ekrem and his pronouncements on the stupidity of writing ghazels: it was so personal that its publication was officially forbidden. — Equally vigorous is the criticism of the newspaper Miûnî and its owner Miûdî Bey in Nâtîjî's Mushûfên-dêmî. — Translations and commentaries are found in Samûl-i, 1303 (first published in Yûzûd-i Müsûdî; verses of the Persian poet Şîlî-i Têrêzî with commentary): Sinîbût ëd-i-Pûrê (Persian maxims) — Religious in content are: Adîgî-i Kûmîn, 2nd ed., 1306 (translation of the treatise by Fakhrî-dîn al-Râzî on the Tâhîhî, Lûtî-i 'alîyê in the Miûthîr el-Ghâfîh, first appeared in the Têrêzîmânî); Têzêrî-i Kûrânî, Menûnî-sînî (on the Hvî-i midemûfîn at the beginning of certain Surâs); Khûrûtî at-Hûlûr, 1304, the commentary on Sûrâ cixî (Pâfûdî) translated from the Tefir-i bûhî; Esmûlî-i 'Allî, sayings of the caliph 'Ali (Mêhêkîbî-l-ebn 'l-Zîyâ, No. 1); Hûkûm al-Râzî (sayings of Saiyîd Ahmad al-Râzî): Nûmûnî-i al-Fûrûhî (wise sayings of Muslim celebrities); Vêdîtî, 1305 (Persian originals and translations); Mîtûrêm, 1304: translations from Arabic, Persian and French; Mûmînî-i Mûsûfdîxtürk, 1306: literary essays based on a collected volume in MS. by another unknown M. Mustâfar 1279; Numûnî-sî-nûhan (an abridgement from selected authors) — correspondence: Mükûtîhîn, 1303 and 1311 (correspondence with his friends and pupils); Mükübettêrî-7ê- Mustêmôvit, 1311 (correspondence with A. Miûhtar); Şûhî bêlî (correspondence with Şâhîîbî Wûfî); İnêzî, 1301 (correspondence with Bûsîhî Fu'sênî on V. Hügo). — Works on literary criticism: Miûtêllî: a collection of expositions of his critical theory which had appeared in the Tèrûmûnî and were regarded in their days as of fundamental importance; Mûmînî-far Miûtêllî, 1305—1306: a collection of the literary lectures which he had given in the Şîhânî and the Law School (58 in number, No. 1—3 even reached a third edition); Isfêtêhâtî-i cebirî, 1307 and 1314, his celebrated masterpiece on literary history, really only concerned with style; also Mükûtî-7ê Debê, 1320. — His important lexicographical works include: Kâmari-7½rmânî, 1308, only 5 parts; first appeared in the Murawwûd. Tûhâtî-i Nâtîjî = Lûgâtî-sî-mênuîe, 1317. Nâtîjî only wrote the text as far as art. Fêruz, p. 832: the remainder p. 833—1426 was prepared by his friend Mustûfêlîzîdê Yûzûdî Bey. — The biographical works are: Têrûmûnî-Êttêrîtêrî, 1307, 2 parts (biographies of 13 Ottoman poets); Esmûlî, 1308, about 50 somewhat arbitrarily chosen biographies in the style of the old Têkîre's — His only drama Hûzîm (Hûzîm Bey yahûd Hûzîm), 1326: Têrêzî Rûkîn, the translation of Zola's Thêrêzî Ruquîn: a promised
 translation of Fénélon: Terkuyt-i Benet never appeared.

The four parts of his much used Ta'lim-i Kirdat, from 1300 on, were largely responsible for the development and spread of Nädji's style in the widest circles. The first part reached the 31st edition by 1320.

Announced but never published were the following: Ahekk-i milt, Musammat-i Râghib (on Ködja Râghib), Ferai-i tişkiye, Terâmiden Terâmug.

Nädji was a contributor to a number of papers and magazines: the Terâmîn-ul Habîbat; the Şedîl-i Vaṭît, the periodicals Afzî, Gendi Kûlûm, Mîrîn ibn hatîlî, Qadîn ibn hajîsî, etc.

With Nädji neo-classicism came to an end although his followers, especially Ali Kenâl, made several attempts to revive it again in the İlibûn against H. Dîhdîl and in the Şâbik against Dînbâl Shîhîb al-Dîn. The movement did not get beyond these efforts, for his followers were as little able as Nädji himself to produce works of permanent value. The present generation has advanced quite out of Nädji's world.


(Th. Menzel)

NADJIS (A.), impure, opp. şâhîr, cf. TA'HARA. According to the Şî'ah doctrine, as systematised by al-Nawawî (Munâfiq, i. 36 sqq.; cf. Chaçali, al-Waqifî, i. 6 sqq.), the following are the things impure in themselves (nağhâtî): wine and other spiritsur drinks, dogs, wine, ma'âfî, blood and excrements; milk of animals whose flesh is not eaten.

Regarding these groups the following may be remarked. On wine and other spurious drinks, cf. the art. KHAMAR and NABIME. — Dogs are not declared impure in the Kur'an; on the contrary, in the description of the sleepers in Sûra xviii. the dog is included (verses 17, 21). In Hudûth, however, the general attitude against dogs is very strong, as may be seen in the art. KALI. Goldziher considers this change due to an attitude of conscious contrast (mutkalaňa) to the estimate of dogs in Parsism. It must not, however, be forgotten that the Jews also declared dogs impure animals, just as swine. The latter are already declared forbidden food in the Kur'an (Sûra xvi. 116: vi. 146; v. 4; ii. 168). — As to ma'ûfî, cf. the article. — Blood is mentioned in the Kur-an (Sûra xvi. 116; vi. 146; v. 4; ii. 168) as prohibited food. As to the religious background of this prohibition cf. the art. MA'TAH. — As for excrements and several kinds of secretions of the body, the theory and practice of Jews and Christians sufficiently explain the attitude of Islam in this respect. It must also be admitted, though data are very scarce, that in early Arabia religious impurity included some of these things. — Details are to be found in the large legal works of each of the madhâbhs (cf. Bibli).

Of the differences of the schools regarding this subject the most important only may be mentioned. Spirituous drinks are not impure according to the Hanafis (cf. NAZIM). Living swine are not impure according to the Malikis. — The Shi'a adds to the things mentioned above the human corpse and the infidels. The human corpse was one of the chief sources of impurity according to Jewish ideas (cf. already NUMBERS, ch. xix.). A current in early Islam tending to follow the Jewish customs in ceremonial law was very strong; the Shi'a view regarding the human corpse may be a residuum of it. — The impurity of infidels is based upon Sûra ix. 28, where the polytheists are declared to be filth (nağûf). The Sunni schools do not follow the Shi'a in the exegesis of this verse.

The nağûf sins enumerated above cannot be purified, in contradiction to things which are defiled only (mutanadîjdî), with the exception of wine, which becomes pure when made into vinegar, and of hides, which are purified by tanning. On purification cf. the art. TA'HARA, GÜSSÜ, WUROP.


NAJDJ AL-DIN KUBRA, the founder of the order of the Kubrawiya or Dhababiya, is one of the most striking personalities among the Persian Shivis of the xiii—xiv century A.D. A large number of popular legends are associated with his name, many of which are not yet forgotten at the present day in Central Asia. His importance for the development of Sufism is very considerable and in the long series of his books we find many distinguished representatives of Sufi
teaching, Nadjm al-Din, whose full name was Ahmad b. 'Umar Abu 'l-Dhannah Nadjm al-Din al-Kubra al-Khwāṣī the with the honorific title al-Tāmāt al-Kubra (the "greatest visitation": Sura Ixxix. 34) and Shāhī-

Wāli tarāḥ (the Shāhī who prepares saints) was born in the town of Khwāṣ in Khawrām in 540 (1145), spent his youth in travel during which he met in Egypt the famous Shāhī Rūzbahān al-Wazzān al-Misīṣ. He became his murid and under the supervision of the Shāhī went through a course of most rigid ascetic discipline. The youth won the favour of his teacher who gave him his daughter to wife and adopted him as a son. Nadjm al-Din spent some years in Egypt where two sons were born to him. One day he heard the news of the sudden death given by Imām Aḥā Naṣr Ḥafiẓ in Tabriz highly praised. He at once went off to Tabriz and studied there under the direction of this theologian who lived in the Khwāṣ al-Zāhida in the Sarmaodin quarter. There Nadjm wrote his first theological treatise, a kind of inaugural dissertation entitled Shāhī al-Sunnat wa 'l-Maṣūṁ. During a disputa which arose out of this work he made the acquaintance of the Shāhī Bahā Farājī Tabrātī under whose influence he decided to give up the study of theology and devote himself entirely to the contemplative life of the mystic. Bahā Farājī regarded all learning as something superfluous; in his view true knowledge could only be obtained through divine illumination. Nadjm al-Din soon recognized that he could hardly come any nearer his goal by this route. He turned to Shāhī Ammārī Yaṣīr who advised him to train as a complete Sufī in the school of Ismā'īlī Kāvīrī. Nadjm al-Din received his second maḥfīz at the hands of the latter, a so-called maḥfīz-i taqarrūk ("Shirkāt al-maḥfīzāt"). After his return to his first teacher Shāhī Rūzbahān the latter found that he had thoroughly grasped all the depths of Sufī learning and recommended him to transfer his activities to his native land of Khawrām. Nadjm al-Din settled there with his family, bought a khānsakāh and founded the order of the Kubrawiya or Ḥabashābiya. His teaching met with great success and he soon found himself surrounded by pupils among whom were the most distinguished Sufis of the xiiith–xiiiith century such as Mājīlī al-Din Baghdādī (the Shāhī of the famous poet Farād al-Dīn 'Abīrār), Sa'd al-Dīn Ḥamāwī, Bahā Kamāl Ḍandī, Shāhī Ṭafrī al-Dīn 'Alī Lālī, Sa'id al-Dīn Bahkharī, Nadjm al-Dīn Kāzī and many others. Bahā al-Dīn Wadād, the father of the great Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, is also said to have been his pupil, but this is hardly possible. Nadjm al-Din met his death on 10th Jumādā I 618 (1221) while taking of Khwāṣī by the Mongols. All his biographers are agreed that the Shāhī had gone out to meet the enemy in the open field and met a martyr's death with a weapon in hand. The Institute for Oriental Research in Leningrad possesses a manuscript in Eastern Turki entitled Shāhī Nadjm al-Dīn Kubrā mī Shāhī Khwāṣī-ni Khwāṣī-kil. chambā Bāgni (How Shāhī Nadjm al-Dīn was martyred and the town of Khawrām destroyed). It is a kind of historical novel dealing with the last days of Khwāṣī and its fall. Nadjm al-Dīn appears in it as the protector of the city against the Mongols. By his power he makes Khwāṣī invisible to the enemy and it only falls into the hands of the conquerors after the Shāhī decides to sur-

render it. It is possible that this book is a version of a Persian biography of Nadjm al-Dīn called Tāhlīj al-Fakhā'ir and mentioned by Ḥaḍījī Khalīfī (i. 234).

Nadjm al-Dīn was a prolific writer and left a number of valuable treatises on different questions of Sufism. The greater part of his works are written in Arabic. Ḥaḍījī Khalīfī gives the following list of his works: 1. al-Ṣa'd al-Shahrī (i. 339) — a brief exposition of the ten fundamental principles of Sufism (printed in Constantinople in 1526 with a Turkish commentary); 2. Riṣāla fi 'l-Sulāk (iii. 410–411) — or more correctly fi 'l-Dīn al-Suḥūk, described in Ahlwardt: N°. 3456; 3. Riṣāla al-Ṭarāq (iii. 418) — in Ahlwardt, N°. 3272–3273 (possibly with N°. 414). 4. Muṣallāt al-Tawārīkh (xv. 171) — unknown to me; 5. Faṣūliyy al-Dīnān in Persia — a treatise with this title is given in Flugel, Wiener Katalog, iii. 332, except that the latter is described as in Arabic; 6. Lūmāt al-Lām — or with the full title al-Khāṣif al-lūm min Lūmāt al-Lām in Ahlwardt N°. 3087; 7. Hilāvat al-Tālībīn — unknown; 8. Tafrī — probably the great commentary on the Ḥaḍījī entitled Alī al-Fakhā'ir, whose first volume I discovered in the Public Library in Leningrad (see Islamica, vol. 1, fasc. 2–3, p. 272). Nadjm al-Dīn is also known as a composer of Persian quatrains; but it is still very difficult to decide whether the quatrains attributed to him are really his. Twenty-five of these poems were published in the Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de Russie (1924, p. 36).

The Sufi writings of Nadjm al-Dīn form a transition from the older Sufism of the first theologians (the Nadjīpur school of the xiiith–xiiiith centuries) to the later Sufism of Ibn al-Arabi and his successors (Nadr al-Dīn Ḥaqqī, Fakhr al-Dīn Ṭarāḍī). Like the earlier theologians Nadjm al-Dīn likes to deal especially with the practice of Sufism, the stations on the way to true knowledge. Metaphysical questions however are also considered by him and his works with the writings of Ibn al-Arabi form the basis for the further development of philosophical theology in the xivith century. This is not the place to go fully into his conception of Sufism; but it is not to be doubted that his teaching can hardly be neglected in a careful investigation of the history of the development of Sufism.


NADJRAN, a district (Wādī) and town in northern Yaman, according to other (Ibn Khurādādbih, B. G. A., vi. 133, 248) in southern Nadīr or in the Ḥijāz (Bakrī, Muṣā'm, p. 575). The position and course of the Wādī has not been exactly ascertained. It rises on the eastern slopes of the Yaman highlands, probably between 43°
and 44° East Long., and runs, perhaps turning north at first, mainly in a southeasterly direction behind 15° and 17° N. Lat. finally disappearing in the great sand desert. The distance from San`a' [q.v.] is put at 6-7 days' journey (E. Glasei, *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, ii. 50); according to Philip's investigations (*The Heart of Arabia*, ii. 166 sq.), it is seven days' reasonable caravan journey south of Sulayl. The older idea that the course of the Wādī Nadīrān ran N. E. (or that there was a more northerly twin Wādī Hābūn) arose out of the erroneous idea first finally corrected by Philip (op. cit., p. 165) that the Wādī Dawāsir, with which the Wādī Nadīrān was wrongly thought to be connected, runs from W. to N. E.

The Wādī Nadīrān drains a wide area of northern Yemen and ʿAsir (Hamādān, *Sijist Djamal al-ʿArab*, p. 53, 110, 114, 247). It is, and was in antiquity, celebrated for its fertility. Of European travellers only Joseph Halévy visited it in the spring of 1870. He describes (*Bullet. de la Soc. de Géogr.*, series vi., vol. xii., p. 478) the valley, some 2 miles broad, as exceedingly fertile and well cultivated with villages concealed in thick palm-groves. Stobā (xvi. 781) calls it a peaceful and rich country. To Muslim writers it is a miracle of fertility and wealth, even more so than the Yemen in general; its cereals, vegetables and fruits were unriphied (Hamādān, p. 199 sq.); there were also mines there (Baladhūrī, *Kitāb Fathāt al-Bulūdūn*, p. 14) and the staple products of the Yemen, leather and cloth, were also made there. To this day in less favoured parts of Arabia they talk of the prosperity of this Wādī (Philip, op. cit., ii. 226).

The population of the Wādī Nadīrān, according to Philip, is comparatively large; the majority belong to the tribe of Yām. But several unrelated tribes, often at enmity with one another, share in the possession of this rich country. It was so in the early Muslim period. The Bann ʿl-Ḥārīh b. Kaʿb, who appear in Ḳālidī as lords of Nadīrān, were not really such. They belonged to the large group of tribes Madāḥīd; which was represented by other tribes also. Their rivals were and are Hamādīn tribes (Hamādān, p. 115, 9) among them Māḏīhīd, important at the present day, (subdivisions Yām etc.) and Bakrī (subdivisions ʿShākir etc.); other tribes like al-ʿAṣ, al-Aʃā etc. should also be mentioned. We have no reliable information about places with a settled population. In the eastern part of the Wādī. Halévy visited a village of Ḳahfa which was afterwards put on the maps at hazard. In the immediate vicinity was another village Ṣahīla, and an hour to the west Madīnāt al-Khuddūd (see below). The Arab geographers mention village (jūrā) of Nadīrān and the names of some of them are given as well as those of districts, tributary wāds, hills and springs.

Through Nadīrān runs the very old caravan road from Hadramawt through the Ḳūḥā to the eastern Mediterranean [cf. Marīz]. Nadīrān was of some importance as the last station in the Yemen on a caravan route from the Yemen to al-Yamānā and thence to Bahriyy and the Ṣafī. During Persian rule in the Yemen and later in the Abūbāsīd period this road must have been of no less importance than the one just mentioned to Syria, which latter however owing to its importance in the early period of Islam is almost alone mentioned in Muslim literature (A. Moberg, *The Book of the Himyarites*, p. ix.; cf. also M. Hartmann, *Die sudarab. Frage*, p. 496, 509). On the road see Ibn Khudādhibī (B. G. A., vi. p. 152 sq. and 193; A. Sprenger, *Post- und Reisereisen*, p. 134-135). A series of forts served to keep it safe (Sprenger, op. cit., p. 158; Hamadhānī, B. G. A., p. 28; Yāḥūṭ, *Muḥjam*, iv., p. 541 s.v. al-Mushāʾkha and thereon lyali, *Mufaddalīya*, ii. p. 105). On the present importance of the road and of Nadīrān, see Philip, op. cit., ii. 226.

The road in those days probably went several days' journey across the desert to the Wādī Dāwāsir, which was the first station on the other side; at the present day it is an insignificant village (q.v.) corresponding to it. This road via Nadīrān is certainly that which connected the Yemen at different times with the ancient Babylonia in the east, with Syrian Christian as well as with Iranian culture.

Little is known of the town of Nadīrān. Ptolemy mentions it as a metropolis. Aelius Gallus attacked it and destroyed it (Strabo, loc. cit.; Pliny, vi. 28 [323]). From this Glasei (loc. cit., ii. 50; cf. p. 224) concludes that there was no town of Nadīrān after this but the existence of the town is proved in many ways for various later periods (see below). Now however, no town seems to bear the name. Halévy thought he had found the ruins of the old town in Madīnāt al-Khuddūd (see below), which he describes as considerable ruins on the south bank of the river bed. Of the city wall roughly built of granite the south and west sides were less destroyed than the others. A mosque, which still stood among the ruins, belonged, according to local tradition, to the early Muslim or even pre-Islamic period (J. A., ser. vi., vol. xix., p. 90 and 49). In remarkable agreement with this, Bakrī, *Muḥjam*, p. 80 says: "Al-Ukhḍūd, which is mentioned in the Kurān, was in one of the towns of Nadīrān. This city however is now in ruins and nothing is left of it but the mosque which 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb built'."

On the history of Nadīrān we have only scanty and mainly legendary notes. The name occurs several times in the South Arabian inscriptions: there is one (C. I. S., iv., No. 363) reference to the "towns" of Nadīrān (aḥārār N.; cf. above the towns of Yām N.). There was the Yām. In the oldest inscription of north Arabia, the Nabataean inscription of the year 328, the name is also found.

In the tradition of the introduction of Christianity into the Yemen, Nadīrān plays a part in keeping with its importance for the communications between Yemen and Mesopotamia (see above). According to one reference (*Histoire Néostérienne*, ed. Addini Scher, i. 218 sq. = *Patriol. Orient.*, iv. 330), it was a merchant of Nadīrān who first spread Christianity there after he had been converted in al-Ḥura. Christianity is said to have received a further impetus in the time of Justinian from monophysite Christians who, expelled by Byzantine territory, came to al-Nadīrān also via Ḳīra (op. cit., i. 51 sq.).

The Christian tradition of later persecutions of the Christians in South Arabia connected with Abyssinian invasions of the Yemen is widely disseminated; Nadīrān was the principal scene of these, first perhaps under Sharābīl Yasūk in the last third of the fifth century, notably under Dīn Nuwās, who died in 525. On this tradition
which exists in many forms, Greek, Syriac and Ethiopic, see A. Moberg, *The Book of the Histori- ees*, p. xxiv.—lxiii., where the sources and other literature to be consulted are given.

Arabic literature has also something to say about these happenings, especially in the annotations of the *Kūrān* exegists on Sūra Ixxvii. 4 sqq. on the *Aqīlib al-Ukhḍīd*. But what there is of historical value in this Muslim tradition comes from Christian sources; only it is usually so distorted as to be almost unrecognisable. What it records regarding the introduction of Christianity into Naḍrān by a certain Faimyūn or 'Abd Allāh b. al-Thāmīr is on the other hand a distortion of certain episodes in a Syriac Christian cycle of legends about the Persian martyrs Petheon and Yazid and has really nothing to do with Naḍrān or Arabian (A. Moberg, *Über einige christliche Legenden in der islamischen Tradition*, p. 5, 11 sq., 22, 30 and the references given). The name Naḍrān al-Ukhḍīd from the ancient Naḍrān is of course the result of the localisation of al-Ukhḍīd in Naḍrān. Hamdānī (op. cit., p. 67, 169) mentions in the same region a Balad or town of al-Ukhḍīd; C. van Arendonk mentions a hill Ukhḍīd (*De origine van het zaïdiësche Islamaat in Yeemen*, p. 168).

It is not till the time of Muḥammad and the early Caliphs that we have really historical references to the use of these and even these to be critically used. We are told that Khaliḍ was sent with 400 horsemen to the Banū 'l-Ihdūr b. Ka'b (and the Banū 'Abd al-Madān: Ibn Sa'd, 1/1, 112, 3) in Naḍrān and made them adopt Ḩiḍr and send an embassy in homage to the Prophet (Ibn Hishām, p. 595; Ibn Sa'd, 1/1, 72). 'Amr b. Hazm was appointed amīl in Naḍrān and 'Ali was ordered to collect the zakāt there (Wādiqī bi Wellhausen, p. 417 sqq.; Ibn Sa'd, 1/1, 122). In addition to pagans and Jews there were many Christians there who formed, it seems, an autonomous community. Muḥammad received an embassy from them also and concluded a treaty with them which guaranteed the possession of their property and the free exercise of their religion in return for a fixed contribution on their part (Ibn Hishām, p. 401 sqq.; Ibn Sa'd, 1/1, 84 sqq., 35 sqq.). This treaty was confirmed by Abū Bakr and 'Omar. 'Omar however at a later date drove the Christians and Jews out of the Arabian peninsula whereupon the Christians founded a new Naḍrān in the 'Irāq, two days' journey south of Kīfā. The details are variously recorded and it is not quite clear to what extent 'Omar's orders were actually enforced. Bakr (op. cit.) says that the Jews and Christians in Naḍrān were not at all affected by the measure. In any case, at a much later date (see what follows), there were not a few Christians in Naḍrān and there are of course still many Jews in the Yaman. In the year 40 A.H. Naḍrān was defeated by Djiyār (Abū dāwūd, Tāhā, i. 3452). The scantiness of the historical tradition, fantastic accounts of the wealth of the region and the remarkable liberty enjoyed by Christians in Naḍrān gave rise to legends and inspired poets. The "material" which thus arose is very fully detailed and utilised in H. Lammens, *Le Califat de Yezid 1er* (M. F.O. R., v/ii., p. 327—369).

In the end we find Naḍrān an important fortified town, often simply called al-Hadjar (cf. Hamdānī, p. 86), mentioned in the accounts of the fighting which led to the creation of the Zādi insāmāt in the Yaman in the third century A.H. At this time there were still Christians and Jews there, who were obviously still an important element and enjoyed considerable consideration from their Muslim neighbours (van Arendonk, op. cit., p. 128 sq.). On bishops of the Naḍrānīs or in the Yaman in the 7th and 8th century from Syrian sources see Moberg, *The Book of the Historiastes*, p. liv. The tributes of Naḍrān submitted to Turkish rule as little as those of eastern and northern Yaman generally. Naḍrān now belongs to the kingdom of Ibn Sa'd.

On other places Naḍrān see Yākūt, *iv. 751.*

**Bibliography:** given in the article and in some of the works quoted there; on the history cf. especially Balādhūrī, *Fatḥī*, p. 64—68; Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, i/ii., p. 312 sq., 317 sqq., 321 sqq., 349—355; i/ii., 350—359.

**Nafaka.** [See Nikāh Tālāk.]

**Al-Nafī.** [See Allāh, ii.]

**Nafi' b. al-ʿAlāʾrak al-Ḥanāfī al-Ḥanṣālī, Abī Rāshīd,** according to some sources, the son of a freed blacksmith of Greek origin (Balādhūrī, ed. de Goeje, *p. 56*, chief of the extreme Khāridjītes [q.v.], who after him are called Azrāḥītēs [q.v.]. At first, after his secession to Ahwāz, Nafi' joined 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] in Makka. Soon, however, he and his followers turned their backs on the holy city and arrived before Bāṣra, where they spread terror among the inhabitants, who left the town in multitudes. Al-Mu̇ahallab, however, succeeded in driving them back to Persia. They made a halt in Ahwāz, where they practised išrā'īl in accord with their doctrine. The bloody battle of Dālār, fought against Muslim b. Thālūs, put an end to his life (64 or 65 = 683—684).

His special doctrine comprised the following points: 1. secession (barā'a) from the quietists (al-Kāshī); 2. examination (ṣajī), to those who wanted to join his encampment; 3. declaring in-fidels those who did not perform hidjra to him; 4. declaring it allowed to kill the wives and children of opponents. This is al-ʿAshʿarī's enumeration, which differs slightly from that of al-Shābāštī (*p. 90*).

NÁFILA (A.), plur. náwâfil, part. art. fem. I from n-f-l, supererogatory work.

1. The word occurs in the Qur'án in two places. Sūra xxi. 72 runs: “And we bestowed on him [viz. İbrâhîm Isaac and Jacob as additional gift] (nâlātân).” In Sūra xxi. 61 it is used in combination with the vigils, thus: “And perform vigils during a part of the night, reciting the Qur'án, as a náfîl for thee.”

In hadîth it is frequently used in this sense. “Forgiveness of sins past and future was granted him [Muḥammad] and his works were to him as supererogatory works!” (Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 250). — In another tradition it is said with reference to the month of Râmâdân, that Allah “vouchsafes even before its beginning” (Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 524). Of peculiar importance, also in a different respect, is the following hadîth hadît: “When My servant seeks to approach to Me through supererogatory works, I finally love him. And when I love him I become the hearing through which he heareth, the sight through which he seeth, the hand with which he graspeth, the foot with which he walketh” etc. (al-Bukhârî, Kifâyât bâb 38).

Finally the following tradition may be translated: “Whoso perform the náfilah” [q. v.] in this way [viz. in the way described in the foregoing part of the tradition], receives forgiveness of past sins and his salâh and his walking to the mosque are for him a náfîl” (Muslim, Tahârâ, trad. 8; Mâlik, Tahârâ, trad. 30). In the parallel tradition (Muslim, loc. cit., trad. 7), the term is kifâyât “expiration.” — This parallelism is an indication of the effect ascribed to supererogatory works in Muslim theology, viz. the expiration of light sins (cf. al-Nawâlî on Muslim, Cairo 1283, i. 308).

Further it must be observed that in theological terminology náfîla is often applied to those works which are supererogatory in the plain sense, in contradistinction to other works which have become a regular practice. The latter are called sunna, mu'âkbâda, the former náfîla or sunna náfilah (cf. infra, sub 2).

The place of supererogatory works in theology is further accurately defined in the Wâsiyát Abî Hanîfâ, art. 7: “We confess that works are of three kinds, obligatory, supererogatory and sinful. The first category is in accordance with Allah’s will, desire, good pleasure, decision, decree, creation, judgment, knowledge, guidance and writing on the preserved table. The second category is not in accordance with Allah’s commandment yet according to His will, desire” etc.

The term for supererogatory works used here is not náfîla, but fâdîla.

2. Náfîla is used in hadîth especially as a designation of the supererogatory salâh (Bukhârî, Kifâyât, bâb 11; Tâhâdîdîdî, bâb 5, 27). Sometimes it appears in the combinations salât al-nâfilah (Ibn Mâdhîn, Tâhârâ, bâb 203) and salât al-nawâfil (Bukhârî, Tâhâdîdîdî, bâb 36).

In jîhâd this terminology is often, but not always followed, the other term for the supererogatory salâhs being salâh al-tâfaawwûn (e. g. Abû ʿIshâq al-Shârîzî, Kitiâb al-Tanbîh, ed. A. W. T. Juynboll, p. 26), a term that goes back to the Qur’án (Sūra ii. 153, 180; ix. 80), and which occurs also in canonical hadîth (Abû Dâwûd has a Kitiâb al-Tâfaawwûn in his Sunan). The whole class of supererogatory salâhs is called náwalî as well as sunan. Nâfilah, as a general designation of supererogatory salâhs, covers three subdivisions. The following juxtapositions may give a survey of the terminology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nâfilah (Fatîhid al-Munawwir, i. 156, Hanâfî)</th>
<th>Sunan (Fagnan, Addition, p. 23, Mâlikî)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sunna</td>
<td>náfilâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandâthâ</td>
<td>nâlâtâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tâfaawwûn</td>
<td>námilâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'âkbâda</td>
<td>níshâfî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râzâkâna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be added that the term râzâkâna is used especially for the supererogatory salâhs preceding or following the musâkâta; they belong to the first subdivision.

In Şî'î jîhâd náwalî is the widest term; by mu'râqgâhâbâl the daily and non-daily supererogatory prayers are designated.


(A. J. Wensinck)

AL-SAIYIDA NAFISA, a mausoleum outside Cairo, south of the Mosque of Ahmad b. Tüla in the direction of the sepulchral mosque of al-Shârî. Among the female saints [cf. WALT] in Cairo next to Saiyida Zainab bint Muḥammad [q. v.] and “Sitt Sekîna” (Sakalîn) “Sitt Nefîsa” takes a very prominent place. In the official recitations of the Qur‘an, the Saiyida Nafisa, where the reading is held on Sundays, takes third place among them all immediately after Imám al-Shârî and Imám al-Husaini (see Bergstrasser, in Ist., xxl [1933], 110 sqq.). The sanctuary is visited by both men and women, especially in the evening. The door leading to the sarcophagus itself is only opened once a year. The following number of other buildings besides a mosque, including a library and Süfî cells. The land around it is a much sought after place of interment.

Nafisa was a daughter of al-Hasan b. Zaid b. al-Hasan [q. v.]. She came to Egypt with her husband ʿIshâq al-Mu‘tamin, a son of Djezîf al-Sâdîk [q. v.]. She had a reputation for learning and piety. Şâhî frequently visited her to collect traditions; on his death, his body was brought to her house so that she might say the prayer for the dead over him. She had children but her descendants soon died out. She herself died in
Nafs

Nafs! (A,) soul. Nafs, in the early Arabic poetry, meant the self or person, or ruh meant breath and wind. Beginning with the Kur'ân nafs also means soul, and ruh means a special angel messenger and a special divine quality. Only in post-Kur'ânic literature are nafs and ruh equated and both applied to the human spirit, angels and djinn.

I. The Kur'ânic uses. A. Nafs and its plurals anfus and nafus have five uses: 1. In most cases they mean the human self or person, e.g., ill. 54: "Let us call...ourselves and yourselves": also xii. 54; li. 20, 21. 2. In six verses nafs refers to Allah: v. 116b: "Thou [Allah] dost know what is in myself [says 'Isa], but I do not know what is in Thyself (nafsika)"; also iii. 27, 28; vi. 12, 54 and xx. 45-5. One reference, xxv. 4 (cf. xili. 17), is to gods: "They [nafs] do not possess for themselves (anfusikum) any harm or benefit at all!" 4. In vi. 130 the plural is used twice to refer to the company of men and djinn: "We have witnessed against ourselves (anfusina)". It means the human soul: vi. 93: "While the angels stretch forth their hands [saying, Send forth your souls (anfuh)]": also l. 15; lxxiv. 16; lxxix. 40, etc. This soul has three characteristics: a. It is amrniru, commanding to evil (xii. 53). Like the Hebrew nefesh the basal idea is "the physical appetite," in Pauline usage w3kh, and in the English New Testament "flesh." It whispers (l. 15), and is associated with al-haza, which, in the sense of "desire," is always evil. It must be restrained (lxxix. 40) and made patient (xvii. 27) and its greed must be feared (lix. 9b). b. The nafs is lawwama, i.e., it upbrands (lxv. 2); the souls (anfuS) of deserters are straitened (lx. 119). c. The soul is addressed as nafjina, tranq wil (lxxix. 27). These three terms form the basis of much of the later Muslim ethics and psychology. It is not-worth that nafs is not used in connection with the angels.

B. Ruh has five uses: 1. Allah blew (nafakh) of His ruh, a., into Adam, giving life to Adam's body (xv. 29; xxxviii. 72; xxxii. 8), and b. into Maryam for the conception of 'Isa (xvi. 91 and xxxvi. 12). Here ruh equates with ruh and means the "breath of life" (cf. Gen. ii. 7), the creation of which belongs to Allah. 2. Four verses connect ruh with the anm of Allah, and the meanings of both ruh and anm are disputed. a. In xvii. 87, it is stated: "They ask thee [O Muhammad] about al-ruh; say: al-ruh min anw' rabbii, and ye are brought but little knowledge." b. In xvi. 2, Allah sends down the angels with al-ruh min amrikhu upon whomsoever He wills of His creatures to say: "Warn that the fact is, There is no God but Me, so fear." c. In xi. 15, Allah "cast al-ruh min amrikhu upon whomsoever He wills of His creatures to give warning," d. In xlii. 52: "We revealed (sawllin) to thee [O Muhammad] ruhan min amrikhu; thou knewest not what the book was, nor the faith, but We made it to be a light by which We guide whomsoever We will of Our creatures." Whatever meanings anm and min may have, the contexts connect al-ruh in a. with knowledge; in b. with angels and creatures, to give warning; in c. with creatures, for warning, and in d. with Muhammad, for knowledge, faith, light and guidance. Therefore this ruh is special equipment from Allah for prophetic service. It reminds forcibly of Bezalel, who was "filled with the spirit of God in wisdom, in understanding and in knowledge" (Exodus xxx. 30, 31). 3. In iv. 169, 'Isa is called a ruh from Allah. 4. In xviii. 4; lxxviii. 38 and lxx. 4, al-ruh is an associate of the angels. 5. In xxvi. 193, al-ruh al-amini, the faithful ruh, comes down upon Muhammad's heart to reveal the Kur'ân. In xix. 17, Allah sends to Maryam "Our ruh," who appears to her as a well-made man. In xvi. 104, ruh al-kubus sent the Kur'ân to establish believers. Three other passages state that Allah helps 'Isa with ruh al-kubus (ll. 81; ll. 254 and vi. 109). This interrelation of service and title imply the identity of this angelic messenger, who may be also the ruh of 4. Thus in the Kur'ân ruh does not mean angels in general, nor man's self or person, nor his soul or spirit. The plural does not occur.

C. Nafs, breath and wind, cognate to nafs in root and to ruh in some of its meanings, does not occur in the Kur'ân, but is used in the early poetry (F. Krenkow, The Poems of Tufail and At-Tirimmah. London 1927. p. 32). The verb tanafasa (Sura lxx. 15) is derived from that meaning, while the only other Kur'ânic forms from the same radicals are fultanafasi 'l-mutannahum (lxxiii. 26) and are derived in al-'Abari, Dhami al-Bayan, Cairo 1921, lxxv. 57, probably correctly, from nafs, "he desired".

II. The Umayyad poetry first uses ruh for the human soul (Kitab al-Idhâm. ed. 1285, xvi. 126, last line; Cheikh, Le Christianisme, Bairiat 1923, p. 338) where the Kur'ân had used nafs as in No. 5 above.

III. Of the early collections of traditions, Malik's al-Muwatta', Cairo 1359, l. 126 uses nasama, which does not occur in the Kur'ân, and nafs (ll. 262) for the soul or spirit, while Ibn 'Hambal's Musnad uses nasam (vi. 424), nafs (l. 297; ii. 364; vi. 149) and nafs and ruh (iv. 287, 296).
Muslim's al-Saḥīḥ (Constantinople 1331), viii. 44, 162 sq. and al-Dūghānī's al-Saḥīḥ, Cairo 1314, iv. 153, both use ṛūḥ and arwāḥ for the human spirit.

IV. The Tadhīb al-ʿArūṣ (v. 260) lists 15 meanings for nafs and adds two others from the Līlān al-ʿArab, as follows: spirit, blood, body, evil eye, presence, specific reality, self, tan, haghhtiness, self-magnification, purpose, disdain, the absent, desire, punishment, brother, man. It states that most of these meanings are metaphorical. The Līlān (viii. 119-126) finds examples of these meanings in the poetry and the Kurān. Lane's Arabic Lexicon faithfully reproduces the material (p. 28576).

The lexical treatments of nafs disclose these facts: 1. Any attribution to Allah of nafs as "soul" or "spirit" is avoided. 2. In man, a. nafs and ṛūḥ are identified, or b. nafs applies to the mind and ṛūḥ to life, or c. man has nafs, two souls, one vital and the other discriminative, or d. the discriminative soul is double, sometimes commanding and sometimes forbidding.

V. The influences that affected the post-Kurānīc uses of both nafs and ṛūḥ were the Christian and Neo-Platonic ideas of ṛūḥ with human, angelic and divine applications, and the more specifically Aristotelian psychological analysis of nafs. These influences are clearly shown in the records of the religious controversies.

A. Al-ʿAṣḥārī [q.v.] (H. Ritter, Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam von Abu'l-Ḥasan ʿAllī ibn Ḥunayn al-ʿAṣḥārī, Istanbul 1929) reports the Rāfiḍīya doctrines of the incarnation of ṛūḥ Allāh in Adam and its transmigration through the prophets and others (p. 6, 46), as well as the conflicting positions that man is body (ḏiyūm) only, body and spirit, and spirit (Ṭūḥ) only (p. 61, 329 sqq.). His creed of the orthodox (p. 290-297) omits any statement about the nature of man.

B. Al-Baghdādī [q.v.] (al-Farāk bāḥn al-Farāḥ, Cairo 1328) records the same heretical doctrines about man's nature (p. 28, 117 sqq., 241 sqq.), says the transmigration theories, were held by Plató and the Jews (p. 254) and describes the incarnation beliefs of the Ḥulūliya sects (cf. Ḥulūl] among whom he includes the Ḥallāḏiyā (p. 247). His position is "The life of Allāh is without ṛūḥ and nourishment and all the arwāḥ are created, in opposition to the Christian doctrine of the eternity of the Father, Son and Spirit" (p. 325).

C. Ibn Ḥazm [q.v.] uses nafs and ṛūḥ interchangeably of man's soul (Kitāb al-Fīqḥ fī l-Milāḥ, 5 parts, Cairo 1317-1321; v. 66). He excludes from Islam all who hold metempsychosis views, among whom he includes the physician-philosopher Muhammad b. Zakariyyā al-Kāzī (i. 90 sqq.; iv. 187 sqq.). He rejects absolutely the doctrine of some of the Ashʿarīya of the continual re-creation of the ṛūḥ (iv. 60). He always that ṛūḥ created the spirits of all Adam's progeny before the angels were commanded to prostrate to him (Ṣūra vii. 171), and that these spirits exist in al-Barzakh [q.v.] in the nearest heaven until the angel blows them into embryos (iv. 70).

D. Al-Shahrastānī [q.v.] (Kitāb al-Mīlāḥ wa-l-Nihāl, ed. Careton, part i, London 1842) in his description of the belief of the pagan Arabs concerning survival after death does not use the terms nafs or ṛūḥ, but says the blood becomes a wahrān bird that visits the grave every hundred years. One of his most important sections (p. 203-240) deals with the orthodox and heterodox doctrines of al-ṭūḥ. Al-Hunayn [q.v.], or true believers, debate with al-Saḥīḥ [q.v.], who are dualists, eucharitians and gnostics. His account of the views of the Ṣab'a faithfully reflects the doctrines of the Ṣab'a (Rāṣūl, 4 vols., Bombay 1305), who taught that man is a whole compounded of a corporeal body and a spiritual nafs (i.ii., 14), and that the substance (ḏjuhr) of the nafs descended from the spheres (al-ṭūḥ). But al-Shahrastānī rejects the Neo-Platonic idea that human souls (nafs) are dependent upon the souls of the superhuman spirit world (al-nafṣ al-ṭūḥāmiyāt) (p. 210, 224 sqq.), and the Hermetic doctrines that the nafs is essentially evil (p. 236) and that salvation consists in the release of the ṛūḥ from material bodies (p. 226 sqq.). He applies the term ṛūḥ to all spirits, good and evil (p. 213). His description of the nature of man (p. 216 sqq.) with three souls, vegetative, animal and human, each with its own source, need, place and powers, resembles that of the Ṣab'a (Rāṣūl, ii. 48 sqq.). Indeed, the Aris and Al-Kindī reject the idea of the human soul as given in De Anima and handed down by Alexander of Aphrodisias and Porphyry, had been adopted with little modification by the Muslims philosophers, such as al-Kindī [q.v.], al-Fārābī [q.v.], each of whom wrote a Kitāb al-Nafs, Ibn Sīnā [q.v.] who wrote two, and Ibn Miskawayh [q.v.], whose Tahāfūt al-Ṭūḥāk has the same inmaterial (p. 1) and functional (p. 7) psychology for its ethical basis. Al-Shahrastānī achieved the long needed interpretation of the conflicting usages of nafs and ṛūḥ in the Greek and Christian heritage, and in the Kurān and Muslim tradition. But the philosophers, even with his support, were not able to force the Greek psychology upon orthodox Islam. The Muṭahallīmus [s. art. KALK] and the great majority of Muslims broadened the ṛūḥī terminology, but retained the traditional views of the nature of the soul as a direct creation of Allāh having various qualities.

VI. Aristotle's principle of the incorporeal character of spirit had nevertheless found a permanent place in Muslim doctrine through the influence of Islam's greatest theologian, al-Ghazālī [q.v.]. In al-Tahānawi's Dictionary of the Technical Terms (ed. Sprenger, Calcutta 1862) are extracts of the doctrines of al-Ghazālī on man's ṛūḥ and nafs. He defines man as a spiritual substance (ẓāhlor ṛūḥān), not confined in a body, nor imprinted on it, nor joined to it, nor separated from it, just as Allāh is neither without nor within the world, and likewise the angels. It possesses knowledge and perception, and is therefore not an accident (p. 547 at top; cf. Tahāfūt al-Fihās, Cairo 1302, p. 72). He devotes the second section of al-Risāla al-Laduniyya (Cairo 1327, p. 7-14) to explain the words nafs, ṛūḥ and ḥālī (heart), which are names for this simple substance that is the seat of the intellectual processes. It differs from the animal ṛūḥ, a refined but mortal body in which reside the senses. He identifies the incorporeal ṛūḥ with al-nafs al-mustajāna and al-ṭūḥ al-amālī of the Kurān. He then uses the term nafs also for the "flesh" or lower nature, which must be disciplined in the interests of ethics.

VII. This position of al-Ghazālī's was that of the theistic philosophers in general, as well as some of the Muṭahallīmus and the Shīʿa, but it has never dominated Islam. The great analytical philosopher
and theologian, Fāyḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, could not bring himself to accept it. In his Mushafīt al-Ghāth, v. 435, commenting on Sūra xvii. 85, he quotes as the opinion of al-Ghazālī the statement that in the latter’s Tahāfūt (p. 72; cf. also Rāzī’s Muḥājrat, Cairo 1323, p. 164), but on p. 434 (l. 9 and 8 from below) of the Mushafīt he acknowledges the strength of the corporeal doctrine, and in his Manzil Īdt al-Dīn, on the margin of the Muḥājrat, soul (nafs) is presented as blameless (ṣītīl) the view of the philosophers that the nafs is a substance (ḏawarāḥ) which is not a body (ḏārim) and not corporeal.

VIII. Al-Baidāwī’s [q. v.] system of cosmogony and psychology is given in his Jawāl al-Anwār (lithograph ed. with commentary Abu ʿI-Thānak’ al-Jsāfānī and gloss by al-Djardjant, Stambul 1305, p. 285 sqq.; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 418, ii. 111, printed Cairo 1323). He discusses 1. The classes of incorporeal substances, 2. the heavenly intelligences, 3. the souls of the spheres, 4. the incorporeality of human souls, 5. their creation 6. their connection with bodies and 7. their survival. His cosmogony follows: Allāh, because of his unity, created only one Intelligence (ʿāfd). This Second Intelligence, that emanated first (ḍa’īfl) from Allāh, is the cause (ʿillā) of all other potentialities and is not body (ḏārim), nor original matter (ḥayūṭ) nor form (ṣawwā). His secondary cause (ṣabāb) of another Intelligence, that emanates from the second a third intelligence and so on to the tenth (p. 288) who is the rāū of Sūra lxxviii. 38 (cf. al-Baidāwī’s Anwār al-Tanzil, ed. Flesicher, ii. 353; l. 4) whose effective influence is in the world of the elements and who is the producer of the spirits (arwāḥ) of mankind. Below these intelligences are the high or heavenly angels, which the philosophers call al-nafs al-falāḥiyā, and the low nafsān, which are in two classes: earthly angels, in control of the simple elements and the earthly souls, such as the reasoning souls (nafs nāṭḥiḥī) controlling particular persons. In addition (p. 285) there are the incorporeal substances, without effect or control, who are angels, some good (al-kurāb) and some evil (al-gharāb) and the qīnān, who are ready for both good and evil. This is the classification he refers to in his commentary on Sūra ii. 28 (ed. Flesicher, i. 47, 23). His psychology resembles that of al-Ghazālī, whom he mentions (p. 294). For the incorporeality of the soul (ḏawārāḥ al-nafs) he presents five arguments from reason, four Qurʾān verses and one tradition. His commentator remarks (p. 300) that these prove only that the soul differs from the body. He then argues that all nafsān are created when their bodies are completed. The nafs (p. 303) is not embodied and is not close to the body, but is attached as the lover to the beloved. It is connected with that rāū which comes from the heart and is generated of the finest nutritive particles. The reasoning nafs produces a force that flows with that rāū through the body, producing in every organ its proper functions. These functional powers are perceptive, which are the five external senses, and the five internal faculties of the human consciousness, imagination, apprehension, memory and reason, and the active (al-nudhirāb) which are voluntary (ṣītīyā) and natural (ḏabīyā, p. 308).

IX. The dominant Muslim doctrine concerning the origin, nature and future of al-rāū and al-
manifestation of the Divine essence. This place receives a rûh, who is Adam, the khalîfat and the perfect man. He discusses (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 129 sqq.) the essence and properties of the rûh, quoting among others the view he says is "attributed" to al-Qazwînî which is in al-Tâkhyât (as above). He finds the differences of doctrine harmless because all agree that the rûh is associated with the agent of the last tractate on the nafs and rûh (M. Asín Palacios, Tratado Acerca del Concepción del Alma y del Espíritu, in Acta du XIVe Congrès international des Orientalistes, Paris 1906, iii. 167—191) he describes how men may reach the distinction of "the perfect man" through the cultivation of the qualities of the rûh and the suppression of the nafs.

Ibn al-Arâbî's contemporary, the poet Ibn al-Fârîd (Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, Cambridge 1921, chap. iii.), at times identifies his own rûh with that from which all good emanates (al-Tâ'âya al-کhârîja, on margin of Dânîn Ibn al-Fârîd, Cairo 1319, ii. 4 sq.) and with the "pole" (kuh) upon which the heavens revolve (p. 113, 115). Al-Kâshânî, the commentator of al-Tâ'âya, explains that this identity is with the greatest spirit (rûh al-arwaâh) and the greatest "pole." The compiler of the commentaries on the Dânîn states (ii. 196) that incarnation (kuhîli) and union (îshrâh) with Allah are impossible, but there is real "passing away" (fana) and attainment (wâliî) of the rûh and nafs in the nafs of Allâh, for His nafs is their nafs.

Abd al-Karîm al-Dîljânî carries this position of existential monism on to strict animistic pantheism. In al-Însân al-khânîl (q.v.) (Cairo 1343) the terms rûh al-kûdus, rûh al-arwaâh and rûh Allâh stand for a special one of the aspects of the Divine Reality (al-Hâkîkî), not to be embraced under the command "be" nor created. This spirit is the divine aspect in which stand the created spirits of all existences, sensible and intelligible (p. 94). Existence itself subsists in the nafs of Allâh, and His nafs is His Essence (adlîn). Moreover, each sensible thing has a created spirit (rûh) (p. 94). One of the aspects of the angel of Sûra xlii. 52, who is named the command (amr) of Allâh, and who is an aspect of Allâh as above, is given to the rûh of Muhammad, which is identified as the rûh mentioned in the verse. That angelic and divine rûh thereby becomes the Idea (khâlık) of Muhammad (p. 95 sq.) and he thereby becomes the "perfect man" (p. 96, 131 sqq.). The rûh which is the specific nature of the human nafs has five names: animal, commanding to evil, instinctive (al-mulâkhana), reviving, and tranquil. When the divine qualities actually describe the nafs, then the names, qualities and essences of the gnostic (arifî) are those of the One Known (Mā'dîrîf) (p. 150 sq.).

XI. In geomancy ("Jim al-râmîl") the first "house" (sâtî) of the umûmâtî (cf. Madâgascar, supra, iii. 73) is called nafs because it guides to problems concerning the spirit of the inquirer, and to the beginning of affairs (Muhammad al-Zanîtî, Kitâb al-Fasîl fî 'Jim al-Râmîl, Cairo n.d., p. 7; cf. Henr. Corn. Agrippae, Opera, Leyden, n. d., but early xvith cent., p. 412: Nam primus dominus personam tentat quaerentis.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article see especially D. B. Macdonald, The Development of the Idea of Spirit in Islam, in Acta Orientalia, Oslo 1931, ix. 307—351 (reprinted in M. W., xxii. [1932], 25—42, 153—168) upon which much of the present article is based; Muslim philosophical psychology goes back to Aristotle's De Anima (best ed. by R. D. Hicks, Cambridge 1907); for the early metempsychosis beliefs see I. Friedlander, The Héleódorî of the Sûlitîs etc., in J. Am. O.S., xxix. 1—80, xx. 1—182; for the later Aristotle and Ibn Sînâ see S. Landauer, Die Psychologie des Ibn Sînâ, in Z.D.M.G., xxix. [1875], 333—418; English translation by A. E. van Dyck, Avicenna's Offering to the Prince, Verona 1906; M. Horten, Die philosophischen Systeme im Islam, Bonn 1912; T. J. De Boer, The History of Philosophy in Islam, London 1903. (E. E. Calverley)

AL-NAFUSA, in Berber Infesin, name of a Berber tribe. According to the common genealogical scheme (cf. Ibn Khaldûn, Kitâb al-Ibar, i. 107—117 of the text), the Nafusa are one of the four branches of the large body of the Botr, whose name derives from their chief Mâghîths al-Abtar. At present the dwelling place of the Nafusa is south-west of Tripoli, on the plateau of the same name which from the frontier between Tunisia and Tripolitania tends eastward, if taken in the largest sense, comprises the regions of Nûlt, Fassafo and Yefren. The inhabitants of these regions are generally called Nafusa, although, in a genealogical sense, this name can be applied to some groups only. Probably the name Djalal Nafusa (in Berber Drâr n Infesin), which originally belonged to a part of the plateau, was extended to the large area between Wazzen and Yefren on account of the fact, that of the tribes inhabiting it, the Nafusa were of prominent importance. This use of the name in its widest sense is also to be found in the book by Ibrahim b. Shimân al-Shamâmhi "Castles and Ways of the Nafusa plateau" (1302 = 1884—1885), in which all the territories of Yefren, Fossafo and Djalâl are mentioned.

The scarce data on the history of the Nafusa, which we possess, are to be found, for the largest part, in Arabic sources. In the Greek and Latin authors of pre-Islamic times there is no single sure allusion to them. The name occurring in Cosippus Tophanius (second song, l. 146: Quaeque nefanda colunt tristis montana Navusi), does not refer, in all probability, to a place or a tribe of Tripolitania, but rather of the Aurâs (Awras), its plateau or its neighbourhood. The fact that Navus represents a form closely connected with Nafusa, proves only that the name was widely spread among the Berbers, that it is old and may be probably connected with such words as anfûsîn, fem. anfûsîn "right, to the right hand" in Arabic.

In Islamic times the name is recorded for the first time in connection with the capture of the town of Tripoli by 'Amr b. al-Âs (22 or 23). According to Ibn Idrîs (i. 2 sqq., text) the siege of the inhabitants was called to their aid the Nafusa who came to their aid. At that time they were residing also in the vast plain of Djafara, situated between the Djabal and the Sea; one of their chief towns, if not their capital, was Sabra on the coast (Roman Sabratha, formerly Phoenician), west of Tripoli, which by Ibn Khaldûn (Ibar, i. 181, l. 8, text) is called "the city of the Nafusa." This town was taken
by surprise and plundered by a body of cavalry sent by 'Amr. This raid was probably undertaken not only to continue the conquest farther westward, but also to punish the Nafusa, whose territory 'Amr had invaded in order to conquer it (cf. al-Bakri, p. 9, 10, text), and which he had to abandon by order of the Caliph.

According to some sources, the Nafusa at that time were Christians; according to other reports, however, they were Jews. Our latest local information makes it probable that Christianity had spread widely among them; though the conversion of single groups to Judaism is not excluded. In fact traces of Byzantine basilicas have been found on the plateau, e.g. at Temezda, 'Imramen etc., which are also mentioned in some sources and which must have been used by large numbers of the indigenous population.

When the Arab had conquered North Africa, the Nafusa of Saba and of the coastal region retired, according to the common opinion, to the plateau, where they remained hostile towards the conquering forces. A fresh attack of the Tripolita population, however, makes it clear that a part of them must have stayed in their old dwelling-places where they intermarried with other tribes and, in course of time, became arabised. In fact there are tribes in the Western Djafera and in Tripoli, the town and its surroundings (the regions of al-Sahl, Taguira, etc.), that, according to the local genealogy, derive from the Nafusa. Apart from this ethnic tradition, there is the fact, recorded in several sources, that after the first case of intervention of the Nafusa in the affairs of the town of Tripoli — which may have been partly due to a Christian opposition to the Muhammadan invasion — they wanted, under successive dominations, to make their presence felt and their influence preponderant in the north-western region of Tripolitania, so that the outlines of the history of the small, but strong and civilised Berber unit may be supposed to be the following. Having its centre in the plateau, it intended to make felt, as often as possible, its dominion in the coastal region and thus keep the control of the main way of communication between Egypt and Ifrikiya, which ran along the coast and which was followed by the various expeditions to the Maghrib. Even at present such aspirations may be stirred in the minds of the most cultivated of these populations, to such an extent that even some of them have reckoned with an eventual reoccupation of their old territories in Western Djafera.

The period in which the Nafusa, according to the sources available to us, vigorous were most active and took a part in the events happening in North Africa, was that of the great Kharijij [q. v.] revolts, which began in 122 (729—740) and did not cease before the ivth (5th) century, i.e. before the era of the Fatimids. When the Wahbi doctrines began to spread among the North African populations in the second century A.D., they embraced them and so joined the rebellious movement of the Berbers against the Arab conquerors, a movement which, prepared by several other causes, found also some support in the Kharijij heterodoxy. The Nafusa embraced the Ibadhi, i.e. the more moderate form of the Kharijij doctrine, and remained ever faithful to it with heroic attachment. In alliance with other Berber tribes, either Ibadis or other branches of the sect, they repeatedly made war upon the Arab governors of Ifrikiya.

In 140 (757—758), they elected as their imam, probably with the intention of founding an Ibadite principality — an intention which manifests itself also at other times — an Arab called Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb 'Abd al-A'īn b. al-Samh al-Muṣaffir [q. v.], one of the missionaires of Ibadism in North Africa. Under his command and in conjunction with other Berber groups, they occupied Tripolis, fought against the Susrife [cf. al-Sufiriya] Wafargjuma, who had sacked Kairawan where they had settled, and against the armies sent by the 'Abbāsids to reconquer Ifrikiya. Finally, in 144 (761—762), Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and a large number of his followers perished near Tanorqha (Tawurgha) in a great battle against the general Muḥammad b. al-Āsh'ār al-Khuzāʾi, the governor of Ifrikiya.

Another notorious imam of the Nafusa was a Berber Abu Ḥattīm Yaḥyā b. [q. v.], whose enterprises survive in oral tradition on the plateau, who speaks of his 175 expeditions with the Arabs. He was killed in battle in 152 (771). When the Ibadī kingdom of the Rustainids [cf. Rustam], which had Tahirt as its centre, had been founded, the Nafusa did not elect an imam of their own any more, but formed a part of this kingdom under a governor who depended upon it. Some of these governors, e.g. Abū Ḥālid 'Abd al-Ḥamid al-Djanawīn (of Iğnāvān), Abū Mauṣūr Ḥiyāb (of Tendemmira), are often praised by the Berbers of the Djafer, for their importance and ability in maintaining the interests of Ibadism, and also for their learning and piety.

The Nafusa were a valuable support of the kingdom of the Rustainids, of which they formed the eastern bulwark. Being near the territory of the Aghlabides [q. v.], they shared to some extent the vicissitudes of this state which had arisen in Ifrikiya in the beginning of the ivth century A.D. The town of Tripoli was in the possession of those princes: Western Djafera, on the other hand, till near the Sea, and probably also part of Eastern Djafera, was in the power or under the influence of the Nafusa. When Tripoli was beleaguered in 267 (880—881) by the Tulūn prince al-ABBĀS, who, having revolted against his father Almād, sought to conquer Ifrikiya at his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invoked by the inhabitants of Lebd). This fact, which reminds of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslims, proves clearly the influence the Nafusa possessed in northwestern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 283 (896—897) by the Aghlabides, when Ibrāhīm II b. Almād, who led an expedition from Tunis to Egypt, found his passage through the coastal region of Tripolitania barred by the Nafusa. The bloody battle of Mānāt, which was followed by acts of terrible cruelty inflicted upon hundreds of Nafusa prisoners, and which is narrated in a more or less anecdotal form in the Sunni as well as in the Ibadī sources, is ascribed, ultimately, to the desire of the Caliph to punish the Nafusa who were the principal support of the heretical state of Tahirt; or to the resentment of the Aghlabides at acts of enmity committed
by the Berbers, as well as in the humiliation they had suffered when the expedition of the Tulunid al-Athas, which was directed against them, had been averted by the Nafusa, to whom this exploit became a point of glory.

In reality, however, taking into account the whole political situation as well as the historical antecedents, it is evident that that battle, which is still mentioned in the oral tradition of the Idrisites as the most terrible disaster they ever suffered, was the inevitable encounter between the Aghlabid power and the supremacy of the Nafusa exercised in the former's immediate vicinity and even in its own territory.

Many of the Aghlabids as well as that of the Rustamids had been destroyed by the Fatimids \[q.v., the Nafusa found themselves face to face with those new masters of Eastern Barbary. There exist reports of an instance of their strenuous opposition to Fatimid powers which endeavoured to subdue them in 310 (922—933), and which defeated them in the following year.

There are, however, reports concerning the part taken by the Nafusa, or at least by tribes from the plateau, in the great Khairid rebellion, which was led by Abu Vasid and which ended with the victory of the Fatimids. Probably the Idrisite populations of the Djohal, although having given up the idea of forming one large autonomous state, endeavoured to avoid any dependence upon the various kingdoms and empires which successively held the supremacy in North Africa, while the latter, on the other hand, endeavoured, as far as possible, to obtain a footing also in the mountainous region which forms the strategic key to the plain stretching towards the coast.

When the Almohades \[q.v.] undertook the conquest of Western Ifrikiya under Abd al-Mumin (554—555 = 1159—1160), the Nafusa were also subdued by his army. Their territory became the scene of violent struggles and massacres, of raids and partial conquests during the long period of the reign of the Banu Chihnya, who attempted to restore the Almoravid empire and who, from 580 (1184—1185) onwards, for nearly half a century and with varying success, fought chiefly in Oriental Barbary. In these fights Arabs of the tribe of Debba (belonging to the Banu Sulaim), took part who had come to Tripolitania during the well known invasion of the Banu Hithal and Sulaim. Some clans of the Debba, especially the Mahjamid and the Djouwi, settled in the coastal region west of Tripoli, where the Nafusa had exercised their power before. Yet the great mass of the latter must have retired to the plateau not at the time of the conquest, but in consequence of the Arab invasion.

The Nafusa remained in nearly the same attitude of defence of their independence, during the supremacy in Ifrikiya of the Hashids \[q.v., and, afterwards, of the Turks. While other populations in the neighbourhood gave up their Ibadism in order to embrace Sunnism, and consequently became arabised, the Nafusa stuck to their faith and to their Berber vernacular, withdrawing themselves to the rough coasts of their mountains, and from time to time taking part in the acts of hostility and in the rebellions which the interior opposed to the efforts of the government of Tripoli to maintain its own authority and, chiefly, to levy taxes.

In the nineteenth century, the Turks, after having re-taken in 1251 (1835—1836) the direct administration of Tripoli, had to fight long and bitterly for the conquest of the plateau of the Nafusa also. The struggle lasted, with varying success, till 1274 (1857—1858); in this period the shahkh Chihna b. Khalifa distinguished himself by courage and endurance; he is usually represented as the hero of Berber independence defended against the Turks. In reality, however, he was an Arab and the Arab tribe of the Mahjamid had the largest share in the wars, while the Berbers, according to all appearance, did not take part in them on a large scale. During the Italian occupation of Tripolitania in 1911, the Nafusa were at first hostile in accordance with their old aspiration to found an independent Idrisite kingdom which should extend up to the Sea and include the region of Sabratha. Defeated in 1913 by the valiant general Lequiio near al-Astaha they offered their submission to the Italian authorities and ever since have proved very faithful subjects. When inner Tripolitania, in consequence of the effects of the Great War, was troubled by rebels, they showed an heroic attachment to Italy, fighting her enemies under great sacrifices. When in 1922 the reconquest of the inland had begun, they voluntarily took part in it, side by side with the regular troops, with perfect loyalty.


Works in which the Nafusa are mentioned: The Arabic chronicles referring to the conquest of the Maghrib, as well as the
Additions and Corrections

p. 691b, l. 23, to be added: 13. 'Iḥd al-jawhar al-thamin (extract in L. Massignon, Recueil, p. 171, note 1).

p. 692a, l. 29, to be added: He has been buried at the feet of the poet Niyāzī Miṣrī at Kastro (Lemnos), where his tomb was still shown in 1916 (cf. L. Massignon, Recueil, p. 164).
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AL-NAFÚSÍ AND SAHIL AL-FARISI, the Abādite scholar of the Rustamid family, who lived in Tāhir in the 11th (10th) century. Some say that he was one of those who, by their learning and religious zeal helped to make that town famous. He was a complete master of Berber and served as interpreter under the imām `Atīf b. `Abd al-Wahāb in the first half of the third century A.H., or even till 258 (871—872), and under Abū Ḥātim Yūsuf b. Muḥammad who, with a short interruption, was imām from 281—294 (894—907). This shows that the Rustamid princes of Tāhir spoke Arabic, as was to be expected from their Oriental origin, and needed interpreters in their dealings with the Berber speaking peoples. When the Fatimids had destroyed the Ibadite power, Abū Sahil settled at Marsa `l-Khārez (La Calle, between Bōne and the Egyptian frontier); or at Marsa `L-Dādjudjī on the Algerian coast, between Ain Taya and Cape Djinet (cf. e.g. al-Bakrī, ed. de Slane, Algiers 1911, p. 64 sqq., 82).

al-Nāfūsī is best known as the author of a big Berber dictionary, containing religious and historical poems, both dealing probably with the doctrines and history of Ibadism. It has been lost, like so many other works of Berber Ibadites; yet perhaps parts of it may be recovered by further search in the Mzāb, at Gerba and among the Nafūsas. At any rate, Abū Sahil has an important place in the literary history of the Berbers, especially the Ibadites, who composed books on theology and law, chronicles, poetry and biographies.

Such a literary movement is usually explained by the need which the heretics felt of making clear their doctrine, especially the points in which it differed from the sunna, to the inhabitants of the interior of the Central and Eastern Maghrib, who did not know Arabic, and who must have been numerous about 1000 A.D. Yet another thing, which can be seen to-day, must not be forgotten, viz. the attachment of these peoples to their own tongue as a symbol of opposition to the Arabic speaking world in general and Muslim orthodoxy in particular. At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, some Berber groups in the neighbourhood of Vefren in Tripolitania were led by Sanās propaganda to give up their old Ibadite faith and embrace orthodoxy. This change in its turn caused the Berber dialect to be less used; as if heresy were bound up with the national language, and the giving up of the heresy removed the last obstacle to complete arabisation. This assumption is confirmed by some religious poems (they deserve to be called literature) in the region of Passāp, where the love of the national language is still strong. In them the author says explicitly that he uses Berber to uphold and strengthen the Ibādite faith, which once flourished gloriously, but afterwards decreased, and is now well nigh disappeared. In past times also, the Berber literature of the Ibadites was partly a symbol of non-conformity and nationalism; so when Abū Sahil, who was rooted in Arabic civilisation by his origin, devoted himself to the study of Berber so as to become the best Berber scholar of his time and to compose in it works. He must have felt in his deeply religious mind the connection between that language and the faith he professed.


NAGPUR, a city, tāḥsīl, district, and division of the Central Provinces of British India. The modern Central Provinces and Berar, which formed part of the eighteenth century Bhonsla kingdom of Nagpur, lie between 17° 47' and 24° 37' N. and 75° 37' and 82° 24' E., with an area of 113,285 square miles, and a total population of 17,951,147. Nagpur division contains a population of 3,595,578; Nagpur district 933,168; and the city 215,003 (1931 Census Report).

The history of this area, which roughly corresponds to Gondwāna, has been profoundly influenced by the long range of the Satpura hills through which the Bhrāmpur—Asirgarh gap provided the chief route from Hindustān to the Dakhan. When the Muhammadan invaders first came into contact with Gondwāna, it contained four independent
Gond kingdoms: the northern kingdom of Garha-Mandla; two central kingdoms with their capitals at Dêogarh and Kheli respectively; and a southern state with its capital at Candâ. In the reign of Akbar the imperial forces overran the northern kingdom, forcing it to pay tribute, despite the heroic efforts of the Dowager Râmi Durgâsvât. After this, the political predominance of the Gond chiefs was shifted to Dêogarh which in its turn also suffered from the aggressive schemes of the Mughal emperors. Early in the reign of Awrangzib a punitive force under Dîlîr Kân entered both Candâ and Dêogarh, with the result that, in 1670, the ruler of Dêogarh embraced Islam as the price of the restoration of his kingdom ('Ālamgîr-nâmâ, p. 1022—27). Both these states paid tribute to the emperor through a Muslim agent stationed at Nagpur. This however was not the earliest reference to Nagpur in the Mughal period, for the Pâdshah-nâmâ of Lâhârvî describes its capture by Kân Dâwânî, in 1637 (for a still earlier identification see Hîrâ Lal, p. 10).

The most famous ruler of Dêogarh was the converted Gond chief, Bakht Buland, who visited the court of Awrangzib (Mâ'dîshî-i 'Ālamgîrî, p. 273). Because of his contumacious attitude he was replaced by another Muslim Gond named Dînîrî (ibid., p. 340). For some years after this Bakht Buland remained in imperial service, until, escaping from imperial control, he once more raised the standard of revolt in Dêogarh (Mun'âshkah al-Lukbd of Kâfi Khâtî, p. 461). Although Dêogarh was recaptured for a time by Awrangzib’s forces, Bakht Buland remained in open rebellion and was never really subdued. Eventually under this able ruler the Dêogarh state comprised the modern districts of Chhindwâra and Bêtûl, together with portions of Nagpur, Seoni, Bhandâra and Bâlaghât. The last important Gond ruler was Cânâl Sultân who died in 1739. It was he who fixed the capital at Nagpur which he converted into a walled town.

The dissensions led to the intervention of Râghudî Gânsâl, who was governing Beráîr on behalf of the Marâthâ Pâshâ. Eventually, in 1743, the Marâthâ leader took over the administration of the country. By granting a nominal authority to the Gond Râjîâ, Bûrhân Shâh, and his descendants, the Gânsâl possessed a useful pretext for disavowing, when expedient, the rights of the Pâshâ, but in practice reference was usually made to Pûna on important matters, such as the succession. Bûrhân Shâh’s descendants have continued to occupy the position of state pensioners, and the representatives of the family resides at Nagpur with the title of Râjîâ or Sanâthânâk. Râghudî’s reign witnessed a great influx of Kunbis and other Marâthâs into Nâgpur. The treacherous attitude of his successor Dāndîshî led to his defeat; by the combined forces of the Nizâm and the Pâshâ, and to his acknowledgement of the latter’s supremacy.

It was under Râghudî II that the Nâgpur kingdom attained its greatest extent and included practically the whole of the modern Central Provinces and Berâîr, together with Orissa and certain of the Cutâ Nagpur states. Unfortunately for the solidarity of his kingdom he joined forces with Sânâhâ against the British, and, in 1803, after the battles of Aâsâye and Aârâbân, was compelled to subscribe to the treaty of Dêogarh, by which he was deposed of a third of his dominions (Aitchison, i. 415—417). He was succeeded in 1816 by his son, Paskoâl, an imbecile, who was murdered in the following year by the notorious Appâ Sâhib. On the outbreak of war between the British and the Pâshâ, in 1817, Appâ Sâhib attacked the British Residency but his troops were defeated in the brilliant action at Sitâbâlî. This resulted in the deposition of Appâ Sâhib, who was succeeded by Râghudî III, on whose death, in 1853, without heirs, natural or adopted, this dependent principality was declared by Dalhouse to have lapsed to the Paramount Power.

The British administered Nâgpur by means of a Commission until the formation of the Central Provinces in 1861. Today, the city of Nâgpur supports a flourishing Muhammadan community, in the suburb of Mehdiâbâgh, the members of which are Dîâdî Bohérâs of the Shâ’ sect [ibid. bohórâs]. The members of this community live together in the buildings of the institution, where their children are educated and their women taught suitable accomplishments.


nâhîye, an administrative district in the Ottoman empire which corresponds somewhat to the Swiss canton or French commune. It is a subdivision of the kaðâ (kast, q.v.), which may be compared with the French arrondissement and is governed by a kâ-im-nâfâm [q.v. while the nâhîye is under a muâdir. This official who used to be appointed by the wâlî, the governor of the province, received his instructions from the kâ-im-nâfâm, to whom he was subordinate. The subdivisions of the nâhîye are called kârîy, i.e. village. The term nâhîye for an administrative district is of recent origin. For the earlier provincial administration which did not know this name, cf. A. D. Mordâmîn sen, Stambul und das moderne Turkenthum, N.S., Leipzig 1878, p. i sqq.


(nâhîkî, nîshâ from the pre-Islamic divine name Nâhîk noted by Wellhausen and Nohleke among the Tamils, the Nâhîk (of Madâhâdî) and in Moçu before Islam. — In Kûfa and Sâmârâ it was the name of the ‘Al Nâhîk, a family of Shî scholars of the tribe of Nâhîk; descendants of Nâhîk, grandfather of Kâmîl b. Ziyâd, a partisan of ‘Abî, also celebrated as the founder of the Kumâlîya sect (for Kâmîlîya: Ibn Sa’d, vi. 124; kâdat of Mi’dân Sâmîti in Dâshî, Hayâzîn, ii. 98). Two of its members settled in Sâmârâ (Tûsî, Fihrist, p. 203; cf. p. 179, 196; the first ‘Abî Allâh b. Muhammad (Kâshî, p. 6) was the heterodox writer of the Mimîya sect mentioned by Mas‘ûdî and Ibn Hazm whose name Friedlander, following Barbier de Meynard, had read “Bhûkî” (sic: in

**AL-NAHIL**, "the Bee", Sūra xvi. of the Kur'ān. The title is taken from verse 70: "Thy Lord has made this revelation to the Bee". Khāzin (iil. 105) says that it was also called "Sūra of the Bees" because there are differences in several passages to cattle. As to its date, it is reckoned among the later Meccan Sūras and includes several verses of Medinese origin; the commentators however are not agreed on this point.

The Sūra of the "Bees" contains four abrogated verses: verse 69 is annulled by v. 92; verse 84 by ix. 5; verse 108, part 1, annulled by the end of the same verse and by ix. 5.

**Bibliography**: Noldke-Schwauly, Geschichte des Qurān, Leipzig 1909–1928, i. 145 sqq.; Sell, The Historical Development of the Qurān, London 1925; Mottet, le Coran, Paris 1929; al-Nasḥibī, Abīb al-Nas̩hibī, Cairo 1275; Ibn Sulama, al-Nazik̩ wa l-Manāṣir, on the margin of the preceding; Suyūṭī, Iskānī, Cairo 1343; the commentaries on the Kurān.

(Maurice Chemoul)

**AL-NAHRI, the constellation of the River (Eridanus).** It corresponds to the Perseus, Flamen, Annnis of the ancients (cf. Aratos, Phaëthon, p. 338; Gemius, Epsagory; Poltemy, Abuensest). Aratos observes (l. 360) — probably one of the first to do so — that the river of heaven represents Eridanus (Hēd̩anos, river of the morning; or river of darkness, of the west?) turned into stars, in which Phœbus, the sun, fell, struck by the thunderbolt of Zeus, after his unsuccessful attempt to ride to heaven. (The opinions of the Greek authors varied regarding the identity of the earthly Eridanus. It is often identified as the Po (Padas), in later times however sometimes with the Rhone (Rhodanus, probably on account of the similarity of sound with "Eridanus") or even with the Rhine (Rhenuis) while Strabo denies there was such a river for he calls it "θὸν μνημόθεν ὅλιθον "the nowhere existing"). According to another view (Eratosthenes, c. 37); the constellation of the river represents the Nile since "this alone flows from the south" while the river of heaven at the time of its culmination seems to flow from the south point of the horizon to the north; a third group of authors see in it the figure of Oceanos.

While Aratos clearly names only that portion of the river of heaven which lies between Orion and Cetus (the Whale), Eratosthenes and Hyginus continue it in a southeasterly direction as far as the neighbourhood of Canopus (ζ Κανωπίς); on the other hand, Ptolemy, like all later writers, gives it its southwesterly direction and already calls the star of the first magnitude at its southern point (α Eridani, Achnar, cf. below) "δρακοντες Περσαναθ, the position of which however he gives incorrectly as he could not himself observe it in Alexandria on account of its great southern declination (θ + 100° = 67° 25').

Al-Nahr is one of the constellations of the southern heavens. In the north it is adjoined by the Bull (al-Thawr), in the east by Orion (al-Dżubur, the Giant, or al-Dżawwāl, the Bride), the Hare (al-Arnab) and the most western subsidiary stars (khabīd al-Sūrā) of the Great Dog (al-Kabīr al-Sūrā), which are now included in the constellation of the Dove and the Sculptor's Tool, in the west by the Whale (Khit or Kailus). The constellation of al-Nahr contains, according to Abi al-Rahmān al-Sūfī (210 a.h.), primary stars (i.e. those which form the figure, kawābūd min al-Sūrā); there are no subsidiary stars included in it. It begins with ζ Eridani on the left foot of Orion (ω Orionis, Rigel), winds westwards to η Eridani, then southwards to α and ν Eridani via τ, as far as τ to α 12 Eridani and finally in a southwesterly direction via δ, ε, η Eridani to ε Eridani.

The fresco in the dome of Kusair 'Amra shows in the surviving portion the constellation of al-Nahr as a narrow ribbon, which runs directly westwards from the raised foot of Orion, a little below the figure and parallel with the latter in the direction of the Whale.

The Arabs give to the inverted quadrilateral formed by α Orionis, λ, β and ν Eridani, which appears to support the left foot of Orion (Rigel) the name "fore throne (foot-stool) of Orion", Kuwāt al-Dīwān al-Mubaddala, in contrast to its "back throne", Kuwāt al-Dīwān al-mu'āzābāk or Arūb al-Dīwān. The stars ζ, ν, δ and τ·Eridani together with ι and ξ Ceti, which enclose an area with very few stars in it, are called Liṭhi al-Nā'ān, "Ostrich Nest", the numerous small stars surrounding it are called al-Balūd, "the eggs", or al-Kudil, "the egg-shells". The most southerly star in Eridanus, also the brightest (α Eridani, first magnitude), is called al-Zalīm, the "male ostrich", or Asghar al-Nahr, the "last of the river" (in the Alfonsine Tables whence comes the name still used at the present day Achnar to Acanar, between Acherion and Felixhaul (i.e. Fum al-Hāz, "mouth of the fish", a Piscis Australis) in the region of the present Phoenix) is a considerable number of stars which the Arabs called al-Riqāf, "the ostrich chicks". Al-Sūfī states that in Shirāz he observed a series of stars near the horizon which had the shape of a ship (sawrāq), (+, φ, μ, β, η, γ Phoenixis), the brightest among them (α, according to Sūfī, of third, in reality of second magnitude) forms a Piscis Austrini and η Ceti [Domeb (Dhunāb) Kāfīrān, "sail of the whale"] as approximately right-angled isosceles triangle with a line from a Piscis Australis to θ Ceti as base, the stars within which according to al-Sūfī are also to be included in al-Riqāf. The star α Phoenixis is called al-Dirādī al-thānī "the Second Frog", in contrast to the "First Frog", al-Dirādī al-nawwāl, which is represented by a Piscis.


(W. Hartner)

**NAHĪK AL-MALIK.** [See Diqla.]

**AL-NAHRAWĀLĪ (NAHRWANĪ), Arab historian. Kufa al-Din Muhammad b. 'Alā' al-Din Ahmad b. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Kāf Khan Maḥmūd al-Makki al-Kādiri al-Makki al-Hanafi was born in 917 (1511) in Mecca, to which his father, a member of a scholarly Indian family, had migrated from Nahrawālī in Gujrat. To complete his studies which had been...**
begun under his father, he went in 943 (1530)
to Cairo, where he was taught by al-Suyūtī’s pupils,
and to Stambul. On his return home he received a
teaching appointment in the Madrasa al-Ashrafīya.
In 965 (1557) he again went to Stambul via
Asia Minor and afterwards was appointed to the
Kanbayātlya in Mecca. When in 975 (1567) the
al-Sulāmīnya Madrasa was founded for all four
orthodox rites, he went to it and later became
Mufīt of Mecca. He died in 990 (1582; according
to others in 988 or 991).
His first literary effort seems to have been a
description of his second journey to Stambul,
which has not survived. His other works cannot
be chronologically arranged with certainty. These
are the poetical anthology, intended to supply quotations
for letter-writers which in the Leyden (Cat. cod.
ar., i. 356) MS. is called Tāmībāl dāl al-Maṣūma
al-Sūrī fī l-Ahār al-faṣra al-Nādira, in the Cairo
(Fīhrī, iv. 220: ii. 68) Tāmībāl wa l-Mu-
ḥādara bi l-Ahār al-mufrada al-Nādira, and a
collection of riddles entitled Kunz al-ʿAsīma
fī Fann al-Muḥādara, which is preserved in Berlin
No. 7348, in the Escorial (Cat. Derenburg,
No. 556), in Stambul (Aḥṣif Ef., iii. 107, 289)
and in Cairo (Fīhrī, iv. 507), which is quoted by
Abd al-Kādīr al-Buḍshā (Khanārat al-Idāb,
iii. 112), and on which Muḥīr al-Dīn ʿAbd
al-Muṭin b. ʿAbd al-Bakr in 993 (1585) wrote a
commentary entitled Tārīkh al-mufrada (MSS.
in Uppsala, No. 63; Paris, No. 3417, 5; Escorial,
ep. cit., No. 536, 2; extracts in Leyden, ep. cit.,
No. 522). It is not possible also to date his
collection of biographical matter of which there
only survives the synopsis Muntakab al-Ṭuḥīb
in Leyden (ep. cit., No. 1045). His two principal historical works date from
the last two decades of his life. On 1st Ramadan 981
(May 3, 1573) he finished his history of Turkish
rule in the Yamāt entitled al-Bāb al-Yamāt fī
l-Fath al-ʿAkhbārīn; it begins with the year 900
(1494), describes the first Turkish conquest under
the vizier Sulāmīn Pașa, the return of the Zaidīs
and the second conquest by the grand vizier Sinān
Pașa, to whom the work is dedicated; an appendix
describes his conquest of Tunis and Goletta. He
prepared a second edition after the accession of
Sulṭān Murād III in 982 (1574); cf. S. de Sacy,
in N.E., iv. (1759), p. 412-521 and to the MSS.,
Paris (Blöchet, Cat. des Mis. Ar. des nouvelles
acquisitions, No. 5927), Escorial (Lévi-Provençal,
No. 1720; Cairo, Fīhrī, v. 56), also D. Lopes.
Extracts de historia da conquista da Jaman pelos
Omanenses texts ar. con trad. e notas, Lisbon 1892.
In 985 (1577) he finished his history of Mecca
dedicated to Sulṭān Murād, entitled al-Ṭāmīb al-
Balad (Baṣr) Allāh al-ḥarbām, which
Wustenfeld published in the Chroniken der Stadt
Mekka, vol. i, Leipzig 1857, and is printed Cairo
1303, 1505 (on the margin of Ahmad b. Zaini
Dahān’s Khatūṣat al-Kalām jī Bayān Umārā
al-Balad al-ḥarbām), 1316; to the MSS. given in G.
A. L., ii. 382 may be added Tubingen, No. 231;
Paris, No. 1637-1642, 4924, 5932, 5999; Leyden
(Cat. ii, No. 926-930; Cambridge (Browne,
No. 4-44); Ambrosiana, H., No. 116 (Z. D. M. G.
iv. 75); Vatican, No. 284; Sulāmānīya, Stambul
No. 815; Nūrī Qudsī al-Muḥāmida, No. 3047; Cairo
(Fīhrī, v. 32); Bankiopoe, iv. 1685; Avāfiya,
p. 178. This work was translated into Turkish
by the famous poet Bākī (q. v.) (MSS. in Gotha,
No. 158; Vienna, No. 895; Or. Ak., Krafft,
No. 260; Cambridge, Suppl., No. 72; ed. by
Gottwald, Kaisan 1280). A synopsis entitled Flām
al-ʿAṣrām fī al-ʿAṣrām bi-Bīnaʾ al-Muṣājja al-Hār-
rīm, MSS. Leyden, ep. cit., No. 931, Cairo,
Fīhrī, v. 32; Bankiopoe, xv. 1089. It was made by
his nephew Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Karīm b. Mu-
ḥīb al-Dīn b. ʿAlī al-Dīn, b. 29th Shawāwī 961
(Sept. 26, 1554) at Ahmādābād in Gujārat, brought
up in Mecca by his uncle, then teacher in the
Madrasa al-Muṣājja, 982 (1575) Mufīt of Mecca,
990 (1582) Imam al-Haram, d. 15th Dhūl-l-Ḥijja
1014 (1608) (al-Muḥīb, Khatūṣat al-ʿAṣrām,
iii. 8).
His son Muḥammad in 1005 (1596) wrote a
history of Mecca and Medina and of the exploits
of Hasan Pașa who became wali of Yaman,
entitled Hāthāwī al-Inān wa l-ʿĀlam fī l-Ḥār-
rīm li l-Hārīm min al-Yaman bi-Mawāfāt
l-iʿAṣrām, 937; Cairo, Fīhrī, v. 2; v. 3.
Bibliography: Ẓahīr al-Shāfiʾī al-NaḤrawān,
p. 206 (quoted from Sarks, Muḥāmān al-Maṣūma,
p. 1871); al-NaḤrawān, al-Kawsāq, ep. cit., Berlin,
No. 9886, fol. 267; Ibn al-ʿAṣfur, al-Nūr al-awfīr (cod. Bankiopoe), fol. 194; al-Khafṣā, Ṭalḥāṣat al-Abūbaī (Cairo
1294), p. 153-157; Wustenfeld, Geschichte
schreibers, p. 534; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 882.
(C. Brockelmann).

NAHRWĀN, or, according to the popular
pronunciation, NĀHRWĀN (Yaḥṣūb, iv. 846 sqq.),
name of a large territory between Bāgh
dīd [q. v.] and Waṣīt [q. v.], known through the
battle between ʿAll and the Khāridjīes [q. v.]
in 38 (658).

NAḤW (Ar.), lit. direction, path, also intention,
but gradually acquired the special meaning of
grammar. The Arab philologists divide it into
two branches: accidents, tan al-tarq or tarf,
comprising the theory of verbal stems and their
conjugation, the formulation of nouns and adjectives,
the formation of the plural and of the feminine,
etc., i.e. with individual word-forms only, and
syntax, tan al-naḥw in the narrower sense. The
fundamental grammatical conceptions of the Arab
philologists are taken from Aristotelian logic, which
came via S. R. scholars to the Arabs (on the
dependence of the Arabic phonetic system on the
Indian, cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 97). As
the beginnings of Arabic learning in general are lost
in obscurity, so also is the origin of the appellation
naḥw uncertain even to the Arabs themselves.
The caliph ʿAli is said to have instructed Abu l-Aswād al-Duʿālī, who is regarded as the
founder of the tan al-naḥw, how he should divide
up the subject and to have ended by saying:
naḥw, "take this path"; whereas the new science
received the name of naḥw. According to another
story, Abu l-Aswād himself laid down the
principles of Arabic grammar and said to the people:
naḥw, "follow this," from this the name
naḥw is said to be derived. The stimulus to deal with
the problems of language is said to have come
from the caliph ʿAli; he, the story goes, taught Abu
l-Aswād the fundamental principles of naḥw and
expounded to him the division of all language
into three categories: tan, jīl and ḫarf. Another
explanation as to how Abu l-Aswād came to lay
down the principles of Arabic grammar seems to
be nearer the actual facts. Ziyād b. Abī [q.v.] asked him to put on record the principles of grammar which "Alī had taught him; but he was reluctant to do this and asked the governor to excuse him this task. When however on one occasion he heard a Kurān reader make a mistake, which destroyed the sense, in reading the sacred book, he declared himself ready to carry out the task. He therefore had a clerk come to him, to whom he dictated and said: "When you see me in pronouncing a letter make the mouth completely (fataṣa), put a point above the letter; when I close it completely (damma), put a point in front of it, and when I half close it (kaṭara), put the point below the letter". In this way the invention of vowel signs is traced back to Abū 'l-Aswād.

Another story, which deals with the same question, tells how a newly converted mawla made a grammatical error in the hearing of Abū 'l-Aswād; one of the latter's household laughed at this but Abū 'l-Aswād said: "These are mawlās who long for Islam, who accepted it and thereby have become our brethren. How would it do if we were to draw up the laws of language for them? He thereupon prepared the chapter on subject and object". There must certainly be an element of at least probability in these anecdotes. By the accession of non-Arabs to Islam the danger arose that the Arabic language might be corrupted by foreign elements, where was further the demand that the sacred text of the Kurān should be read aloud without error and its meaning accurately interpreted; thus arose the necessity for a systematic investigation of the language of the sacred book and the laying down of the rules of its language, so that those ignorant of the language could guide themselves. Other anecdotes which relate to the problem of the origin of naḥfa and all of which, of course, like those already given, are to be regarded as ṣawḥī, also describe Abū 'l-Aswād as its foun[de]t, so that he may with justice be called the earliest Arabic philologist (naḥfa). None of his writings has come down to us. He is regarded as the founder of the philological school of Baṣra, the origin of which must therefore go back to a very early period (Abū 'l-Aswād died about the end of the first century a. H.). Only to mention some of the most important, to this school also belonged Abū 'Amr b. al-Aʿlā and his pupils Abū Ḫa[i]dā and al-ʿAṣmaʾī, to whom we owe most of our knowledge of the Ǧīḥiliyya, Sība[wi]h, whose great work on grammar became "the book" par excellence, Khālīlī, who is regarded as the inventor of the system of prosody, and many others. Very early there arose in the new city of Kūf a a rival to the scholars of Baṣra. There also learned men of the time with linguistic problems. While at first ideas were exchanged between the two schools, and students went from Kūf to Baṣra to study, and well known Baṣran scholars came to Kūf; gradually a considerable rivalry arose between the two. The Baṣrans laid greater stress on grammatical principles than the Kūfāns and were in general regarded as more faithful and more accurate transmitters. The questions disputed and the differences between the two schools are dealt with in a work by Abū al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Abī Saʿīd b. al-Anbārī. To the Kūfān school also belonged al-Kisāʾī and al-Muḥaffalāl al-Dabībī. After the third century the centre of Arab learning was transferred to the capital of the Islamic empire, Bagdad. In the new Bagdad school which arose there the differences in point of view between the Kūfāns and Baṣran schools gradually disappeared.


NAṬĪB (A.), literally "substitute, delegate" (nomen agentis from ṣawḥīm to "take the place of another"), the term applied generally to any person appointed as deputy of another in an official position, and more especially, in the Mamlūk and Dīhlī Sulṭānates, to designate a. the deputy or lieutenant of the Sulṭān and b. the governors of the chief provinces (see also the article EGYPT, above, vol. ii., p. 162). In the Mamlūk system the former, entitled ʿaṭīb al-ṣaṭārīna al-maʿṣūma wa-kādī al-mamlukī al-kitābī al-ḥadīthīyya, was the Vice-Captain proper, who administered all the territories and affairs of the empire on behalf of the Sulṭān. This was, however, only an occasional office, and its holder is to be distinguished from the ʿaṭīb al-ṣaṭārīna, the temporary governor of Cairo (or Egypt) during the absence of the Sulṭān or of Damascus during the absence of the ʿaṭīb al-ṣaṭārīna. The six niyyāḥās of Syria which replaced the Ayyūbīd mamlukās—Damascus, Ḥalab, Tripolis, Ḥamā, ʿAṭāfād and al-Karāk (their number was from time to time increased by the erection of Ghaza and other districts into separate provinces) — were each administered by a ʿaṭīb al-ṣaṭārīna (also entitled kādī al-mamluki), who was an "amīr of a thousand", the ʿaṭīb of Damascus being superior to the others. At the end of the thirteenth century Egypt was also divided into three similar niyyāḥās: Alexandria (from 757), Upper Egypt (al-wadāb al-kārīr or al-kullīh) and Lower Egypt (al-wadāb al-kātīr). The plain title of ʿaṭīb was held by the citizens of the citadels of Cairo, Damascus, Ḥalab, etc., who were not under the jurisdiction of their respective governors, and by various anīrīs of lesser rank holding subordinate commands. (For an instance of more recent use, see art. ẒĀḤIR.)

In the Dīhlī Sulṭānate the ʿaṭīb was the powerful minister who was the deputy of the king himself. The earliest reference to the office seems to be the appointment of the Bāṣrī ʿAdī b. Aṭīqīn as deputy on the accession of Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Dīn Bahrām Shāh in 637 (1240) (Minhāj al-Dīn, Tabāšīr-i Naṣīrī, in Bibli. Ind., p. 191). In fact, the support of the nobles was conditional upon the appointment of this person to the deputyship. Although this was a separate office from that of the wāzīr, nevertheless under powerful ʿaṭībs, like Malik Kāfūr in the reign of ʿAlī al-Dīn Khālīfī and Khusrāw in the reign of Mubbrār Shāh, its existence was not conducive to the growth of the powers of the wāzīr.

In its most common acceptance, in Persian and Turkish as well as later Arabic, ʿaṭīb signified a judge-substitute, or delegate of the kādī in the administration of law. In modern Arabic it
means usually a Parliamentary deputy, while al-naʿib al-unmûni is the Public Prosecutor, the head of the Parquet (al-nîyâbâ al-unmûniyâ).

Na'wâb [for nawâb, intensivum of naʿib (but not employed in Arabic), a puristic correction for navaib, shortened from nawâbâh, the Arabic plural of naʿib, employed as plur. dignitatis], the term used under the Mughal rulers of India to designate a vicerey or governor of a province. It is not known when the title first became current. It is sometimes found in combination with other titles, e.g. the Na'wâb-Wâriz of Oudh, the Na'wâb-Nâjm of Bengal. The Na'wâb of Arcot (Carnatic) was a governor under the authority of the Nâjm of Hâidarâbâd.

Na'wâb (Na'wâb) is used also in Persia as a title of royal princes, and in India as an honorific, without necessarily having any office attached to it. Na'bob is an English corruption of Na'wâb, which was also applied in a derogatory sense to wealthy Anglo-Indians who had returned from the east. It has been suggested that the term first became familiar to Englishmen in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Bibliography: In addition to the standard histories: E. Quatremère, Histoire des sultans manœlouks, Paris 1840, i/i., p. 93–99; M. van Berchem, Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Paris 1903, i., p. 209–228 (analyzes the epigraphic evidence); Gaudez-Denombry, La Syrie à l'époque des Manœlouks, Paris 1923; Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, London 1903, s. v. Nabob; J. Price, The Saddle put on the Right Horse, or an Enquiry into the Reason why certain Persons have been denominated Nabobs, London 1883.

(H. A. R. Gibb) (C. Collin Davies)

Nā'īla. [See Isâf.]

Nā'īlī, properly Yenî-Zâde Muṣṭafâ Çelebi, called after his father Pirî Khalîfa also Pirî-Zâde, a celebrated Ottoman poet. He is usually described as Nâ'îlî-i Kâdîm, "old Nâ'îlî," to distinguish him from Yeni Nâ'îlî, young Nâ'îlî, the poet and mewlevî Nâ'îlî Süleyûf Efendi of Monastir, author of several Süfi works who died in 1293 (1876) in Cairo.

Nâ'îlî was one of the greatest Ottoman poets of the postclassical period, the period of the weak sultâns (Murâd IV, İbrahim and Mehemmed IV, 1058–1115 = 1648–1703), of rule by women and eunuchs (Kosem Sultan, Bektaşî Agha and Murâd Agha) and of the grand vizierate of the Kâpûlîa. He is a link between Nefî and Yahyâ and Nâbî and Nodîm. He and Yahyâ are the best poets between Nefî and Nâbî, the reviver of Ottoman literature.

Born in Constantinople, on the conclusion of his education he became secretary in the dīvân-i humâyûn and was ultimately a khalîfa in the office of the Department of Mines (ma'den kalent). As his Dīvân shows, he belonged to the Khalwetî order. He was a weak, delicate man of feeble constitution who died in 1077 (1667–1668) in exile, it is said, in a place from which he had been sent by Fâzîl Ahmed Pasha Kapûlû. Bruusâlî Mehemmed Tûhîr's statement that his tomb was in the cemetery of the Sunbuli monastery in Fânilî and that his remains were removed to the cemetery of Pera, when the road was widened, cannot be quite reconciled with the story of his banishment.

Nâ'îlî is one of the most interesting figures in the history of Turkish poetry. He did not, it is true, contribute anything essential to the actual development of Ottoman literature and gave it no new inspiration. He was an innovator but only in the field of style and language. He steadily worked to break down the rigidity and monotony of the post-classical school. His style is extremely artificial. His language is full of Persicisms but not in quite the same way as in the preceding periods. His diction is full of unusual Persian images and expressions with which he enriched the Turkish language in brilliant verses, somewhat exhausting however through the obscurity of their allusions. The fine new phrases and expressions are however not his own but are simply borrowings. Nâ'îlî succeeded in clearing away the stagnation of the literary language of the time by dropping the trite and hackneyed metaphors and phrases, which had been found in all dwâns since Bâkî; and borrowed new phrases and constructions from the Persian.

Although he wrote in Turkish his diction is purely Persian. He follows his Persian models so slavishly that his language is unintelligible to a Turk who does not know Persian. But the Ottoman poets wrote only for themselves and their equals and not for the people whom they ignored.

Nâ'îlî is the chief representative of the highly developed and marvellously elaborated literary language in which, as Gibb says, a rich and delicate Persian embroidery is harmoniously sewn upon the Turkish background, while the two languages remain sharply distinguished from one another.

Nâ'îlî's characteristics are a charming freshness of phraseology, sublety of imagination, an artificial, individual style, gracefulness, clarity and purity of language, succinctness of expression and polished style such as no poet of his time possessed. According to Mu'allîm Nâqî, no Turk can read him without enthusiastically trying to imitate him, which is however hardly possible. His language is so finished and free from all superfluity that the meaning is often obscure and unintelligible. There is however a great deal that charms the reader, especially as his language is most melodious.

As a poet he has not the same powers as he has as a master of language and style. It is his language and not his poetic conception that is his strong point. He did not seek inspiration from his surroundings, like Yahyâ, but from his Persian models.

Nâ'îlî's literary work consists only of a Dīvân, which was printed in Bulâk in 1253 (1837) (only about a third of the MSS. was printed however). It consists of four very fine hymns in honour of the Prophet (na'sî), some 20 kaşâd as the language of which resembles that of Nefî and shows the same exaggeration. The kaşâd are dedicated to Murâd IV and Mehemmed IV, to the grand-viziers Kârâ Muṣṭafâ Pasha (1048–1053), Mehemmed Pasha (1053–1055), Süleyûf Pasha (1055–1057), Süfî Mehemmed Pasha (1058–1059), to the Shâhs al-Islâm Behâ Efendi, Yahyâ Efendi, Hâfez Mehemmed Efendi, the Defterdar and others. The Dīvân also contains a touching mertbât (elegy) written in the terbi-bend manner on the death of his brother who died young, which is almost too extravagant with its effective refrain; also a takkımî, and some muâsadât in the terbiسط and terbiâb manners and a terbiâb-bend.

His most important and most characteristic work
is however over 200 ghazels in which he imitates Fuzuli. In them he continually produces new expressions, new ideas and makes new significances of words. Besides a passion kept within natural bounds and a tenderness of feeling, which reminds one of Nedim and makes a deep impression on any lover, there is an undeniable pessimism, reminiscent of Nâbi, in his outlook on life, probably as the result of political conditions and his poor health. Occasionally there is something cold and forced about him. One feels that his spirit is ill and troubled.

Nâ'îl especially influenced Thâbit and Na'îm. His principal successors as poets were Hesregli 'Arif Hikmet and Venişehirli 'Awni.


**NA'TÂMA, Muṣṭafâ,** a Turkish historian. Muṣṭafâ Na'im known as Na'im was born in 1665 (1075) in Aleppo. After becoming a te'kârdâr (halberdier) in 1100 (beg. Oct. 26, 1688) in the imperial palace, he was promoted to be a secretary in the *Dârân* under the grand vizier Kâ'îlîzâde Aḩmad Pâsha. On the 28th Dju'mâdâ I 1116 (Nov. 28, 1704) he became chief accountant of Anatolia and in 1121 (1707) he was elevated to the post of chamberlain (tekârî). He left several other offices (cf. F. Babinger, *G. O. W.* p. 245) and during the campaign in the Morea was assistant to the commander-in-chief (gefey). He died at the beginning of 1128 (Jan. 1716) at Old Patras, where he was buried in the outer court of the mosque which has now disappeared. On his tombstone cf. Brüssl Mehmêm Tâhir, *Osmanî Mu'llifîlî,* i. 151 below, and on his death the firman of the middle of Shawwâl 1128 in Aḩmad Râfiq, *Hicri on ikînike avrda İstanbul kayats* (1100–1200), Istanbul 1930, p. 52 sq.

The candid and accurate history of the Ottoman empire, which he wrote in his official capacity and which he based upon earlier histories like the works of Kara Celebi-zâde [q. v.], Me'dîhi [q. v.], Aḩmad Şîrîk al-Mânâr-zâde, Hâджî Khalîfa [q. v.] and the imperial Ottoman history mentioned at the end of his work as begun but not finished by a certain ʿIsmetti (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. K.*, iii. 326), covers the years 1000 (beg. Oct. 9, 1591) to 1070 (beg. Sept. 8, 1659). The full title of this much esteemed and largely used work is *Rawdat al-Hsaîn fî Khulûsîd Ahâbir al-Khaṣkâin,* in Hâddjî Khâliî, N. 14525 called simply *Ta'rikh-i Wadeî.*

Muṣṭafâ Na'im also wrote several political treatises (Reâ'îlî cişâvî), which have survived in a collected volume. Na'im interpreted his duties as a historian very seriously and his incorruptible love of the truth secured his work a superiority over those of all other Ottoman historians of the time. On Na'im's view of the "duties of the historian" cf. his own words in A. W. Duda, *Turkische Post,* year iii., Stambul 1928, No. 324, p. 2. The original MS of his Ta'rikh is in Stambul in the collection of the Eriwan-Kosk. On the four editions and their variations cf. F. Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 246; on the third edition see also Ed., 1858, i. 468. A French translation (still in MS) was prepared by Antoine Galland (Fonds François, N. 12,197 in the Bibliothèque Nationale); specimens of it were published by N. Jorga in the *Actes et fragments à l'histoire des Roumanis,* i. (Bucharest 1895) p. 55.

**Bibliography:** Cf. F. Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 246 and particularly Yûnâ Mâzîmî, Stambul 1918, No. 55, p. 49 sqq.; Aḩmad Râfiq, *Hicri ve-Şanârîzâlî,* Stambul 1924, p. 256 sqq.; Sâlîm, *Tâdherî,* p. 681 sq. (according to whom he also studied chemistry and other arts and sciences and was a carefree jolly boon companion) and 'Ali Dânîbî, *Na'imî Ta'rikhî,* Stambul 1927. (Franz Babinger)

**NAHK[UWÁN, NAHK[UvâN,** a town to the north of the Araxes.

The town *Naţâvâa* is mentioned in Ptolemy, v. ch. 12. The Armenians explain the name of Nakchewan (Nakhawan) by a popular etymology as *nahk*[u]van* ("Noah's" first stopping-place) (although the name is apparently compounded with *-awân* "place") and locate the town in the province of Waspurakan (cf. Âyîh, i. 122), or in that of Sinikh. According to Moses of Chorene, l. ch. 30, Nakchewan was in the area populated by Median prisoners *mar* in whom we should see the ancestors of the Kurds of this region (cf. Balâdhûr, p. 208, e. tahr-er-abâh). In the early Arab sources we find the form Naşwât, Balâdhûr, p. 195, 200; Ibn Miskawaih, ii. 148; Samûtî, p. 560; Naşwât. In the Saljûq and Mongol period the predominant form is Nakdwân (as early as Ibn Khûrâbdîdbî, p. 122).

The town was conquered under Qâlbân by Hâşîb b. Mâslama It was rebuilt under Muâwiya by *Âzîz b. Hâtim.* In 87 (705) the Arabs hanged a large number of Armenian notables, whereupon the town acquired a Muslim character. For a short time (about 900) the power was in the hands of the Bağratuni, but the town was reconquered by the Sâdîqs (q. v.) and belonged henceforth to the domain of their vassal, the amir of Golbân (Ordubâd); cf. Markwart, *Sidarmenien,* Vienna 1930, preface, p. 79, 93, 99–101, 115; text, p. 300, 362, 567. It figures in the wars of the Dailami period (Ibn Miskawaih, ii. 148) and in the events of the Saljûq period (cf. Ibn al-Athir under 514 A. H.).

Nakchewan is more particularly associated with the family of Îlyezdî atâbâgh of Ağâbahârdîjan (531–632 = 1136–1225), cf. Mîrkhânâ, *Rawdat al-Safâ,* Lucknow 1894, p. 875–876 whose main centre it was, as is shown by the fine buildings a. the tomb (masâḥaf) of al-ra'is al-adjalî Rûdân al-Dîn Dîmîl.
AJHAR the 1821, the road Mukaddas I, i. 347

The Mongols the town was devastated, as is attested by Rubrub who visited it in 1553, ed. 1839, p. 384, cf. Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii. 82. The town suffered also from the wars between Turkey and Persia (under Murad IV); Ewliya Celebi, ii. 240. Tavernier (1664), ed. 1713, i. 55—55, and Chardin (1763), ed. 1795, i. 79, found it ruined. Nakhchivan was only rebuilt after 1828 when the khanates of Erivan and Nakhchivan were ceded to Russia.

Under the Persians, Nakhchivan (with the district of Az-Djurun = Ordubad) was directly under Adharbaydzhan and not Erivan. Kalb ‘Ali Khan of Nakhchivan was blinded by Aka Muhammad, founder of the Kadjir dynasty. The last chief of Nakhchivan before the Russian occupation was Karim Khan Kangarli. The title appointed by the Russians was Iljan-Khan and Shalik ‘Ali Beg. The maqall of the khane was: Nakhchewan, Alinda-bay (Armenian Ermijak), Mawzuni-khannah, Khok, Daralager, and those of Az-Djurun: Ordubad, Akulli, Dasta, Bilaw, Cinanbor. Among the dependencies of Nakhchewan, Djulfa (since 1828) was directly on the Russian-Persian frontier is very well known (Armenian O斯塔) with the ruins of the town and of an old bridge. (Zafar-nama, i. 399; puli-gasi al-Mulk) and the bridge on the Tabriz-Djulfa railway (built in 1906).

In 1834, after the Russian occupation (Dubois) the khane (the town and 179 villages) numbered 30,323 inhabitants (besides 3,341 inhabitants of Ordubad and its 52 villages). In 1896 the town numbered 7,433 inhabitants (4,512 Muslims and 2,376 Armenians) and the district (uyezd) 86,878.

In 1913 the town had 8,946 and the district 121,365. After the Russian revolution of 1917, the greater part of Nakhchewan was made an autonomous republic (area 5,988 sq.km. with, in 1926, 12,611 urban, 92,345 rural inhabitants). This republic formed a kind of dependency of the republic of Soviet Muslim republic Adharbajdzhan (Baku), from which it is separated however by the Armenian lands of the High Karabagh. Nakhchewan on the Don is the settlement of Armenian colonists founded in 1780 on the Don and is at the present day a suburb of Rostov.

Bibliography: J. Morier, A second journey, 1818, p. 312; Ker Porter, Travels, 1821, i. 210; Ouseley, Travels, 1823, iv. 436. and pl. lxvi; Fraenck, Uber zwei inschriften von Nachtechewan, Bull. scientifique publiée par l'Acad. Impériale, vol. ii. 1837, p. 14—16; Dubois de Montperreux, Voyage au Caucase, 1840, iv. 7—29, and Atlas, iii. 3; series, pl. 20;
NAKSHABĀDI, SHAIKH DĪVĀL-DĪN (d. 751 = 1350), a famous Persian author (not to be confused with the famous Sāfī Shahīk Abū Turāb Nakhshabād, d. 245 = 860) very little is known of his career.

His nisba suggests that he came from Nakhshabād, but he went to India where he became a murid of Ṣāfī Ṣāfī Abū Turāb Nakhshabādī. The Āḥārūr al-Ḥāyīyār of ʿAbd al-Haqq Dīlahwī (Dīlahī 1309, p. 104–107) says that he died in Bāḍiʿān after a long and contemplative life and that his tomb is there. Nakhshabādī was a prolific writer who used his knowledge of Indian languages to translate Indian books into Persian. His best known work is the Tūfīnāmā ("Book of the Parrot") very popular in India and Central Asia, based on the Sanskrit Chakravatī (partly translated into Greek by D. Galanos, Athens 1851). In the preface to this book Nakhshabādī tells us that one of his patrons showed him an old Persian translation of this work and persuaded him to do it again as the language of the old translation was to simple and artless. Nakhshabādī set to work and made a book of 52 chapters (called "nights") replacing some stories which did not seem to him sufficiently interesting by better ones.

The book, completed in 730 (1330), is in the usual form of a framework with inset stories and is characterised by unusually fine language and bold metaphors and similes. Nakhshabādī's language however seems to have been too difficult and precious for later generations as by command of the Emperor Aḥbar, Abū l-Faḍl b. Mubārak rewrote the book in a simplified version (Rieu, p. 753b).

This version however was completely supplanted by Muḥammad Kāḍīrī (11th–12th century) which reduced it to 35 chapters. Kāḍīrī's version became the foundation of a large number of translations into Hindi (Ākānī and Ghaawwānī), Bengali (Capājīrāna Munsī), Turkish (Ṣaṛf ʿAbd Allāh Efeṇī, pr. Bāḵīt 1254 and Constantinople 1256) and Kazan Tatar. There is also a metrical version in Persian by Ḥamīd Lāhīrī (Bland, in J. R. A. S., ix. 163). The same theme is taken by a number of popular versions which were disseminated in Persia in cheap lithographs under the title Cīl (Ṣiḥl) Tūfī ("40 parrots"). The text of one of these was published by Y. Zhukovski (St. Petersburg 1901).

Nakhshabādī's work was known in Europe as early as 1792 when M. Gersans published a free English translation of 12 nights. Kāḍīrī's version was translated into German by C. I. L. Ikon (Stuttgart 1822); the edition contains an essay on Nakhshabādī and specimens of his Tūfīnāmā by Kosegarten. The Turkish version was translated into German by L. Rosen (Leipzig 1858). So far no complete translation of the original work of Nakhshabādī has been published although there is a French translation in MSs. in Munich. E. Bertiels has translated the book into Russian but this version is also still in manuscript. The eighth night was published in original text and German translation by H. Brockhaus (Leipzig 1843 and in Bütter für literarische Unterhaltung, 1843, No. 242, 243, p. 969 sqq.). Nakhshabādī's other works never attained anything like the popularity of the Tūfīnāmā but have almost all come down to us. Among them are: Gūtātī: "Scattered Roses", a novel dealing with the lives of Maʿṣūm-shāh and Nūshābādī (pr. by Agha Muḥammad Kāẓīm Shīrāzī and K. F. Azoe, Calcutta 1912, in Bibl. Ind.); Dīwān u-Kullīyār ("Particulars and Generals") also called Cīl Nāmāt (Rieu, p. 749), an allegory which deals with the descriptions of the various parts of the human body considered as the noblest work of God and as proof of His greatness; Lāḏhīdāt al-Nisā, a Persian version of the Kehā-Sāstra, an Indian work on different temperaments and sexual intercourse; Sikīl al-Sulākī, a collection of sayings of celebrated mystics (Ith. Dīlahī 1895), and Nāḏīrī u-Mawṣīlī, a brief treatise of a Sāfī nature (Rieu, p. 735). His treatise Ḍhāḥara Mubākhrān ā is only known from its mention in the Aḥārūr al-Ḥāyīyār (see above). All the prose works of Nakhshabādī are embellished with ḫīṣ as scattered through them, which show that he was also an excellent poet.


(E. Bertiels)

NAKIR. [See NUNKAR.]

NAKSHBAND, MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD BAHSH AL-DIN AL-BAGDADI (717–791 = 1317–1357), founder of the Nakhshbandi Order.

His name, which signifies "painter" is interpreted as "drawing incomparable pictures of the Divine Science" (J. P. Brown, The Darvish, 2nd ed., p. 142) or more mystically as "holding the form of real perfection in the heart" (Mītīk al-Maṣṭa' quoted by Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 2188).

The title al-Shīb which is given him in a dirge cited in the Kāṭhātāt means "spiritual leader". The nisba al-Uwais implies that his system resembled that of Uwais al-Kanānī. His Acta were collected by one of his adherents, Šaḥī b. Muḥarrāk, in a work called Māʾṣūmat Siḥl-bānī al-Shīb Nakshbandā, which furnished material to the author of Ruknāt al-Ḥaṣāt (583 = 1488), and from which large citations, apparently in the words of Nakshband himself, but translated from Persian into Arabic, are given in the modern work al-Hādīš al-warida fī ʾayāt-ʾīdālī al-Nakshbandīya by ʿAbd al-Majdī b. Muḥammad al-Ḥanīnī (Cairo 1306). He was born in a village at the distance of one farsakh from Bukhārā, called Kūshk Hindūwān, but afterwards Kūshk Aʿrīfān. At the age of 18 he was sent to Sammās, a village one mile from Ramīthān and three from Bukhārā, to learn Sūfism from Muḥammad Bābī al-Sammasī. In this person's system the dābr was recited aloud; Nakshband preferred that of ʿAllā al-Dawlā ʿAbd al-Khalīk al-Gūdādāwī (d. 575 A.H.), which recited it to himself; and this led to ill-feeling between him and the other adherents of al-Sammāsī, who however, it is stated, ultimately confessed that Nakshband was right, and on his deathbed appointed him his khalīfa. After this person's death he went to Samarkand, and hence
to Bukhārā, where he married, and whence he returned to his native village; hence he went to Nasaf, where he commenced studies under a khalīfa of al-Samānī, Amir Kulāl. He then lived for a time in villages near Bukhārā given as Zewartān and Anbilda, then studied with a khalīfa of Amir Kulāl named 'Arif al-Dik-kīrīn for seven years; after this he spent twelve years in the service of the Sultan Khaḥil, whose rise to sovereignty is described by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (iii. 49), and whose capital appears to have been Samarkand. After this monarch's fall (747 = 1347) he returned to Zewartān, where he practised philanthropy and the care of animals for seven years, and road-mending for another seven. The last years of his life appear to have been spent in his native village, where according to the Ṭabīḥah he was buried. Vāṁbėry (Travels in Central Asia, 1864) gives Bāveddīn, two leagues from Bukhārā, as the name of the village which contains his tomb, "whither pilgrimages are made even from the most remote parts of China, while it was the practice in Bukhārā to go thither every week, intercourse with the metropolis being maintained by means of some 300 asses plying for hire".

The biographies bring him into connection with various places and persons. At Herāt a banquet was given in his honour by the Amir Ḥusain (b. Gilḥāy al-Din al-Ghūrī; cf. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, loc. cit.), where in spite of the Amir's assertion that the food had been honestly obtained Nāḵshband refused it, and it had to be given away in charity. He was with this prince also at Sarḵās. Two or three pilgrimages and visits to Bāghārū, Nāḵshār and Tāyshār are mentioned. His sayings were collected by Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Ḫusaini al-Barrānī, at the request of 'Alī al-Din Ḥāṭṭ al-Bukhārī (d. 802 A.H.). (Brit. Mus. Add. 26 294). Persian writings by him are mentioned in the Ḥadīth.


NĀḴSū (A.), pl. nāḵāṭṣ, a kind of rattle used and in some places still used by Christians in the east to summon the community to divine service. It is a board pierced with holes which is beaten with a rod. The name, which comes from the Syriac nāḵāṣ is not infrequently found with the verbs ḍarība or ṣakka in the old Arabic poets, especially when early morning is to be indicated, e. g. 'Antara, app.; Labīd, N. 19, 6; Z.D.M.G., xxvi. 269, 271; Muslims, ed. F. Vollmar, p. 172; Muslim, ed. W. F. Volz, 1867, 6; al-Ḵāṣ in Noldeke's Delectus, p. 26; Kitāb al-Ḡiṣṣā, n. 92. According to tradition, Muḥammad hesitated between this instrument and the Jewish trumpet before deciding on the call to prayer by the muʿāḍthīns [s. adḥān].


(FR. BUHL)

AL-NĀMĀRA, 1. a place in Syria. It is situated in the harra of al-Safā, on an eminence in the Wādī l-Šāhā, which runs from the Djebel al-Draṣa (Djebel al-Hawār) to the plain of Ḥuḥā, at the spot where it joins the Wādī l-Šaʿā'il. It corresponds to the Roman military post of Nanara (Waddington, Inscriptions, N°. 2270). Less than a mile S. E. of al-Namara, Dussaud found the Nabatean-Arab tomb inscription of the "King of all the Arabs," Maru 'l-Kais bar 'Amru, i.e. the Lakhdhim Imrū 'l-Kais b. 'Amru, of the 7th Kislīl 223 of the era of Boṣra = Dec. 7, 328 A.D. (cf. vol. i., p. 382).


Three other places bore the same name in ancient times:


3. Namara, a village in Batania, probably the modern Nimr al-Sawār, N. E. of Derās.


4. Namara, Nam(a)r west of Ṣanānān, between al-Hārā (Er'īn) and Qādis (Gasima), mentioned on an ancient boundary stone.

Bibliography: Clermont-Ganneau, in R. A. O., i. 3–5; Dussaud, Topographie, p. 341 (cf. Namr in Noldeke, in Z. D. M. G., xxix. 437?).

(E. Honigmann)

NĀMÍK KAMĀL BEY. [See KEMAL MEHMED NĀMPI.]

AL-NAH, the Ants, the title of Sūra xxvii. of the Kurā, the whole of which was revealed at Mecca. Noldeke puts it among the Sūras of the second period. It contains 95 verses. Its title is taken from verse 18: "When the armies reached the valley of the Ants one of them said: 'O ye ants, return to your homes lest Solomon and his armies crush you without noticing it'. It contains one verse that was abrogated (verse 94 annulled by ix. 5).

Bibliography: cf. al-NAH.

(Maurice Chemoul)

NAMRUD, also NAMRUD, NIMRUD, the Nimrod of the Bible, is associated in Muslim legend, as in Haggada, with the story of the childhood of Abraham. The Kurān, it is true, does not mention him but probably, as in many other cases, only from dislike of mentioning names. That Muḥammad was acquainted with the legend
of Namrud is evident from the following verses. “Do you not see how he disputed with Ibrahim about the Lord who had granted him dominion? When Ibrahim said: It is my Lord who gives life and death, the other replied: I give life and I slay. When Ibrahim said: God makes the sun rise in the east; do you make it rise in the west; then the liar was humbled” (II. 260). The Kur’ān exegetists are probably right when they see Namrud here disputing with Ibrahim and also when they refer to Namrud the verse: “What did Ibrahim’s people answer? They only said: Kill him, burn him; but God saved him from the fire” (xxix. 23). The legend is already richly developed in Ţabari, but it is at the beginning of the romance of ‘Antar in the Abūna dīrāṣ in which we find its most luxurious development.

ţabari already numbers Namrud among the three or (with Nebuchadnezzar) four kings who, like Sulaimān b. Dawūd and Iblīs l-Karnāin, rules the whole world. His astronomers tried to prove that the child would be born who would overthrow his kingdom and destroy his idols. Ibrahim thus becomes one of those heroes of legend who are persecuted because they are born of parents whose birth is by a tyrant, to whom they are destined to prove fatal, like Moses, Gilgamish, Semiramis, Sargon, Kargā (in the Mahābhārata), Trakhan (King of Gilgit), Cyrus, Perseus, Telephus, Aegisthus, Oedipus, Romulus and Remus, Jesus (see Frazer, Folklore in the Old Testament, ii. 437—455). Āṣā, the wife of Azār or of Tārīk (Terakh), is able to deceive Namrud and his searchers. Ibrahim is born in concealment: maturing rapidly, he engages in a religious dispute with Namrud; Namrud cannot be God for God gives life and death. Namrud replies that he can do this also for he can execute or pardon a man condemned to death. Namrud has Ibrahim thrown into the fire; it becomes a cool health-resort. An angel keeps Ibrahim cool at which Namrud marvels like Namrud the Prodigal of the Cypriot Chronicle in Byzantium. The lore of astrology, the inheritance of Idris and Hermes he acquires by force from the pupils of Idris. Ībīs teaches him magic. He has himself worshipped as a god. Then dreams, voices and omens frighten him. In spite of all Namrud’s cruel orders, Ibrahim is born, brought up and soon shatters the belief in Namrud. Namrud throws those who believe in God to the wild animals but they do not touch them. He denies them food; the sand of the desert becomes corn for them; on every grain of it is written: “gift of God”. Namrud throws Ibrahim into the fire but he is unharmed. Namrud builds a pile of fuel, the flames of which burn the birds for miles round — it is impossible to approach it. Ībīs then designs a ballista which hurls birds on to the flaming pile. Ibrahim spends the finest time of his life there under blooming trees and amid rippling brooks. Namrud then decides to attack the God of the Ganges of Heaven. Starved eagles fly up with his litter, until he hears a voice saying the first heaven is 500 years in width, it is 500 years between heaven and heaven, then comes infinity. Namrud shoots an arrow against God; the arrow comes back stained with blood. Namrud suddenly becomes grey and old and falls to the ground. But he plumes himself on having slain God. Then a gnat puts an end to his life.

The history of the Namrūd legend. Very little can have been taken from the Bible. Kubrāʾī’s expositors and collectors of legends call Namrud aṣhabār (tyrant) no doubt after the gībār applied to Namrud in the Bible (Gen. x. 6); Gellner also sees in aṣhabār amīr (xi. 62) an allusion to Namrud. Ťabari (I. 217) also describes Namrud as a muṭḥāṣābār. Muslim legend and Haggada (Tabar, Sheni on Esther I. 1.; Midr. Haggadol, ed. Schechter, p. 180—181; Gaster, Exemples of the Kabbah, N. 1) make Namrud ruler of the world.

From Haggada comes the association of Namrud with the Tower of Babel and in particular with the childhood of Abrahām, and with the latter’s rescue from the fire (Gen. Rabbi, xlix., 1). The death of Namrud caused by the gnat is also based on Haggada, which makes Titus, the destroyer of the Temple, die in this way. Nebuchadnezzar comes to a similar end (see Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge, p. 97—99). The flight to heaven especially in the romance of ‘Antar with the intervals of 500 years recall the ascent of Nebuchadnezzar in this version and it is given at greater length in the introduction to the romance of ‘Antar.

Namrud’s father Kanaʾān b. Kālīs has a dream which troubles him: it is interpreted to mean that his son will kill him. The child is born, a snake enters his nose, which is an ominous sign. Kanaʾān wants to kill the child, but his mother Sulkhaʾ entrusts him secretly to a herdsman; the latter’s flocks scatter at the sight of the black flat-nosed infant. The shepherd’s wife throws the child into the water; the waves wash him to the bank where he is suckled by a tigress. Already dangerous when quite a boy, as a young man he becomes a robber leader, attacks Kanaʾān with his bands, kills him (without knowing that he is killing his father), marries his own mother and becomes king of the country and later lord of the world. Azār (already in the Kurʾān the father of Ibrahim) builds him a marvellous palace flowing with milk, oil and honey, with mechanical singing birds in the medival epic the Idarīs of the Christ’s Triklinium in Byzantium. The lore of astrology, the inheritance of Idris and Hermes he acquires by force from the pupils of Idrīs. Ībīs teaches him magic. He has himself worshipped as a god. Then dreams, voices and omens frighten him. In spite of all Namrud’s cruel orders, Ibrahim is born, brought up and soon shatters the belief in Namrud. Namrud throws those who believe in God to the wild animals but they do not touch them. He denies them food; the sand of the desert becomes corn for them; on every grain of it is written: “gift of God”. Namrud throws Ibrahim into the fire but he is unharmed. Namrud builds a pile of fuel, the flames of which burn the birds for miles round — it is impossible to approach it. Ībīs then designs a ballista which hurls birds on to the flaming pile. Ibrahim spends the finest time of his life there under blooming trees and amid rippling brooks. Namrud then decides to attack the God of the Ganges of Heaven. Starved eagles fly up with his litter, until he hears a voice saying the first heaven is 500 years in width, it is 500 years between heaven and heaven, then comes infinity. Namrud shoots an arrow against God; the arrow comes back stained with blood. Namrud suddenly becomes grey and old and falls to the ground. But he plumes himself on having slain God. Then a gnat puts an end to his life.

The history of the Namrud legend. Very little can have been taken from the Bible. Kurāʾī’s expositors and collectors of legends call Namrud aṣhabār (tyrant) no doubt after the gībār applied to Namrud in the Bible (Gen. x. 6); Gellner also sees in aṣhabār amīr (xi. 62) an allusion to Namrud. Ťabari (I. 217) also describes Namrud as a muṭḥāṣābār. Muslim legend and Haggada (Tabar, Sheni on Esther I. 1.; Midr. Haggadol, ed. Schechter, p. 180—181; Gaster, Exemples of the Kabbah, N. 1) make Namrud ruler of the world.

From Haggada comes the association of Namrud with the Tower of Babel and in particular with the childhood of Abrahām, and with the latter’s rescue from the fire (Gen. Rabbi, xlix., 1). The death of Namrud caused by the gnat is also based on Haggada, which makes Titus, the destroyer of the Temple, die in this way. Nebuchadnezzar comes to a similar end (see Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge, p. 97—99). The flight to heaven especially in the romance of ‘Antar with the intervals of 500 years recall the ascent of Nebuchadnezzar in
the Talmud (Chagiga, p. 13b). But the flight has far more resemblance to that of Šāh Kāšūs as described by Firdawšī (ed. Mohlb., ii. 31—34).

The Namrud legend borrows from many directions. Taḥbara mentions that Namrud had been identified as the Persian Dāhšīik (Anneles, i. 253) but he refutes this idea (Anneles, i. 323, 324). Bible and the Greek epic were further developed, the marvellous increased, an early history invented, Namrud made an Osēdus, and in the Sirät d'Antar he becomes the hero of a romance. The Muslim Namrud legend then found its way into the late Jewish legend of Abraham. Bernard Chapira (see below) published once in Hebrew and once in Arabic. He is certainly wrong in taking seriously the authorship of Kašb d'Albār, this is one fiction out of many thousands. But the mutual influence of Ḥaggadah and Muslim legend is indisputable. The later Mīzrāj, as M. Grünbaum has clearly shown, Pirī K. Eīsīr, Tawma d' élīyik, Mīzrāj Ḥaggadādī, Sefir ḥayyāshū, Shēbīr Mūsār of R. Elīyah Hakkohen from Smyrna, is influenced in the sections on Abraham and Nimro by Muslim literature.

Bibliography: The commentaries on Sūra ii. 260; xix. 25; Tābarī, ed. de Goede, i. 217, 215, 220, 252—265, 319—325; Ibn al-ʿAtīk, 237, 242; Ibn Ḥišām, i. 29, 37—40; Ḥādīs, Kīmār al-Anbārī, Cairo 1291, p. 40—49; J. Eīsīrī, Kīmār al-Anbārī, ed. Eisenberg, i. 145—149; Sirāt Ḣantar, Caismo 1291, i. 8—79 (1306, i. 4—34); Damīrī, Ḥayāt al-Ḥayātan, s. v. nāṣr; Geiger, Was hat Mohammed..., 2, 1902, p. 112 sq., 115 sq., 121; M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge, p. 90—99, 125—132; Bernard Chapira, Légendes bibliques attribuées à Kab l'al-ḥabar, in R. E. J., 1919, lxix., p. 86—107, Arabic and Hebrew text 1920, ix. 37—44; B. Heller, Die Bedeutung des arabischen Ṣantur-Berman für die vergl. Literaturkunde, Leipzig 1931, p. 16—21; S. Gidersky, Les origines des légendes musulmanes, Paris 1933, p. 31—35. (Bernard Heiler.)

NAMĪS (A.) is a word of many meanings. In St. John’s Gospel xv. 26, the coming of the paraclete is announced. In the preceding verse a passage from the Psalms referring to the haters is quoted and in v. 26 of vāhār is given as source. The verses in the Gospel from 23 on were already known to Ibn Ḥišām in an Arabic version which came from a Syriac one as the reproduction of “paraclete” by al-μανάταμα shows. In the same source the word vāmās was left untranslated: for we find it in Ibn Ḥisāḥ in the form nūmis. Biographical tradition makes Wārākā b. Nawfāy expressly assert the identity of Muhammad with the paraclete promised by Jesus mentioned in the passage from the Gospel. The oldest forms of the tradition giving this episode represent a combination of the Gospel passage with Sūra lxvi. 6. In later developments of the tradition the idea of a paraclete gradually falls into the background till it was finally interpreted as the name of an individual and even received an epithet. Thus we read in Ibn Ḥishām, p. 153 that Wārākā replied as follows to his cousin who asked him about Muhammad’s first vision: “If thou hast reported the truth to me then truly the greatest nāmis has come to him, who used to come to Mūsā, and then he (Muhammad) is the prophet of this umma etc.” In Tābarī the “greatest nāmis” is in a gloss expressly said to be Ḫibīr.

As the personal interpretation is not sufficiently explained by meanings, known to be really old, of the true Arabic word nāmis (root n-m-s) which exists alongside of the Greek loanword, and meanings like “the trusted one, confidant of a secret” seem rather to come from the Greek loanword already known in its reference to Ḫibīr (against Dory, Supplement, s. v.), it was natural to look for a specific use of the word vāmās which admitted of a personal interpretation and could at the same time have been known to the Arabs. Nyberg was reminded by the nāmis doctrine of the Ḥabbān al-Saftā (see below) of the pseudo-Clementine writings; and, Tabari, describes the nāmis of the Wārākā tradition from the vāmās al-wānīs of the pseudo-Clementines, which according to the book Kūfrym Pēter saw revealed to Adam and afterwards again appeared to all prophets worthy of such an honour, lastly to Moses and to Jesus. However startling the agreement of the conception of nāmis al-wānīs with the later forms of the Wārākā tradition, the question still remains open, by what way a personal conception of nāmis could have entered Islam. Baumstark quoted a passage from the liturgy of St. James of Jerusalem: ḥakas, astūn dī vāmin, ṣal⇔bī ukūrūna, la tān ṭāmīmīt and observes that the liturgy was the authoritative one in the Beduin camps and must have existed in an Arabic translation. It is really quite possible to understand vāmās personally here. No explanation of our Wārākā tradition can on the other hand be obtained from Mandaean writings as Lidzbarski has already pointed out in his translation of the Gūzil, p. 247 sq.

That there is a true Arabic word nāmis has already been mentioned. The dictionaries give such varied meanings for it that we can only consider as old and original those that are confirmed by quotations. This holds for the meanings “hind place, hunter’s hut, monk’s cell” probably also for “buzzter, midge” as noun agentis from n-wās “to buzz”. On the other hand, not only the meaning “cunning” and its derivatives must be secondary, but also the already mentioned meanings referred to persons, the latter especially because the word so far as we know, is used also in the later literature predominantly in the material sense and the person connected with the idea is called Ḫibīb al-nāmis etc. (counter-example: Dory, s. v.). Just as the material meanings predominate generally, so also does the meaning of the Greek loanword predominate, apart from course of the old poetry, from which the meaning “midge” and particularly the word nāmisānī “mosquito net” have survived into the modern vernacular. Below we shall therefore deal only with the development of meaning of the Greek loanword.

The favourite form is di vāmā, with or without the addition of Ḫibī. This law is revealed through the prophets, and only men of prophetic spirit can be vāmā al-nāwis in this sense. The double character, political and religious, of the Musulm constitution naturally very much favoured this conception. Thus, for example, al-Kafiṣhāndi, ʿībīth al-dʿāšā, i, Cairo 1903, p. 280 gives as the first among the Ḫibīr sharif, ʿībīth al-nāwis al-mudawalāt bi ʿl-muhaww. Ibn Sīna expressly observes in his encyclopaedia Ṭikṣīm al-ʿUlam al-ʾAṣyīliya (in Madīmūt al-Rūṣīfī, Cairo 1328, p. 230 sq.) in treating of politics that the pertinent works of Plato and Aristotle understand
by verbs not "cunning" and "deceit", corresponding to the usage of the vernacular, but َنَمُوس, revelation, etc., for the laws of the community are dependent on prophecy and the divine law; similarly Sprenger, *Dict. of Technical Terms*, i. 40. Ābū al-Hajāyīn al-Tawhīdī devotes the fourth of his *Muḫadabāt li َنَمُوسِ اللِٰهٰ* (new ed., Cairo 1929).

Here we may mention Miskawayh's (Ibn Miskawayh) definition which is also of literary interest. In connection with his discussion of the function of the dinār as a measure of the equivalence (سُقْدَة) of service and reward, Tadhkīrāt al-Malājīa i. e.g. Cairo, Khaitiyā, 1322, p. 38), he quotes an alleged saying of Aristotle according to which the dinār is a *nāmus*. Nāmus, he adds, in striking contrast to Ibn Sina, means in Greek, *syvía* and *tadīr* [g.v.]. Aristotle says in the *Eth. Nic.*, the greatest *nāmus* proceeds from God, the second is the judge, the third the dinār; the first, as a condition for just settlement between the claims of men, is the example which the two others follow. The well-known filiation of the Muslim books on Hellenistic ethics has resulted in this explanation finding a place in later derivatives from Miskawayh's work, e.g. in *Nafīr al-Dīn al-Thamālī* (Ahlīkī al-Nāfīr), i. 2, 7 (e.g. Tabiz 1320, p. 152), also Kīnalīzāde (Alī b. 'Amr Allāh al-Hinnā), *Ahlīkī al-Dīr* (1324, i. p. 78) and each more fully than the preceding. As a result of these expositions al-Tūsī in the economic part of his book (ii. 2, p. 254) calls gold briefly the smallest *nāmus* (translation in Pleissner, *Der islamische des Kynphiskologers Fräulein*, 1928, p. 63); and Kīnalīzāde also follows him (ii, p. 7).

The *nāmus* doctrine of the Ikhwān al-Safā' can only be briefly outlined here. In part i, p. 56 (Bombay ed.), the *nāmus* is defined as a spiritual kingdom ((*(نَمُوسُ ِالْحَيَاة)) which is upheld by 8 kinds of men. God appears as the *wāqī‘* al-*nāmus*. *Ṣāḥib al-*nāmus* is from the context Muhammad, in so far as one can identify from the context any individuals in the pages of the Ikhwān al-Safā'. A few pages later Muhammad is described as the *wā’if al-*nāmus*. In part iv., p. 57, the angels appear as teachers of the *ṣāḥib al-*nāmus*. Any one who does not guide his life according to the commands and prohibitions of the latter, has no share in divine *nāmus* (p. 147). This spiritual kingdom is the element of the Ikhwān al-Safā'; they sought in the cave of their father Adam [q. v.] for a long period until the fore-ordained time (ِْمَّنَدَّ) came under the rule of the Lord of the greatest *nāmus* (Muhammad?) and they perceived their spiritual state (ِْمَلَعَّ) which was raised in the air and which Adam and his wife had been banished (iv. 107). If the Ikhwān al-Safā' by common effort and uniform self-instruction succeed in building a perfect spiritual state (ِْمَنَدَّ, cf. al-Fārābī*), this state will belong to the kingdom of the Lord of the greatest *nāmus*, who has dominion over souls and bodies (iv. 211). The *nāmus* thus even becomes a kind of divine being, where there is a discussion of the "philosophic service of God", which represents the higher stage in comparison with that of the Muslim teaching regarding obligations and duties. This philosophic service of God had been, they say, practised by the ancient Greeks on the first, middle, and last day of the month. The night of the first day was divided into three parts. The first was spent in worship of *nāmus*, the second in meditation on the *malaqīāt*, the third in humble prostration before the Creator, confession of sins and repetition of prayers by Plato, Idrīs and Aristotle until the break of day (iv. 273 sqq.). Nevertheless the *nāmus* here has not actually taken the place of God. But in several passages of the *encyclopedia* he is represented as giving names. Thus he calls the spirits of the planets angels (ii. 97; cf. iv. 244); he does the same with the natural forces (ii. 102) and (iii. 10) with the nature of origin and decay. Above the spheres (ِْمَرْضَّ) of the three kingdoms is the nature and of man is the sphere of the divine *nāmus*, whose members deal with the affairs of the *nawāmīs* and the divine revelations and which corresponds to the "surrounding" (ِْعَلَٰ) sphere of the astronomers (iv. 251). As the *nāmus* and the ability to become creative in him involves a special organisation of man, he has found an allegorical place in the physiology and psychology of the Ikhwān al-Safā'; here indeed the conception changes from page to page. Thus in the first part of the work (2nd part, p. 48) five kinds of soul are described, two above and two below that of man. The former are the soul of the angels and the divine soul (ِْمَلَعَّ), the latter is the stage of the soul of wisdom, the second that of *nāmus*-prophethood. On the very next page the one is the intellectual soul of wisdom and the other the *nāmus*-like angel soul. On p. 54 we find the following gradation: nature, soul, intellect, *nāmus*. Nature receives through the soul free-will, though the intellect the power of thought and through the *nāmus* commands and prohibitions. The parts of the soul are as follows: vegetable, animal, logical (human), intellectual (wise), *nāmus*, angelic, which latter serves the *nāmus*. Here again there is the tendency to personification. It is in keeping with this when in iv. 119 (cf. also iv. 146) the story of Socrates in prison (in agreement with the Greek tradition and mentioning the *Phaedo*) it is related that Socrates will not escape from prison for fear of the *nāmus*; he justifies his attitude with the words: "He who does not respect the *nāmus* is slain by it". When immediately afterwards the *nāmus* is identified with the *gūrūs*, it is difficult to say whether this is serious or only done out of caution. It is nevertheless remarkable that the sixth essay of the fourth part which treats of the nature of divine *nāmus*, of the qualifications for prophethood and the qualities of a prophet, does not contain the word *nāmus* at all but instead of it always has *gūrūs*. The Ikhwān have spiritual powers of their own; these form a series of four stages, the third of which is the *kuwara* *nāmusiya*; man attains it at 40 and it is the special characteristic of kings and rulers. Possessors of this power are called the distinguished and noble (ِْمُزَمِّنَّ, *kīrām*) brethren. Above it is only the *kuwara* *malaqīa* (iv. 134 sqq.).

The origin of the meaning "cunning" cannot be given with certainty; it possibly comes from the Arabic meaning "place of concealment". That it was particularly common in the spoken language is evident from the quotation given above from Ibn Sina. In any case this meaning has undergone a remarkable amalgamation with the Greek "law" in the literature of magic for the word is there used for magical formulae, particularly those which are based on illusions of the senses. The pupil of al-Ḥanīfī [q. v.] in his
DHâtîn on the latter’s Tâddîra, s.v. simîya (iii., Cairo 1924, p. 56), gives the namūs as the first section of science known by this name. But the meaning of the word is not limited to this kind of magic formulae.

Through translations from the Arabic the word entered the Hebrew literature of the middle ages with the meaning “law, religious law (of other peoples), morality, propriety”; in the latter meaning it has survived in the modern Hebrew vernacular. It is interesting to note that in the modern dialect of Mecca a similar change of meaning is found; according to Snouck Hurgronje, Melkânische Sprichwörter, N°. 10, namūs means the “spotless, honourable name” which one has among men; its opposite is ʻār, “shame”.

The word namūs also plays a considerable part as the title of books.

The “greatest namūs” also occurs as the title of a book; cf. Ivanow, Catalogue, i. 335 sq.


(M. Plessner)

NÂR. [See Dâhânnâmâ, Dâhânnâmâ.]

NÂRSHAKHĪ, Abû Bakr Muhammad b. Hajfar (d. 438 = 950), author of the “History of Bukhârâ”, the original Arabic version of which he presented to the Sîmânûn b. Nâsr in 332 (943—944). In 522 (1128—1129) the book was translated into Persian by Abû Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Kubâwî who omitted several “tedious” passages. Then in 574 (1178—1179) Muhammad b. Ṣafār prepared a new abbreviated edition of the book which he presented to Ṣâdîr ʻAbd al-Asîz b. Burhân al-Dîn, governor of Bukhârâ. Finally an unknown author continued it down to the Mongol conquest. It was in the last form that the book was published by Scheria. The book contains many interesting notes on the situation in Central Asia before Isâm and details not found elsewhere of the Arab conquest (from MâdÂ’iri). The Persian translator added further details from the works of Abu ʻl-Hasan ʻAbd al-ʻRâjmân b. Muhammad al-Nâshâpûrî and probably from [Abû ʻIrâq] Ibâmîn [b. al-ʻAbbâs al-Ṣâli, d. in 243 (857)]. The information about the towns of the district of Bukhârâ, their monuments, their products, their old customs (such as lamentation for Siyyâwûgh, p. 21) is very interesting.

Bibliography: Description topographique et historique de Boukhara par Muhammed Merchacky suivie de textes relatifs à la Transoxiane, publ. by Ch. Scheria, Paris 1892 (Publ. de l’École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, ii. series, vol. xii., p. 1—97). There is also an edition lithogr. in Bukhârâ. The only translation so far is that into Russian by N. Lykovlîn, Tashkent 1897 (ed. by Barthold). Cf. Lercz, Sur les monnaies des Bouakkhar-Khoudakhi, in the Travées de la 3me session du congrès international des orientalistes, St. Petersburg 1879, ii. 424; Barthold, Turkestan, Engl. transl., G. M.S., p. 14; Marquart, Erâmi, s. index; Marquart, Wehrót und Arang, (1907), p. 139 and passim. (V. Minorsky)

NÂSÂ (often Nsa), the name of several places in Persia: in Khurâsân, Fars, Kirmân and Hamâdhan; cf. Yâqût, iv. 775. (According to Bartholomea, nisâya means “settlement”).

1. Nâsâ in Khurâsân was situated in the cultivated zone which lies north of the range separating Khurâsân from the Turkomân stpepes. It corresponds to the Nâsah, Nâsah or Nâsah of the classical authors, celebrated for its breed of horses (Herodoto, iii. 106; cf. Strabo, xi, ch. xiv., § 7). Alexander the Great is said to have built an Alexandropolis at Nasaia. According to Isidore of Charax, ed. W. Sohôf, Philadelphia 1914, p. 8, the tombs of the Parthian kings were in the town of Nâsâ. Rawlinson, in J.R.A.S., 1859, p. 100, believed he saw in the stock of Turkomân horse descendants of the īstân Nasaia (Avesta, Vidvátâ, i. 7 seems to have a different locality in view).

According to Ishâkhî, the town of Nasa was very like Sâragh (i.e. like the half of Marw) and had much water, many gardens and green places and the country round was very fertile. Muâkaddâsî, p. 320, 331—332 says that the ten gates of the town were buried in verder. He confirms the abundance of springs but says the water was not of good quality. Muhammad Nasawî, Sirat ʻIshâkhî al-Dîn, ed. Houdâs, p. 22, says that the place was very unhealthy on account of its very warm climate and that the Turks could only live a short time there. According to Nasawî, p. 50, the town had a strong citadel. The number of tombs of shaikhâs and famous men was so great that the Šâfs called Nasa “little Damascus”, cf. the biography of Shaikh ʻSâîd, ed. Žukowsky, p. 45) written in the 13th century.

Yâqût, iv. 776—778 places Nâsâ 5 days’ journey from Marw, one day from Abīward and 6—7 days from Nâshâpûr. Of its dependencies he mentions: i. 480: Balûz (Frâîzâ); i. 857: Taftâkî; iii. 1243: Shawristân; iii. 866: Farawâ (= Kîzîl-Arwa); iv. 208: Kauk. Durûn, with the fortress Tâq (afterwards Yazir) also belonged to Nasa, cf. Barthold, A istori o orosheniya Turkestan, p. 37—41. Cf. also the Tahrîk-i Nâdîr of Mahdi Khan (Nâdîr’s study was at Khurramâbâd, cf. under the year 1044). The ruins of the capital of Nasa are near the little town of Bagir about 12 miles from Ashkhabad and 8 from the station of Basmân on the Trans-Caspian railway.

2. The Nasa in Hamâdhan perhaps cor-
responds to the Nisāya placed by the inscription of Darius (Behistūn, i. 13) in Media. It is possible that the reference is to the plains of northern Luristan [q. v.] (Alishtar, Khawa) where the well-known bronzes of Luristan were found; cf. Minorsky, in Apollo, London, Feb. 1931.

(V. MINORSKY)

NASĀF. [See KURSHAW].

AL-NASĀFI, nisba [cf. NASAF] of several eminent persons of whom the following may be mentioned:

1. Al-`Aţībānī Mārīm B. Muḥammad B. Muḥammad B. Khālid Al-Dάğārī (d. 508 = 1114); one of the mutakallimin [q. v.], whose scholastic position is between that of the early period as represented by `Abd al-Ḵārīr al-Baghdādī [q. v.], who is still endearing to find a convenient arrangement and an adequate formulation of the contents of kalām, and the younger mutakallims who have at hand the necessary formulations for ready use. Of his works the following are known to me:

1. Tamkūl il-Ḵawādi at-Tawḥīd (Cairo, MS. 2417, fol. 1—30; cf. Fīrisr ... Misr, ii. 51), a treatise in which the contents of the creed are proved according to the scholastic method. The first chapter consists of an exposition of the doctrine of cognition, the last of the doctrine of the immanence. The work closes with a muraqqa` which contains the doctrine de Deo in an abridged form;

2. Ṭabṣirat al-Adīla (Cairo, MSS. 2287, 6673; cf. Fīrisr ... Misr, ii. 8), an elaborate work on dogmatics of nearly the same scheme as the Tamkūl; 3. Baḥr al-Kalām, printed at Cairo 1329 (1911), differs from the two foregoing works in so far as it deals with heresies and is polemical. It is identical with Muṣṣāḥaf at-Ša`lma wa `l-Dāma wa `l-Furqā al-Dallā wa `l-Muṭālā` (Leiden, cod. or. 862) as well as with ʿAṣīfīl (Berlin, No. 1941; cf. Ahlwardt, Versuchnisn, ii. 400). The work is preserved in several libraries under one of these titles (Brockelmann, G.A.L., i. 426, where the number of five works must be reduced to three).

Bibliography: in the art.; cf. also Hādījī Khāliṣa, ed. Flugel, index, No. 6453.

II. Abū Ḥafṣī Īmar Nāḏim al-Din (d. 537 = 1142), jurist and theologian. Of his works the only one edited is the ʿAṣīfīl, which has the form of a catechism. It became popular and was much commented, probably because it was the first abridged form of the creed according to the scholastic method of the new orthodoxy. In Europe it became known as early as 1843 through the edition by Cureton (The Pillar of the Creed, No. 2). For editions and commentaries on this work as well as for the other works of this scholar that have come down to us, cf. G.A.L., i. 427 sqq.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 428 and the references given there.

(A. J. WEINSECK)

AL-NASĀFI, Ḥāfīz al-Din Abū Ṭabarakt Abū Allāh B. Ḥamād B. Ṣāḥib, an important Hāfīzī legist and theologian, born in 1294 in Sogdiana, was a pupil of Šamas al-Ṭaimma al-Kardānī (d. 642 = 1244—1245). Šāhid al-Din al-Dāfārī (d. 666 = 1267—1268) and Baḥr al-Dīn Khwāhārīṣī (d. 651 = 1253). He taught in the Madrasa al-Kutbiya al-Silāshī in Kirmān, came in 710 to Baghdād and died in 820 (August 1310); according to Kuraṣhī and Ibn Ta`ṣhirī (701: 701) apparently on his way back to Iṣfād (in Khusūṭīn), where he was buried. His pupils were Muṣṭafā al-Dīn Ibn al-Sadūṭī, author of the Majma` al-Bahrāin (d. 694 = 1294—1295), and Ḥusain al-Dīn al-Sighniqī, a commentator on the Iṣfād (d. 714 = 1314—1315) [cf. AL-MARGHINĀNĪ].

The best of his works is thought to be the Kitāb al-Manār fī Uṣūl al-Fiqḥ, a concise account of the foundations of law (Dehil 1870, Constantinople 1326 and often later); there are numerous later commentaries but he himself wrote two, one of which is entitled Kitāb al-Atanafī (2 vols., Bulāq 1316). Out of his original plan of writing a commentary on the Ḥidāyat of al-Marghinānī [q. v.] there came the lawbook modelled on it Kitāb al-Wafī, on which he composed in 683 a special commentary, the Kitāb al-Ḳāfis (delivered in lectures in Kirmān in 689). He had previously prepared a synopsis of the Wafī entitled Kanz al-Da`ash (Cairo 1311, Lucknow 1294, 1312, etc.) which Ibn al-Sadūṭī in 683 (this is no doubt the correct reading for 653 in Kaffawi) heard him deliver in Kirmān. This synopsis was used as late as the sixteenth century in Damascus and at the al-Ashtar in Cairo (v. Kremer, Mittel-Syrien u. Damaskus, Vienna 1853, p. 136; do., Egypten, Leipzig 1865, p. 51). The best known printed commentaries on the Kanz are: a. Ṭabṣir al-Ḥaṣāṣa` of al-Zalī` (d. 743 = 1342—1343) in 6 vols., Bulāq 1313—1315; b. Kanz al-Ḥaṣāṣa` of al-ʿAinī (d. 855 = 1451) in 2 vols. Bulāq 1285 and 1299; c. Ṭabṣir al-Ḥaṣāṣa` of Mollā Mīskīn al-Harawi (written in 811 = 1408—1409), Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; d. Taṣfīl al-Raḥmān of al-Tā`i (d. 1192 = 1775), Cairo 1307; etc.; e. the most important: al-Bahr al-rāʿī of Ibn Nadūm (d. 970 = 1562—1563) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e. g. two on the Kitāb al-Wafī of Nasīr al-Dīn al-Samarrjānī (d. 656 = 1258) entitled al-Mustafā and al-Manṣūr; on the Manṣūrā of Naḍim al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣī al-Nasafī (d. 537 = 1142—1143), on the differences of opinion between Abū Ḥanīfa, his two pupils, and al-Sāfī and Mālik, entitled al-Mustafā, as well as a synopsis entitled al-Musafīr (finished in 20th Shabān 670) by Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 428; also on the Munawwagā` fī Uṣūl al-Dīn of Akhsikāt (d. 644 = 1246—1247; Ibn Ta`ṣhirī, Ḥādījī Khāliṣa, No. 13095). On the other hand, he did not write a commentary on the Iṣfād, as Ibn Kuftubagha and Ḥādījī Khāliṣa, vi. 484 say (cf. the story of the origin of his Wafī according to al-Ikānī (d. 758 = 1357) in Ḥādījī Khāliṣa, vi. 419). He also wrote a commentary on the Karst, Mudārik al-Tawḥīl wa Ḥaṣāṣa` al-Tawḥīl (printed in 2 vols., Bombay 1279, Cairo 1306, 1326).

His confession of faith al-ʾUmda fī Uṣūl al-Dīn (apparently also called al-Manṣūr fī Uṣūl al-Dīn: Kuraṣhī, Ibn Da`ūdī) became known quite early in Europe from Cureton's edition (Pillar of the Creed, London 1843). In it he closely follows the Ṣadūq of Naḍim al-Dīn al-Nasafī (see above) and also wrote a commentary on it: al-Fīrimd fī al-Ṭarmīd.

may be said to begin with the conversion of Ghasan [q. v.]; the chief al-Harîrî b. Djabala was an ardent monophysite and in A. D. 542 or 543 he persuaded the empress Theodora to appoint Jacob Baradæus as bishop of Edessa with a wandering commission, and Theodore as bishop of Buâra in the monophysite cause. Nestorian Christianity came to Ḥira [q. v.] at an early date. Its bishops are often mentioned from A. D. 410 till c. 1000 and a monastery was built there by 410. Three Nestorian patriarchs were buried there. Al-Mundhirî III (d. 554) [cf. LAKIEM] was a pagan though he had a Christian wife, who built the convent called (HEFFEKEN X. 127) al-Mundhirî al-Lakhmi. According to the Nestorians the monk Thaumaturgus was one of their chief apologists; but the traditions of his deeds are so full of miracle that even if we accept his story as genuine, it is impossible to believe that he was a Christian. He is said to have been a Christian from birth, and having been converted by the Nestorians, to have recovered his faith by finding his mother among their adherents. The story of his life is given in the works of several writers, and his conversion seems to have been genuine, but it is not known how he came to be associated with the Nestorians. The convent of Thaumaturgus seems to have been built on the site of a pagan sanctuary and a Nestorian bishop was appointed c. 800 A. D. [cf. ABRAHA, HILYAR, SAN'A]. From the borders Christianity percolated into the interior. Bishops are recorded at Aila [q. v.], Dûma [cf. DJAWF] and Taima', and most of the tribes in the north had some knowledge of the faith even if the saying attributed to 'Alli, “All they know of Christianity is wine-bibbing”, is exaggerated. The tribes most affected were, in the west Salih, Ghassan, Djudhâm and Lakhîm, in the east Taghlib, Bakr with 'Ubîl, Hamîf, Rab'a, Tamûn and Tanûkh, and in the centre Ta'î with Thâlab and part of Kufa'.

B. Under Islam (mediæval period).

1. History. It is generally recognised that the attitude of Muhammad towards the Christians, which had at first been favourable, changed towards the end of his life; probably when the expanding boundaries of the Muslim state brought him into contact with Christian tribes [cf. art. MUHAMMAD, iii. 735a]. The problem of subject Christians scarcely arose during his lifetime, since his relations with Christian tribes and settlements (e. g. Aila, Dûma) were generally regulated by
treaties, the best known of which is that concluded with the Christians of Nadiflan [q. v.]. By the terms of this treaty, the last of all, usually applied to keep their religion and manage their own affairs, if they paid a fixed tribute, entertained the Prophet's representatives for a month, gave certain supplies in the event of war with the Yaman, and abstained from usury. To the same period belongs the general command given in the Kur'ān (ix. 29) to fight against those who have received a book until they pay tribute (here called al-dā`īzīn, q. v.) and are humbled.

The conquests of Khalid b. al-Walid suddenly made the problem acute. During the reign of 'Umar it was solved, like all the problems of the state, in a hand-to-hand way, usually by applying the precedent of the Nadiflan treaty. Hira, the cities of Syria and Mesopotamia made individual treaties with the Muslim commanders; the terms differ in detail, but all include a fixed tribute. Muslim governors were set over the provinces and big towns, but the minor officials were not changed. The people paid much the same taxes as before and there was little interference with their social and religious life. Sometimes a church or part of one was taken and turned into a mosque; more often, probably, churches and monasteries were respected, as also were existing property rights. On the occasion of al-İfrāk there was a movement among the tribes to seize the conquered lands, and it would seem that a district was for a time assigned to the tribe Badjia (cf. Baladhuri, p. 267 sq.; Kitāb al-Umm, iv. 192), but in the end 'Umar applied the precedent established by Muḥammad on the conquest of Khaibar and left the conquered lands to their owners, to be administered as a trust for the benefit of the conquerors [see art. FA'AT]. On the other hand, he exiled the Christians of Nadiflan to al-İfrāk so that there might be but one religion in Arabia, though isolated Christians lived in al-Madinah itself. 'Umar had a Christian slave who was set free at his death (Ibn Sa'd, vi. 110), and Abū Muṣā had a Christian secretary who accompanied him to al-Madinah. 'Umar is represented, even in Christian sources, as friendly towards Christians, and in his last charge he recommended the dā`imahs to the care of his successor as the support of his families.

During the following decades the treatment and status of Christians shows many contradictions, and was often determined apparently by individual caprice. While new churches were built even in towns founded by the Arabs, such as Fustat and Basra, and the caliph even helped to restore the church at Edessa (Corp. Script. Chr. Or., ser. iii., xiv. 288), in many other places churches were destroyed, and both Muṣawiyah and 'Abd al-Malik tried to seize the cathedral at Damascus before al-Walid finally incorporated it in the mosque. Christians continued to hold high offices in the administration: Muṣawiyah had a Christian secretary, Saḏīlān, who was succeeded by his son, and 'Abd al-'Azīz had as his treasurer a wealthy Christian, Athanasius, though 'Abd al-Malik despised him of much of his wealth. State accounts in Syria and Egypt were kept in Greek until the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, and local accounts in Egypt were still kept in Greek for long afterwards. There were Christians in the Muslim armies, and some gave military service instead of tribute. When the Ḍārādīma of Mount Lebanon were defeated, a clause in the treaty stipulated that they should wear Arab dress (Baladhuri, p. 161). Yet there was some persecution of Christians, though usually of a milder version. Jews were settled in some of the conquered towns because they were enemies of the Christians (Baladhuri, p. 127). The Jacobites paid a special tax to Muṣawiyah (Corp. Script. Chr. Or., ser. iii., iv. 70), and the government sometimes prevented the election of a patriarch. The Christian Arabs of Mesopotamia formed a special category; these paid double zakāt instead of tribute, but a chief of Taghlib was savagely tortured because he would not renounce his faith. Personal relations between Muslims and Christians were often friendly. It is said of a poet that he never mentioned the wife of a Muslim or a dā`imah (Kitāb al-İfrāk, iii. 291). 'Uthmān showed great honour to Abū Zubayd, and the relations of 'Abd al-Malik with the poet al-Ḳifṭal are notorious [see art. AL-ḲIFṬAL].

From this time, however, the condition of the subject Christians began to deteriorate. 'Abd al-Malik changed the system of taxation in Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia (Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, ed. Chabot, p. 10; Abū Yūsuf, p. 23 sq.), and introduced the personal tax on non-Muslims. In many districts the form of receipt was a leaden seal fastened around the neck or wrist. 'Umar II gave orders to dismiss all dā`imahs from government service, but such confusion resulted that the order was soon afterwards ignored. He was also the author of the famous "ordinances", in later times attributed to 'Umar I (cf. Abū Yūsuf, p. 73), which prescribed the restrictions to be placed on dā`imahs and the wearing of the sunnār (q. v.) as their distinctive badge. (According to the Nestorian Chronicle [Patr. Or., xiii. 630], this had earlier been the badge of Christian scholars.)

By the end of the second century, as may be seen from the works of Abū Yūsuf and al-Ṣaḥīfī, the customs governing the dā`imahs were more or less fixed, but insistence on them depended on the whim of the governor and the temper of the populace. It was now accepted that no new churches might be built in towns where Muslims lived, though the old might be repaired. A governor's fancy or a riot might destroy churches and there was no redress; the cathedral at Ṣan`ā', for example, was destroyed for its wealth. At least six rebellions of the Copts took place during the century. Harūn al-Raḍīd reenacted the "ordinances" forbidding Christians to be like Muslims in dress and style of riding; but during the reign of Maʿmūn, the Christian headman of Būra in Egypt wore black on a Friday and rode in state to the door of the mosque, when his deputy entered and led the prayers. Their use of horses and riding saddles began to raise objection, and restrictions were placed on religious processions; crosses were sometimes tolerated though banners were forbidden. Taxation became heavier and cases of extortion are recorded. The caliph kept a careful eye on the Church and a patriarch had to get his approval and do him homage, often at a price. A discontented Christian found it easy to get government help in making trouble for his opponents. At this time Christian doctors became prominent as favourites of the caliph and they did not always use their influence in a Christian manner. Discussions on religion took place; at one, when Maʿmūn was present, the Catholics, the Head
of the Dispersion, the heads of the Šābians, the chief priest of the fire temple and Muslim theologians took part. Many Christians were in government service or were secretaries to public men, and even the fanatical al-Mutawakkil had a Christian secretary. In 236 (850) this caliph intensified the repressive laws. A Christian had to wear a yellow ṭalasāsan and the zunnār and a woman had to wear a yellow wrap out of doors. If he rode he must have wooden stirrups and two balls on the back of the saddle. Men (or slaves) had to wear the ḡāyiSr q.v.). They were to be dismissed from the civil service. All new churches were to be pulled down and the cross might not be displayed at festivals. Their graves had to be flush with the ground. The title was levied on their houses and wooden devices fixed to them. Four years later they were forbidden to ride horses and were told to wear two yellow ẓurrā'a. These laws are the limit of legal persecution and continued to govern in theory though not always observed in practice.

Christians were always to be found in the civil service; some even were connected with the army. In Egypt it was enacted that they should be present on Fridays when the Muslims were absent (Makrizi, Khatīb, ii. 227). One was called Ṿazīr in the time of al-Mu'tamid; it seems, however, that the title had become cheap and he was only a high official (Yāḳūṭ, Tishād, ii. 130, 259). The first rulers to promote Christians to the highest rank were the Beylids [see 'Abd al-Dawla] and the Fātimids. This was quite exceptional, but their strength and influence in the administration at all times can be seen from the constant complaints of the dishonesty of Christian secretaries. More especially in the financial department they possessed a quasi-monopoly, which lasted in Egypt down to the nineteenth century.

That Muslim intolerance did grow more bitter is shown by comparing the accounts of al-Aḥṣāl in the Kitāb al-Āghāni with the remarks of Ibn Ṭaḥhik ('Umda, i. 21). In later times the rulers were often more tolerant or far-sighted than the populace; nevertheless, additional taxes were sometimes laid on the dāmmms. In Egypt an extra 1 dinār was exacted from them between 1260 and 1250, in addition to the poll-tax, which was then called ǧāliyya (Makrizi, i. 106). At intervals fresh attempts were made to impose a distinctive dress upon them. Their request to wear white turbans with a badge was refused at the instance of Ibn Ṭaḥhik [q.v.] and in Egypt blue became their distinctive colour. On the whole, they were worse off than their Muslim fellow-subjects, for, while both suffered from oppression by the ruler, they were liable in addition to be attacked by their fellow citizens. Cases of mass conversion still occurred, but the disappearance of the large Christian population of northern Mesopotamia, which continued down to the late middle ages to be the chief centre of Christianity in the Muslim dominions, is probably to be connected with the general decay of agriculture there.

2. Legal Status. Here as elsewhere the facts of history do not fit the systems of the theorists, who condemned the laxity of the people on the one hand and the highhandedness of the rulers on the other. The general legal position and the legal views of taxation are outlined in the articles Dhimm,a, Ujra, and Khārāz. To this outline some details may be added from the system of Mālik, which is less liberal than that of Abū Ḩanīfa. Mālik taught that a treaty once made with dāmmms cannot be changed. They may not enter mosques or Mecca and the blood money for them is half that for a Muslim. New churches may not be built in or near the towns of Islām though the old may be repaired. Mālik, when consulted, said that a Christian, who had blasphemed the Prophet, should be put to death, and this was done. A Muslim may not borrow from them, nor become a partner with them in business unless he is present at all transactions. Another opinion would let them be sleeping partners. A Muslim should not rent land from them as a métaier, but it is not illegal, and one who is part owner of a house with a Muslim has the right of pre-emption. One, who is trading in his own town, pays no tax beyond the general tribute; if he goes to another town and buys goods with money brought with him, he pays the trade tax (tithe), but there is no tax on the sale of these goods. Dāmmms must not kill sacrifices for Muslims; if they do, the sacrifices must be repeated. A Muslim woman should kill a beast rather than ask them to do so. If one marries a Muslim woman with the consent of her guardians, they shall all be punished, but if he pretended to be a Muslim, the marriage is invalid. They may not arrange a marriage for a Muslim woman nor a Muslim that of his dāmmi sister. Married dāmmms are divorced by the conversion of the woman. Mālik did not approve of dāmmi foster-mothers for Muslim children. If a Muslim commits adultery with a dāmmi woman, he is punished according to his law and she is handed over to her co-religionists to be dealt with according to their law. The evidence of a dāmmi is not accepted. Should he turn Muslim, his evidence is still not accepted (i.e. about things that happened while he was a dāmmi), consequently dāmmi women cannot give evidence about a birth. If a Christian buys or is given a Muslim slave, the transaction is valid, but the slave must be sold to a Muslim. Muslim law applies to all business dealings between dāmmms, except usury, though they may practise this among themselves. They may not be taught the Qurʾān. A Muslim may not prevent his Christian slave from drinking wine, eating pork and going to church. It may be noted that Māwardi admits the possibility of a dāmmi becoming Ṿazīr (qv azīr al-tanfis). One authority says that eight acts put a dāmmi outside the law: an agreement to fight the Muslims, fornication with a Muslim woman, an attempt to marry one, an attempt to turn a Muslim from his religion, robbery of a Muslim on the highway, acting as a spy or guide for unbelievers, or the killing of any Muslim.

3. Social Status. The fact that Christians, like other dāmmms, were citizens as it were at second remove, was of course reflected in their social position. The full consequences of this disability were to some extent mitigated by their numbers and influence in the public administration, and by their monopoly or quasi-monopoly of important professions. Christians were distinguished more especially as doctors (the family of Buḫṭişuʾ), Ibn Buṭlān [q.v. etc.] and druggists. A Muslim complained that he could get no patients in an unhealthy year because he spoke good Arabic and not the dialect of Ḥunjāḥib [q.v.] and
wore cotton instead of silk (Djähic, Kitāb al-Buhkārā, p. 85) and al-Ghazzālī says that in many towns the pd. actor was so rich, and it was often their improper display which provoked the mob to violence. The prohibition of usury in Muslim law operated in favour of the dhimmis as merchants and money-changers, and gave them the monopoly of such trades as those of goldsmiths and jewelers.

Apart from numerous instances of friendly personal relations between individuals, the generally good relations between the Muslims and Christians is shown by the universal celebration of the great festivals of the Christian year, and the holidays and fairs which accompanied the feasts of the patron saints at the principal monasteries (cf. A. Fischer, in Berichte über d. Verh. d. Sachs. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1929). Christians took part in the intellectual life of the community, and the books they wrote are named with approval by the Muslim historians. The strict letter of the law regarding non-Muslims was not always applied. While marriage to a Muslim was always forbidden, fornication with one was not always punished with death. At times the Muslim murderer of a dhimmī was executed. Even the apostate sometime found mercy, on the ground that forced conversions were not valid. Christians kept Muslim slaves, both male and female, and acted for Muslims in business.

In spite of all this, the stigma of inferiority remained. The humiliating regulations, the need for constant watchfulness, the constant recourse to intrigue and influence to circumvent the law, the segregation of dhimmis in many cities, the poverty and powerlessness of dhimmis in the towns, were their legal disabilities; there could be no true justice for the dhimmī when his evidence was excluded from the Muslim courts, even though kāfs were enjoined not to discriminate against them in other respects, nor could there be any permanent social relationship in the absence of intermarriage. It is not surprising therefore that the Christian communities of the East gradually dwindled not only in numbers, but also in vitality and moral tone.


C. The Ottoman Empire.

Since the period of the Tanzimāt [q. v.] the Ottoman Empire has gradually abandoned the governmental traditions of Muhammadan states, and this change has fundamentally affected the treatment of its Christian subjects. On the other hand, this change was actually brought about by the very problems with which the Ottoman government became confronted through the existence of a large Christian population in its territory.

Up to the beginning of the sixteenth century the treatment of Christians in the Empire was, on the whole, in accordance with the prescriptions of the šarīʿa after the Ḩanafī madhḥab as to the treatment of dhimmis, the chief authority on these questions being the Multāṣf al-ʿAḥbar of Ibrahim al-Ḥalabi (cf. the Constantinople edition of 1390, p. 90). Christians were subject to the payment of the dziercri gebērān, more often called ḥarāddī in Turkey [cf. these two articles], whence the expression ḥarāddī-gēwr. This tax was levied in three classes, according to the financial capacity of the payers. D’Ohsson (Tableau, iii. 4 sqq.) says that in his time (about 1800) each year 1,000,000 tax-forms were issued for the non-Muslims, of which 60,000 were in the capital. The regulations as to the building and restoration of Christian churches were observed in principle; the Ḥanafī madhḥab allows the restoration of decayed churches but not of churches deliberately demolished; Sheikh ī Zāde, however, in his commentary on the Multāṣf (Multāṣf al-ʿAḥbar, printed Constantinople 1276, p. 415) complains that this distinction was not duly observed in his time (1666). From the sixteenth century indeed the building and rebuilding of churches was a subject of frequent intervention by the representatives of foreign Christian powers. The turning of churches into mosques by the Ottoman conquerors — such as the case of the Āya Sōnah — was generally in accordance with Islamic laws of war. Likewise the prescriptions about clothing were observed and from time to time reinforced; as late as the eighteenth century certain sultanāns such as ʿUlmān III and Muṣṭafā III are known to have given special attention to this point.

We also find in the Ḥanānī-nimāt — the contents of which were declared in accordance with the šarīʿa by the Sheikh al-Islām — some special clauses about non-Muslims (ḥājrā). A Ḥanānī-name of the time of Suleimān I prescribes that, in the case of certain crimes that are punished by fines, the fines of non-Muslims shall amount to only half the sum inflicted on a Muslim in each case (cf. the second Ḥanānī-name, published as appendix to T. O. E. M., iii. 3, 4, 6). The same Ḥanānī-name gives directions with regard to the inheritance of non-Muslims.

The Christians thus constituted in the Ottoman Empire, just as in other Muhammadan states, a section of the population which, so far as their relations with the Government went, had minor rights compared to Muhammadans and to which the high functionaries of the state never belonged. They were improperly designated by the term raʿīya, which word originally means all subjects of a Muhammadan ruler, in allusion to a well-known tradition which compares the ruler with a shepherd and his subjects with a flock (raʿīya, cf. al-Bukharī, Ḥadīth, bāb 11). Hence the use of the term rayās in European works when speaking of the Christian subjects of the sultan. Cavar [q. v.] was a more or less contemptuous expression in the idiom of Muslim circles.

There had been, however, since the coming into existence of the Ottoman Empire, several circumstances that presented the problem of the Christian subjects in forms quite different from those prevailing in contemporary Muhammadan states. The
beginnings of the Ottoman state itself had been anything but orthodox. Erteğrul, according to most sources, was only a converted Muslim and ‘Othmān and Orkhan, the founders of the state, had many dealings with the Christian aristocracy of Byzantium, some of whom joined readily the cause and the creed of the new conquerors. Christianity was at that time still widely spread in Asia Minor and was at first adapted to the rather unorthodox mystic form in which the Turcomans of Rûm had made acquaintance with Islām. Large parts of the population adhered for centuries to a Christian-Islamic mixture of religious convictions, such as appeared in the derwish revolt under Simawna Oghlu Bâdr al-Dîn (cf. Babinger, in Isl., xi.), and as survived in the beliefs and practices of the Bektâşis and the mixed worship of certain saints by both the Islâmic and the Christian population. Survivals of this mixed creed were also observed among the so-called Crypto-Christians of Trebizond (cf. Hasluck, in Journal of Hellenic Studies, xli. 199 sqq.). It was only after the restoration of the Empire in the xvth century that the orthodox Islāmic attitude prevailed in the government of the sulṭan, who repeatedly had to take strong measures against the heterodox elements. During this same period it was of no less importance that the Ottoman Empire came to incorporate more and more territories in Europe exclusively inhabited by Christians. With the exception of eastern Thrace, northern Macedonia, Bosnia and Crete, the new subjects were never Islamicized in great numbers; in the Empire they came to form a very considerable minority, which was counterbalanced only by the large Muhammadan population of the Asiatic territories. So long as the government and the Muhammadan ruling class were strong, this did not affect the political system. But this ruling class itself, as well as their powerful military instrument, the Janissaries, were recruited in a large measure from the Greek and Slavonic Christian population of the European provinces and often kept up friendly relations with their non-converted kinsmen (one of the many instances is that of Djiangir Khalil Pasha under Muhammad II). Accordingly much consideration was shown to large parts of the Christian population, and the more so as many Christians served on minor posts in the state chanceries, where they performed important administrative duties (Crusius, Turo- gratia, p. 14). Besides, many high-placed persons, including the sulṭan himself, had, through their harems, many Christian relations without and within the Empire. So the domestic and foreign policy of the state often brought about measures of toleration, which were not altogether in accordance with the strict demands of Muhammadan law. An outstanding example is the way in which Constantinople and its Christian inhabitants were treated after the excesses of the first days of the conquest were over. Muhammad II did all that he could to re-populate his new capital, even with Greeks, when the Muhammadan element proved insufficient; he even had a new Ecumenical Patriarch chosen not long after the conquest (cf. Fr. Giese, Die Stellung der christlichen Untertanen im Osmanischen Reich, in IsL, xix., 1931, p. 264 sqq.). Only afterwards, in the first half of the xvth century, when Muhammadan fanaticism had increased, there was a party which invoking the fact that the town had been taken by force (أنتِوان), claimed the destruction of all churches that were left to the Christians, and only with great difficulty was evidence constructed to prove that Constantinople was really taken by a capitulation (cf. J. H. Mordtmann, Die Kapitulation von Konstantinopel im Jahre 1453, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, xxi., 1912, p. 129 sqq.). Other signs of fanaticism in the same period are i. a. the intention attributed to Selim I to convert all Christians to Islām, the wish of Murād III to turn all churches into mosques and the alleged oath of Murād IV to exterminate all Christians. Still, apart from these occasional outbursts, tolerance prevailed. In the capital a Greek Christian aristocracy and plutocracy was permitted to live in the quarter of Phanar; from their midst came influential persons such as Michael Kantsakzenos, the "pillar of the Christians" (Jorga, iii. 211) in the xvth century, and the well-known Phanariote families who later supplied dragomans to the Porte and the princes of the Danube principalities.

The official attitude towards the Christians was complete abstinence from their domestic religious and secular affairs so long as this did not affect the public order. This explains also the tolerance towards the activities of the Roman Catholic missionaries who were sent from the xvi th century onwards to convert the eastern Christians. The government took no interest in the different denominations of Christians, while their internal divisions reinforced its authority. R. Gragger in his article Türkisch-Ungarische Kulturbeziehungen (Literaturdenkmaler aus Ungarns Türkenzeit, in Ungarische Bibliothek, i. N. 14, Berlin 1927) depicts the tolerant attitude and the sometimes amused interest of the Turkish Pashas in Hungary in the religious disputes between Roman Catholics and Protestants. On the other hand, the serious domestic troubles amongst the Greeks belonging to the much decayed Ecumenical Patriarchate, as the result of which the party of the patriarch Cyrilus Lucaris took, in the first half of the xvi th century, a definite anti-Roman Catholic attitude, could not be wholly indifferent to the Porte, because from that time on the only political protector of the Greeks was the Ottoman government. Arbitrary measures, such as occasional executions of the patriach (for the first time in 1657; v. Hammer, G. O. R., i.lli. 474) and excesses in war time are not sufficient to refute the statement that the attitude of the government was on the whole tolerant.

What, at length, came to influence most deeply this attitude was the interest shown in the lot of the Christians by the governments of the Christian powers with whom the Porte began to enter into peaceful relations. In the first centuries those foreign Christians who were allowed to reside in the seaport towns fell within the category of μυστα’μιν. Legal conceptions of that time did not distinguish sharply between religious denomination and nationality, both being designated by the word millet; therefore a foreigner who embraced Islām was entirely assimilated to the Muhammadan subjects of the sulṭan. In course of time millet came to be used also for the different "national" denominations of the Christians within the Empire. The first foreign power to be interested in the Christians of Turkey was the Vatican, as was manifested several times by the inevitable participation of the Popes in the preparation of anti-Turkish crusades. The Cardinal Protettore di Levante in Rome exercised, through his vicar, considerable influence
on the Latin Roman Catholic community of Pera, which, since the conquest of Constantinople, had enjoyed, like the other Christian communities, administrative independence. This "religious protection" was not altogether in conformance with the wishes of the Christians themselves (G. Young, *Corps de Droit Ottoman*, Oxford 1905, ii. 124), but at those times the Porte followed a policy of non-intervention and did not seize the opportunity of placing these Christian inhabitants of her territory under her more direct control. The same policy made her accept without difficulty the reministrances of a second, more powerful, protector, the King of France, who already before the conclusion of the treaty of 1535 had begun to act as intermediary between the Catholics in Jerusalem and other places in the Levant and the Porte. This intervention of France— which, in the eyes of Christian Europe, served her as an excuse for her entering into diplomatic relations with the Porte— was tolerated equally in favour of other than French ecclesiastics and missionaries, and of non-French Christian prisoners. Occasionally France's protection was also invoked by other than Roman Catholics; in 1639, the Oecumenical Patriarch himself asked the French King to declare himself protector of the Eastern Church. The French capitulation of 1673 recognized at last the protectorate of the King of France over the Roman Catholic foreign Christians, though a general protectorate over all the Christians in the Empire had been demanded originally; the famous capitulation of 1740 confirmed the dispositions of that of 1673 (cf. G. Pelissier du Ruissac, *Le Régime des Capitulations dans l'Empire Ottoman*, Paris 1911, i. 80 sqq.).

A third powerful protectorate arose at this time of the Greek Orthodox Christians, arose in the xviiith century in the person of the Russian Czar. Shortly after the fall of Constantinople Ivan the Great had begun to regard himself as successor of the Byzantine Emperors and, as the power of Russia increased, the Greek orthodox Christians in the western and eastern parts of the Empire came to look upon the Czar as their natural protector. Especially the Christian institutions in Jerusalem and the much impoverished patriarchate of that town benefited by the Russian religious interest. On the other hand, Russia learnt to use her influence with the Orthodox Christians as a powerful political instrument. The peace treaty of Kâčk Kainardjie (1776) recognized at last the right of the Russian diplomatic representatives to interfere in favour of the Christians in the Empire.

With the weakening of the Empire in the xviiith century the so-called "religious protection" became a heavy burden on Turkey's inner political conditions. Especially after the disastrous happenings under Mahmut II's reign, it became clear that the old Muhammadan conception of the state, which left the non-Muslims entirely to themselves, or to others, could no longer be maintained. It was one of the chief stimuli to the introduction of the Tansımât. In order to retain as much control as possible over her Christian subjects the Porte now had to apply her governmental activity equally to non-Muslims and Muslims. Accordingly the Khâfî-i Sherif of Gûl-Khâne (1839) declared that perfect security was guaranteed to all subjects, Muslims or râdîyûs, as to their lives, their honour and their possessions. Still in the following years no important administrative measures were taken, while on the other hand the intervention of foreign powers in Christian affairs continued and led amongst other incidents to the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853. An incident of 1843, in the meantime, had made the Porte give a formal assurance to the French and English ambassadors with regard to the non-application of capital punishment to persons who had renounced the Muhammadan creed (Young, *op. cit.*, ii. 11 sqq.).

The law of May 10, 1855 is an important landmark in the history of Ottoman policy towards the Christian subjects; this law abolished the capitulation tax for non-Muslims and envisaged the possibility of their service in the army (cf. DILMA and the *Bibliography* of this article). This legislative measure was completed by the Khâfî-i Humâyûn of February 18, 1856, which may be regarded as the Magna Charta of the rights of the non-Muslim subjects of the Empire; in this memorable edict the rights and privileges of the different religious denominations and their members were proceeded with more detail: as to their military service the edict laid down the principle that it could be replaced by the payment of an exemption tax, which, under the name of bedel, came to be regularly applied to all non-Muslims. In accordance with the contents of the Khâfî-i Humâyûn, the Ottoman legislation now began for the first time to take notice officially of the existence of the great number of Christian communities existing in the Empire. Organic statutes were elaborated for the more important of these communities (called millet): in 1860 for the Armenian Gregorian community and in 1862 for the Greek Orthodox community. In 1870 followed the capitulation of the Porte, of the Bulgarian Exarchate, while in course of time a host of laws, decrees and regulations were issued, containing more detailed provisions with regard to these and the minor communities: Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, Mount Athos, the Serbian Church, the Nestorians, the Latin communities, and the different churches united with Rome (Armenians, Chaldaens, Maronites, Melkites). This highly complicated legislation aimed at making these Christians Ottoman subjects in the full sense of the word, but met with great difficulties created by the existence of an ages-old system of autonomy and by the frequent intervention of the foreign powers. The leading principle of the government was to divest the purely religious authorities as much as possible of their power and to reinforce the power of the lay institutions. This policy led to endless troubles in which new regulations continually tried to restore order. In the constitution of Midhat Pasha (1876) Islam was proclaimed as the State religion, but immediately afterwards there follows the declaration that the profession of all recognized religions in the Empire is free and that all privileges granted to the different religious communities shall be maintained (art. 11). Art. 9 guarantees the personal freedom of all Ottoman subjects and art. 17 their complete equality before the law.

All the time during the period of reforms the Turkish government had to reckon with reactionary feelings against the changes in large sections of the Muhammadan population, which in many instances made the application of equal treatment, before the law and elsewhere, illusory. This justified to a certain extent the never ending reministrances
of the European powers, who lost no opportunity of insisting on new reforms in favour of the Christians. Art. 62 of the treaty of Berlin (July 3, 1878) stipulated again for the equal treatment by the Ottoman government of all non-Muslim subjects, amongst others that every one, without difference of religion, should be admitted as a witness before the law courts.

The effect of the foreign intervention in their favour encouraged on the other hand large sections of the Christian population to disloyal feelings and actions against their legal government. While the latter did what it could to do assimilate the different groups of the population, the factors of dissolution became at the same time ever stronger. Even the peaceful relations that had hitherto characterized on the whole the intercourse between Muhammedans and Christians—especially in the cities—began to make way for religious hatred between group and group, in which the government officials were often unable to observe the required neutral attitude. Amongst many other symptoms the Armenian troubles which began in 1889 in the Armenian vilayets—where a racial antagonism between Muhammedan Kurds and Christian Armenians had existed for centuries—were the most disastrous. They led to repeated Armenian attempts at revolt and to the notorious massacres in Constantinople of 1897.

By this development the treatment of the Christian subjects ceased to be a religious problem; it became a problem of nationality (millet in the new acceptance of the word) and of race, and at the same time one of the vital problems for the Empire. After the revolution of 1908 and the re-establishment of Miḥdat's constitution, these facts were not yet fully recognized. The Ottomanization of all subjects of the Empire was seriously attempted; the new representative bodies included a number of Christian members; occasionally there were Christian ministers. Then the world war precipitated the inevitable course of events. This time non-Muslims were for the first time incorporated in the Turkish army, but only for service behind the front. At the same time, the domestic policy of the Young Turks took a pan-Turkish turn, from which religious motives were quite absent. National Turkish feeling prevailed. The measures of deportation of Christian inhabitants from the frontier zones—measures from which the Armenians especially suffered terribly—were inspired by fear of disloyalty towards Turkey, though in their execution remnants of religious fanaticism, notably on the side of the Kurds, certainly played a large part.

The events after the armistice of Mudros have proved that a great part of the Christian population preferred independence or incorporation into a Christian state to remaining with Turkey. And the Turks themselves also were ready to part with their Christian subjects. Under these circumstances, were concluded at Lausanne, in 1923, the agreements with Greece for the exchange of the Greek population of the new Turkish state against Turks established on Hellenic territory; only Constantinople and some islands were excluded from this measure. Since by the events of the war the number of Armenians and other Christians in Asiatic Turkey had already been reduced to a very small minority, the result was that the present Turkish republic has only to deal with a Christian population of no numerical importance, most of whom live in Constantinople. The Lausanne treaty of 1923 in its articles 31-45 only the obligation for Turkey to treat the minorities on an equal basis with the Turkish subjects; it provides for their right to live after a personal legal statute of their own. Finally the treatment of Christians in Turkey has definitely ceased to be a legal problem in the old sense of the word since, by the alteration of the Constitution on April 5, 1928 the state has been completely secularized (cf. Tarîk, Istanbul 1931, iv. 213) by cancelling the article declaring that the state religion is Islam.

(AL. KRAMERS)

AL-NAṢĀRĪ, MUḤAMMAD B. AḤMAD B. `ALĪ B. MUḤAMMAD, an Arabic historian, biographer of the last Khwārimshāh Djiyāl al-Dīn Mangubītī [q. v.], was born in Khurāndiz (Vāqī, ii. 415), an estate in the district of Naṣīr [q. v.] in Khūrānd in which his family was reputed to have been already settled in the pre-Muhammedan period (Riht., ed. Houdas, p. 53). During his father's lifetime he represented him when the vizier Nīẓām al-Mulk, dismissed from office by Sulṭān Muḥammad, visited the family estates on his journey to Khwārizm and was received by him (tibîl, p. 30). He only mentions incidentally that he had stayed in his youth with Inānḵhān in Māsandarān before the latter had risen to power. When the Mongols invaded Khūrānd in 1221 he had already succeeded his father in his ancestral citadel, which he saved from sacking by payment of 10,000 ells of cloth. Nīẓām al-Dīn al-Sāmaṭānī was his guest at this time; he enabled him to escape to Khwārizm before the arrival of the enemy and in gratitude Nīẓām al-Dīn procured him a rich grant of land from Ozīlgh Shāh, son of Muḥammad (p. 57 sqq.). When in Naṣīr, the capital of his district, Naṣīr al-Dīn Ḥamzā b. Muḥammad, the representative of a local royal family, came to power as successor to his nephew Khkīyār al-Dīn (p. 99), he appointed him his māṭīb (p. 104) and in this capacity he took part in a battle fought by Inānḵhān, as governor of Khūrānd, at Nakhdjuwān near Naṣīr against the Mongols; according to the full story of the battle (p. 66), this was the only occasion on which he personally took part in a battle. When after the death of Sulṭān Muḥammad (1220) his eldest son Ghiyāth al-Dīn ascended the throne, Naṣīr al-Dīn took the side of his younger brother Djiyāl al-Dīn, and for this an expedition was sent against him under Tūlāḵ, son of Inānḵhān. To save himself he sent Naṣawī with 1,000 dinārs to Ghiyāth al-Dīn. After long wanderings and a two months' sojourn in Isfahān, he succeeded in giving the money to Djiyāl al-Dīn's minister Sharaf al-Mulk, who then wrote a despatch to Tūlāḵ ordering him to abandon the siege of Naṣīr; but this arrived too late and Naṣīr al-Dīn had already been slain (p. 109). Naṣawī did not dare to return home but went to Djiyāl al-Dīn when the latter had entered Marāgha. He was appointed by him Kāṭīb al-Inṣālā (p. 110) and henceforth accompanied him master on all his campaigns. When Dīyā al-Mulk 'Allā al-Dīn to escape the jealousy of the vizier Sharaf al-Mulk had himself appointed governor of Naṣīr he aroused such discontent there by his misgovernment that he was appointed in his stead governor of his native town with the title of vizier but had to stay with Djiyāl al-Dīn and sent a deputy to his governorship (p. 149).
When Djalal al-Din in 1230 was surrounded by the Mongols at Hant and fought his way out once again, Nasawi became separated from him and was kept a prisoner for two months in Amed but finally made his way to Maysafarikin where he learned of the sad end of his king who had been murdered by a Kurd on Aug. 16, 1231 (p. 245).

Ten years later in 659 (1241), he wrote the history of his sovereign entitled Sirat al-Sultân Djalal al-Din Mankobi. It opens with a confused and romantic account of the early history of the Mongols and begins his subject with Muhammad's campaign to the 'Iraq in 614 (1217). He relies for his facts mainly on the stories of high officials of his hero's court; as a result his interest is mainly in diplomatic documents and administrative measures while military matters, which were his hero's main occupation, are dealt with rather briefly. His model was apparently the Kitâb al-Yarnî of al-Uthbi which his master Nasrat al-Din was said to know by heart (p. 104); but he had not al-Uthbi's secure command of Arabic so that his style is fortunately much simpler and more matter of fact, in spite of all his attempts at rhymed prose and plays upon words. Persian influence on his style, which Houdas claims to notice, is on the other hand nowhere marked.


(Ch. Brockelmann)

NASHÎÅT MIRZÅ 'ABD AL-WÅHåBÅ OF ISFÅHÅN, one of the best Persian poets and stylists of the period of the early Kåfårs. He was a physician in Shiraz and in his native city, devoting many hours to literature and displayed a great facility. He wrote verse in Arabic, Persian and Turkish and was further celebrated for his great skill in qâbåså. Rumours of his poetical gifts induced the Kåfår Fåth 'Ali Shah (1797–1834) to invite him to Teherân as court poet. There Nasåht soon rose to great honour and in 1809 was appointed Munshå al-Mamlåk (secretary of state) with the title of Me'tamad al-Dawla. In this capacity he carried through several important negotiations for the Shah, such as the restoration of peace among the nomad tribes of Khorasan in 1814 and 1818. Besides his own poems, he wrote an introduction to Sahâ's famous Şåhånsåkhî-nâma and drew up a whole series of important diplomatic documents. Specially celebrated is the letter written by him to George III in which he expressed regret at the interruption of the friendly relations between England and Persia. He died in 1828–1829. He collected his poems into a book published in Teherân in 1266 (1850) under the title Gâdsâni-yt Nasåht (the "Treasury of Joy"). Nasåht's ghazels are all imitations of those of his great predecessors, particularly Hâfîz, but are distinguished by elegance and simplicity, smooth rhythm and considerable depth of feeling.


(E. Berthels)

NASHÅWÅN B. SA'ÅD B. NASÅWÅN AL-HIMÅYÅR ÅF. AL-VÅYÅN, an Arab Philologist. The notices of this individual and his career are exceedingly scanty. In Yaghût's Irshåd and in Suyûtî's Fångha he is described in laudatory terms in the usual phrases as a great scholar, authority on fiqh, philology and nask; he was also distinguished as a historian and poet and was equally versed in all the other branches of science. He compiled a dictionary entitled Shâma al-‘Ulåm wa-Dawnåh al-‘Arab min al-Kulåm in eight (according to others eighteen) volumes which his son later revised and condensed into two volumes; he also wrote a treatise on rhyme, Kitâb al-Kawåvî, and a book of a religious and philosophical nature, Kitâb Hår al-In wa-Târikh al-Sâmån. We know neither the year nor the place of his birth, nor with whom he studied nor in what places he lived. Only one story of his life has survived and that sounds improbable. Yaghût says he was a great chief who besieged cities and fortresses and ruled over a hill-tribe in the Sabr range. Al-Suyûtî takes this story from Yaghût. According to al-Suyûtî, he was a follower of the Mu'tazila. He is said to have died on the 24th Dhu 'l-Hijjå 573 (1117). The importance of Nashåwan lies in the fact that he was particularly well acquainted with the South Arabian tradition. He took up the work of his predecessor al-Hamåndåf. The task of rescuing from oblivion the legends of the South Arabian kingdoms. He uses these as the basis of his work and gives long quotations from the writings of his predecessor. His famous so-called ‘Hamåråtå Qåså, al-Kåsåtå al-Himåyårå, is based on such traditions of the Himyarite rulers; it celebrates their deeds and the splendour of the South Arabian kingdom. In the commentary on this poem the annotator gives very full notes, in which he narrates legends of South Arabian princes and their history. Von Kremer supposes, relying on internal evidence, that the author of the Qåsåtå and the commentator are the same person i.e. that Nashåwan himself wrote the commentary on his Qåsåtå. The commentator, whose name is not given, must at any rate have been very well acquainted with Himyarite tradition. In the already mentioned dictionary Shâma al-‘Ulåm, Nashåwan also uses his knowledge of South Arabian history. Whether all the facts given by him are historical cannot be discussed here; many of them are certainly based on tradition, since Nashåwan himself, as his nask shows, was of South Arabian blood. His works played a part in the struggle of the tribes of the south Arabian origin against the northern Arabs for predominance in the Muslim world.

that al-Biruni when dealing fully with the Jewish intercalation (op. cit., p. 55, 57) connects the Hebrew word for intercalary year, 'ibbîr, with meṣubhirîth "pregnant woman" and observes: "they compare the woman of a superfluous month to the year to the woman carrying something which does not belong to her body". In this connection we may recall that Tabari (op. cit., p. 91, 6) explains the Arabic nasî as nasî "pregnant woman" among other interpretations, saying nasî'at al-mar'a, "on account of the increase which the child in her means". This agreement in the two explanations, which can hardly be accidental, might really indicate that nasî in the sense of intercalation or intercalary month is modelled on the Jewish 'ibbîr and thus support al-Biruni's statement which is in itself not impossible. Caussin de Perceval ([J. A., ser. iv., vol. i., p. 349) even quotes the Hebrew nasi (prince) as a title of honour of the leader of the Sanhedrin, to whom fell the duty of dealing with the intercalation (cf. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin, p. 11a: "the intercalation of the year may only be done with the approval of the nasî"). According to one of the meanings of the Arabic nasî given in Tradition, it was really the "name of a man" (see above), a meaning which is all the more remarkable in this connection, as it does not suit the Kur'anic passage. There is a definite agreement in the fact that in the Jewish intercalation only the month following Adar was an intercalary month while in the Arab system, as the critical examination of Tradition — contradicting the literal interpretation of its text — shows, only the month following Duha 'Hijjâda i.e. the intercalated month in both cases was inserted between the normal last month and the normal first of the year, Nisân or al-Muharram.

Nothing certain is known about the process of intercalation among the Arabs. It can only have been periodic and irregular attempts at correction based on observation of nature, particularly vegetation. The technical part must have been exceedingly simple and primitive. The same is true of the Jewish intercalation in the older period (see Bab. Talmud, op. cit., p. 10b–13b). As the Jewish system served to move the feast of Pesâh to a suitable season of the year, the Arab system may only have been intended to do the same for the badîj and the fairs associated with it in the vicinity of Mecca. It was not intended to establish a fixed calendar to be generally observed. The Beduins had never had one and they have no use for one. According to Tradition, the management of the nasî was a prerogative of the Banî Kinâna: and indeed fairs were held on the lands of the Kinâna.

Bibliography: A. Moberg, An-nasî in der islamischen Tradition, where the most important references are given. (A. MOBERG)

NASÎB (A.), the introductory lines of the Arabic kasîda [q.v.] which are devoted to recalling the memory of a woman whom the poet loved long years before. The nasîb is, so far as we know, the only kind of love-poem which has survived to us from the Arabic literature of the pre- and early Muḥammadan period and is almost the only place where women are the subject in the poetry of the Arabs. The essential feature is that the subject of the nasîb is always the lament of a man for a lost beloved. Even in the earliest kasîdas that have survived the nasîb is already...
in the stereotyped form. It treats its subject again and again in the same way with only the slightest variations. We can distinguish three constantly recurring principal motives:

I. A Beduin on his wandering through the desert passes a spot where there are the traces of a tent-trench which has fallen in, dried camel dung, sooty stones, which once formed a cooking place, and tent-pegs. From these things he sees that this spot has been the resting-place of wandering Beduins. After some reflection he recalls that his tribe encamped here long before, jointly with another tribe, during the spring grazing and that he himself spent a happy time with his beloved. The poet usually then gives a description of the deserted camping place, the _aflāl_; it can only be traced with difficulty as the wind and the rain which has fallen upon it have obliterated it and made it almost unrecognisable. The rain has produced a rich vegetation and gazelles and antelopes with their young have found shelter there.

II. The poet recalls the day when the two tribes, his own and that of his beloved, struck camp. There had been various signs of the approaching departure. The camels were brought back from the pastures and loaded; the raven, the bird of ill omen, also foretold the separation to the poet. In his mind he again sees the camels with their litters before him and compares them to ships. The _women_ sit in the litters, among them his beloved. They go off and he follows them in spirit.

III. While grief for his lost beloved is keeping the poet awake, she sends him from far away her _dābab,_ a vision of herself. He is surprised that his delicate beloved has been able to travel so far, as she was never a good walker. The vision arouses painful memories in him and he weeps copiously as he recalls the beauty of his beloved.

Each of these three themes may be followed by a full description of the personality and journey of his beloved; she is a distinguished and modest lady, one of the noblest of her tribe; she is frequently married and sometimes even has children. Her husband is held up to ridicule. She is coquettish and likes to torment her lover. Her physical charms are described very fully and the various parts of her body celebrated in fine similes (in the style of the _wasf_, cf. the Song of Solomon and the _Alt-ägyptischen Liebeslieder_, ed. W. Max Müller). Her dress, her perfume and her jewellery are described in laudatory terms. The feelings of the lover are then detailed. Grief has made him old and grey; he is ill with longing for his beloved and after all these years his tears still flow at the thought of her.

Like all early Arabic poetry the _nasīb_ in matter and structure follows with considerable strictness a definite chain of ideas so that there is a certain uniformity about it. We constantly find the same or similar comparisons; the ideas of the different poets do not differ essentially from one another but only the form and method of expressing them. The traces of the _aflāl_ look like writing made by the _falam_ on parchment. The poet is like a gazelle or an antelope, a simile which continuously recurs with new variations. The tears of the poet run like water from a leaky skin or fall like pearls from a necklace when the string is broken and so on. In consequence of the wealth of the Arabic language in synonyms these similes have an ever-new charm in spite of the many repetitions. Stereotyped metonymies, such as we find in all branches of Arabic poetry, are also common in the _nasīb_. Thus the beloved, the _aflāl_, the showers of rain, and parts of the body etc. are designated by metonymy. The _nasīb_ usually begins (in so far as it has survived in its entirety) with formal phrases: _li-man al-diyār_ etc.; frequently it ends with _dī_ dībā “leave this”, whereupon the poet turns to the description of the camel.

The _nasīb_ had already become fixed in form in the pre-Muhammadan period, and no poet could break away from it. Gradually its contents became more and more colourful; it became more and more stereotyped and stiff. In the old Arab poetry there is already no difference between the _nasīb_ of a Beduin and that of a townman. Kās b. al-Khaṭṭām, Ḥassān b. Thābit and ʿAdī b. Zaid describe the beauty of their beloved in the same way as, for example, Imraʾ al-Kās, and they treat their separation from her just like a Beduin poet. We must remember however that in the pre-Muhammadan period even a townsmen knew Beduin life (of ʿAdī b. Zaid we know that he spent a part of the year in the desert; cf. _Kitāb al-ʿAghāni_, Cairo 1928, ii. 105). In later times however, the poets no longer knew the life of the desert from their own experience; the _nasīb_ thus became more and more stereotyped. In the end it became a matter of ridicule that every ʿaṣīda began with the lament at the _aflāl_; a critic of the ʿAbbasid period (cf. Goldzither, _Abhandlungen_, p. 144) asks whether every man with a command of language who would write a good poem must of necessity be lovesick.

From the _nasīb_ we learn of amatory relations of a kind which probably played a considerable part in pre-Islamic Arabia. These were unrestricted relations, not contracted in the forms which were already used in pre-Islamic Arabia at a marriage. They were based on natural inclination and spontaneous devotion and ended with this. As is evident from the _nasīb_ such unions were usually concluded in the spring grazing season when different tribes were encamping peacefully side by side. When the end of this fine season of the year came these love affairs also came to an end as a rule. The position and the reputation of the _khulla_ (as the beloved is often called) were not affected by this illegitimate relation; she remained in her tribe and went off with them, while a _baghiy_ did not live with her tribe.

As is the case with all Arab poetry, the question what is the oldest _nasīb_ and its origin cannot be answered. Arab tradition records that Muḥāhil was the first to put a _nasīb_ in front of a _kāfīdā_; this does not mean however that he was the first to compose one. In the _Kitāb al-ʿAghāni_ (Cairo 1928, ii. 123 sq.) we find a parallel to the _nasīb._ Al-ʿUlmānī sent to King Amunhirān a girl with an accompanying letter which described her merits of mind and body. In the tales of the _1001 Nights_ also, _nasīb_-like poems are inserted but these are all of a comparatively late period. Many parallels may be found in the _Song of Solomon_, and old Egyptian love-poems resemble in spirit and conception and frequently often in phrase the Arabic _nasīb._

**Bibliography:** cf. the references in the article _Kāsida_; I. Guidi, _Il Nasib nella Kāsida Araba_, in _Actes du XIVe Congrès International_.

---

**NASIB** 857
NASĪBIN, a town in Mesopotamia. The name is certainly Semitic origin and to be derived (with Philon Byblios in Steph. Byz.; Muller, F. H. G., iii. 571, fig. 8) from *Nasība* = *ṣṭḥ珥* (nabī). The idol of Naṣibin is said to have been called Abnil (Assemani, Bibl. Orient., i., Rome 1719, p. 27); i.e. “stone of El” (according to W. Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, London 1927, p. 210, note 1). On coins the usual form of the place-name is *Nasēbīn* (Uranios in Steph. Byz.: Nasībīn; Pliny, Nat. hist., vi. 42: Nesbīn); in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae and elsewhere we find the forms Nitibis, Nibitten, Nibizibi (J. Markwart, Sudarmenen u. d. Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 259 sqq., note 1). In Armenia the town is usually called Mebin (on the form see Markwart, op. cit., p. 166 sqq., note 3); Mattēos of Edessa (ed. Waterhoffst, 2nd ed., 1898, p. 245 = Dulsaurier’s transl., p. 206) calls it *Nσpεi*, also called Mebin or *Nσpιn* (also on p. 62 *Nεpιn*).

But he also mentions a *Nσpιn*, which is the town of *Silār* (p. 157 = p. 158, ch. 46 of Dulsaurier’s translation which p. 413 wrongly connects these with our Naṣibin and Sippara) which lies on the left bank of the Euphrates on the road from Severak or Sevavarker (Arabic Suwaida) to Hīj Nawm (Armen. Harans Msroy) (Mattēos, p. 157 = 130 Dulsaurier; 186 sq. = 155 sq. Dulsaurier). This Nasibin concerns to the "town of Naṣibin on the bank of the Frat, called Naṣibin al-Rūm, 3-4 days journey from each of Āmid and Ḥarrān on the road from Ḥarrān to the land of Rūm" (Vakht, Muṣfīm, iv. 789), in Pseudo-Wägild (Futak Diyar Raba va-Diyar Babr, transl. by B. G. Niebuhr, in Schriften der Akademie von Ham., vol. i., Hamburg 1847, p. 50, 175 sqq.) mentioned along with Suwaida, i.e. Suverek, as Naṣibin al-Ṣaghir. The name of which is marked on the Turkish General Staff’s map of 1333 (1917-1918), scale 1:200,000, sheet Siverak-Khārput, 20 miles almost due west of Siverak and 1½ miles from Kanṭara at a bend of the Euphrates. The Syriac authors usually identify Naṣibin with the Sūthā of the Bible and say that Nimrod founded the town (Michael Syr., Chron., transl. Chabot, i. 20; Barbehraeus, Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 8).

The town lay in the plain below the Māsurān ʿāmr [see TUR ĀRABI] on the river Myddions (Theophil. Simok., ed. de Boor, v. 5, 1; Muṣfīm.), the Hirmās of the Arabs, Nehr Māsū or Mašū of the Syrians (Assyr. Kharmogn); Noldeke, in Z. D.M.G., xxxii. 328, the modern Dejaghdā. The country between Naṣibin and the Tigris was called Bēḥ ʿArabaye by the Syriacs (Theophil. Simok., i. 15, 3; Ṣassābā, ii. 16, 1; v. 1, 3; 3, "Aṣābiā; G. Hoffmann, Auszuge aus syr. Akten pers. Mart., P. 23, note 170), by the Armenians Arvastan (cf. Arwastān, in J. A., 1869, p. 168; Arwastān-
of Mesopotamia. Odenathus of Palmyra in 261
again took Nisibis from the Persians and destroyed it.
(Histo. Aug., Trebellius Pollio, Triginta tyranni,
p. 13; cf. Diodor. made the town, which had
become Roman again at the peace of 297 A. D.
(Marquart. Erinnerungen, p. 169), the sole centre of
trade between Persia and the Roman empire (Petr. Patric.,
iv. 63; lvi. 22: Expositio totius mundi et gentium,
p. 22 in Riese. Geogr. lat. min., p. 105) and one of
the principal fortresses on the Mesopotamian lines
on the lines see Poidebard, Syr., x., 1930,
pp. 33–42. In the Persian wars of Constantinus,
Nisibis, Orientis prorsimus castrum (Amm. Marc.
xxv. 8, 14) was three besieged (338
and 346 and 359 A. D.) (Peeters, Anal. Hist.,
xxvii., 1920, p. 285–373). During the first siege died
the monk Jacob of Nisibis, the teacher of Ephraim,
who had built the great church in his native
town in 313 A. D. Perhaps he is to be regarded as the
founder of the "Persian school" of Nisibis,
which Ephraim transferred from there to Edessa
in 362 as a result of the persecutions by Šapūr II
(on it see I. Guidi, Gli statuti della scuola di
Nisibis, in Giornale della Societa Artistica Italiana.
iv., 1890, p. 165–195; J. B. Chap. L'ecole
Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Litteratur, Bonn 1922,
p. 115 sq.: Th. Herrmann, Die Schule von Nisibis
1926, p. 89 sqq.)

In the war of 359 Šapūr II at first passed by
Nisibis on his way to Tela and Amid, while the
Roman army was stationed at Nisibis (Ammian.
Marc., xx., 7, 1–6). After the death of Julian,
Jovinianus had closed among other things the great
fortress of Nisibis under the peace of 363 (Amm.
Marc., xxv., 7, 91). The inhabitants were allowed
to migrate to Amid (Amm. Marc., xxv., 8, 77–9,
6; Sozom., iii. 33 sq.; Ps.-Dionys. of Tellmaheb,
Chron., under the year 674; Syr. Vita of Ephraim,
ed. Lamy, p. 24 sq.; Faustos Byz., Venice 1832,
p. 26; Nau, in K. O. C., ii., 1897, p. 58). They
were perhaps sent on from here and settled
in the above mentioned "Little Nisibin". From this
time the fortress on the lines was Sargathon,
70 stadia west of Nisibis, the modern Serdjc-Khan
(Honigmann, Syr., x., 1929, p. 283 sq.).
The Romans made frequent attacks on the lost town
but always without success, for example in 421–
422 A. D. after their victory at Sargathon (Socrat.
Hist. Est., vii. 18), in 503 under their general
Arelabindos (Jos. Styl., ch. 5, 37, p. 44, ed. Wight
under Dux and Strateles Timostratos (Zach.
Rhet., 191, 256) and in 572 under Patriarch
Marcianus (John of Ephesus, iii., 6.). In the
sixth century the inhabitants were still inclined
to be friendly to the Romans (Ps.-Zach. Reth.,
vii. 6, p. 211, ed. Land). After the Nestorian
academy of Edessa had been transferred to Nisibis
in 489 by the Metropolitan Barsawmā as a result of
the persecutions of the Nestorians in the
Byzantine empire, the town remained for centuries
the intellectual centre of Nestoriantism (cf. also
Mas'ūdī, Kītāb al-Tambīh, ed. de Goeje, p. 150).
In the reign of Khusraw II the Church of St.
Sergius in Nisibis was built (Theophyl. Simok.
v. 1, 7). Sergius Stratelates was elected in particular
veneration by the nomad tribes of this region
(Noldeke's Šahrāb, p. 284, note 1; Peeters,
in Huchard, Vienna 1911, p. 187; Hersfeld-Sarr.
Archiv. Reise im Euphrat- u. Tigrisgebiet, i., 1911,
p. 138, note 2).

In the year 18 (639) Šā'īb b. Ghanm advanced
against Nisibin which after a brief resistance
submitted to the Arabs on the same terms as
had been granted to al-Ruha (Caetani, Annali dell'Islam,
v. 35. 37. 55. 57, year 18 A. H., § 83, 87,
127, 129; according to al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje,
p. 175 sq. and al-Khwārizmi, ed. Baethgen, in Abū
f. d. Kunde d. Morgenst., viii./ii. 110 sq. not till
the following year; cf. Caetani, op. cit., p. 165,
19 A. H., § 428, 43). In the reign of Ābd al-Malik
in 684 A. D. Buraida rebelled in Nisibin (Mich.
Syrian., ii. 469; Barhebr., Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjan,
p. 111; Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, i., 755,
54 A. H., § 15). An earthquake devastated the town
in 717 (al-Khwārizmi, op. cit., p. 122, year 99 A. H.);
The Metropolitan Cyriacus in 738–739 completed
the choir of the Church (Στ. οικ.) and the altar
of the Cathedral of Nisibin (al-Khwārizmi, op.
cit., p. 128, year 141 A. H.). In the period of troubles
in Mesopotamia the people of Dara, Nisibin and
Armenia had gone to the Palmyrene expeditions
(Mich. Syr., i., 103; Barhebr. Litt., p. 153). A band of
Karakants in 315 (927–928) attacked Kafartūš. Rās al-Ain and Nisibin (al-Mas'ūdī,
Kītāb al-Tambīh, p. 384).

Saif al-Dawla began his campaign against Armenia
in 328 (940) from Nisibin (Freytag, in Z.D.M.G.
x. 467). Byzantines in 531 (942) under John Kur-
kus invaded Mesopotamia and took Mašāfīrān,
Arzan and Nisibin (Barhebr. op. cit., p. 179;
Weil, Gesch. d. Chal., ii. 690). Nisibin by this
time probably belonged to the Hamdānīd Nasr
al-Dawla (Z.D. M. G., n. 482). After his death
358 (969–969) his son Abu-l-Muẓaffar Hamdān
was for a short time governor of Nisibin (Z.D.
M. G., n. 485). The Byzantines again attacked
the town under the Domestics (the Armenian Mēb)
on the 1st Maharram 352 (Oct. 12, 972) and
instituted a dreadful massacre in it (Barhebr., p. 192; Z. D. M. G., n. 456; Weil, iii. 19 sq.;
Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Antāšī. ed. Krakovský-Žasil,
wrongly makes the Emperor John Tzeschos himself
conduct the campaign: cf. against this: D. N.
Anastasićević, in Byz. Zeitschr., xxx., 1929–1930,
p. 403 sq.).

Toghlulbeg's army in 435 (1043) laid waste
the country round Nisibin (Barhebr., op. cit., p. 226).
Sūltān Ghāthī al-Dīn in 1106 sent Abū Manṣūr al-
Dujawlī, lord of al-Mawsī, to Nisibin against
the Franks (Mich. Syr., iii., 103). Soon afterwards
the Ortokīd Iğhāzī Nāṣīn al-Dīn took the town
(Mich. Syr., op. cit.; Barhebr., Chron. Syr., p. 273) and
after the Sulṭān had granted it to the emir Mawdūd
it again in 513 (1119–1220) (ibid., p. 217). But it
changed hands again very soon, when in 515
(1121–1122) Sūltān Māḥmūd gave it to the emir
Bursüklū along with al-Mawṣī. Džāzrāt b. 'Omar
and Sīndžūr (Barhebr., p. 285). The Franks in
523 (1128–1129) advanced as far as Māḥmūd, Nisibin
and Ra's al-Ain (Barhebr., p. 289). In 1134,
Zangī put down a rising in Nisibin (Mich. Syr.,
iii. 242). Bābek, installed there as governor by
Zangī himself, destroyed all the fortresses in the
neighbourhood so that Zangī might have no base
against him (Mich. Syr., iii. 264). Nūr al-Dīn of
Halab in 1171 took the town without opposition and dealt rigorously with the Nestorian Christians there. All their new buildings were destroyed the treasuries plundered and about 1,000 volumes of their writings burned (Mich. Syr., iii. 359 sq.). After his death, his nephew Saif al-Din of al-Mawṣīl seized the town (Mich. Syr., iii. 360). It surrendered to Salāh al-Dīn in 1182 (Barhebraeus, Chron. Syr., p. 260). In the following year the latter gave it to ʿImād al-Dīn Sinḏjar, Nasībin and other towns in exchange for Halab (Barhebraeus, p. 362) and he ruled there till his death in 594 (1198) (Barhebraeus, p. 398, 402). In the region of Nasībin there was fierce fighting in 582 (1186–1187) between Kurds and Turkomans (Barhebraeus, p. 370), ʿImād al-Dīn was succeeded in 1198 by his son ʿAbd al-Dīn but ʿNūr al-Dīn Arslānšāh of Mawṣīl immediately took the town from him. But when a severe epidemic wrought great havoc in his army, he abandoned it and ʿAbd al-Dīn returned thither (Barhebraeus, p. 402). ʿNūr al-Dīn in 606 (1209–1210) took a second siege of Nasībin temporarily (Barhebraeus, p. 416 sq.). Malik al-ʿAdīl took the town in 606 (1209–1210) from ʿAbd al-Dīn (Barhebraeus, p. 424). After his death (615 = 1218–1219) it passed to Malik al-Aghṣaf of Urfa (Barhebraeus, p. 424, 439).

The Arab geographers placed Nasībin in the fourth clime, the southern boundary of which ran about 12 farsakh south of the town on the direction of Sinḏjar (al-Masʿūdī, Kitāb al-Tanbih, p. 32 sq., 35, 44). According to Yāḵūt, it lay on the upper course of the Hirmās in the midst of numerous gardens. Ibn Hawḵal, who in 358 (968–969) visited a town which lay at the foot of Dījāl Bābās, speaks of the pleasant life in it, apart from the dangerous scorpions found there. Al-Makdisī describes the fine houses and baths, the market, the Friday mosque and the citadel. Ibn ʿDhibār also visited it in 580 (1184–1185) and mentions its gardens, the bridge over the Hirmās inside the town, the hospital (mārisṭān), several schools and other places of interest. In the viijth (xvith) century it was already for the most part in ruins; but the Friday mosque was still in existence and the gardens around it from which rose-water was exported (Ibn Baṣṭa). Hamm al-Mustawī, according to him, took in 930 the water and a circumference of 160 places, praises its fruits and wine but laments the unhealthy moistness of the climate, the large number of scorpions and the plague of midges.

Ḫūlūgī in 657 (1259) occupied al-Ruḥā, Nasībin and Harrān (Weil, Gesch. der Chalifen, iv. 10). The Mongol Khān Mangū Tımūr [q. v.] died, poisoned in Dījārāt b. ʿOmar, on his way from there to Nasībin on the 16th Muḥarram 681 (April 26, 1282) (Barhebraeus, p. 546 sq.). When Tımūr Khān in 1395 was on his way to ʿĪrāb ʿAbdīn, the people of Nasībin and Maṣīra hid in caves from the Mongols but were suffocated in them with smoke (App. to Barhebraeus, Chronography), ed. Wallis Budge, ii., p. xxxiv.). The Hasanibā Khurṣū of 605 pillaged Nasībin and the country around (ibid., p. xxxvi).

The town passed into the hands of the Ottomans in 1515 (v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii, Pest 1828, p. 449 sq.). It became the capital of a sandjak in the pashalik of Amid (Hādjiḏ Khaliḏa, Diwan-numa, Stambl 1732, p. 438). Later it was placed in the sandjak of Mādīn in the pashalik of Baghīdād (St. Martin, Mémoires sur l’Arménie, i., Paris 1818, p. 161 sq.). To its position on the southern border of the highlands and on the road from al-Mawṣīl to Syria it owes its great strategic and commercial importance. The building of the Baghdād railway has brought it new life; it is said now to have about 50,000 inhabitants.
the son of a Turkish slave-girl named Zumurrud.

He was the only caliph of the later period of the caliphate who was able to pursue a consistent policy. This was entirely directed towards restoring the temporal power of the caliphate. The caliph was assisted by the fact that the Seljuq empire which had previously held the secular power had begun to collapse. In the confusion which caught about its final downfall, the caliph did all he could to hasten its end and did not hesitate to support the Khwarizmshah Takasb as the strongest rival of the dying Seljuq empire in his fight against the last Seljuq Sultan Tuğhrî II. This struggle finally ended in the defeat of the Seljuqs at Kâny where Tuğhrî died fighting (Rabi' I, 590 = March 1194).

As a result of the diversity of the political aims of the two allies a quarrel broke out between the caliph and the Khwarizmshah as soon as negotiations for the partition of the Seljuq territory were begun. The caliph wished to seize the opportunity to extend his personal estates by incorporating the Persian provinces while the Khwarizmshah in the exercise of the temporal power wished to succeed to the whole inheritance of the Seljuqs. While Tuğhrî was involved in war in the east, Ibn al-Kaṣṣâb, the caliph's vizier, was able to conquer Khûzîstân and other Persian provinces (beg. of 591 = 1195). His troops were however completely routed by Tuğhrî on his return (Shi'bân 592 = July 1196) so that the caliph had to abandon his conquests. Only Khûzîstân was left to him.

In the years following, the caliph had a hand in the intrigues of local rulers in Persian 'Irâk, usually against the Khwarizmshah (from 596 = 1200 'Ala al-Dîn Muhammâd). The disputes with the latter culminated in 613 (1216) when the caliph had a supporter of the Khwarizmshah, Oghâlmîsh, vizier of the governor of Persian 'Irâk, assassinated by Isma'îlî envoys. The Khwarizmshah now began to prepare for the decisive struggle against the caliph; he prepared for war and in 614 (1217) invaded Persian 'Irâk. Here, in order to destroy the caliph as a political force also, he had his 'ulama' in a fetûh declare the caliph al-Nâṣîr unworthy of the caliphate and appointed an 'Alîid in the 'Ali's Mulk from Tîrmîzî as imâm. The caliph in vain attempted through negotiations to persuade the Khwarizmshah to retreat. Instead he advanced on Baghdàd from Hamadân. But he was unable to deal his blow at the caliph owing to an unexpected circumstance; for in consequence of the early coming of a severe winter, which destroyed his army, the Khwarizmshah was forced to abandon his march and return home with the intention of advancing on Baghdàd next year.

In order to meet the danger threatening him, the caliph however in the meanwhile began negotiations with the Mongol Cîngiz Khân in order to persuade him to attack the Khwarizmshah. In 616 (1219) the latter was attacked and decisively defeated by Cîngiz Khân before he could resume his intended campaign against Baghdàd. He died while fleeing from the Mongols on an island in the Caspian Sea (617 = 1220).

The caliph had thus achieved his immediate aim and rid himself of his most dangerous opponent for the moment. But the Mongols were approaching perilously near him, especially after the conquest of Marâgha (618 = 1221) had established them in Aḏhârbâjîân. At first however, there were only minor complications with the Mongols.

On the other hand, after the temporary withdrawal of the Mongols, the young Khwarizmshah Djalâl al-Dîn Mangubarti, Muhammâd's son and successor, attacked al-Nâṣîr and took Khûzîstân from him.

As al-Nâṣîr had concentrated his whole attention on the east where he was fighting to strengthen and increase his private domains, he took no interest in the west where Saladin was waging his great struggle with the Crusaders and gave Saladin very insufficient help in spite of several appeals from him.

Al-Nâṣîr's policy seems also to have aimed at the restoration of the internal unity of Islam in addition to restoring the temporal power of the caliphate. He himself had a leaning to the Shi'â of the Imâmî sect (Twelver-Shî'â) and invited Alîds to his court; he seems to have wished to reconcile in his person the claims of 'Abbasids and 'Alîds. He also established an agreement with the extreme Isma'îlî sect of the Assassins. In 608 (1211—1212) the Grand Master of the Assassins, Hasan III, abandoned his claims to the Imamate and paid homage to the 'Abbasid caliph.

Al-Nâṣîr's efforts to centralise round his person the order of chivalry known as the futuwa in a reorganised form are also perhaps connected with his political plans; in 578 (1182-1183) he had himself been admitted by the Shaikh 'Abd al-Dîjâbâr b. Sâlih into the futuwa order. He then only allowed those of the organisations of the order to remain in existence which acknowledged his personal control. By admission into the order he was then able to establish connections with the princes of the Muslim world, who now regarded him as the head of their order (the chroniclers tell us of this in the year 607 = 1210). Ibn al-Furtû gives us a description of the robing of a prince as an external sign of his admission into the order in the presence of the caliph's envoy (the story is reproduced in v. Hammer, in J. A., 3rd ser., vi., 1855, p. 285 sq.). The strict regulations introduced by the caliph into the futuwa order are well illustrated in the edict of 9th Safar 604 (Sept. 4, 1207), published by P. Kahle in Isla'm, 4, 1895, p. 104, and also in the Oeffentl. Verzeichn. of 25th Jumâdâ' II 603 (Dec. 26, 1206), published by A. Abulfedâ'î, in Isla'm, 1, 1894, p. 447 sq.).

Al-Nâṣîr died on the last night of Ramadân 622 (Oct. 6, 1225) at the age of about 70. Ibn al-Athîr describes him as tyrannical towards his subjects and inconsistent in his measures; his fondness for the futuwa and its sporting activities (cross-bow shooting, training carrier pigeons) seems to him a strange caprice. Ibn al-Tîjân judges him more favourably; he describes him as unceasingly engaged in the duties of a ruler and lays stress on his rich endowments, although he also mentions his fondness for money. When a medieval Muslim ruler is reproached with covetousness it usually only means that he was endeavouring to carry through a sound and cautious financial policy. Al-Nâṣîr is further reproached with having allied himself with the Mongols and thus being the cause of the great disaster which the Mongol hordes later inflicted on the lands of Islam.

Among buildings known from inscriptions to have been built by al-Nâṣîr are the Talisman Gate in Baghdàd (618 = 1221-1222; blown up in March 1917 on the retreat of the Turks from Baghdàd) and...
the sanctuary of the Mahdi (Ghaibat al-Mahdi) in Sāmarrā. Both are interesting and suggestive for his political aims, the latter as a distinctly Shī'a sanctuary for his Shī'a tendencies and the Tullusman Gard for the remarkable pictorial representation once visible upon it; the caliph seated between two dragons, the jaws of which he is tearing apart and grasping their tongues. According to M. van Berchem's brilliant interpretation, we have here the caliph represented as victorious over two enemies, who had disputed his spiritual power: the Grand Master of the Assassins Ḥasan III as for a time the representative of the most radical opposition to the orthodox 'Abdābbasī Caliphate, who had finally paid homage to the caliph in 608 and died in 618; the other, the Khwārizmshāh who had dared in 614 to set up an anti-caliph but was overcome in 617 and died a fugitive. In this connection the inscription also is interesting; in it the caliph uses the expression al-ḍaʿwa al-lāḥiyya, which is a name the Assassins gave themselves (cf. van Berchem, in J. A., ser. 9, vol. ix., 1897, p. 456 and 462), for M. van Berchem’s, in Reise in (G.M.S.), li. [q.v.]
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AL-NAṢĪR IBN ʿALENNĀS (the last name is also written ʿAnناس, Ṣanناس and even Ībnīnas by Ibn Ḥāṣār), fifth ruler of the Ḥammādīd dynasty, succeeded his cousin Bulukkîn b. Muḥammad in 454 (1062). His reign marks the apogee of the little Berber kingdom founded by Ḥammād (q.v.). The ephemeral rise of the Ḥammādīs was the immediate result of the downfall of their relations and neighbours, the Ţirds of Irikiyya, the first victims of the Ḥilāfī invasion. On his accession, al-NAṣīr, who lived in the Kaʿlāt Banī Ḥammād, was already ruler of a little kingdom, the chief towns of which were Asḥir [q.v.], Miliana, Algiers, Hamza (Buirra), Ngaus and Constantine. Shortly afterwards, he regained Biskra whose governor had rebelled against Bulukkîn; but his chief hope of extending his territory lay in the decline of the kingdom of Kairawān.

The abandonment of the old capital by the Ţird al-Muʿizz and his flight to al-Mahdiyya (1057) had left Irikiyya a prey to anarchy. The country districts were in the hands of the Arabs and the towns had chosen their own rulers; on all sides governors were in rebellion; leaders of the tribes imposed their authority on the threatened citizens; some towns turned to the Ḥammādīs who were able to protect them. The people of Kaṭṣīliya [q.v.] for example sent a deputation to al-NAṣīr to convey them their homage; the people of Tunis did the same. At their request the Ḥammādīs sent them as governor Ṣabd al-Ḥaḳḳ of the Ṣanḥāḏa family of the Banū Khūrāsān. The latter worked wonders; he negotiated agreements with the marauding Arabs which secured the safety of the city. Later, after casting off Ḥammādīs suzerainty, he made Tunis the capital of a kingdom.

If the arrival of the invading nomads had meant an immediate accession of strength to al-NAṣīr and an increase of population and economic activity to his capital, they were not without danger as neighbours. The Arabs soon involved him in a dangerous adventure. In 457 (1064) the Aṯḥāḥdājī, one of their tribes, asked him to help them against their enemies, their brethren the Ṣiyāḥ, who had joined the Ţirid ruler Tamīn [q.v.]. Al-NAṣīr agreed, seeing an opportunity to invade and perhaps annex Irikiyya. He put himself at the head of a large army which included Arabs, Ṣanḥāḏa, and even Zenāṭa, led by the king of Fās, al-Muʿizz b. ʿĀṭyā. The Ṣiyāḥ in their turn received subsidies and arms from al-Mahdiyya. The armies met at Sība, near the ancient Sufes. From the first the Zenāṭa of Fās won over by the enemy, gave way, which resulted in the rout of al-NAṣīr. With great difficulty he reached Constantine with 200 men, then the Kaʿlā the outskirts of which were systematically sacked by the Arabs.

After this disaster al-NAṣīr tried to make terms with the prince of al-Mahdiyya, but the negotiations failed, perhaps through the fault of the ambassador, and al-NAṣīr incited again by the Aṯḥāḥdājī, resumed hostilities against the unfortunate Ţird kingdom. He entered Laribus and Kairawān (460 = 1067) but these successes led to nothing; he had to abandon them again as he could not hold his conquests. These adventures, into which he was dragged by the Arabs and which brought him no lasting advantage, lasted for some ten years. In 470 (1077) al-NAṣīr made peace with the Ţirid Tamīn and gave him his daughter in marriage.

The Arab scourge which had ruined the kingdom of Irikiyya began now to threaten seriously the Ḥammādīd kingdom. The Zenāṭa, hereditary enemies of the Šanḥāḏa lords of the Kaʿlā, found among the immigrant nomads allies always ready to resume the conflict. In 468 (1075), the Zenāṭa chief Ibn Khīzārin, supported by the Banū Ḍādi of Tripolitania seized Mizān and Aṯḥāḏ. Al-NAṣīr succeeded in driving him back to the desert where, drawing him into a trap, he had him murdered. He sent his son al-Manṣūr against the Zenāṭa Banū Tūḏīn, who had joined the Banū Ḍādī and were lying waste the country districts of the Central Maḫṭrib. The rebels were caught and tortured.

The Aṯḥāḥdājī Arabs themselves, of whom al-NAṣīr had hoped to make valuable auxiliaries, proved most undesirable neighbours. Although he seems to have put down — not without cruelty — the majority of the revolts, life in his ancestral capital became more and more difficult from year to year. This decided him to select another. Occupying the lands of the Biḍīya Berbers, he founded there, on the site of the ancient port of Sūda, a town which was first called al-Nāṣiriyah and later became known as Bougie. There he built the so-called Palace of the Pearl (Kasr al-Jaṭīr). Having peopled his new capital he exempted the inhabitants from the kharādi and in 461 (1068) he settled there himself” (Ibn Khaldūn). The exodus of the Ḥammādīd royal family to the coast was caused by the same event as had led the Ţirds of Kairawān to move to al-Mahdiyya: the settlement of the nomad Arabs in Barbary and the insecurity which resulted in the interior. This exodus was only completed under al-NAṣīr’s successor, his son al-
Manşîr [q.v.]. The latter assumed power at his father’s death in 851 (1088).


Al-Nâşîr, the name of two Aiyûbîd s.


In this perilous position, Dâwûd appealed to another uncle al-Mâlik al-Ashraf, who administered the Aiyûbîd possessions in Mesopotamia. The latter came to Damascus but then took al-Kâmîl’s side and arranged with him a formal division of the whole kingdom. By the arrangement between the two brothers al-Ashraf was to receive Damascus and Dâwûd Harrân, al-Ra‘kî and Hims, while al-Kâmîl took southern Syria with Palestine, and Hamá was left to Dâwûd’s brother al-Mâlik al-Mu‘azzâm. But when Dâwûd would not consent to this, al-Ashraf began to besiege Damascus. After al-Kâmîl had concluded peace with the Emperor Frederick II he joined al-Ashraf and after a three months’ siege, forced his nephew to yield (Shabîn 626 = June—July 1229) whereupon al-Ashraf was recognised as lord of Damascus under al-Kâmîl’s suzerainty while Dâwûd had to be content with al-Kerák [q.v.], al-Shawbâk and several other places. In spite of this unfriendly treatment, Dâwûd remained loyal to al-Kâmîl when the other Aiyûbîd [q.v.] combined against him, and entered his service in Egypt. Soon after al-Kâmîl accompanied by Dâwûd had taken Damascus, he died in Radjab 635 (March 1238) and Dâwûd whom al-Kâmîl had appointed governor of Damascus had to return to al-Kerák. In Egypt al-Kâmîl’s son al-Mâlik al-‘Adîl was recognised as his successor and appointed his cousin al-Mâlik al-Dawûd Yânus governor of Damascus. When Dâwûd tried to assert his claims to Damascus he was defeated at Nâbulus. In the following year Yânus, who did not feel secure against Sultan al-‘Adîl, exchanged Damascus with his cousin al-Mâlik al-Sałih Aiyûb for Sindjar, al-Ra‘kî and ‘Ana. This pleased neither al-‘Adîl nor Dâwûd so they joined forces for an attack on Aiyûb. The events that followed have already been fully related in the article AL-MÂLÎK AL-SALIH NAJÂB AL-DÎN AIYÛB SO that the reader may be referred to it. After Dâwûd had lost all his possessions except al-Kerák he appointed his youngest son al-Mâlik al-Mu‘azzâm Íjâs as his deputy and died to Halâb (647 = 1249—1250) where he was kindly received by al-Mâlik al-Nâşîr Yûsûf (see below). His private fortune in the form of valuable jewels, valued at least 100,000 dinârs, he entrusted to the care of the caliph al-Mustasim, who acknowledged the receipt of them but never could bring him self to restore the treasure entrusted him. Soon afterwards Dâwûd’s two elder sons, who had felt themselves neglected, turned to Sultan al-Mâlik al-Salih Aiyûb and offered him al-Kerák in return for fiefs in Egypt which offer the latter gladly accepted. Alleging unfavourable reports about Dâwûd, al-Mâlik al-Nâşîr Yûsûf had brought him to Hims in the beginning of Shabîn 648 (Oct. 1250) and put under arrest. In 651 (1253—1254) he was released on the intercession of the caliph on condition that he was not to stay in any lands under the rule of al-Mâlik al-Nâşîr Yûsûf. He therefore wanted to go to Baghhdād but was not admitted into the city. He then lived for a time very wretchedly in the region of ‘Aina and al- Hadîthâ until he found a place of refuge in al-Anlîr. His appeals to the caliph were not answered; finally however the caliph obtained him permission to settle in Damascus. After several unsuccessful efforts to get back his property in Baghhdād which had been confiscated, he was in the desert when he was taken prisoner by al-Mâlik al-Muqthîb, then lord of al-Kerák and al-Shawbâk and brought to al-Shawbâk. As the caliph thought he could be of use to him in the impending fight with the Mongols, he sent an envoy to al-Shawbâk to fetch him; the envoy was bringing him back to Damascus when he heard of Hûtîd’s capture of Baghhdâd; he thereupon left Dâwûd who went to al-Buwaïdî, a village near Damascus. Here he died of the plague on 27th Dâjmâlād I, 657 (May 12, 1259). Abu l-Fida’i speaks highly of Dâwûd’s eloquence and poetical gifts.

route (644 = 1264) and Isma‘īl had to flee to ʿAṭābog ʿAlī of Damascus and take refuge with ʿUṣūf [see AL-MALIK AL-SALIH NASIR AL-DIN AYYUB]. In 645 (1248—
1249) the latter’s general Shams al-Din Lu’lu’ al-Armani attacked Ḥimṣ [q. v.] and after a two months’ siege forced the emir al-Malik al-Aṣhrāf to capitulate and cede the town to ʿUṣūf in return for Tell Bāṣīr [q. v.]. Two years later, the latter conquered Naṣīb, Dārā and Karkišā from the Aṭābog of al-Mawṣil Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ [see AYYUBID]. After the assassination of Tūrānghā [see AYYUBID] in 648 (1250), ʿUṣūf was made sūlṭān by the Damascenes and in Rabī‘ II (July 1250) he entered Damascus. To avenge the murder of Tūrānghā he prepared for war against Egypt and proposed an alliance with Louis IX of France; but these negotiations came to nothing. In Radijāb of this year (Oct. 1250) the Syrians were defeated by the Egyptian emir Fāris al-Din Akṭār near Ghazza. ʿUṣūf did not lose courage however but prepared for a new attack on Egypt. In the vicinity of al-ʿAbbāsā [q. v.] he met the Egyptian army (Dhū ’l-Ka‘dā 648 = beg. of Feb. 1251); victory was within ʿUṣūf’s grasp when the treachery of his Turkish mamlūks turned the scale in favour of Egypt. ʿUṣūf had to take flight, several Syrian princes were taken prisoners and Akṭār invaded Syria where he occupied Nābulus and several other important towns until a strong Syrian force finally checked his further advance. After long negotiations, peace was finally concluded at the beginning of the year 651 (1253) by which ʿUṣūf had to give up any claims on Egypt, but a year or two later war was very nearly broke out again. On the advance of the Mongols under Ḥūdghā [q. v.], ʿUṣūf endeavoured to avert the danger by showing a humble frame of mind and sent envoys with presents to the Mongol camp; but when he began to calculate on getting support from other Muslim rulers and answered a threatening message from Hīlāḡū in a challenging fashion, the latter laid siege to ʿAṭābog. ʿUṣūf seems at first to have thought of advancing against him to raise the siege. He encamped in front of Damascus and sent messengers with appeals for help in all directions but as neither Syrians nor Egyptians answered him and ʿAṭābog fell into the hands of the Mongols (652 = 1250), there was nothing left for him but to abandon Damascus and go south. Hāmāt, Ba‘albek and Damascus were taken and ʿUṣūf had finally to surrender to Hīlāḡū. The latter had him executed, probably after the defeat of the Mongols at Hīmṣ towards the end of the year 659 (1261; see also the article ʿAṭābog). According to Abū ʿl-Fida‘, ʿUṣūf was distinguished for his scholarship and poetical gifts; he was further kindly and good natured and fond of good living and so lacked the strength to maintain order in his kingdom.


AL-NĀṢIR, the name of two Mamlūk sultāns.

1. AL-MALIK AL-NĀṢIR NASIR AL-DIN MUḤAMMAD, the ninth sultān of the Bahri Mamlūks, son of Sultān Kāltūn [q. v.] and a Mongol princess named Aslān (Āshān) Ḥāṭṭūn. Born in the middle of Muḥarram 684 (Dec. 1285), he received homage as sūlṭān after the assassination of his brother al-Malik al-Aṣhrāf Khalīl in Muḥarram 693 (Dec. 1293). After the two emirs Zān al-Dīn Ktbgha al-Mansūr and ‘Alam al-Dīn Ṣanḍjār al-Ṣuddāj had agreed that the former should hold the office of administrator of the government (niyāḥat al-aṣrāf) and the latter the vizierate, these appointments were confirmed by the nine year old sūlṭān; but the agreement between the two high officials was not long maintained. When al-Ṣuddāj tried to get rid of his rival, he was unsuccessful and was himself killed. In order to get all the power into his own hands, Ktbgha pardoned the two murderers of Sultān Khalīl, who naturally felt it necessary to overthow Nāṣir in order to escape his vengeance, and when al-Khāli‘ī’s old Mamlūks mutinied out of indignation, they were brought to terms by the loyal troops. Ktbgha then succeeded without much difficulty in persuading the emirs that the political situation required a man and not a child on the throne, whereupon al-ʿNāṣir was deposed and Ktbgha proclaimed sūlṭān with the title al-Malik al-ʿĀdil (Muḥarram 694 = Dec. 1294). Two years later (Muḥarram 696 = Nov. 1296), Ktbgha shared the fate of his predecessor. He was succeeded by one of al-Khāli‘ī’s murderers, al-Malik al-Mansūr Ḥusān al-Dīn Lāḏūn al-Mansāf who was murdered in Rabī‘ II 698 (Jan. 1299). The emirs in authority then agreed to recall the 14 year old Nāṣir who was in al-Mansūr’s hands and in Dhū ‘l-Hijja 2 (Jan. 1299) he entered the capital in order to receive for the second time the diploma of sūlṭān from the caliph and the oath of fealty from the emirs. The actual rulers were now the administrator of the kingdom Sullār al-Mansūrī and the commander-in-chief of the troops, Rūkw al-Dīn Ba‘lbar al-Dirāshnagī. The most important event in the period was the war with the hereditary enemy, the Mongols. In Rabī‘ I, 699 (Dec. 1299) the Ilkhān Ḥīzān [q. v.] crossed the Euphrates and was soon before ʿAṭābog. In the same month Ṣuddāj who had left Cairo in Dhū ‘l-Hijja 698 (Sept. 1299), because the Egyptians had long been afraid of a Mongol invasion, reached Damascus. The sūlṭān encountered the much superior enemy near Ḥīmṣ, his tried emirs were defeated and the army returned to Egypt in great disorder while Ḥīmṣ fell into the hands of the Mongols. Damascus met the same fate, except the citadel which was bravely defended by its Egyptian commander Arjāwāsh. In the meanwhile the Egyptians were preparing with desperate energy to resume the struggle and in Radijāb 699 (March—April 1300) a new army left Cairo. But when the Mongols found they could not take the citadel of Damascus, they withdrew before it came to a battle and the Egyptians reoccupied Damascus, Ḥīmṣ and the whole of Syria. After an unsuccessful campaign against northern Syria in Rabī‘ II 700 (Jan. 1301) which only resulted in the pillaging of the region visited by the Mongols, Ghāṣān sent an embassy to open up peace negotiations; but as these overtures came to nothing, the decision was left to arms for the third time. In Shābān 702 (April 1303) the Mongol general Kuṭlūshāḥ (Kuṭlūghshāḥ) crossed the Euphrates and at the same time a portion of the Egyptian army under the command
of Baibars al-Djāshnagīt entered Damascus. On 24th Ramaḍān (April 20), a battle was fought on the plain of Marj al-Suffar after the rest of the Egyptian troops under Sultan al-Nasir and the caliph al-Mustakfi had joined Baibars. Nightfall put a stop to the desperate fighting but it was renewed next day and ended with the total defeat of the Mongols; 10,000 prisoners are said to have fallen into the hands of the victors. Ghazzān died soon afterwards and his successor Ulajābdī did not dare to measure his strength with his formidable opponent. For three years al-Nasir's sovereignty in Egypt was a fairly peaceful one apart from a few military enterprises of slight importance. At the beginning of the year 702 (1302), an expedition was sent against the Templars who had established themselves in the island of Arwād on the Syrian coast and harassed the mainland opposite [see Ṭartūs]. The district of Sīs [q.v.] was also invaded; its ruler had made common cause with the Ilkhān and did not send Egypt the usual tribute promptly. The Egyptian authorities were on the whole on good terms with foreign powers; on the other hand, home affairs gave cause for anxiety. After the defeat at Hims, the Beduins in Upper Egypt rebelled against the authorities and levied taxes on their own account. A large army was therefore equipped to punish the rebels. At the same time, the governor of Kūs advanced from the south and cut off their access to the southern desert. The rebellion was put down with ruthless vigour, the men massacred without mercy, the women and children taken prisoner and rivalry carried off. Many took refuge in caves difficult of access but they were suffocated with a great deal of smoke. The large Christian and Jewish elements in the population had also to suffer a great deal. Several of the Umayyads, ‘Abbdūs and Fāṭimīd caliphs had already issued special regulations affecting non-Muslims and the ‘Abbdūs al-Mutawakkil had gone furthest in this direction; in general however, such measures were only enforced for a short period and were therefore usually repeated after a time; at least this is true of Egypt. In al-Nasir’s reign many Christians were holding honoured positions as officials when suddenly some insignificant cause the secret jealousy of the Muslims flared up and in 701 (1300–1301) an edict was issued which ordered among other things that in future Christians should wear blue and Jews yellow turbans in order to be at once distinguishable from the true believers or nor were they to be allowed to carry prisoners or ride mounted. Very soon a prohibition was issued against the appointment of Christians and Jews to the offices of the sultan or of the emirs. The immediate consequence of this measure was that several churches were destroyed by the fanatical mob and the others remained closed until the authorities allowed them to be reopened at the demand of the Byzantine emperor and other Christian rulers. On the 23rd Dhu ‘l-Hijdжа 703 (Aug. 8, 1303) the whole of Egypt was affected by a terrible earthquake in which not only many private houses but also palaces and mosques were destroyed and large numbers of people perished. All traces of the catastrophe were however obliterated with the greatest energy and the emirs and well-to-do citizens vowed with one another in spending lavishly to restore the shattered buildings. After an unsuccessful attempt to escape from the tutelage of the two emirs Sallār and Baibars, both of whom aimed at the sole power and regarded each other with suspicion, the sultan, who was prevented from exerting any influence in the government, left the capital on the 24th Ramaḍān 708 (March 7, 1309) under the pretext that he wished to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca but went instead to al-Kerāk. On reaching the citadel, he told the emirs who accompanied him that he was abandoning the pilgrimage and abdicating in order to live in peace in al-Kerāk. Baibars was proclaimed his successor under the name of al-Mu’izz. Baibars’ story of his旉 dragged (May 5, 1309) while Sallār remained in office as administrator. Baibars however enjoyed no real popularity; an oppressive rise in prices made many hate him among the people who without justice blamed him for the difficult times. Sallār was intriguing secretly and al-Nasir was vigorously adding to the number of his followers in Syria. When Baibars heard that al-Nasir had entered Damascus and the Syrian emirs had gone over to him, there was nothing left for him but to abdicate and appeal for mercy to his rival. The latter pardoned him and even offered him the lordship of Sīhāywn [q.v.]. But after he had made his entry into Cairo al-Nasir had Baibars strangled (beg. of Shawwāl 709 = March 1310). Very soon afterwards, Sallār was also disposed of; he died of starvation in prison. The Mongols not long after this resumed hostilities. Two emirs who did not feel safe with the sultan went to the Ilkhān Ulajābdī and urged him to invade Syria. The Mongol expedition did not however go beyond the city of the town of ar-Rabha (Ramaḍān 712 = Jan. 1315). When the Mongols saw that their efforts were unavailing, they abandoned their plan of campaign and retired. At the beginning of the year 715 (1315) a campaign was undertaken against Malāţiya, on the course of which see the article Malāţiya. At the same time, the lord of Sīs had to cede several strongholds and increase his annual tribute. Little Armenia was several times invaded by the Mamļūks who wrought great havoc there. In Mecca the sons of the Shāhid Abū Numāy [q.v.] were engaged in a prolonged struggle for supremacy; as the Mamļūk sultāns claimed to exercise a kind of suzerainty over the two holy cities, al-Nasir intervened without however playing any very effective part. His authority was recognised in Madīna in 717 (1317) and when he intervened in the domestic troubles of the Yaman and sent troops thither to support al-Mujāhid, one of the pretenders to the South Arabian throne, he was himself invaded by the Meccans (725 = 1325). In the meanwhile, the situation had improved in favour of al-Mujāhid so that the troops sent to his help by al-Nasir had to return amid great hardships after achieving nothing. Al-Nasir also tried to extend his power into Nubia. For this purpose he sent in 716 (1316–1317) a Nubian prince named Abū ʿAllāh, who had been converted to Islam and brought up in Egypt, with an army to put him on the throne. He succeeded in driving out the legitimate heir but the latter was able after a time to return and expel the intruder Abū ʿAllāh whose tyrannical rule had made him generally hated. Al-Nasir was more successful in N. W. Africa; in 711–717 (1311–1317) he was mentioned as sūltān in the khūṭba in the pulpits of Tunis, whose ruler, the Ḥāṣif Abū Zakariyyāʾ Yahyā, owed his throne to him. In 723 (1325) he finally concluded peace with the Ilkhān
Abū Sa`īd. After the latter's death in Rabī’ II 736 (Nov. 1335), Hasan Buzurg pledged himself to recognise al-Nāṣir’s suzerainty if the latter would support him with an armed force. Al-Nāṣir, who was a better diplomat than soldier and had not the courage to intervene at this decisive moment, did not fulfil the condition. Al-Nāṣir had diplomatic relations with most of the rest of the known world and at his court appeared embassies not only from the Golden Horde, the Ikhān, the Rasūls of Yaman, the king of Abyssinia, and the Ḥafīds of Tunis, but also from the Emperor of Byzantium, the Czar of Bulgaria, the Pope, the King of Aragon, Philip VI of France and Sulṭān Muhammad b. Tughluk of Dīlī. Al-Nāṣir died in Dhu l-Ḥijjādha 741 (June 1341); he left eight sons, who reigned one after the other but were themselves ruled by the emirs who were usually quarrelling among themselves. His immediate successor on the throne was al-Malik al-Mansūr Sa`īd al-Dīn Abū Bakr, who was deposed after only two months in favour of another son of the late sulṭān. The third reign of the Christians, improved, and they alleviate their hard lot, although his efforts sometimes failed against the stubborn opposition of the Muslim clergy. The ordinances of the period when Sallyar and Baibars were the real rulers were at least not enforced to the full extent and we even find that the sulṭān put Christians, i.e. Copts, into the government offices, presumably simply because they were cleverer and more wily than the Muslims. Men of learning were treated with a benevolent interest, and the Aḥyābīd Abū 1-Fīdā` (q.v.), celebrated as a historian and geographer, was the sulṭān's trusted friend “perhaps the only one among all the nobles whom al-Nāṣir treated till his death with equal love and respect” (Weil, iv. 400). Al-Nāṣir further abolished many taxes which oppressed the people. He built canals and roads and carried out other public works for the improvement of means of transport. Architecture in particular flourished exceedingly; among the splendid buildings which date from his reign special mention may be made of al-Ḵāṣr al-Abālak, al-Mudārās al-Nāṣiriyya, and Djāmil al-Nāṣir. These works however cost large sums of money and there were really no bounds to his extravagance. He was able through his long reign to maintain the Mamlūk state in its place among the great powers, and he was also able to make his authority felt at home. In some respects he reminds one of Sulṭān Baibars 1; like the latter he was little scrupulous in his choice of means. To undeniable gifts he added suspicion, covetousness and a yeowengeful nature, and it has been observed, undeniably with justice, that al-Nāṣir inspired more awe than respect.


II. AL-MALIK AL-NĀṢIR NĀṢIR AL-DĪN HASAN, the nineteenth sulṭān of the Bahri Mamluks, son of the preceding. After the murder of his brother al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Sa`īd al-Dīn Ḥaḍḍī, Ḥasan who was then only eleven, or, according to others, thirteen years old was proclaimed sulṭān on the 14th Ramāḍān 748 (Dec. 1347). Another son of Sulṭān al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muhammad b. Kalātūn, called Ḥusayn, was also put forward but this plan fell through and he never attained the throne at a later date. More important than the elevation of this prince to the throne was of course the distribution of the high offices of state among the emirs; the emir Baibogha Arwas became administrator of the kingdom, his brother Mendjek al-Ŷusufi vizier, and the chief emir Shiḵẖū, Aṭībeh of al-Malik al-Šāliḥ Šāliḥ al-Dīn Šāliḥ (q. v.), afterwards sulṭān. Thanks to Baibogha's adroit policy, al-Nāṣir was able to survive for four years, although, except for the last few months, he exercised no influence worth mentioning on affairs of state. His reign was filled with unedifying quarrels among the ruling emirs and systematic raiding by the Beduins. The most noteworthy event of the period was however the visitation of a great part of the world by the devastating pestilence, which, known in Europe and the “Black Death”, spread from Asia through Egypt and over almost all Europe to England and Scandinavia. In Egypt the plague raged in the second half of the year 749 (1348–1349) being accompanied by a no less fatal cattle-plague. In Syria it had appeared a few months earlier. Everywhere countless men fell victims to the angel of death and it is not surprising that the political and economic life of the state was crippled. The plague only died down in the following year. In Shawwāl 751 (Dec. 1350) the sulṭān succeeded in getting rid of the most powerful emirs and taking the reins of government into his own hands, but after a very few months he was deposed and his brother al-Malik al-Šāliḥ Šāliḥ al-Dīn Šāliḥ, the eighth of the sons of Sulṭān Muhammad b. Kalātūn, was placed on the throne (Djumādā I 752 = Aug. 1351). He ruled only for three years; on the 2nd Shawwāl 755 (Oct. 20, 1354) he was dethroned and his brother al-Nāṣir restored. The real ruler at first was Shiḵẖū, but in 758 (1357) the latter was waylaid and so severely wounded that he died a few months later. His successor Šargahmish, who was suspected of having instigated the murder, did not allow the sulṭān the slightest independence, but was however arrested in Ramāḍān 759 (Aug.–Sept. 1358). In Muḥarram 761 (Nov.–Dec. 1359) the governor of Ḥalab undertook an expedition against Sīs and established Muslim garrisons in Adana and Tarsus. About the same time, the troops who had been sent to Mecca by the Egyptian government to settle the endless family feuds there were defeated by the Meccans and those taken prisoners sold in Jambū' as slaves. On hearing this the sulṭān is said to have sworn to exterminate the enemy completely, but before he could carry out this plan, he was himself deposed. For, as he wished to preserve his independence, he quarrelled with the powerful emir Yalbogha, who had reproached him with his extravagance. The latter combined with several other dissatisfied emirs and prepared to fight. Al-Nāṣir was defeated and had to abandon his plan of escaping secretly to Syria. Instead he was taken prisoner and handed over to his enemy Yalbogha (Djumādā I 762 = March 1361). His ultimate fate is unknown; according to one, in
itself quite credible, story he was strangled and his body thrown into the Nile. His mosque (Jami' al-Sultan Hanan) built in Cairo in the years 1356-1363 is considered the most important example of Egyptian-Arabic architecture.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khaldûn, al-'Ibar, v. 447 sqq.; Ibn Iyâs, Tāriikh Mîrî, i. 190 sqq.; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, iv. 476 sqq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Melkb., i. 87 sq.

(K. V. Zettersten)

**Al-Nâṣîr**, honorific of the fourth sovereign reign of the Maghribi dynasty of the Mu'āmins of Almôabads [q. v.], Abu 'Abd Allâh Muḥammad b. Ya'kûb al-Mansûr b. Yûsûf b. 'Abd al-Mu'min. He was proclaimed on the death of his father on the 22nd Rabî' 1 (Aug.-Sept. 1313) challenged him to do, he made war on the Karâjmans his first duty and played a considerable part at least in damming back the threatened Ismâ'îlisation of the Yaman. He died at San'da, probably in 315 (927); his tomb is there. All succeeding bearers of the title except the next one: 1. Abu 'l-Fâtîh al-Nâṣîr al-Dâlîmî, so called from his first Caspian sphere of activity, were of his family although of different lines. In the Yaman, in contrast to his predecessors, he began operations south of Shân'a, fell in 447 (1055) fighting 'Ali al-Sulâhî there and was buried near Dhamîr. The life of 3. Al-Nâṣîr Shâhî al-Dîn was marked by internal strife which ultimately caused his death. In the first half of the viii\(^{th}\) (xiv\(^{th}\)) century, several imâms had disputed the succession. About one third of the fifteenth century the father al-Mahbî 'Ali b. Muhammad attained considerable influence, which was however much reduced in the period before his death at Dhamîr in 774 (1372). Shâhî al-Dîn became sole imâm and advanced as far as the Thâmâ against the Rasûlîds [q. v.]. But when in 793 (1391) he died at Shân'a, his death was concealed for two months on account of the insecurity and his body was concealed in the castle in a coffin covered with plaster. It was only when rumours of his death reached the Kâdi al-Dawwarî in San'da that the latter arranged for his burial in Shân's. The son 'Ali b. Shâhî al-Dîn could only obtain recognition as 'Imâm of the Dîhâdî' and fell in 840 (1336), one of the many victims of the great plague. When in spite of opposition a Zâdî power was once more built up, it was destroyed by the young dynasty of the Tâhirîs from the Thâmâ (818—1517), especially by its second member 'Abd al-Wâhîb b. Dâwûd, from 883 (1478), until at the end of the xi\(^{th}\) (xvi\(^{th}\)) century Al-Hâdî Izz al-Dîn b. al-Hâsân again reestablished and extended their power. His son 4. Al-Nâṣîr al-Hâsân b. Izz al-Dîn (c. 900—929 = 1494—1523) who had primarily inherited from his father a love of learning, could only maintain a limited power in the north. He had to put up for a long time with an anti-imâm al-Mansûr Muḥammad b. 'Ali al-Sârâjî in Shân's. 5. Al-Nâṣîr al-Hâsân b. 'Ali b. Dâwûd at the end of the x\(^{th}\) (xvi\(^{th}\)) century organised in the north one of the centres of resistance to the Turks who had been penetrating into the country since 927 (1521) and 943 (1536) but was taken prisoner by them in 1024 (1616—1597). Among the pretenders within the family of al-Mansûr b. al-Kâsid (d. 1029 = 1620), the liberator from the first Turkish conquest, was 6. Al-Nâṣîr Muḥammad b. Isâk b. al-Mahdî al-Hâsân; he set up first in 1136 (1723—1724) in the north in the hills of Sûfîyân among the Banû Bakîl, then in 1139 (1726—1727) away in the south at Zafîr but had finally to submit to his cousin's son al-Mansûr al-Hâsân b. al-Kâsid b. al-Hâsân b. al-Mahdî al-Hâsân and died in 1167 (1753) as a private individual in Shân's. In 1252 (1836) the dissatisfied troops who had been discharged by the very extravagant imâm al-Mansûr 'Ali b. al-Mahdî 'Abd Allah
Nāṣir ʿAli of Sarhind (d. in Dihlī on the 6th Ramaḍān 1108 = March 29, 1697), one of the best of the Persian poets of India, who were by this time very numerous; their productions however are for the most part of little artistic value. Of his life we know only that he travelled a great deal but finally settled in Sarhind where he enjoyed the favour of the governor Saif Khān Badākshān and of the amir al-ʿUmarāʾ Dhu l-ʿFīrār Khān. His principal work is a version of the love story of Madhumaltā and Manāhīr in Persian verse, the original having been written in Hindi by Shāhī Dījmān. The same subject was taken after Nāṣir ʿAli by Mīr ʿAskār ʿĀdīl Khān Rāzī (d. 1696), one of the governors of Delhi under ʿAlāmghir (1659—1707), who called his poem Nīkr u-Mīh. Besides the poem Nāṣir ʿAli wrote a short Mathnawi, Safī in character, and a description of Kaḥfar both of which still survive. His lyrical Dīānā was collected by his friends after his death; it consisted of the usual ghazals, some Safī bānā mā and poems in praise of the Kalendar dervishes (lith. Lucknow 1844 and 1251 and Cawnpore 1862).

Bibliography: H. Ethé, G.I.Ph., ii. 252; 310; V. Ivanov, Curzon Collection Cat., N. 278—279 and Asiatic Society of Bengal Coll., N. 813—817. There are MSS. in most European libraries.

Nāṣir al-Dawla ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh, a prince of the Ḥamānid dynasty [q. v.]. From the year 308 (920—921) he acted as lieutenant to his father, Abu l-Haidājā ʿAbd Allāh [q. v.], in the governorship of al-Mawsīl, and on the latter's death in 317 (929) succeeded to the leadership of the Ḥamānid family. Owing to the part played by Abu l-Haidājā in the second temporary deposition of the Ābāsids caliph al-Muqtaṣarīd [q. v.], the latter, on his restoration, attempted to put an end to the Ḥamānid's control of al-Mawsīl by appointing a governor unconnected with them. Nevertheless when this officer died during the same year al-Hasan was confirmed in all his father's holdings.

The Ḥamānids profited by the rapid decline in the power of the Ābāsids that set in from this time to extend their rule; and though they remained tributary to the caliphs, by 332 (943—944) they had secured control of most of the Ḫuzār and of northern Syria. Al-Hasan also made two unsuccessful attempts, in 322 (934) and 326 (938), to add Adharbājān to his dominions. During the early part of this period of expansion al-Hasan was much occupied in the suppression of local rebellions. He was anxious also to remain in the caliph's good graces, and for this reason declined to assist the general Muʿnis [q. v.] in his quarrel with al-Muqtaṣarīd, which ended in the latter's death. In 323 (935), however, the caliph al-Rādi attempted to displace him in the governorship of al-Mawsīl in favour of his uncle Saʿīd. Al-Hasan thereupon had Saʿīd murdered; and though al-Rādi at first sought to impose his will by force of arms, he was in the end obliged to agree to al-Hasan's restoration.

The reign of al-Rādi saw the final collapse of the traditional Ābāsíd system of government with the appointment of Ibn Rāʾik as amir al-ʿumārāʾ [q. v.]. This development resulted in a still greater weakening of the caliphs' power; and in 327 (938—939) al-Hasan made an attempt to withhold his dues, which, however, were promptly exacted by Ibn Rāʾik's successor, Badjīkam [q. v.]. In 330 (941—942), again, when the caliph al-Muttaqi [q. v.] and Ibn Rāʾik (who had meanwhile been restored) fled to al-Mawsīl from Baghdad on its occupation by the brothers al-Barūdī [q. v.], al-Hasan had Ibn Rāʾik assassinated, forced the caliph to give him the amirate together with the Ḫūdān Nāṣir al-Dawla, and later married his daughter to the caliph's son. But though he and his more celebrated brother ʿAlī, who was at the same time entitled Saif al-Dawla [q. v.], were able to restore al-Muttaqi to his capital and drive the Barūdīs back to al-Ḥasā, they were almost immediately obliged by a revolt of the Turkish troops under Tūzn [q. v.] to retire again to al-Mawsīl. Al-Muttaqi now appointed Tūzn amir in Nāṣir al-Dawla's place. But his evident helplessness encouraged Tūzn to abuse his power; and in 332 (943—944) the caliph again sought refuge with the Ḥamānids. Saif al-Dawla now tried, though without success, to defeat Tūzn in battle, while al-Hasan removed the caliph for greater safety from al-Mawsīl to Raḵkā. After some months, however, al-Muttaqi was persuaded by Tūzn's professions of loyalty into returning to Baghdad, only to be met on the way by the amir, who blinded and deposed him. On this Nāṣir again withheld Tūzn and al-Muttaqi [q. v.], the new caliph, came against him and forced him to pay. Tūzn, however, died in 334 (945—946), whereupon Nāṣir made a bid to recover the amirate. But later in this same year Baghdad was occupied by Ahmad b. Būyeh Muʿizz al-Dawla [q. v.]; and henceforward Nāṣir's career hinged chiefly upon the maintenance of his power against that of the Bahyids.

The struggle began immediately. As soon as he was established in Baghdad Muʿizz al-Dawla led an expedition against the Ḥamānids, and though Nāṣir al-Dawla forced him to return to the capital by himself occupying the east bank and blockading the Round City, in the end he drove the Ḥamānid forces out. Nāṣir retired to ʿUkbārā, and from there sued for a peace that should grant him the tributary lordship of all the country north of Taḵrīt, as well as Syria and Egypt. But a revolt among his Turkish troops forced him to flee before this was concluded, and it was only by the aid of a force sent by Muʿizz that he succeeded in suppressing it. Muʿizz's object in helping him was no doubt to preserve some order in the Ḥamānid
dominions until he should be ready to absorb them. For he now took one of Nasir's sons as a hostage for his obedience, and two years later led another expedition against al-Mawsil. This again came to nothing, however, since Muizz was obliged to make peace before attaining his object, owing to the outbreak of trouble in Persia, where his brother required his assistance. Nasir now agreed to pay tribute for Dijar Rab'a, the Dijazaria and Syria, and to have the names of the three Byzians pronounced in the jami'a after that of the caliph throughout this territory.

It was not till 345 (956—957) that further trouble arose between the rival potentates. In that year Muizz was called away from Baghdad to deal with a revolt, whereupon Nasir sent two of his sons to occupy the capital. Muizz, however, succeeded in overcoming the rebel; and on his return the Hamdanids decamped. Yet in spite of this provocation Muizz contented himself with exacting an indemnity and a renewal of Nasir's contract to pay tribute, and it was only when Nasir withheld the second year's payment that he took further steps against him. He then advanced into his territory, took al-Mawsil and Nishân, and finally sent a force to al-Râba. Nasir, who had fled first to Mayafatikin and then to Aleppo, which was now held independently by Saif, attempted to make peace. But Muizz rejected his advances, and Nasir, who had been much attached, offered to take his brother's place as tributary for al-Mawsil, Dijar Rab'a and al-Râba.

Five years later, in 353 (964), Nasir opened negotiations to recover his position as tributary for these territories. But he included in his demands one, for the recognition of his son Abu Taghib al-Ghadanfar [q.v.] as his successor, which Muizz was unwilling to grant. He again attacked the Hamdanids, occupying both al-Mawsil and Nishân, but they were more successful in withstanding him on this occasion; and an agreement was arrived at whereby Abu Taghib undertook the payment of tribute for his father's former holdings.

In 356 (967) both Muizz and Saif died. Almost the last action recorded of Nasir is the advice he then gave his sons to refrain from attacking Muizz's son and successor Bakhtiyar until the latter had made peace and returned to his own possessions. Nasir lost all interest in life, and so antagonized his family by his avarice that they resolved to take the control of affairs into their own hands. Abu Taghib, who had in any case taken his place as tributary, and his mother, Nasir's Kurdish wife Fatma bint Ahmad, contrived to gain possession of all his property and possessions; and when Nasir attempted to enlist the help of another son, they imprisoned him in the castle of al-Salâma in the fortress of Ardûnâught. He died, still in confinement, either the next year, 357 (968), or the year after.

Nasir al-Dawla's rule was disastrous for the territory over which he had control. The contemporary Ibn Hawkal [q.v.], refers in several passages to his ruinous exactions and tyrannical seizures of land (see his descriptions of al-Mawsil, Balad, Sindjir and Nishân). Ann Miskawail notes that by bringing fictitious claims against landowners he would force them to sell to him at low prices, till he became not only the lord, but also the owner, of most of the region of al-Mawsil.


Nasir al-Dawla. [See Ibn Bâkîva.]
Nasir al-Dîn. [See Hâmîdî.]
Nasir al-Dîn al-Mu'izzî. [See Sâid.]
Nasir al-Dîn Kûbâ. [See Sâid.]
Nasir al-Dîn al-Tûsî. [See al-Tûsî.]
Nasir-î Khusrav, whose full name was Aib Mu'in Nasir b. Khusrav b. Harîmî, one of the most important Persian poets of the xith century.

Life. Nasir was born in 394 (1003) in Kûbâdîn in the district of Balkh. The Persian historians usually call him 'Alawi which in this case can hardly mean descent from the caliph 'Alî but simply indicates his adherence to the Shi'a. His father was probably a small landowner in the vicinity of Balkh. Nasir received a good education and was early acquainted with almost all branches of the learning of his day. In the forties of the xith century we find him as an official in Marw where, according to his own confession, he led a rather dissolute life. In 1015 however, a sudden change came over him, the real reasons for which are unknown, but which Nasir himself explained by a prophetic dream. He decided to give up his position and all his pleasures and went on pilgrimage to Mecca on which he visited the Kab'a four times. This journey had important results for Nasir. He left Persia at a difficult period, when the country was being laid waste by the continued wars between the various princes. He found the same wretched picture in all the other Muslim countries which he had to traverse on his journey. Only Egypt proved a pleasing exception; there he saw prosperity, rich bazaars, harmony and tranquillity. As the Ismai'îs and the Fatimids were ruling in Egypt at this time, Nasir concluded that Iklâm had diverged from the true path and that only Ismai'îsm could save the true believers from inevitable ruin. Nasir made the acquaintance of several Ismai'îl dignitaries, joined their sect and finally received the blessing of the caliph al-Mustansir (1036—1094) in order to spread the new teaching in his native Khurasân. He was consecrated as a hujjâta, a fairly high official in the complicated Ismai'î hierarchy. Returning to Balkh he devoted himself with the greatest zeal to his new task. But the Sâldaks who ruled the land soon became convinced that Nasir's activity was a serious threat to them. He was persecuted and had to flee from Balkh. He went first to Mâzandarân but found that this also was not safe enough and was finally forced as a last resort to take refuge in the Vûmgân valley among the inaccessible mountains of Badakhshân. There in these poor and inhospitable highlands the aged poet spent his last years; there his most important works were written and there he died in 1060 or 1061 (452—453). Down to the present
day there has survived in this region a little sect known as the Nasiriya, which owes its origin to the "saint Sho Nasir" and tells fantastic stories about its founder.

Works. Nasir's works were probably very numerous but have survived only in very imperfect and corrupt form. The most important is the great philosophical Divan, which was composed in the miserable years of his exile. The artistic value of his poems is not especially high, the style is often clumsy and awkward but the philosophical matter which still awaits its investigator is of very great importance for the history of Persian literature. It is a complete encyclopedia of Isma'ili teaching but of course unsystematic and disconnected. From the linguistic standpoint also the work is of extraordinary interest. A good edition of the Persian text appeared in "The"rān in 1928. Two not very long didactic poems are appended to the Divān: Kāhānā-nāma, which puts into a whole philosophical system having an undeniable similarity with the teaching of Avicenna, and Sāfār-nāma which sharply criticises the aristocracy of the kingdom and praises the peasant, "the nourisher of every living creature".

The best known of Nasir's prose works is the Safar-nāma, a description of his pilgrimage to Mecca which is an exceedingly valuable source of the most varied information. Unfortunately this work has come down to us only in a very mutilated form and has probably been edited by a Sunnite hand. The other works of Nasir are mainly Isma'ili textbooks. Among them first place should be given to the Zād al-Musāfītnāmeh. It is an encyclopedia of a special character which deals with the most varied questions of a metaphysical and cosmological nature. A good edition of the Persian text was published in Berlin in 1923 (Kaviani). No less important is the Wadhī-i Din, an introduction to Isma'ilism, which gradually initiates the reader into Isma'ili beliefs by methodical quotations from the Kūrān cleverly put together. A number of other similar pamphlets like Umm al-Kitāb, which were quite recently fairly widely disseminated among Isma'ili of the Pamirs are credited to our author but so far nothing definite has been ascertained about their authenticity.

Although a considerable portion of Nasir's works is now available in good editions, one cannot yet assert that sufficient light has been thrown upon his striking personality. It would be particularly valuable if his philosophical system could be studied as it is of far reaching importance for the history of thought in Persia.

Bibliography: 1. Ethé, G. J. Ph. ii. 278-283; do, Nasir Chorassian Sāfār-nāma, Persian and German (Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 645-665; xxiv. 428-494); do, Kurzere Eides u. poetische Fragmente aus Nasir Chorassian Divān (M. G. W. Gotta, 1882, p. 124-152); do, Auswahl aus Nasirs Kaidad (Z. D. M. G., xxvi. 478-508); do, Nasir bin Khausa's Leben, Denken und Zuchten, Leyden 1884; E. Fagman, Le livre de la félicité, Persian and French (Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 643-674); edynmations by F. Teufel, (Z. D. M. G., xxvi. 96-114); Ch. Schefer, Sefer Nameh (text and transl. with introduction), Paris 1881; this edition is now somewhat obsolete and it is advisable to use for the text the new edition, Berlin 1923 (Kaviani), which also gives as appendix the text of the Kūhānāt-nāma and of the Sāfār-nāma.

Translation: Guy Le Strange, Nasir-i Khusrav, Diary of a Journey through Syria and Palestine, London 1888; A. P. Fuller, Account of Jerusalem (J. R. A. S., 1872, p. 142-164); E. Berthels, Safar-nāma (Russian), Leningrad 1933. — In addition to the new edition of the Divān, already mentioned there is also oldest lithographed text, Tabriz 1280. A Tarjā'ī-hand, the authenticity of which is doubtful, has been publ. with Russian transl. by V. Zhukovski, in Zapiski (iv. 386-393). Text of the Wadhī-i Din pr. Berlin 1925 (Kaviani).

(E. Berthels)

Al-NASIRA, Nazareth, the home of Jesus, lies in a depression sloping to the south surrounded by hills in a fertile district. While the hills to the north and northeast are not very high, in the northwest the Djebel al-Sikh rises to 1,600 feet above sea-level. The name of the town, which does not occur in the Old Testament, is found in the New and in the Greek fathers of the Church in the varying forms Ναζαρης, Ναζαρης and Nazarēs with Ω, but according to Jerome it had in Hebrew a gate, which is confirmed by the Syriac Nazrat and the Arabic Nashr as well as by the Talmudic derivative form נַחֲלָר while the Christian Arabic has Ω. All these forms as well as Naξαρές (Mark i. 24) have in the first syllable an Ω obscured to σ in Talmudic. In Christian Aramaic there is a subsidiary form נזרא with Ω in the second syllable with which is connected the derivative Naξαρας (Matt. xxvi. 71; John xviii. 5), Cf. τον Ναξαρανιαν (Acta xxiv. 5). The Mandaean term Naṣorān (e.g. Dalman, Avram, Gramm. 2, p. 178; Gressmann, in Z. A. T. W., xliii. 26 sq.) is usually connected with this but Lidzbarski (Mandaische Liturgien, p. xvi. sq.; Z. S., i. 230 sqq.) wants to explain it as "observers", while Zimmern (Z. D. M. G., lxxxiv, p. 429 sqq. 76, 46) seeks its origin in the Babylonian nāšīra. That the Arabic nāṣīra, Christians, nāsūn and nāṣūnīya come from the name of the town is known to the Arab writers.

Nazareth, which in the time of Jesus was a little town of no importance (cf. John i. 47: "what good can come out of Nazareth"?; it is not even mentioned by Josephus), was not in the early Christian period one of the places of the New Testament to which large numbers of pilgrims went. According to Epiphanius, it was inhabited exclusively by Jews till the time of Constantine the Great. The number of Christians however gradually increased and was maintained after the Muslim conquest (636). In the time of Arculf (c. 670) it had two churches, and in 332 (943) Mas'ūdī mentions a church held in great veneration there, no doubt the church of St. Mary. Before Galilee was conquered by Tancred and the Crusaders, Nazareth was destroyed by the Saracens; it revived under Christian rule, especially after the bishopric of Scythopolis was transferred thither. The Russian abbot Daniel (1113—1115) has given us a very good picture of the Church of the Annunciation and of the Well of Mary there in this period. 1187, Saladin took Nazareth and at the peace between him and Richard (1192) it remained in his hands. In 1251, during the last unsuccessful crusade, Louis IX undertook a pilgrimage from 'Akka to Nazareth. Yāḳūt (623 = 1225) who relies on the Gospel story instead of Muslim legend mentions Nashira as a village 13 miles from Ṭabarīya. In 1661 (1263) the Mamlūk
Suľğan Baibars ordered the emir ‘Alā’ al-Dīn to destroy Nazareth and particularly the Church of St. Mary. Dimashqī (c. 1300) calls it a Jewish town belonging to the province of Sāfat and inhabited by Yamanīs, and Khalîl al-Zāhibī (d. 872 = 1468) numbers it among the townlike villages in Sāfat. The Christian visitors however describe Nazareth as a wretched village inhabited by very few Christians with a ruined church and complaint of the hostile attitude of the Muhammadan population. It was not till 1560 that better days dawned when the Druse chief Fāghr al-Dīn [q.v.] opened the town to the Franciscans. The Roman Catholic monastery with the Church of the Annunciation was rebuilt, although not completed till a century later. There were only a few Christians in addition to the monks in the town, until in the middle of the xviiiith century the Sheik Fāghr al-’Amīr of ‘Akka increased its prosperity after which they gradually grew in number.

In 1890 according to G. Schumacher, there were 7,419 inhabitants in the town of whom 1,825 were Muslims, 2,870 Greek Catholics and the remainder Christians of other confessions; since then the number has increased. Jews were not allowed to live there. The great monastery with the Church of the Annunciation in the southeast belongs to the Roman Catholics, the Church of the Annunciation in the northeast to the Greek Church. The Muslims have a mosque of considerable size and five walls. The well of Mary which has a dome over it and is open on one side, has its water brought from a spring below the Greek Church of the Annunciation.

**Bibliography:** Ibnu Sa’d, ed. Sachau, i/1, 26; Mas’ūdī, ed. Paris, i, 123; Yāqūt, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv, 729; Dimashqi, ed. Mehran, p. 212; R. Hartmann, Khalîl al-Zâhibî’s Zubdat Kadh al-Manâlik, 1907, p. 47 sq.; Die Pilgerfahrt des russischen Altes Daniel, transl. by Lasken, in Z.D.P.V., vii, 17 sqq.; Propst, Die geograph. Verhältnisse Syriens und Palastinas bei Wilhelm Tyrs., i, 55; Rohricht, Geschichte des Konigs Jerusalem, p. 441, 444, 855, 920 and passim; Robinson, Palästina, iii, 419 sqq.; Sir George Adam Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, index s. v.; Tobler, Nazareth in Palästina, 1868; G. Schumacher, in Z. D. P. V., xiii, 235 sqq. (with map and photograph).

(Fr. Buhl)

**NASIRABĀD.** [See SĪSTĀN.]

**NASKH.** (A.), infin. from n-sīkh, with the technical sense of "abrogation (of a sacred text)". See ƙurʿān, 3.

**NASHK.** [See ARARIA, d.]

**AL-NÁṢIR (the vulture).** It gets its name from the fact that it tears the dead animals on which it feeds to pieces with its beak and devours them. It huts till it can no longer fly. It is said to attain the age of 1,000 years. Its eyes are so sharp that it can see its prey at a distance of 400 farsakh; its sense of smell is equally sharp but fragrant scents are so deadly to it that they destroy it. It shows great endurance in flying and follows armies and pilgrim caravans in order to fall upon the corpses of man and beast. It also follows flocks because it is particularly fond of stillborn lambs, a statement which is confirmed by Brchm who says it attacks lambs. It lays its eggs on high cliffs and is said not to sit on them but to leave them to the heat of the sun. It is however very anxious lest its eggs or young be eaten by bats and therefore covers them with the leaves of the plane-tree. The use of the gall, brain, flesh and bones in medizval times corresponds to the usage in ancient medicine.

**AL-NÁṢIR, the title of Sīrā ḍ., taken from its first verse.** The word means "help, assistance" and is often used of God's help in war and then with the meaning of "victory". Sīrā lxi. 13 is also associated with al-fāṭiḥ, cf. xviii. 13. The Sīrā clearly belongs to a later period and verse 2 in particular recalls the year 9, the Year of the Embassies. It is therefore natural to refer al-fāṭiḥ (verse 1) in keeping with the frequent use of the word to the capture of Mecca, except that it is not mentioned as a fact (as Weil, Ibn Ḥīḍām, p. 933 translates it) but is represented as an assumption, which is also true of verse 2. This is perhaps only a rhetorical figure intended to emphasise the general prevalence of the idea and does not exclude reference to a particular event.

**Bibliography:** Noldeneg-Schwall, Geschichte des Qovān, i, 219 sq. (Fr. Buhl)

**NÁṢR b. AHMAD b. ISMĀ’IL called al-Sā’īd, a Sāmānīd.** After the murder of his father in Djamā’ā II, 301 (Jan. 914) the eighth year old Naṣr was put on the throne and the able vizier Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Djaḥānī given the regency. Soon afterwards the people of Sīstān rebelled against the Sāmānīds and placed themselves under the rule of the governor Badr al-Kābir appointed by the caliph al-Muḡṭādir. At the same time the caliph’s generals al-Faḍl b. Ḥamād and Khalīl b. Muḥammad al-Marwazī occupied the towns of Ghazna and Bust which were in the possession of the Sāmānīds. When al-Faḍl fell ill, Khalīl rebelled against al-Muḡṭādir, routed the troops sent against him and went to Kirmān where he encountered a force sent against him by Badr. The battle ended in Khalīl’s defeat; he was himself wounded and taken prisoner; he died soon afterwards of his wounds. In the same year, the uncle of Naṣr’s father Ishāk b. Ahmad b. Asad rebelled in Samarqand and marched on Bukhārā, accompanied by his son (Ramāḏān 301 = April 914) but was driven back by Ḥamāyya (Hamāyya) b. ‘Alī. A second attempt also failed; Ishāk took to flight again and Samarqand fell into the hands of the government troops. He then tried to hide himself but had finally to come out of his place of concealment and throw himself on Ḥamāyya’s mercy. The latter took him to Bukhārā where he remained till his death, while his son Ḥyṣ went to Farghānā. In the year 302 (914—915) another son of Ishāk’s, Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad, stirred up trouble in Nāṣībūr in combination with al-Husain b. ’Alī al-Marwazī (al-Marwārūdā), who had rendered great service to the Sāmānīds but felt he had been neglected by them. After Muḥammad’s sudden death Ḥusayn, who was suspected of having poisoned him, went to Nāṣībūr and seized the town. In Rabiʿ I 306 (Aug.—Sept. 918) he was taken prisoner by Ahmad b. Saḥl, a tried general, who had been long in the service of the Sāmānīds, and brought to Bukhārā, while Ahmad took up his residence in Nāṣībūr. Ḥusayn was after some time released and given a position at
the court of Naṣr; for some unknown reason he was again thrown into prison and ended his days there; in the following year, Ahmad b. Saḥl deserted the Sāmānids because Naṣr had not kept his promise to him, and recognised only the caliph's authority. He went from Naisabūr to Dījrān and drove out its governor Karategin. He then returned to Khurāsān and entrenched himself in Marv; in Rajab 307 (Dec. 919) however, he shared the fate of Ḥusain. Ḥamūya cunningly succeeded in enticing him out of the town. Ahmād was defeated and taken prisoner and died a few months later in Bukhārā in prison. In Tabaristān also there was fighting. After the death of the Zaidī mām al-Ṭūlū (q.v.), al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḵāsim, called al-Dīrī al-Saghār, was recognised as his successor. In 308 (920—921) the latter sent his general Lailā b. al-Nuṣnī al-Dalāmti to Dījrān. From there he went first to Dāmghān and then to Naisabūr where he had the khitāb read for al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḵāsim (Dhu Ḳ-Ḥidjdā 308 = April—May 921), after Karategin had been put to flight. In the neighbourhood of Tūs he encountered Ḥamūya b. 'Allī whom the government of Bukhārā had sent against him. At first a considerable part of the Sāmānīd army took to flight but Ḥamūya himself stood firm and Lailā had no further success; he had to take to flight, was captured and beheaded by Ḥamūya's orders (Rabi' I 309 = July—Aug. 921). Karategin then returned; but when he left Dījrān and Abu l-Ḥusain b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-Ṭūlū seized the town, Naṣr sent 4,000 horsemen there, led by Simudār al-Dawāṭī, who at once laid siege to Abu l-Ḥusain. When the latter made a sortie with a force twice his size, he fell into an ambush but escaped to Astarābād and thence to Sāriya. Simudār then went to Astarābād; but when his efforts came to naught he bribed Abu l-Ḥusain's deputy Mākān b. Kūktī and persuaded him to pretend to vacate the town for a time and then to reoccupy it. This was done as arranged; Simudār occupied Astarābād but soon afterwards out of Dījrān. In 310 (922—923) Ilyās b. Ḩāšāk rebelled in Farghāna and went to Samarqand; this enterprise came to nothing through the ability of Abū ʿAmr Muḥammad b. Asād, who with 2,500 men prepared an ambush and scattered Ilyā's army, said to have numbered 30,000 men. After some time, the latter joined the governor of al-Shāhīd, Abu l-Faṭl b. Abī Yūsuf, but had again to take to flight and went to Kāshgār where he joined the Dīkānī Toghtāstin. After failing in an attempt to invade Farghāna he returned to Kāshghar. He was finally pardoned by Naṣr and settled in Bukhārā. About the same time Abu l-Faṭl Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān al-Baḷūnī (cf. Barānī) was appointed vizier in place of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Dījātin. In the year 314 (926) Naṣr at the instigation of the caliph al-Muṣṭafād undertook an expedition against al-Raŷi where Fāṭīk, a freedman of the rebel governor Yūsuf b. Abī l-Sāḥib, was ruling. He took the town in Ḥumādā II (Aug.—Sept. 926) and returned to Bukhārā after two months' stay there. Al-Raŷi remained in possession of the Sāmānīs till the beginning of Shābān 316 (Sept. 928) when the governor appointed by Naṣr fell ill and surrendered the town to the ʿAlīd al-Ḥasan al-Dīrī and his general Mākān b. Kūktī. In 317 (929—930) or 318 (930—931) Naṣr's brothers, Yahyā, Manṣūr and Ibrāhīm, whom he imprisoned in the citadel of Bukhārā, succeeded in regaining their freedom with the help of their followers among the dissatisfied elements of the citizenry and seized the town. When Yahyā claimed the throne, Naṣr who had gone to Naisabūr at the head of a large army to assist the caliph against the rebel Asfār b. ʿShirīṭa had to return as quickly as possible and after several encounters with Yahyā was able to restore order. Yahyā was pardoned and the governorship of Khurāsān given to the emir of Ṣaghānīyān Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Muṣṭafrī. On the fighting in Dījrān and Kūrmān see the article MĀKN b. KĀKTI.

The last year of Naṣr's reign was marked by a great revival of Shīʿa propaganda, which had never ceased in Khurāsān and had been particularly encouraged just at this time by the rise of the Fatimid caliphs. When the people of Naisabūr paid homage to an ʿAlīd named Abu l-Ḥusain Muḥammad b. Yahyā as caliph, Naṣr invited him to Bukhārā and when he left not only gave him a robe of honour but also granted him an annual allowance from the treasury. Husain b. ʿAlī al-Marwāzī had been converted to the Shīʿa by Fatimid emissaries in Khurāsān. He was followed by Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Nakḥshbīdī (al-Nasāfī) who transferred his activities to Bukhārā and gained a number of proselytes among the high officials. He finally succeeded in winning Naṣr himself over to his party and in inducing him to pay the Fatimid caliph al-Kātīr [q.v.] a considerable sum to atone for the death of Husain b. ʿAlī who had pinned away in a Bukhārā prison. This naturally aroused the wrath of the orthodox clergy, who were joined by the Turkish guards and provoked a powerful reaction. Naṣr regretted his complicity and is said to have abdicated in favour of his son Nāḥī, who had not been guilty of any heresy. Naṣr's ill-health may have contributed to this decision. The details are variously recorded; in any case, the Shīʿis in Bukhārā and Khurāsān were persecuted and al-Nakḥshbīdī with several followers executed.

According to the usual statement, Naṣr died after thirteen months illness of pulmonary consumption on 27th Rajab 331 (April 6, 943); others say he was murdered like his father. According to some reports, he died earlier, on 12th Ramadan 330 (May 31, 942). This latter date perhaps refers not to his death but to his abdication. Nāḥī's formal accession in any case only took place after his father's death.

If we may believe Ibn al-ʿAthīr, Naṣr was distinguished by a singular gentleness of character; according to other sources however, this was not the case. He was also celebrated as an enlightened patron of poets and scholars and is particularly held in honour for encouraging the poet Rūḍāqī [q.v.] in every way.


(Κ. V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

NASR B. SAIYĀR AL-LAIṬHĪ, GOVERNOR OF KHURĀSĀN. As early as 86 (705) we find him distinguishing himself in the campaigns of Kutayba b. Muslim (q.v.) in Central Asia and from this time onwards his name is often mentioned in history. In 106 (724) he took part in the campaign conducted by Muslim b. Sa'd al-Kilâbi, governor of Khurāsān, against Farghāna. When the two tribes of Rabi'a and al-Azīd refused military service, Naṣr was sent with the Muḍarīs against the mutineers and defeated them at al-Barūkān near Balkh. After serving for some years as commander of Balkh he was relieved of his office but afterwards sent to it. When the governor of Khurāsān Asad b. 'Abd Allah al- Kašī (q.v.) died and the caliph Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik sought counsel of a trusted adviser, who was acquainted with the conditions in Khurāsān, regarding the filling of the vacant post, the latter proposed among other names that of the seventy-four year old Naṣr because he was "abstemious, experienced and shrewd" (ṣafī muḍjarrāb ḍalla), and in Radjāb 120 (June—July 738) he received the diploma of investiture. He honestly endeavoured to live up to the above description of him. The old cities of Khurāsān were four in number: Merw, Nāīsībīr, Merw al-Rīthā and Herāt; there were also special commands in Balkh, Samarakand and Khwārizm. After taking over the governorship, Naṣr transferred his headquarters from the remote Balkh to the more central Merw. In 121 (738—739) he declared war on his Turkish neighbours and advanced to Samarakand. From there he penetrated to Ughurāsana and thence on to al-Shāb. The Turkish chief Kuršul, who had shortly before killed the Khākhān and was regarded, as one of the leading personalities among the Turks, along with al-Hārīth b. Suraidj, a Murdijī who had rebelled against Arab rule and taken refuge among the unbelieving Turks, endeavoured to check his progress; when the opposing forces actually met however, Kuršul was taken prisoner and killed. Naṣr then made peace with the ruler of al-Shāb on condition that he banished al-Hārīth, whereupon the latter went to Fārīst while Naṣr continued his campaign into Farghāna without winning any considerable success. The result was that he had to be content with concluding a treaty of peace. The Soghdians who had at an earlier date migrated to join their Turkish neighbours in al-Shāb and Farghāna, but found the troubled conditions prevailing after the assassination of the Khākhān intolerable and wished to return to their old Iranian home, were treated by Naṣr with a wise leniency and an agreement was come to by which the transoxianians who had been converted to Islam but had gone back to the faith of their fathers were not to be persecuted in any way, the private debts and arrears of taxes of the emigrants were remitted and the Muslim prisoners taken by them were only to be restored to liberty after the evidence of witnesses had been taken and a judicial decision given. These measures, it is true, provoked not only the displeasure of the Arab emirs in Khurāsān but also the dissatisfaction of the caliph Hishām; nevertheless Naṣr succeeded in carrying out his plans. As regards domestic politics he regulated the relations between the Muslims and those under their protection by an important reform in the system of taxation, by which he ordained that all landowners, including Muslims, should pay the land-tax (ḥarādī) while the poll-tax (ḏījya) should be imposed on non-Muslims exclusively. But the deep rooted clannishness of the Arab caused him continual difficulties. In the first four years of his tenure of office he chose his subordinates exclusively from the tribe of Mūdār; then he began to be little more broad-minded in this respect and to pay some attention to the Yanmaš and thus gradually to pave the way to a reconciliation of the tribes at feud with one another. In the year 123 (740—741) the governor of the Ḫūrāšān, Yusuf b. Ōmar al-Thakafi, endeavoured to arouse the caliph's suspicions of him; Hishām however put through his plan and left Naṣr in his post. When al-Walīd ascended the throne in Rabi'a II 125 (Feb. 743) he confirmed Naṣr in office but soon afterwards allowed himself to be persuaded by Yusuf b. Ōmar to recall him and therefore ordered him to come to Damascus and to bring with him all kinds of hunting-birds and musical instruments. Naṣr however did not hurry and before he reached the frontier of al-Īrāk, the news of the caliph's assassination reached him and he at once turned back. When al-Walīd's successor, Yazid III, appointed Manṣūr b. Djamhūr governor of al-Īrāk and Khurāsān, Naṣr refused to recognise him. In 126 (743—744) trouble broke out among the Azd and Rabi'a in Merw. When Naṣr wanted to pay the troops not in money but with the gold and silver instruments procured for the caliph al-Walīd they mutinied; Djamhūr b. All al-Kirmānī put himself at their head and appealed to their feelings by demanding vengeance for the Banū Mughallāb who had been mercilessly persecuted by the Īmāydūs, course which he knew would appeal to them. When the Mudārīs appealed to Naṣr to render al-Kirmānī innocuous, he declined at first but later yielded to them and had him arrested (end of Ramadān 126 = middle of July 744); but a month afterwards he escaped from prison. Negotiations were then opened between Naṣr and al-Kirmānī but they led to no real decision. A much more dangerous opponent was al-Hārīth b. Suraidj who at the end of Djamālādī II 127 (beginning of April 745) again appeared in Merw after a many years' sojourn among the Turks. In order to be safe from this rival, Naṣr had unfortunately secured a pardon for Hārīth and his followers from the caliph Yazid III and after his arrival in Merw he endeavoured to win al-Hārīth over by the greatest indulgence and friendliness. He even went so far as to confer on him the governorship of Transoxiana: but all his efforts were in vain; al-Hārīth adhered firmly to his Murdijī conceptions and stubbornly refused to recognise Naṣr as governor. As his following was steadily growing, he finally demanded that Naṣr should resign his office and leave the choice of his successor to a court of arbitration. Naṣr said he would agree to this, but when he declined to obey the judgment of the court insisting on his
resignation, open fighting broke out. Al-Ḫṣīrī tried to take the city by surprise but was driven back (end of Djamā'ī ii 128 = end of March 746). He then joined forces with al-Kirmānī and they attacked Naṣr with their combined strength. After several days’ fighting, the latter had to abandon Merw and retire to Naisābūr; it was not long however before the two rebels fell out. Among other things al-Kirmānī’s cruelty made him hated; in addition there were the endless feuds among the various Arab tribes. After al-Ḫṣīrī’s most influential follower Bīṣhr b. Djamūzī al-Dabha had left al-Kirmānī with 5,000 men, al-Ḫṣīrī soon followed his example but was killed in the fighting that ensued (end of Rājdāb 128 = April 746). Al-Kirmānī was now lord of Merw. The Yamanīs stood by him while the Muḍarīs sought refuge with Naṣr in Naisābūr. Naṣr’s position was thereby no means an enviable one. So long as al-Ḫṣīrī was in the hands of the Kāhriyids and the ‘Allīd rebel Abū Allāh b. Muʿṣīwīya [q.v.], Naṣr’s communications with the caliphate were cut and even after Yazīd b. ʿOmar b. Huhiba had regained al-Ḫṣīrī for Marwānī, he could not reckon on any very considerable help. There was therefore nothing left for him but to concentrate his efforts on the reconquest of the city of Merw. After repeated encounters between his troops and those of al-Kirmānī, he went there in person and pitched his camp opposite that of his opponent. The two rivals continued to fight with varying fortunes without being able to bring about a decision. Naṣr’s appeals to Marwān and Ibn Huhiba for reinforcements remained unheeded; in view however of the danger that threatened from Abū Musa [q.v.], the leader of the ‘Abbāsīd prog- paganda negotiations were begun between Naṣr and al-Kirmānī. After a son of ʿUṯmān b. Ṣurayjī had killed al-Kirmānī to avenge the death of his father, the Kāhriyīd Shābīb b. Salama took his place and in the name of the Azd concluded a truce for one year. Abū Musa was able however to bring this agreement to nothing by persuading ‘Ali b. ʿAlīddīl al-Kirmānī that Naṣr had insti-gated the murder of his father and the Azd who were devoted to him broke the truce just con- cluded and resumed hostilities against Naṣr. When Abū Musa was approached for assistance by the two combatant parties he was able to come forward as an arbiter and decided in favour of the Azd against the Muḍarī. He then entered Merw, according to the most probable statement in Rābī’ ii 130 (Dec. 747), and made the inhabi-tants swear allegiance in general terms to a caliph of the family of the Prophet without a name being mentioned. For Naṣr of this he was nothing less than a colleague but to seek safety in flight. From Merw he fled via Sarakhs and Tūs to Naisābūr, where the news reached him that his son Tamīm, whom he had sent against Abū Muslim’s general Kāhṭabā b. Shābīb al-Ṭā’ī [q.v.] had been defeated and slain at Tūs. From Naisābūr he went to Kūmīs and thence to Djurjān. Nubātā b. Ḥanṣaḷa al-Kīḥābī was here with a large army which Ibn Huhiba had at last sent him by the caliph’s orders. But Naṣr and Nubātā did not cooperate and in addition the Kāsīs went over from the former to the latter. On the 1st Dhu‘l-Hijja 130 (Aug. 1, 748) Nubātā was defeated by Kāhṭabā and fell in the battle. After his defeat Naṣr could no longer stay in Kūmīs but fled, pursued by Kāhṭabā’s son Hasan, to al-Rayā, without receiving any support from the Umayyad officials. Reaching al-Rayā, he fell ill; nevertheless he wished to continue his journey to Hamaddān but was no longer able to move without assistance; he had to be carried and died in 12th Rābī’ i 131 (Nov. 9, 749) in Sāwā [q. v.] at the age of 85. Naṣr combined with his eminent qualities as a statesman considerable gifts as a poet.


(K. V. Zetterstede)

Naṣr Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Abū ‘l-Maʿāṣirī of Shīrāz, a Persian author and statesman, vizier of the Ghaznavid Khusraw Malik (1160—1185) by whose orders he was arrested and executed. Naṣr was the first Persian to succeed in giving a satisfactory Persian version of the celebrated Kāhālīa d-Dīma. His version is based on the Arabic of Abū Allāh b. Maḵāfī and was completed about 328/1144, i.e. in the time of Bahramīshāh (1118— 1152). For a long time his translation was regarded as a model of elegant Persian style which could not be surpassed and served as the basis for the metrical version by Kānīfī (658 = 1260) and for a series of Turkish translations. It was only in the xvith century when even Naṣr Allāh’s language appeared too homely and archaic that his translation was superseded by the celebrated Anwār-i Suhailī of Husain Wāṣīq al-Kāhīfī [q.v.], d. 393 (1532—1533).


Naṣr al-Dawla Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Mar- wān, third and most important prince of the Marwānī dynasty [q.v.] of Diyar Bakr. He succeeded to the provincial sovereignty on the death of his brother, Mumāhīd al-Din Abū Maṣrāf Sāʾd, in 401(1010)—in 411—after a struggle with the latter’s murderer, and was in the same year formally recognized by the ‘Abbāsīd al-Kādīr, from whom at the same time he received his lākḥab, and by the Būyid amīr, Sulṭān al-Dawla. Though now established in the capital, Majāfīrīkīn, he was unable to obtain effective control of Āmid, the next most considerable city of the province, until 415 (1024—1025), when his tributary, Ibn Damna, who had hitherto ruled it, was assassinated: and during his reign of over fifty years, he suffered several ineffective attacks on his territory from the Uqailīs of Diyar Rābīʿa’ to whom he appears, at one period at all events, to have paid tribute (see Ibn al-Athīr, ix. 121),
and to whom, in order to compose a quarrel arising out of his divorce of a lady of that family, he was obliged, in 421 (1030), to cede Nişbid. In 433 (1041—1042) Diyar Bakr was invaded from Adharbaidjan by the bands of Ghuzz Turkmens which had pushed northwards on the advance of the Seljukid leaders into the Dibaj; and for two years parts of it were subjected to their depredations. Otherwise the province enjoyed, throughout his reign, a tranquillity remarkable in this troubled age.

The ruler of Diyar Bakr was regarded as a principal guardian of the frontier of Isfand, and as such was expected to harass the Christians whenever opportunity offered (see the letter addressed to Naşr al-Dawla by the Seljukid Tughriel-beg: Ibn al-Ajdār, ix. 275). Nevertheless Ibn Marwān's relations with the Byzantine Empire were for the most part amicable, being based on a pact of mutual non-aggression, to which both parties appealed when it was infringed. The only important breaches of this agreement occurred in 418 (1027), when Naşr al-Dawla seized Rhuhā (Edessa), which, however, was recovered by the Greeks four years later, and in 426 (1034—1035), when an attempt was made by the Christian inhabitants of that city, in league with Arabs of the Numair tribe, to invade his territories. Later their good relations were of use to the Emperor—Constantine X—who, in 441 (1049—1050) obtained Ibn Marwān's help in securing from Tughriel-beg the release of the Georgian general Lapi'riti with whom he had been in league against the Georgian king, and who had been captured the year before by Tughriel's half-brother Ibrahim Ināl. Up to 436 (1045) Armenia, which also marched in part with Diyar Bakr, was still independent of the Empire; and in 423 (1032) a Marwānid commander led a successful raid into this country. In 427 (1035—1036), on the other hand, a haqā'id caravan from northern Persia was attacked and looted near Aṣīr by Armenians of the Sunā'a tribe, upon which Ibn Marwān forced the aggressors to give up their prisoners and booty.

Early in Naşr al-Dawla's reign the north of Syria and parts of the Dijāzira contiguous to Diyar Bakr were obliged to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Fātimid caliphs, though their hold on these parts remained somewhat precarious. And his own territories were menaced by Fātimid pretensions, when in 430 (1038—1039) the governor of Damascus, Anṣūfiktin al-Dżibārī, who was then reasserting his rule in northern Syria, projected an attack on Diyar Bakr. This, however, came to nothing.

The reign of Naşr al-Dawla saw the rise of the Seljukids from complete obscurity to the empire of Persia and the 'Irāk. His first communication with them occurred as early as 435 (1043—1044), on the Ghuzz invasion of Diyar Bakr, when he addressed a letter of protest to Tughriel, who, though he was scarcely in a position to do so, undertook to restrain the marauders. (It may be noted, nevertheless, that Ibn al-Azraḳ describes this Ghuzz invasion as having been actually instigated by Tughriel, who, he says, granted the province to its two leaders in advance; cf. Amedroz, The Marwānid Dynasty of Mayyafārīqīn, in J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 137. Surely this author is mistaken in considering the date 434 as wrong, since it agrees exactly with those given by Ibn al-Athīr). Eight years later Naşr al-Dawla acceded to Tughriel's demand for recognition as suzerain; and this subservience, which was renewed in 446 (1054—1055), when Tughriel made a triumphal tour through Adharbājān and Muslim Armenia, spared Diyar Bakr the experience of a Seljukid visitation. In the following year, however, Tughriel's attention was drawn to the murder of a Kurdish chiefman by Naşr al-Dawla's son Sulaimān, his lieutenant in the Dijāzira; and in 448 (1056—1057), when the sultan was obliged to visit al-Mawājil in order to oppose a combination of Shi'i leaders headed by al-Basāṣīrī [q. v.], he forced an indemnity from Ibn Marwān by laying siege to Dijāzirat Ibn 'Umar.

Naşr al-Dawla was sagacious, or fortunate, in his choice of the three warirs who served him in turn, namely Abu l-Kāsim al-Ifahānī, to whom he owed his throne (in office 401—415 = 1010—1025), Abu l-Kāsim al-Maghibī [q. v.] (in office 415—428 = 1025—1037) and Abu Naṣr Ibn Dżahir (afterwards entitled Fakhr al-Dawla) [q. v.] (in office 430—435 = 1030—1035). It was no doubt owing in part to their abilities that the remarkable tranquillity enjoyed by Diyar Bakr during his reign was turned to advantage and resulted in an equally remarkable prosperity. This Naşr al-Dawla fostered by a reduction of taxation and by renouncing the practice of fining the rich in order to augment the revenues. Nevertheless his court is said to have surpassed those of all his contemporaries in luxury, and many instances are quoted of his profusion and generosity. Mayyafārīqīn became during his reign a centre for men of learning, poets and ascetics, as also a refuge for political fugitives. Among the latter were the Byzantine princes al-Malik al-Aziz [q. v.], who was ousted from the amirate in 436 (1044—1045) by his uncle Abū Bakr al-Din. [q. v.], and the infant heir of the Abbāsid al-Kā'im—afterwards al-Muṣtabī [q. v.]. — who was removed with his mother from Baghdād on the occasion of its occupation in 450 (1059) by al-Basāṣīrī.

Naşr al-Dawla is described as being resolute, just, high-minded and methodical, and though much addicted to sensuality, he was strict in his observance of religious injunctions. He died, aged about eighty, on 24th Shawwāl 455 (November 1061), leaving Fakhr al-Dawla still in office to secure the succession to his second son, Abu l-Kāsim Naşr, Nasr al-Din.


(HAROLD BOWEN)

NAŞR AL-DIN (pron. Nasreddin) KHODJA, the hero of the stories of wit and stupidity among the Turks, who bears a strong resemblance to the German Till Eulenspiegel, the English Joe Miller, the Italian Bertoldo, the Russian Balakirev, etc. Various opinions are current about his life. One tradition for example makes him a learned man of Hārūn al-Rašid, but another makes him a contemporary of al-Khwārizm-shīb 'Alī al-Din Takāsh (reigned c. 1172—1200). The two traditions are not to be taken seriously; at most they might be regarded as an indication that many of the jests of the Khodja date from the period of the caliphate or that some of them came through a Persian intermediary.
The other versions of the life of Nasreddin can be divided into two groups, of which the first puts him in the xivth and beginning of the xvth century (the period of Bayazid I, Timur and the eighth Karamanid 'Alâ' al-Dîn), and the second in the xivth century (the period of the Saljûq 'Alâ' al-Dîn).

The first view appears to come from the Travels of Ewliya Çelebi (ii. 16—17). There, for example, the story of Timur's meeting with the Khodja in the bath is told, when the Khodja said that he would give 40 akâb for Timur's shirt but nothing for himself. In spite of all the improbability of such an utterance and in spite of the fact that the older tezkires put this answer in Ahmadî's [q.v.] mouth (cf. also E. J. W. Gibb, Ottoman Poems, 1882, p. 166—167) Ewliya's story, was given currency in Europe by Cantimir, Dier, Goethe, von Hammer, etc. When Mehemd Temefik accepted this story of Ewliya's in his editions of the jests of Naşreddîn and Buadam (since 1853) which were later translated into German (about 1890), it was given new life and became almost the predominant opinion in Europe.

The second group of traditions champions the xiiith century as the period of Naşreddîn and relies on the following facts. Firstly the poet Lami'î (d. 1532—1533) asserted in his Lâfi'î, that Naşreddîn was a contemporary of Shâyi'ad Hamza who lived in the xiiith century; secondly in old manuscripts the Khodja is associated with the Sulân 'Alâ' al-Dîn Koprulu-Zade (see Bibli.) therefore inclines to the view that he was a contemporary of the Saljûq 'Alâ' al-Dîn. Sh. Sâmi Bey (Kâmûs al-A'tâm, vi. 4577) and P. Horn (see Bibli.) had already decided for the Saljûq and the latter definitely for 'Alâ' al-Dîn, but Koprulu-Zade supported his view by evidence, partly new, which we proceed to quote: 1. the inscription on the tomb of Naşreddîn in Aşkhehir bears the date 386, which on the supposition that it is reversed, would indicate that the Khodja died in 683 (1284—1285); 2. on two authentic charters of endowment (waqfyya) of the year 655 (1257) and 665 (1267), respectively, a certain "Naşreddîn Hodja" appears before the kâdî as a witness; 3. the statement which the former had made in a mufti of Siwri-Hišr, Hasan Efendi, made about 45 years ago in the Me'müöli-i Mevârî about Naşreddîn, agrees with this assumption. According to Hasan Efendi, Naşreddîn was born in the village of Khörtö near Siwri-Hišr in the year 605 (1208—1209), held there the office of İmâm in which he succeeded his father, and moved in 635 (1237—1238) to Aşkhehir where he died in 683 (1284—1285).

Although this evidence is by no means to be rejected off hand, it seems to have been completely neglected by other scholars (Krymski in 1927 [see Bibli.] does not even mention Koprulu's book) except for my article entitled "Je li Naşreddîn hodja "Heye"? ("Did Naşreddîn Hodja really live?") in the Christmas supplement to the Belgrade Politika (Jan. 6, 1932), where it was described as worthy of consideration, if not yet absolutely convincing.

After all these traditions and opinions, it is not a matter for surprise that some scholars (H. Ethé, R. Basset, M. Hartmann, A. Weselks [see Bibli.] have been more or less sceptical about the historicity of the Khodja.

These doubts are to some extent closely connected with the question of the origin of Naşreddîn's jests. Basset, for example, thinks (in Recherches etret al Dîjâh a.. . ) that they are a translation of the old Arabic droll stories which were current in large numbers at the end of the fourth (tenth) century about a certain Djuhâ (Djuhâ) of the tribe of Fazîra in Kfâ. Djuhâ's stupidity became proverbial among the Arabs, as is already evident from Mâdînî (d. 1124) (cf. Arabum proverbia, ed. G. Freytag, i. 403, N°, 175), and a Book of Anecdotes of Djuha (d. 688) (written by Khodja Naşreddîn's) is expressly mentioned as early as the Fihrist of al-Nâdîm (d. 995) (cf. Flûgel's edition, i. 313). This collection, which had previously reached the west through oral transmission, was translated into Turkish in the xviith or xviith century and the hero identified with a certain Naşreddîn Khodja, whose existence Basset thinks is at least doubtful.

This thesis of Basset's was not everywhere accepted without demur. Horn and Christensen (see Bibli.), for example, do not believe in a translation from the old book of Djuhâ's jests and Wesselski holds the view "that there is no evidence of the existence of any story of Djuhâ in the period before that of Naşreddîn's alleged or actual life, which could with certainty be assumed to be the source of one of the jests of Naşreddîn". M. Hartmann describes Naşreddîn's jests as the common property of the literature of the world, expressed to some extent in a specifically Turkish guise and therefore regards any question as to whether there ever was such a person as of little importance. Horn and Krymski also regard the Khodja's jests as folk stories found almost everywhere, which lacks similarly but admits that these jests form an independent collection "into which probably very many stories from the old book (of Djuhâ) have been incorporated".

Whatever the truth may be, one thing seems to be certain: the immediate source for most of the stories of Naşreddîn is to be sought, as Basset and Hartmann say, in the world of Arabic culture and travel where Djuhâ certainly is often the hero of such anecdotes. In other words, Djuhâ might be regarded as the ultimate prototype of many of the adventures of Naşreddîn. While Basset's theory then may not be correct in all details, it seems to be right in its main features, especially in the fact that it has directed the student of Naşreddîn to the influence of the rich Arabic literature of humorous anecdote. That many of these stories are originally not Arabic but Persian, Syriac, Indian, Greek, etc. is quite natural, especially when we remember that they are common to many literatures, but in this case it must often have been the Arabic version that was the source upon which the Turkish drew.

For the problem of Naşreddîn it is also important to put on record that stories of Djuhâ are very early mentioned by Persian poets and authors (Mînâ'îfi, d. 1040—1041) and transmitted (a story in Anwâr [c. 1190] three stories in Djalîl al-Dîn Rûmi [d. 1273] and a dozen stories in Uzûh-i Zakînî [d. 1370—1371]). When we remember the part played by Persian culture among the Saljûqs of Kûrm and their Ottoman successors, we cannot consider it impossible that some stories of Djuhâ may have come to the Turks through Persian literature.
This is all the more probable as Djalal al-Din Rumi himself spent the greater part of his life in Anatolia (especially in Konya) and used Djihâş (as Djihâ is called among the Persians) popularity to illustrate his mystic ideas (cf. Mathnawí, ed. Nicholson, ii. 3116 sqq.).

Particularly in view of this popularity and the fact of oral transmission, it is not impossible that the common people altered the name Djihâş (Djîhâsh) which was strange to them, into Khodja, as Basset repeatedly insists (Mélanges africains et orientaux, Paris 1915, p. 49). On the other hand, there may have been a droll Khodja named Nasreddin among the Ottomans (or Seljûks), around whom gathered humorous stories of others, in addition to his own jests, and thus became the typical representative of wit and stupidity. For this reason he was probably also credited with the tales of the simplicity of Karâkûsh [q.v.], Saladîn's steward, who had been dead since 1201.

Other jests attributed to Nasreddin go back several centuries further which is proof that they cannot originate with him. The fact that most of the jests are not original is obvious (cf. e.g. Wesselski's parallels), in spite of all the changes and transformations they have undergone among the Turks.

One of the Turkish versions (with additions) was, according to Basset, translated in the middle of the 16th (xvith) century into Arabic and thus the Turks returned to the Arabs part of what they had formerly borrowed from them. Nasreddin and Djihâş, being similar types, later became amalgamated in such a way that the Arabic editions identify the two in the title: Nâşrâdâr al-Khodja Nasr al-Dîn Efendi Djihâş. Sometimes however, the Arabs distinguish between the two by calling Nasreddin the "Rumelian Djihâş" (Djihâş al-Rîmi). This Djihâş of the Nâsâdîr easily reached the Berbers through the Arabs as Si Djeha (Djîhésh). In a similar way the Nubians procured their Djawha and the Maltese their Djihan. Whether the fool of Sicilian popular story, Giûfa or Giûch also comes from Djihâş is a further question.

On the other hand, the Turkish version of the jests of Nasreddin (under his or another name or anonymously) became known not only to the Rumanians, Bulgars, Greeks, Albanians, and Jugoslavs but also in Armenia, Georgia, the Caucasus, the Crimea, the Ukraine, Russia, Turkestan etc. On these long travels, Nasreddin naturally underwent many changes; distortions and additions were made which are quite foreign to the Turkish text, so that the number of his (or Djihâsh's) stories increased to several hundreds (in Wesselski to 515 or 555). The oldest manuscript (Leyden, No. 2715) which was already in the possession of a European in 1625, only contains 76 jests.

The first edition of the chapbook on Nasreddin, which was the foundation of many later editions, appeared in 1837 (125 jests). Mehmed Tewfik's edition (1899 = 1883) in which the coarse stories of the chapbook are omitted only contains 71 but a few months later Tewfik published a further 130 under the name Bu Adam ("This Man", i.e. the same Nasreddin) (in the final edition of 1902 Bu Adam only contains 96 stories). Anecdotes of Nasreddin were later collected by I. Kunois from the lips of the people between Aidin and Konya and separately published (Budapest 1899, with 166 stories and introduction, and in

Radloff's Proben der Volksliteratur der turkischen Sämme, vol. viii., St. Petersburg 1899). The fullest, but uncritical, Turkish edition is that of Behîr (pseudonym of Weled Çelebi), the fourth edition of which (1926) contains nearly 400 anecdotes.

The Turkish editions in the Roman alphabet are much shorter (e.g. Nasrettin Hoca Hikayeleri, 1928 [only 79 pp.] and Letatîf Nasrettin Hoca, 1929 [only 96 pp.]) or are divided into various periods of Nasreddin's life (like the Nasrettin Hoca of Kemalettin Sukru 1930—1931, in four parts).

The first European translations were based on the early editions of the Turkish chapbook: the German by Camerloher and Prelog (Trier 1857, with 126 jests) and the French of Decourdemanche (Les plaisanteries de N. hodja, Paris 1876, also containing 126 anecdotes) which was increased in the second edition (1908) by those about Karâkûsh. Decourdemanche also provided a translation based on much larger material (he drew upon unpublished manuscripts also entitled Sottistier de Nasr-Edîn-Hodja (Brussels 1878, with 321 humorous anecdotes). While the translation by Camerloher and Prelog made it possible for R. Kohlitz and his stories told of Nasreddin in European collections and to trace many of them back to an Indian origin (Orient und Occident, i. 1862), a later edition with additions in his Kleineren Schriften zur Marxenforschung, i. (1898), Decourdemanche's translation served Dragománov as the basis for his studies on the dissemination of stories of Nasreddin in the Ukraine (Kiewskaja Starina, 1886).

Later (about 1890) Mehemed Tewfik's edition, including a portion of Bu Adam was translated into German by Mullendorff (Reclam No. 2735). The remainder of the Bu Adam stories (No. 131—226) were translated by Menzel; the much too long Abenteuer Buadems (= No. 197) in the Turcibische Bibliothek (vol. xiii., 1911) and the others in the Beitrage zur Konntnis des Orients, vol. ix. (1911), p. 124—159. Nasreddin's jests have also been translated into English, Russian, Hungarian, Greek, Serbo-Croat, Little Russian, Bulgarian, etc. Wesselski's Der Hudscha Nasreddin (1911) is at present the most complete translation of these anecdotes in a number of versions (see Bibli.).

In conclusion, it may be mentioned that some anecdotes of Nasreddin were retold by A. Pann in Rumannian (1853), by Murad Efendi (= Fr. v. Werner) in German (1858), by V. Velîchko in Russian (1892), by V. Sûrat in Little Russian (1896) and by Kopolu-Ziide in Turkish verse (1918).


NAŞRANİ. [See Naşarın.]

NAŞRİDS, AR. BANU Naşr, also sometimes called Banu ’L-AHMA, a Muslim dynasty which ruled over the kingdom of Granada in the north of Spain from 629 to 897 A. H. (1231—1491).

While, thanks to the narratives of the contemporary Ibn al-Khālid [q. v.] and Ibn Khalādun [q. v.], we are very well informed about the history of the Kingdom of the Naṣrids down to the second half of the xivth century, we have for the later period only a very few sources available in Arabic — and it is not always easy to fill the gaps from Christian sources — : a few pages of al-Maṣkari’s Naṣf al-Ṭib and the short anonymous chronicle published in 1863 by Muller.

We give below a chronological list of the Naṣrids; when a date A. D. is not preceded by its equivalent A. H., this is because it is not given either by Muslim historians or Arabic inscriptions.

5. Abu ’l-Walid ʿIsmā’īl I: 713—725 (1314—1325).
10. Abu ’Abd Allāh Muḥammad VI: 761—763 (1360—1362).

20. Abu ’Abd Allāh Muḥammad XI (Boabdil): 1°, 887—888 (1482—1483); 2°, 892—897 (1487—1491).


I. Foundation of the Naṣrid kingdom. At the time when the power of the Almohads was beginning to collapse in Spain, two influential families, the Banū Mardanšah in Valencia [q. v.] and the Banū Hūd in Murcia [q. v.], took advantage of the civil strife to form for themselves little principalities in the east of the Peninsula. At the same time a member of the Arab family of the Banū ’L-įmah, settled in Arjona, a little town some 20 miles north of Jaén, who traced their descent from the chief of the Banū Kharradā, Saʿd b. ’U要害, also tried his fortune at profiting by the troubled times. He was Muhammad b. Yūsuf b. Abūd b. Naṣr and was known as al-Shāhik. In 629 (1231) he found a few supporters to proclaim him; these were mainly members of his own family and of another, related to it, the Banū Aḥsikkīlāla. The towns of Jaén, Guadix and Baza rallied in the following year to his standard. After various exploits the details of which are somewhat obscure, Muḥammad I, ancestor and founder of the dynasty of the Naṣrids, took Granada, in 635 (1237—1238) and made this town his capital. He soon decided to build a royal residence on the famous hill of the Alhambra [q. v.]; al-Hamrāʾ or Ḥamrāʾ Ǧarnāта). In the course of the following year, he made himself lord successively of Malaga and Almeria. The little town of Lorca did not come under his sway until 663 (1264—1265). Hitherto Muḥammad I had had to employ all his forces to fight against his Muslim rivals and in order to have his hands free he declared himself the vassal of Ferdinand I, king of Castille (1217—1252) to whom he undertook to pay a considerable annual tribute. He had to take part with his overlord in the capture of Seville from the Muslims in 1248 and be a passive witness of the triumphs of the armies of the king of Castille in the south of Spain. When on the death of Ferdinand I, Alfonso X succeeded him, Muḥammad I had to renew his oath of vassalage to the latter. His kingdom, “the kingdom of Granada”, was now the only area in the Peninsula ruled by Muslim princes; bounded by the Mediterranean from the Straits of Gibraltar to Almeria, this kingdom did not extend farther inland than the mountains of the Serrania de Ronda and the Sierra d’Elvira.

II. The Naṣrid kingdom in the xivth century. — Muḥammad I died in 671 (1273) and was succeeded by his son Muḥammad II, called al-Faṣīḥ, who on his accession sought an
Alliance with the Marinids who were finally putting an end to Almohad rule in Morocco. The Marinids answered his appeal. On coming to the throne Muhammad II had found himself faced with the necessity of putting down threatening rebellions; the most serious was that of the Banū Ashkilūla, governors of Malaga and Guadix. He was able to rout the rebels near Antequera, with the help of forces sent him by the Infante Don Philip and Don Nuño de Lara. On the other hand, he soon realised that the king of Castille, his suzerain, had every interest in letting the kingdom of Granada exhaust itself in internal strife. This is why the Nasrīd turned to the Marinids. In consideration for the return of Algeciras [q.v.] and Tarifa [q.v.], the sultan of Fās Abū Yusuf Ya‘qūb b. Abū al-Ḥāṣan agreed to cross into Spain where he inflicted two defeats on the Castillian troops. The chroniclers of the Marinid dynasty record the four expeditions of the king of Fās into Spain and give details of the loss of Tarifa which the Spanish leader Alonso Perez de Guzman, celebrated in legend as Guzman el Bueno, was to defend heroically a little later, in 1293. But it is from this time that the permanent intervention of the sultanāt of Fās in the affairs of the Nasrids of Granada dates; under pretence of a ḥijā‘a they were able at every opportunity to add to the confusion of a political situation already much troubled and to weigh heavily upon the destinies of the Nasrīd throne by playing a game of alliances which were often broken as readily as they were made. The kings of Granada henceforth were to have at their side a regular body of Moroccan soldiers, the ḥusūrāt (sing. ḥāṣṣi) under the command of a Marinīd shāhīd, consisting of adventurers of fortunes who had become more or less undesirable in their native land.

When he died in 707/1302, Muhammad II was succeeded by his son Mūḥammad III who was later to be known as al-Makhluq (the deposed). He was not who built the great mosque of the Alhambra. He had to put down risings by the governors of Guadix and Almeria but had to bow before the rising of a prince of his family, Abū l-Diyūyīsh Nāṣr b. Muhammad, who assumed the power in 708 (1309). Mūḥammad III abdicated and withdrew to Almuñecar [q.v.].

Nāṣr's reign was hardly any longer or happier than that of his predecessor. After a display of energy by which he forced the king of Aragon to raise the siege of Almeria and the king of Castille to raise the siege of Algeciras, he failed against a conspiracy hatched by a Nasrīd prince Ismā‘īl, who seized the power in Granada and left only the town of Guadix to Nāṣr. The latter established himself here in 713 (1314) and stayed there till his death in 722 (1322).

The fifth Nasrīd ruler, Abū l-Walîd Iṣmā‘īl I b. Faradj b. Iṣmā‘īl b. Yūsuf b. Nāṣr, was one of the most remarkable members of the dynasty. As soon as he had assumed the power, he showed a certain strength of character and did his best to put his frontiers in a state of defence. He regained for a time the old Nasrīd lands which had passed to the Marinids: Algeciras, Tarifa and Ronda. In 719 (1319) he had to meet an offensive from Castille and with the help of the Shākid al-Ghuzat, Abū Sa‘īd ‘Ummān b. Abī l-‘Ula al-Marin, he inflicted heavy defeats on his enemies at Alicum and in the Sierra de Évora. In this last battle the Infantes Don Juan and Don Pedro, guardians of king Alfonso XI, were killed. Soon afterwards, Ismā‘īl I regained the fortresses of Huescar, Orce and Galera, then that of Baza. In the following year he took Martos. In 725 (1325) he was assassinated in his palace at the instigation of one of his relations with whom he had quarrelled, the lord of Algeciras Mūḥammad b. Ismā‘īl. He left four sons of whom the eldest, Mūḥammad, succeeded him on the throne of Granada.

Mūḥammad IV was still a minor on his accession and remained for several years under the strict guardianship of his ministers, notably of the vizier Mūḥammad Ibn al-Mahṛūk. The latter, after a long struggle with the Shākid al-Ghuzat Ibī Abī l-‘Ula, was finally put to death by orders of his sovereign who then took the reins of power into his own hands. The remainder of his reign was continually troubled. The help which he sought from the Marinid Sultan Abī l-Ḥasan al‘Ali against the Christians earned him the enmity of the family of the Banū Abī l-‘Ula. In succession he lost Ronda, Algeciras, Marbella and Gibraltar and was ultimately assassinated in 733 (1333).

His brother Abū l-Ḥajjābāl Yūsuf I b. Ismā‘īl succeeded him and reigned for a considerable period. His first care was to avenge his brother by expelling from his kingdom the Banū Abī l-‘Ula who took refuge in Tunis and in giving the office of Shākid al-Ghuzat to a Marinīd lord, Yāḥyā b. ʿUmar Ibn Rahlūs. The struggle with the Christians was resumed in his reign. He sought and obtained the help of the Marinid Abu l-Ḥasan, who crossed the Straits of Gibraltar in 741 (1340) with a large force and laid siege to Tarifa. This expedition ended disastrously. The king of Castille, Alfonso XI, with his army and that of the king of Portugal inflicted a sanguinary defeat on the Muslims near the mouth of the Río Salado, on the 7th of December, 741 (Oct. 30, 1340). Abu l-Ḥasan had to take refuge in Algeciras, whence he was able to reach Morocco. Yūsuf I returned with all speed to Granada, while Alfonso XI profiting by the confusion of the Muslims seized Alcalá la Real, Priego and Benamejí. After taking Algeciras he granted the Nasrīd king a truce of ten years, at the end of which he laid siege to Gibraltar. Alfonso XI however died of the plague during the siege. Yūsuf I himself was assassinated by a madman in the great mosque of Granada on the day of the feast of the 'Breaking of the Fast' of 755 (Oct. 19, 1354). This Sultan's name will always be associated with certain monuments of the Alhambra. It was he for example who built the great gateway of the enceinte, called Bab al-Shari‘a (gate of the Esplanade; commonly called wā‘yūn (the gate of Justice), in Spanish Puerta Justicia and de la Justicia) the inscription on which records that it was finished in Rabī‘ 1 749 (June 1348; cf. my Inscriptions arabes d’Espagne, No. 171). It was also Yūsuf I who in 750 (1349) built the madrasa of Granada (ibid., No. 172).

His successor was his eldest son Mūḥammad V, who bore the honorific ṣākāb of al-Ghānī bi-līlāh. This sultan left the exercise of power in the hands of his father's old minister, the ḥādhib [q.v.], Rīdwan, who maintained peaceful relations with Castille. After a few years, a conspiracy of dissatisfied Nasrīd princes forced Mūḥammad V to abdicate and take refuge in Guadix, and afterwards in Morocco where he was well received by the Marinid sultan Abī Salīm (760 = 1359).
Isma’il II b. Yusuf I, brother of Muhammad V, a Nasrid prince devoid of personality and prestige, was put on the throne, but only for a few months. In 761 (1360) he was assassinated at the instigation of the ra’is Muhammad VI b. Isma’il b. Nasr, who seized the power; his troops soon afterwards suffered a defeat at the hands of the Christians at Guadix. He was soon overthrown by Muhammad V who had returned to Spain and asked the help of Peter the Cruel of Castile to recover the throne. Muhammad VI also appealed to the Christian ruler but the latter had him put to death in 763 (1362).

Muhammad V’s second reign lasted for good or evil another 30 years. It was mainly occupied by family quarrels and civil strife. It was at this time that the famous vizier Lišān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb had to seek refuge in Morocco, which however did not save him from assassination. It (1392) and the throne passed to his son Muhammad VII. The latter imprisoned his elder brother Yusuf in the fortress of Salobreña and resumed the offensive against the Christians, who took the fortress of Zahara from him in 809 (1407). When he died next year his elder brother Yusuf III, the prisoner of Salobreña, assumed power and held it till his death in 820 (1417). After him his eldest son Muhammad VIII became king of Granada; he is usually called by the chroniclers al-Aisar (“the left-handed”). It was in his reign, also much troubled, that we find the family of the Banu ‘I-Sarrādīj, the Abencerrages [q. v.] and that of the Zegrīs (Arabic ḏāghrī: “man of the frontier”) beginning to play an important part in the history of Granada and the civil wars which characterise it. After various adventures, Muhammad VIII had to abandon his

**Genealogical Table of the Nasrid Sultans.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naṣr</th>
<th>Yusuf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Muhammad I</td>
<td>Isma’il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Muhammad II</td>
<td>Faradj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Isma’il I</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Muhammad V</td>
<td>9. Isma’il II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Muhammad VI</td>
<td>daughter married to Ibn al-Mawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Muhammad IX</td>
<td>12. Muhammad VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sa’d</td>
<td>17. Muhammad X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Muhammad XI</td>
<td>17. Muhammad X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is also at this date that the history of the Nasrid dynasty not only by Ibn al-Khaṭīb, but also by Ibn Khaldūn, stops. Our information about the later rulers is not only scanty but also inaccurate. The relations of the kings of Granada and of the rulers of Castile continued to be much what they had been, truces or expeditions of short duration with limited objectives. But gradually the ultimate aim of Castilian policy became apparent and generally became more and more easily attainable: the capture of Granada, which was at the same time to put an end to the Nasrid dynasty and to Muslim rule in Spanish lands. Below we give only a brief sketch of the last period of the history of the Nasrid kingdom.

III. End of the Nasrid kingdom. — Muhammad V died in 793 (1391) and was succeeded by his son Abu ‘I-Haṣṣādīj Yusuf II who reigned only a short time. He died in 794 capital for a time and went to seek an asylum with the king of Tunis, while Muhammad IX known as al-Ṣaḥīr assumed power. Muhammad VIII soon returned and his second reign was marked by the disastrous battle of Higueruela, near Granada, in which the Muslims were routed by the army of John II on July 1, 1431. Al-Aisar had to take refuge in Malaga for some months during which the throne passed to Yusuf IV b. al-Mawl, a grandson of Muhammad VI. Al-Aisar then resumed the throne for a third time but the frontiers of his kingdom were shrinking every day. The towns of Jimena, Huescar (1435) and Huelma (1438) fell into the hands of the Christian power and in 1445 Muhammad VIII was forced to abdicate in favour of his nephew Muhammad X, while the Abencerrages, gathered at Montefrío, proclaimed Abu ‘I-Naṣr Sa’d sulṭān. It was during the latter’s reign that in 1462 Gibraltar was taken by Rodrigo.
NAŞIDS (A.), etymologically: what is apparent to the eye, as a technical term: text. In this sense the word does not occur in the Kur'an nor in the Hadith. Al-Shâfi'i, on the other hand, appears to be acquainted with it. In his Râzâla he uses it chiefly in the sense of nasî' kitâb (p. 7, 16, 30, 41) or nasî' hukûma (p. 5) “what has been laid down in the Kur'an”. In other passages nasî' kitâb is distinguished from sunna (p. 21, 4, infra, 24, 71, pass., 30, 31, 65, 21). The combination nasî' sunna occurs, however, also (p. 50, 14, 65, 2).

From these passages it may also appear that Al-Shâfi'i uses the term chiefly to denote legal precepts. In accordance with this the definition of the term has given in the Li'am al-‘Arah: “The nasîs of the Kur'an or of the sunna means the precepts (ahkâm) contained in the plain words (zâhir) of these sources”.

An extension of the term has taken place chiefly in three directions, so that nasîs, apart from the general sense of text, may mean: a. the text of a precept of the law, written or not written; b. the zâhir [q.v.] of a sacred text; c. the sense of such a text. For other special meanings of the term, cf. Dozy, Suppléments aux dictionnaires arabes, s.v.

Bibliography: al-Shâfi'î, al-Rûzbâ fi 'Cifî al-Fikr, Cairo 1321; Muhammad â'âl-talabnâwî, Dictionary of the Technical Terms, ed. A. Spranger, Calcutta 1862, p. 1405 sqq.

NASSADS were the light wooden warships built in Nassau or Hohenau (Lower Austria), the “Nassauer” or “Hohenauer”, Magyar nassd, pl. nassdok, Slav. nasad, which were used on the Danube. They were usually manned by Serbian seamen who were called martâloses (from the Magyar martalics, martalics, lit. “rober”). According to a Florentine account, this Danube flotilla in 1475 consisted of 300 ships manned by 10,000 “nassadists” armed with lances, shields, crossbow or bow and arrow, more rarely with muskets. The larger ships had also cannon. About 1522 the commander of the Danube fleet was Radic Boško who reorganised it at Peterwarina (cf. K. J. Jireček, Geschichte der Serben, 1, v. 258 sq.). Through want of money, the Serbian seamen then deserted to the Turks (žibda, p. 262) who after the fall of Belgrade seized the Danube fleet and developed it into a powerful arm. About 1530 the Danube fleet consisted of 800 nassads and was commanded by the voivod Kâsim (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., iii. 85).


NASTALÍK. [See ASAALAI, i. 39th.]

NAŞUH PASHA, an Ottoman grand vizier, was of Christian descent and was born either in Gumuldjina (the modern Komotini, Thrace, Greece) or in Drama. According to some sources (e.g. Bauder and Grimestone in Knolles), he was the son of a Greek priest, according to others (e.g. Na’im, Ta’rib, first edition, p. 283: arnaud
of Albanian origin. He came early in life to Stambul, spent two years in the Old Seray as a tekerdar (halbardier) and left it as a caush. Through the favour of the sultan's confidant Mehemmed Agha he rapidly attained high office. In quick succession he became woiwod of Zila (Anatolia), master of the horse and governor of Fulek (Hungary). He married the daughter of the Kurdish Mir Sheref and thereby obtained riches as great as his power, which every one was now beginning to fear. His ambition and arrogance, his venality and cruelty knew no bounds and he was even said to be aiming at the throne. In 1015 (1606) he was to conduct the campaign against Persia, as the son-in-law of Mir Sheref and on account of his local knowledge, with the rank of third vizier and serasker, but his attention was claimed by the trouble in Anatolia which was affecting the whole of Asia Minor; through Kurd treachery he lost a battle and it was only in the autumn of 1608 that his troops joined the army of the grand vizier who received him very coolly (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv, 252 sq.). In 1011 (1602) Nasu§ Pasha had been appointed governor of Siwas, the next year of Halab and in 1015 (1606) of Diyarbakr. His goal was the grand viziership. He did not hesitate to ask the sultan to give him the imperial seal and the post of commander-in-chief in return for a sum of 40,000 ducats and the maintenance of the army at his own expense. Ahmad I handed on the offer to the grand vizier, who summoned Nasu§ Pasha to him and fined him that sum as a punishment (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv, 446 sq.). When soon afterwards the grand vizier, the Croat Kuyu§ji Murad Pasha died at the age of over 90, Nasu§ Pasha became his successor (Aug. 22, 1611). In the following year he married A§laha, the three year old daughter of Sultan Ahmd I (Feb. 1612). His arrogance now knew no bounds; all his opponents were ruthlessly disposed of. His personal qualities dazzled everyone: "Of imposing appearance, brave and eloquent, never weary of talk or action, but at the same time passionate, incontinent he could not conduct and flattering words and always intent on humbling the other viziers" (J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv, 472). As human life was nothing to him but wealth everything, he accumulated vast treasures. Sycophants and astrologers nourished in him the delusion that he was born to rule. The number of his enemies increased from day to day as a result of his intrigues and his ruthlessness. When on Friday the 13th Rama§an 1023 (Oct. 17, 1614) he was to accompany the Sultan to the mosque, suspecting no good, he said he was ill. The bosţandi§i batb§§ sent to him had him strangled by his own garden guards. His body was buried on the Ok Maidan. His estate which fell to the coffers of the state was enormous: pearls, jewels, carpets, cloth and bullion without number (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv, 474 sq. quoting Mezeryn, ii, 195). — Nasu§ Pasha left several sons; none of whom Hus§in Pasha (d. 1053 [1643]; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., v, 260 and Hadji§ji Khi§lsa, Feddlek, ii, 226) had a son named Me§med. The latter wrote a history of the Ottoman empire (Deli§i Tamwarthi§i Ati§i Qumini) from the death of Murad IV (1048 = 1639) to 1081 (1670) the original MS. of which is in Dresden (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 211).


NATIDJA (A.) is the usual name for the conclusion resulting from the combination of the two premisses (muqaladaini) in the syllogism (biya§). It corresponds to the Stoire biya§ one word in the works of Galen known to the Arabs is applied to the various discharges from the body but also means, as with the Stoics, the conclusion. Aristotle used the word viyhe§i§ (that which concludes or completes the syllogism).

In place of the usual natida§ we also find ri§f or ra£fi (== deduction). (T. DE BOER)

NATIK. [See §A§TV.]

NAVARINO (Na§vrino), a little seaport in the southwest of Messenia not far from the ancient Pylos, opposite the promontory of Koryphasion on which there was in prehistoric times an acropolis and later a thriving classical city, an often mentioned settlement. The harbour of Navarino is one of the safest in the Greek east for it is sheltered by the island of Sphacteria, which lies right opposite it and has intimate connections with many ancient, medieval and modern events. Recent research has shown that Navarino has no connection with the Homeric Pylos. The latter was in Triphylia near the village of Kakobatos where prehistoric tombs were recently excavated. The derivation of the name Navarino cannot be given with certainty. According to Falmayer, Gesch. der Halbinsel Morea, i, 188, the name Navarino is a distinct survival of Avar rule in Morea between 587 and 587. On the other hand, Hopf thought that it owed its name to the Navarrese (cf. below). Falmayer's view has been adopted by E. Curtius, Peloponnesos, i, 86; ii, 181 and W. Miller among others. According to M. Leake, Travels in the Morea, i, 411, the name Navarino developed from §i§ ci§ 'Agia§vo§. Hopf's view is however wrong, for Navarino is mentioned before the appearance of the Genoese in the Morea. In the middle ages the country round Navarino
was called Zonglon (Zonchio), from which came the French name of the place Chinchin (Old French junc = junco). One of the earliest mentions of Navarino is in the geographical treatise, the *Nuzhat al-Muslihim* of Idrisi; he refers to the place as Irouda and adds that it has "a very commodious harbour". After the period of Frankish rule, information about Navarino becomes fuller. The Knights, who under Guillaume de Champlitte and Godefroy de Villeharduin had planned the conquest of the Morea, in 1205 took its inhabitants and governor prisoners after the capitulation of Navarino.

During the last decades of Turkish rule in the Morea, the Turkish family of Bekir-Agha of Navarino played a prominent part. Soon after the outbreak of the War of Liberation, the Greeks laid siege on March 29, 1821 to Navarino where the Turks of Arcadia (Cypris) had also taken refuge. On Aug. 7, 1821 the Turks surrendered to the Greeks who massacred them all without mercy in spite of all agreements. In the spring of 1825, Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt occupied Navarino and the neighbouring fortress in spite of a heroic defence by the Greeks.

What gave Navarino its special place in history was the naval battle fought on Oct. 20, 1827 in its harbour between the combined fleets of England, France and Russia on one side and those of Turkey, Egypt and Tunisia on the other, in which the latter were almost completely destroyed. It is calculated that the Turks lost 6,000 killed and the allied losses were only about 1,000. Soon after the battle, Ibrahim Pasha concluded a truce with Admiral Codrington.

Navarino remained in Ibrahim Pasha's hands until the spring of 1828. The French under General Maison then relieved the Egyptian-Turkish troops. Alfred Reumont gives a fine picture of Navarino under French occupation in 1832.


**NAVARINO**

During the first Russo-Turkish War in the reign of Catherine II (1768—1774) Navarino played an important part. After a stubborn defence for six days by the Turkish garrison and the Muslim civilian population, the Russians on April 10, 1770 forced the surrender of Navarino, no longer strongly enough fortified but still amply provided with munitions and artillery, to capitulate. By the terms of the treaty, the Turks of Navarino went to Chania (Crete) leaving behind them a number of Christian women whom they had imprisoned in their harem. Soon afterwards the Russians made Navarino, the fortifications of which they renovated, their principal base of operations in the Morea. Fate decided that the Russians had to evacuate Navarino again. On June 1, 1770, the Russian ships sailed from the harbour of Navarino. The Turks next day occupied the well placed fortress, which was in part burned and destroyed.

**NAVAS DE TOLOSA**

was a place in the south of Spain in the province of Jaen on the frontier of Andalusia, a short distance from the modern town of Carolina. Its site corresponds to that of a fortress called Hisn al-Khrib in the Muslim period. It was in the plain which lies in front of it that there was fought on the 15th Safar 609 (July 16, 1212) the great battle between the Christians and the Almohads which ended in the rout of the latter.

As a result of the defeat of Alarcos [q. v.], the king of Castille, Alfonso VIII, had concluded a truce with the Muslims. On its expiration at the end of the xiiith century, the Christian troops began a series of surprise attacks on the Muslim frontiers. Disturbed at this, the Almohad ruler al-Náṣir [q. v.] prepared a great expeditionary force in Morocco while on his side the king of Castille secured the help of the kings of Aragon,
Navarre and Leon, as well as of the Count of Portugal and the Pope, who preached a crusade against the infidel. The Christian troops gathered in Toledo, and the counter was a bloody one. The Muslim volunteers from Morocco and the Andalusian contingents soon lost ground and the Almohad 'abd were in their turn decimated. The victors were able to exploit their success and took Ubeda [q. v.]. Baiza [q. v.] and other strongholds. The Christian victory of las Navas de Tolosa was certainly one of the most important steps in the "Reconquesta".


E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL

NAVAR, [See NURJ.] AL-NAWAWI (or AL-NAWAWI), MUHYI AL-DIN ABD ZAKARIYA\\x27 VAYAYA B. SHARAF B. MUN [following Nawawi's own spelling, Suyufi, fol. 53b] B. HASAN B. HUSAIN B. MUHAMMAD B. DUMA B. HIJIZM AL-HIZAMI AL-DIMASHKI, a Shafi'i jurist, born in Muharram 631 (Oct. 1233) in Nawa south of Damascus in Liwa lbil. The ability of the boy very early attracted attention and his father brought him in 649 to the Madrasa al-Rawahiya in Damascus. There he first of all studied medicine but very soon went over to Islamic learning. In 651 he began the pilgrimage with his father. About 655 he began to write and was called to the al-Ashrafiya school of tradition in Damascus in succession to Abu Sulayman who had just died. Although his health had suffered severely during his life as a student, he lived very frugally and even declined a salary. His reputation as a scholar and a man soon became so great that he even dared to approach Sulaiman ibn Barbares to ask him to free the people of Syria from the war-taxes imposed upon them and to protect the teachers in the madrasas from a reduction in their income. This was in vain however, and Barbares expelled al-Nawawi from Damascus when he alone refused to sign a fatwa approving the legality of these exactions. (This action of al-Nawawi's is commented in the popular romance Srar al-Zahir Badurs, Cairo 1326, xi, 38 sqq. in which the Sultan, cursed by al-Nawawi, becomes blind for a time.) He died unmarried in his father's house in Nawa on Wednesday 24th Radjab 676 (Dec. 22, 1277). His tomb is still held in honour there. It was al-Nawawi who has retained his high reputation to the present day. He had an exceptional knowledge of Tradition and adopted even stricter standards than later Islam; for example he admits only five works on Tradition as canonical, while he expressly puts the Sunan of Ibn Madja on a level with the Musnad of Ahmad b. Hanbal (cf. Sharh Muslim, i, 5; Adhkar, p. 3). In spite of his fondness for Muslim, he gives a higher place to Bukhari (Tahdak, p. 550). He wrote the principal commentary on Muslim's Sahih (pr. in 5 volumes, Cairo 1283); as an introduction to this, he wrote a history of the transmission of this work and a sketch of the science of Tradition. He gives not only observations on the isnads and a grammatical explanation of the traditions but also comments on them, mainly from the theological and legal aspect, quoting when necessary not only the founders of the principal schools but also the older jurists like al-Awza'i, al-Ash'ar, etc. He also inserted headings (ta'jam) in Muslim's work. We may also mention his frequently annotated Kibbd al-Arduw (pr. Bulbah 1294 and often since) and portions of commentaries on al-Bukhari (G. A. L., i, 158) and Abu Daud (Ibn al-'Attar, fol. 10r); and an extract from Ibn al-Salah, 'Ulam al-Hadith with the title al-Ta'rib wa l-Tazirr, partly transl. by Maqriz in J. A., ser. 9, xvi.—xviii. and printed at Cairo 1307, with a commentary by al-Suyfi, Tadrib al-Rawi.

Al-Nawawi's importance as a jurist is perhaps even greater. In Shafi'i circles he was regarded with his Minhad al-Talibin (finished 669; pr. Cairo 1297 and greater; ed. van den Berg with French transl., Basel 1882—1884; cf. thence Snouck Hurgronje, Verehr. Geschr., vi, 3—18) as the highest authority along with al-Ra'mi and since the tenth (xvith) century the two commentaries on this work by Ibn Hadjd's Ta'hib and al-Ramt's Nibhai, have been regarded almost as the law books of the Shafi'i school. The book consists of excerpts from the Muharrar of Rafi' and, as the author himself says, is intended to be a kind of commentary on it. It certainly owes the estimation in which it is held also to the fact that it goes back via al-Ra'mi and al-Qazwini to the Imam al-Haramain. We should also mention the Kawaqif fi Mukhtarar Sharh al-Khub (on Ghazali's Wa'd) finished in 669 on which commentaries have often been written and the commentaries on Shafii's al-Muhaffidhab and al-Tanbih (G. A. L., i, 357) and al-Qazwini's al-Wasti, which do not seem to have survived, and a collection of fatawa's put together by his pupil Ibn al-'Attar (Cairo 1352).

His biographical and grammatical studies resulted in the Tahdak al-Aswad (on the names, Wustenfeld, Gottingen 1842—1847; Part 2 only in Ms. in Leyden; included by Ibn al-'Attar among the unfinished works and there are certainly gaps in it) and al-Tahib fi Adhrk an-Tanbih. To his mystical tendencies — he had attended lectures on the Kishla of al-Kusairi and transmitted it — we owe works like the Kishla al-Adhkhar on the prayers, finished in 667 (pr. Cairo 1331 and frequently), the Kishla al-Salihin (finished in 670; pr. Mecca 1302, 1312) and the incomplete Bidan fi Al-Atifin fi al-'Azub wa l-'Aqib al-Aswad (on the collection of I. Am. of C. T. A.). An almost complete list of his some 50 works is given in Wustenfeld, p. 45 sqq., those that are still in MSS. are given in Brockelmann, G. A. L., i, 394 sqq. and Index and those that are printed in Sarkis, Madqam, vol. 1876—

1579).

Bibliography: Ibn al-Atar (d. 724 = 1324), Tahdak al-Talibin fi Tarjummat Kishla. al-Imam al-Nawawi [with many notes], MS. Tubingen, No. 18; al-Schaww (d. 902 = 1496—1497), Tarjummat Kishla al-Schawu. . . . al-Nawaw, MS. Berlin, Wetzstein, 1742, fol. 140—207 (Ahlwardt, No. 1012b); al-Suyufi, Minhad fi Tarjummat al-Nawawi, MS. Berlin Wetzstein II, 1807, vol. 58—68 (Ahlwardt, No. 1012b); al-Sukki, Tahdak al-Adhkhar al-Tabrak, Cairo 1324, vi, 165—168; al-Dabhal, Tahdakar al-Atif al-Hasan, Haidarabadd. n., 259—264; al-Vad, Mir'at al-Juran, Haidarabadd 1339, iv, 182—186; the other sources are printed in Wusten-
feld. Über das Leben und die Schriften des Schiit Abū Zakariyyā jāhīn al-Nawawī, Göttingen 1849; Snouck Hurgronje, Versfr. Geschichten, ii. 387 sq. For the reference to the popular romance I am indebted to HEPFENING, Plath.

AL-NAWAWĪ MUHAMMAD B. 'OMAR K. 'ARABĪ AL-DJĀWĪ, an Arabic writer of Malay origin, born in Tanārā (Banten), the son of a village judge (panggu) after concluding his studies made the pilgrimage to Mecca and settled there permanently about 1855, after making a short visit to his native land. After he had studied and completed his education with the teachers of the holy city, he set up as a teacher himself and gained great influence over his fellow countrymen and their kinsmen. From 1870 he devoted half his time to authorship. He was still alive in 1888.

He wrote a large number of commentaries on popular textbooks, which are listed by Broekelmann, G. A. L., ii. 501 in addition to Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 362 sqq. Of these the following may be mentioned, with some information added to what is contained in these two works.

He expounded the Kur ʿān in his al-Tāfīs al-mināt al-Mālām al-Tanzil al-musir ʿan Wa’dhī Maḥālīn al-Ta’wil, Cairo 1305. In the field of Fiḥḥ he expounded the Fath al-Kāfī of Muhammad b. al-Ḳāsim al-Ghazzī (d. 918 = 1512), a commentary on Abū ʿShādā) al-Ḳahfī’s al-Taḥkīr, entitled al-Ta’wil, Cairo 1305, 1310, and again entitled Kitāb al-Habīb, Cairo 1301, 1305, 1310. He wrote a commentary on al-Ghazzī’s Bulḥāyat al-Hidāya under the title Maṭīrī “Uṣūlīna, Bulāk 1293, 1309; Cairo 1298, 1304, 1307, 1308, 1310, 1327. — On the Manāḥīṣ al-Maṣābīḥ of Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Ṣāhirī al-Mañīb (d. 977 = 1569) he wrote al-Fath al-māqūlī, Bulāk 1276, 1292; Cairo 1297, 1298, 1306; Mecca 1316. — On the Sufiṣāt al-Sāliqī of Abū ʿAlī b. Yahyā al-Ḥadrī, he wrote the Sulfām al-Munāḏidāt, Bulāk 1277, Cairo 1315, 1328. — He wrote a commentary on the Ṣaḥīḥ of Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Zahīdī (d. 819 = 1416) put into verse by his fellow countryman Muṣṭafā b. ʿOthmān al-Djāwī al-Ḳatīrī as al-Fath al-maṣūmī on ṣalāt, alms, fast and pilgrimage under the title al-Ṭāʾif al-ṣāliḥ, Cairo 1300; the Sulfām al-Naṣīḥa of Sālim b. Ṣamīr al-Ṣāhirī in Ḥaḍramawt, ended in Batavā, was expounded under the title Kūḥīṣāt al-Sāliqī, Cairo 1292, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1305; Bulāk 1299. — On the exposition of the ṣaḥīḥ al-bukhārī by his colleague Muhammad b. Sulaimān Ḥusain Allāh entitled al-Ḳiyād al-buḥra he wrote the commentary al-Ṭāṣma al-yāmīna, Cairo 1299, 1308, 1329; Bulāk 1302.

In the field of dogmatists he annotated al-Sanjūqī’s Ṣumma al-Burāqīn (d. 892 = 1490) entitled Dhor‘āt al-yakīn, Cairo 1304; the Shāfiʿī’s Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muṣālibīn of Ahmad al-Maḥrūqī (d. 1281 = 1864) entitled Nāʾr al-ṣāliḥ, al-Maḥrūqī, Cairo 1303, 1329; al-Bahārī’s Rīṣāla fi līm al-Tawāhid entitled Tāḥram al-Durārī, Cairo 1301, 1309, Mecca 1329; the Muṣālibīn of Abu ʿIyāl entitled Kāf al-Ṣaḥīḥī, Cairo 1301, 1303, Mecca 1311; the anonymous Fath al-Rāfīqī entitled Hidāyat al-Ṣāḥīḥī in a Maḏmūna, Mecca 1304; the al-Dur al-ṣāliḥ of his teachers Ahmad al-Nahrāwī entitled Fath al-māqūlī, Cairo 1298.

In the field of mysticism he wrote a commentary on the Mawṣūma al-Hidāyat al-Asbāḥīyya of Zain al-Din al-Malābīrī (d. 928 = 1522) entitled Sūlam al-Fudālī, Cairo 1301, Mecca 1315; and on his Maṣbāḥ fi ʿĀdāb al-mānī he wrote the Kānī al-Ṭāḥīlīyān, Cairo 1320. On the Manṣūrī al-tamāmī entitled Taḥrif al-Humān of ʿAlī b. Ḥusain al-Dīn al-Humānī (d. 975 = 1567) he wrote al-Miṣbāḥ al-Zawīn, Mecca 1314. — His commentaries on stories of the life of the Prophet may be classed as edifying popular literature; such he wrote on the Mawṣūma al-Nābi under the title al-ʿArārī, Cairo 1926, which is ascribed to some Ibn al-Djāwī, by others to Ahmad b. al-Ḵāsim al-Jāhārī, entitled Fath al-Ṣālim al-Muṣālibīn ʿalā Muṣālibī al-Ṣaḥīḥī Muhammad b. Kāsim wa-yawṣummat al-Falāṣīf al-Fawāsī al-Bayān Afṣal Muṣālibī, Ibn al-Djāwī, Bulāk 1292, entitled Buḥrat al-ʿĀlamīna fi Sharī`at Muṣālibī Sālīhī al-ʿĀlamīna Bi-lBaʿlīn al-Djāwī, Cairo 1927 and Fath al-Ṣālim al-Muṣālibīn ʿalā Muṣālibī al-Ṣaḥīḥī Muhammad b. Kāsim, Mecca 1306, as well as on the Mawṣūma of Dīn al-Barzāndī (d. 1179 = 1765) entitled Tāḥīlīs al-Mushtākin, Bulāk 1292, and again under the title al-Maṣbāḥ fi ʿĀdāb al-mānī, published 1906, and on his al-Ḳarāṣīāt al-nabawīya entitled al-Durār al-baḥtīyā, Bulāk 1299. He made an excerpt from al-Ṭāṣma līna’s (d. 923 = 1517) Muṣālibī entitled al-Ṭāṣma al-Malābīrī al-Mawṣūma Muḥammad al-Sāliqī al-Adīnī, Cairo 1299.


Bibliography: In the article; cf. also J. L. Sarks, Muṣālibī al-Maḏmūn, col. 1579—1883, (C. BROEKELMANN)

NAWBA, an art-form in the music of the Islamic East similar to the European cantata or suite. There are two varieties: 1. the nawba of chamber music, and 2. the nawba of military music (for the latter see TAIL KAÂNA in the Supplement). The nawba of chamber music varies in construction according to its provenance, and does not always carry this particular name. As early as the viith century A.D. we appear to see this nawba in its nascent stage. The musicians at the court of the Caliphe under the early Abbasids performed in turn (daw'r) and succession (nawba), and by the time of al-Wathīq (d. 847) we know that a court musician had a particular day for his nawba (Kūthb al-造船, ill. 177; v. 82, 120, vi. 73; x. 123; xvii. 131; xxi. 150). Some musicians were famous because they specialized in certain genres of music, such as Ibrahim al-Mawsili in the mawāṣṣi' and Hakam al-Wādīt in the ṭazāf rhythms (造船, vi. 12, 66), and a programme made up of these diverse types of music probably led to the term nawba being transferred to the programme itself (Rihiera, Las Cantatas, p. 48).

Although we read in the Alī Lāila wa-Lāila of a nawba (ii. 54), a ṭazāf (a quick movement; cf. the modern dardf) of a nawba (ii. 87), as well as a complete nawba (iv. 173) being played, yet it is not until the xith century A.D. that we
possess precise information about the nawba and its integral parts. *Abd al- basir b. Ghaibi [*q.v.] tells us that among the ancient forms of musical composition were the nawba, *nashid* and *bashi*. The *nashid*, he says, was made up of four movements (*qādī* viz. the *kanī* or *kān*, the *qāzāl*, the *tārāna*, and the *fāṭī.* In the year 1579, whilst at the court of Djalal al-Dīn al-Husain the Djalālīrīd sultan of al-īrāq, Ibn Ghaibi introduced a fifth movement to the *nawba*, which he called the *mustaṣāl.* During this occasion, he tells us, he composed fifty *nawbāt* for the court, and the words of one of these have been preserved (fol. 90v). These five movements were instrumental as well as vocal, and besides the verse-form being specified (the *tārāna* for instance was in *rūdā*), the rhythms (*kānī* or *kān*) for the instrumental accompaniments were also prescribed, one of the *thākil* group being essential. The purely instrumental movements are also mentioned by Ibn Ghaibi including the overture called the *tīhrāw*, which even to-day is the prelude to the *nawba*. He calls it *nashīr* (**"embroideries"**), and says that the *tīhrāw* al-*falistānī* has three, five or seven sections (*sawāb*).

In days of old the *nawba* was considered the most important art-form in the music of Islamic peoples. To-day it has fallen into neglect and in some countries will probably soon disappear. Two distinct cultures may be found in the modern *nawba*, the Eastern and Western. The former is clearly a survival of that *nawba* described by Ibn Ghaibi in the xivth century A. D. The latter is claimed (Yaffi) to have had its origin in al-Andalus in the viih—ixth century, and is known to-day as the *nawba gharānī*. It is confined to North Africa, the purest type being found in the West, whilst the nearer the East is approached the more we find the influence of the Eastern *nawba*.

The *Levant*ine *nawba* to-day comprises the following movements: 1. The *tārīm*, an instrumental prelude played by the *māqallim* or *chef d'orchestre*; 2. The *bīhrāw* or *bāṣraf*, an instrumental overture; 3. The *kār*, a vocal movement; 4. The *mūrabāt*, whose name recalls the form of the xivth century *tārāna*; 5. The *nāṣīr*, also reminiscent of the *nāṣīr* of old, since its function is tonal "embroidery"; 6. The *aghrūr* *sawāt*, in slow rhythm; 7. The *ṣarīf*, comprising verses; 8. The *yārīk* *sawāt*; 9. The *bīhrāw* *sawāt*, an instrumental finale (cf. Thibaut and Lavigne, v. 2861). A shorter *nawba* is described by Ducoudray (p. 22), whilst the famous British musician Sir Arthur Sullivan has related (Fortnightly Review, 1905, p. 86) his experiences as an auditor of the *nawba*.

The various movements, especially the instrumental ones, are also cultivated in the Near East as sole items of performance, the *bīhrāw*, *tārīm*, and *ṣarīf* being special favourites. The *bīhrāw* or *bāṣraf* is still composed in sections as of old, but these are called *kīhān* instead of *buṣīdī*. Another interesting type of *nawba* in Egypt includes the dance, and an example is given in complete score by Victor Loret. It comprises seven movements: 1. The *bāṣraf*, for instruments and voices; 2. The *tūrkmānī* al-*awālāwī*, for the ballet; 3. The *salūm*, for the solo dance; 4. The *tūrkmānī al-*thānī*, for the ballet; 5. The *tākīm*, for the solo dance; 6. The *tūrkmānī al-*kāhīthī*, for the ballet; 7. The *māqīḥ* for the solo dance. The whole is accompanied by choir and instruments.

In *Western Turkey* the *nawba* of to-day shows that in the Middle East it has developed somewhat differently from that of the Levant. Here, more attention has been paid to the purely instrumental movements, and they have been kept separate. The *nawba* is here called a *maḥāmī*, a name which properly stands for "a melodic mode". It is divided into three parts, the first two being instrumental, with the old *hūgāt* or instrumental pieces, and the *naṣir* comprising vocal-instrumental pieces. The names of most of the sections of the *maḥūdīl* and *naṣir* refer to either rhythmic (*ṣūdī*) or melodic modes (*maḥāmī*), although two of them, the *tīhrāw* and the *tārāna*, retain names which occur in the xivth century Ibn Ghaibi treatise. In Būk̇hārā, only six *maḥūdī* (= *nawbāt*) appear to have survived, although the Uzbek claim that they know others. These six have recently been described by the Uzbek poet Fitrat, whilst the notation has been published by a Soviet Union official, Colonel V. A. Uspensky. There is also another but shorter type of *maḥāmī* known in Būk̇hārā, and six of these also have survived. In K̇h̄wārizm, the *maḥūdīl* of the *maḥūdī* (= *nawbāt*) differ from those of Būk̇hārā, and here an additional one has been spared the ravages of time. The K̇h̄wārizmī *maḥūdīl* are probably purer than those of Būk̇hārā because they appear to have been handed down, not *viva voce* as elsewhere, but by means of a notation which was known as early as the time of the K̇h̄wārizmī Shāh al-Andalus Muhammad (d. 1220) (cf. Pro-Musica, New York 1927, v.; _The Sad- but_, London 1924, iv.).

In *North Africa*, as already stated, a different tradition in the *nawba* has been followed. Here there are several varieties, but the most highly esteemed is the *nawba gharānī*. As the name signifies, al-Andalus is the place of origin, and this is claimed for both the words and music. Although MSS. exist which contain the words of the Granadan *nawbāt*, yet we only know the music itself from modern Moorish practice. We have of the "twenty-four *nawbāt*", which tells us that the *nawbāt* were composed in the twenty-four modes (*jūbī*). Others say that the Andalusians only possessed twelve or fourteen *nawbāt* (F. Salvador- Daniel, p. 52; Yaffi, Pref.) but it has now been shown (Farmer, An Old Moorish Lute Tutor) that there were twenty-four originally, but their names are different from those which some writers have presumed (Delphin et Guin, p. 62; Lavigne, v. 2859). The *nawba gharānī* as performed in Algeria to-day comprises the following movements: 1. The *dāirā*, a short vocal prelude. 2. The *mustahbīr*, an instrumental prelude; 3. The *tūshīya* or *tawwila* ("ornamenting"), the overture proper; 4. The *mādah* or *muṣaddar*, a vocal movement, preceded by a short instrumental prelude called a *kursī*; 5. The *bāsilī* or *bāsīlī*, a vocal movement preceded by a *kursī*; 6. The *dārīf*, also a vocal movement preceded by a *kursī*, and whose name is practically identical with that of the above; 7. The *insīrāf*, a vocal movement which is introduced by a *tūshīya*; 8. The *kāhīthī* or *mūsēlāt*, the finale (British Museum MS., Or. 7907; Yaffi, Majdūmi, cf. Lavigne, v. 2941; Delphin and Guin, p. 65). The words of the classical Granadan *nawbāt* have been edited from MSS. sources and *vià voce* by Edmond Yaffi in his Majdūmi al- Aghānī, whilst with the collaboration of Jules Rouanet he issued his Répertoire de musique arabe
et mauro which contains the music of a complete nawba gharao and sundry movements from others.

In 1865, Christianowitsch published his Esquisse historique de la Musique arabe, which also contained the major portions of seven Granada nawbas. Another type of nawba practised in Algeria, but not a secondary improvised movement, is the tâhiyâ. In Morocco the five movements of the nawba are the basîj, the kârim muawwiz, the bajâli, the jâdî, and the daraf, as well as the overture tâhiyâ.


**NAWBÂHTI.** This Iranian patronymic (moe of nay = hâbat "new fortune") was borne in Baghdad during the first two Abbâsid centuries by a family remarkable for its influence on the advancement of learning and on the political legitimacy of the Abbasid caliphate. It claimed descent (cf. Bûthuri, *Divân*, p. 115) from the Persian hero Gîw son of Gûdarz celebrated in the *Shâhâname* (cf. Jastî, Iranîshâns Nûrân, p. 59 and Christensen, *Kōyânîdâr*, p. 117). Its first known representative Nawbakht, an astrologer, owed his fortune to the future caliph al-Mansûr, to whom in prison he is said to have foretold the throne and later the victory over the caliph riding on a white horse in the same year (144 = 762) in which, having drawn up the horoscope of Baghdad, the new capital, he was granted feasts in it. His son Abû Sahl Timâdî (on this curious prenome cf. Ibn Abî ʿUṣâbil, ed. Aug. Müller, Leipzig 1884, iii., xli) [Vorwort] and H. Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. 9) (d. 1707) had seven sons by his wife Zerrin, the founders of the various branches of the Al Nawbakht in which we find theologians like Ibrâhîm b. ʿIsâk b. Abî Sahl (wrote about 961 the *Kitâb al-Yâfi*, on which a commentary by ʿAllâm al-Ḥarîrî is known).—Abû Sahl Ismâʿîl [cf. *NAWBÂHTI*], Husain b. Ruh, third wali of the Imâmîs (cf. Ibn Ruh), and Hasan b. Mūsâ (cf. *NAWBÂHTI*); astronomers like Faḍîl b. Abû Sahl (Ibn al-Nâdim, *Fihrist*, p. 275); who has been confused with al-ʿAlâmîn's (minister) and Mūsâ b. Hasan Ibn Khiyriq; secretaries of state; and finally enlightened students of poetry to whom the editors of the diwâns of Abû Nuwâs, Ibn al-Rûmî and Bûthuri went to establish the texts.


(Louis Massignon)

**NAWBÂHTI, nisha of the Nawa bâkt family.**

1. Faṣîl b. (Abî Sahl) b. NAWBAHTI (d. 200 = 815) an astronomer like his father (with whom he is confused) and, like his brother Hasan, attached to the Dâr al-Ḥikma to translate from Persian, wrote at least seven books (Ibn al-Nâdim, *Fihrist*, p. 274). All that survives of them is a fragment of the *Kitâb al-Nuwasîn* or "Yahushâfîn") in questions relating to horoscopes (*Fihrist*, p. 238-239).

2. Ismâʿîl b. ʿAlI ... b. NAWBAHTI (235-311 = 849-925), the real political leader of the Imamî party, who kept in close touch with the famous vizier ʿAlî b. al-Furûst (whose father, Muhammad Mūsâ b. Hasan, we may note, may have been a follower of the Nusairî heresy; cf. Nawbakht, *Fihrist*, p. 78), and was also a theologian (cf. Massignon, *Passion d'al-Hallaj*, p. 142-159) who disputed with the learned Thâbit b. Qurra, the Muʿtazilî Djabrîlî, and the mystic Hallâdî; he also refuted, after their deaths, Abu ʿl-ʿAtâhiya, Abu Isâ al-Wârâkî and Ibn al-Rawandi. Of his 32 works (Ibn al-Nâdim, p. 176; Türk, p. 57) only a fragment of the *Tunibî* survives (in Ibn Babawî, *Qâliba*, p. 53-56) (cf. Ibn al-Nâdim, p. 176) which gives us the first outline of the *Shî'î qâliba*.

3. Hasan b. Mehî ... NAWBAHTI d. before 310 (922), classed in this family through his mother, sister of the preceding: an Imâmî theologian, student of Hellenistic philosophy, author of 44 works (Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. 17-20; Eghbal, p. 129-134) of which there survives, besides fragments of the *Kadd ʿala l-qulub* (in Khâbî, vi. 380) and of the *Aṣ wa-a-Dîwânh* (Mârîjî, ii. 156; Ibn al-Ljâwzi, *Tallât*, p. 42-43; 47, 49, 69, 74, 81-82, 88, 91), only one complete text, of very great value for our knowledge of the sects of the Shî'î, the *Kitâb Fârak al-Shî'â*, ed. H. Ritter (Istanbul 1931, vol. iv. of the *Fihrist*).

In an interesting chapter (*op. cit.*, p. 143-161), A. Eghbal has collected the passages of the *Fihrist* and in a contemporary, Sa'd b. ʿAbd Allah ʿAsâbî (d. 999 = 914), which shows either plagiarism or the use by both of an earlier source.

(Louis Massignon)
NAWĪ, MUHAMMAD RIDĪ of Khābāshān in the vicinity of Mashhad, a Persian poet. The son of a merchant, in his youth he spent some time in Kāshān where he studied under the Mawlid Muhājīm. Moving to Marv, he became intimate with the Hákim Nūr Muhājīm Khān there. Like the majority of Persian poets of the xvth century, however, he was attracted by the brilliant court of the Moghuls and went to India where at first he found a patron in the person of Mirzā Yūsuf Khān Mashhādi but soon afterwards entered the service of Khākāshāh Mīrza ‘Abd al-Rahīm and remained with him and with prince Dānīyāl till his death, which took place in Burhānpūr in 1019 (1610). Nawī’s best work is his poem Shāh-nūdūtān (“Burning and Melting”) which has a touching theme, the devotion of a Hindu princess who accompanies her late husband in death on the funeral pyre. It is written in excessively artificial language and distinguished by the originality of its subject, which had not been taken by any Persian poet before Nawī. Nawī’s works were very highly esteemed in India, and he is said to have received 10,000 rupees, an elephant and a horse with valuable trappings for a Sāfār-nāma dedicated to the Khākāshāh. His Divān, which is entitled Lubḥ al-ล-حربih, has come down to us but has so far attracted little attention.


NAWĀRūZ (f.), New (Year’s) Day, frequently represented in Arabic works in the form Nawrūz (Kalkashandī, *Sītb al-‘Aṭbah*, ii. 408). It was the first day of the Persian solar year and is not represented in the Muslim lunar year (Masʿūdī, *Murūjī*, iv. 416 sq.). In Achaemenid times the official year began with Nawrūz, when the sun entered the Zodiacal Sign of Aries (the vernal equinox) Popular and more ancient usage however would appear to have regarded the midsummer solstice as Nawrūz (Bīrūnī, *Chronology*, transl. Sachau, p. 185, 201). It was the time of harvest and was celebrated by popular rejoicings, but it also marked the date when the āharīj was collected. The two different dates were retained in Persia proper and also in Īrān and Dījālī under Islam, and ʿAmmāz al-īṣāfānī states (*Zad al-Riḥāq*, Berlin 1340, p. 104) that Nawrūz in the first year of the Hijrī fell on the 18th Ḥāzīrān (June), which he erroneously equates with the 1st Dhu ‘l-Kaʿaṣa. Confusion arose however because the intercalation of one day every four years which allowed the date to correspond with the position of the sun was omitted in Islam (Masʿūdī, *Kītāb al-Taniḥ*, p. 215) and unscrupulous revenue officials found it to their advantage to keep to the false calendar date rather than to the correct traditional one because it permitted them to collect their dues earlier (Maṭrī, *Kītāb*, ed. Wiet, iv. 263 sq.). By the time of the Caliph Mutawakkil the date of collection of āharīj had advanced by almost two months and in 245 A.H. he fixed the date of Nawrūz as the 17th Ḥāzīrān, which approximated to the old time (Tabari, iii. 1448; Bīrūnī, *Chronology*, p. 36 sq.). The reform had no lasting effect and the Caliph Muṭṭadīd was compelled again to move the date which was fixed as the 11th Ḥāzīrān (Tabari, iii. 2142). Later again, in Sultan Malikshāh’s reform of the calendar, the Persian astronomers proclaimed the vernal equinox as Nawrūz (Ibn al-Thirī, x. 34; 457 A.H.) and the first day of the new era fell on the 10th Ṭamāzūd 471 (March 15, 1079).

Nawrūz was adopted in Egypt as elsewhere and has been retained by the Copts as the New Year’s Day (Maṭrī, *Kītāb*, iv. 241 sq.), but it now falls on September 10 or 11.

Popular festivities have marked Nawrūz wherever it has been celebrated. In Sāsānian Persia the kings held a grand feast and it was customary for presents to be made to them while the people who gathered to make merry in the streets sprinkled each other with water and lit fires. Both in Īrān and Egypt these customs persisted in Muslim times (Tabari, ii. 2163; Maṭrī, *Murūjī*, vii. 277; Maṭrī, ed. cit.; Kalīgāshādī, ii. 410) and although Muṭṭadīd attempted to prevent the customary horseplay in the streets during the midsummer satirnalis he was unsuccessful (Tabari, loc. cit.). In the various parts of the Turkish Empire the day was celebrated as a public holiday and in Persia it has throughout its history been marked by great festivities as the chief secular holiday of the year.


NAZĀR (A.) probably did not receive until the ninth century A.D. the meaning of research in the sense of scientific investigation as a translation of the Greek ἀναστήμα. With Aristotle (e.g. *Metaph.*, 1064 b 2) the philosophies were then divided into theoretical (nazārīya) and practical (ʾʿalāʾīya); the latter seek to obtain the useful or the good for man, the former pure truth, in physics, mathematics and metaphysics.

Nazar is primarily an epistemological conception and after the example of Ammonios Hermiae, a pupil of Proclus, is dealt with among the Arabs in a work prefixed to the *Isagoge* of Porphyry (Προαγωγὴ τῆς Συνολουσίας) (cf. the article ΜΑΝΤΙΚΗ). Nazar is also discussed as an activity of the human ʿakī in psychology but in this case as a rule under synonyms like ḥikr, ṭafakkur etc. (cf. NAFS).

The history of this terminology has still to be written. In the oldest, still incomplete, logic (edited by Abū Lūlā b. al-Muḥaffad or his son Muḥammad) ʿilm and ʿʿalāʾ are already distinguished as branches of philosophy (ḥikmā), but ʿʿalāʾ is defined as a ṯaḥqūq and ṭafakkur of the ʿkhāl (i.e. of the mind) (cf. G. Furlani, *Di una presunta versione araba di alcuni scritti di Porfirio e Aristotele*, in *R. R. A. L.*, ser. vi., vol. vi. [1926], p. 297).

The old speculative theologians of ʿIslam were
perhaps more familiar with the distinction *'ilm al-qiyas* than with *naẓar* or *'amāli*. The *'aql* is generally considered as a "root" of the Mu'tazilī system. The Zaidī al-Kāshī mentioned it (beginning of the third century A.D.) among his *'iqlīs: *'aql*, *kūrān* and *ṣumma* (K. Struthmann, *Die Literatur der Zaiditen*, in *itd.*, ii. [1911], p. 54). *Naẓar* was felt to be an intuition like *ra'y* and *kiyās* in *'aql*. The Hanbalī school objected to the adoption of *naẓar* but its greatest re-creative Ibn Hazm admitted *'aql* without hesitation — of course the *'aql* created and equipped by God — as a source of knowledge. Not blind belief (*taklīf*) nor deduction from the unknown (*kiyās*) were to lead to it the acceptance of the *kūrān, ṣumma* and *ṣumma*, but quite certain knowledge. There is nothing which Ibn Hazm insists upon so often and so emphasis here as this: there is no other way to certainty than that of tracing to sensory perception (*biyż*) and intuition of the intelligence (*'aql*). Indeed sensory perception is so much preferred by him that comprehension by the reason is called a *sīnīk* (*Kīhā al-Fā'īl*, i. 4—7). The philosophical point of Ibn Hazm, which requires closer investigation, recalls Hellenistic edicting according to which all human cognition arises either from sensory perception or intuition or is derived from these sources through the intermediary of proof. Many however emphasize the direct evidence of sensory perception and reason, and regard the method of proof as a difficult and uncertain one. Hence we have from the Stoics onwards the emphasis laid on general agreement (Ar. *iṣna'd* and *iṣlātim*), as a criterion of truth. Only where there is no agreement is investigation necessary.

The dualistic epistemology of the eclectics (senses X reason) was very greatly modified in Islam by the penetration of the intellectual monism in the Neo-Platonic mysticism and Aristotelian logic. While different stages in human knowledge were distinguished, true knowledge was only to be attained by rational intuition and the intermediary activity of the mind. The main thing for the Neo-Platonist was intuition ( *naẓar, baṣar*). It is remarkable how in the Neo-Platonic *Theology of Aristotle* the latter is made to say (Arabic, ed. Dietetici, p. 163):

"Plato recognised all things by *naẓar al-'aql* (intuition), *lā bi-maṣḥūk wa-kīyās*, i.e. Plato as the divine perceives everything at once like God himself and pure *'aql*: *Naẓar* in this sense of direct perception is constructed with *lā*, in other cases however with *fī*. For *naẓar fī* transmitted reflection of the human intelligence, the theology generally uses *fīr* and *ra'y* and the world of the senses, with which our soul is associated, is called *'aql al-fīrā wa l-ra'ayīya*. Following the *Theology*, the Muslim mystics generally used *naẓar* for spiritual perception (cf. L. Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, Paris 1922, index).

In *kālim* however, in the disputes of the theological sects, *naẓar* receives the dialectic meaning. Logical proof seems to have first been admitted into the *'ilm al-dīn* by the *Shāfī*. In his *Fatāwa* (ed. Ritter, ii. 51 sq.) al-Aṣārī gives a survey of the different views of the eight parties of the Rawḏāf, *fī l-naẓar wa l-kiyās*. According to him, groups 1—3 consider all cognitions (*maṣārif*) as necessary (*'ilār*) (i.e. given with the mind itself or not given) so that *naẓar* and *kiyās* can add nothing to them; these as well as group 8, which traces all knowledge to the Prophet of God and the Imāms, differ is the rest on this point. The other four recognize some kind of acquired knowledge (in both cases the reference is to the apprehension of God) as follows: 4 (the *Ashāb l-Hishām b. al-Hakam*) by *naẓar wa l-biṣālīl*; 5 (al-Hasan b. Maṣā) possibly by a kind of *kālim* which cannot be more exactly defined (cf. this *kālim* with the *kašf al-ṣīl* of the later Aṣ̄ārī school); 6 and 7 (ambiguous) by *naẓar wa l-kiyās*, with appeal to the testimony (*ḥadīṯ*) of the *'aql*. We are also told (p. 144) of a section of the Mūdārijīs that a belief (*imān*) without *naẓar* is in their opinion not a perfect belief.

Ashārī himself is probably the best evidence of the fact that the speculation of the human *'aql* was not regarded as a source (or method) of knowledge for the first time in his school but before him by several sects. *Naẓar* (like *ra'y* in *'aql*) was most probably applied to the activity of the mind of the reflecting theologian (besides *naẓar* we find synonyms like *biṣālīl, kālim, ra'y, fāhū, škrū, ṣinkūsh, ta'amūl, tālīb*; perhaps also others). The logical methods here are still affiliated with the Aristotelian (deduction by analogy) and *iṣlātim* (*proof by circumstantial evidence*). From what we know of *kiyās* in *'aql* (cf. the article *iṣlātim* al-Šīrī by J. Schacht, and Snouck Hurgronje, *Vereerl., Gesch.*, ii. 130 sq.), and of *kiyās* in medicine (see Mas'ūdī, *Paris 1861—1877*, iv. 40; vii. 172 sq.), we have probably to think of a process which is a mixture of induction and deduction, often used very arbitrarily. Analogous cases, often superficially regarded as similar (cf. *Mafṣūḥ al-ʿUmm̄* ed. v. Vloten, p. 8 sq.), were sought for, the *ila*, i.e. not the actual cause (*kaus*) but the reason (*ra'ā*) in a higher conception of method or species, under which the further cases could be grouped. For Aristotle and his followers in Islam (Farābī etc.) deduction had one meaning; they believed in causality or even in the creative activity of abstract thought. The great majority of Muslim theologians, jurists and physicians did not rise so far. It was not till the school of Ashārī that the method of *naẓar* superficially grasped penetrated into *kālim* and *kālim* was defined as *'ilm al-naẓar wa l-biṣālīl*. Rejected at first by the majority, gradually tolerated and used as an instrument against heretics and sophists, *naẓar* in the orthodox school was finally recognised as a religious obligation.

Let us now turn back to the general conception of the *'ilm naẓariyya*. Al-Farābī (d. 950) distributed them from the philosophical point of view in a special treatise (*Taḥṣīl al-ʿUmm̄*, Cairo n.d.) in a way which became the model for later times. It was he who first worked on the logic of Aristotle wherefore his school was often called that of the *Mantiqīyȳan*. He assumed with Aristotle that the *'aql* contained in itself the fundamental principles of all knowledge, the evidence of which had simply to be acknowledged. But the way of reflection and proof leads to the non-evident, the culmination of which, apodeictic proof (*burhān*), is described in the "Second Analytic." From this eminence the branches of knowledge can be surveyed. After some observations on philology (cf. the Stoics) first and most fully logic — whether as instrument of philosophy or a part of it is a matter of indifference. Logic itself is of course a *naẓar* with an object
of its own. Next come the science of physics, mathematics and metaphysics with main and subsidiary branches. Each is a nazār. But it is noted that for example among the physical sciences medicine is a mixture of theoretical and practical and similarly music and mathematical subjects. Metaphysics is however like logic purely theoretical. Finally the three practical sciences of Aristotle, ethics, economics and politics, are united under the head of political science, with the addition of ḥikma and kalām; al-Fārābī remarks that the science of kalām and the art (sināʿa) of kalām have to do partly with opinions (ʿarāʾ), partly with actions (ʿafāʾil).

In conclusion let us compare with this philosophical division that of the Aṣḥāʾī theologian Abūl-Kāhir b. Tāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 1037—1038) in his Lālī al-Dīn, Constantinople 1928, p. 8–14. After the distinction between divine knowledge and the knowledge possessed by other living creatures is laid down, the latter is classified as follows:

I. ḍarāʾī (necessary, directly evident)
   1. ṭabīḥa 2. ḥissi

II. muḥkamāt (= ʿulūm nasārīya) (acquired)
   1. ʿaḥāfa ʿamrīya

(knowledge acquired by reason and by law)

The ʿulūm nasārīya are further divided into four according to the way in which they are acquired:

1. Ṣiddātāt bi ʿašrāt min ʿiḥāfat al-ʿayn wa ʿi-nazār (speculative theology);
2. Muʿāmāt min ʿiḥāfat al-qāṣarīn wa ʿi-nāʾār (e.g. medicine);
3. Muʿāmāt min ʿiḥāfat al-ṭāhir (legal science);

Compared with the ʿašrāt monism of Fārābī this division still looks rather eclectic. But from the xth to the xiiith century s.n. philosophy and theology, without becoming one, were approaching one another more closely. Ibn Sīnā, who died upon Fārābī, was the intermediary. Ghazālī sought to combine the nasar ēlād of the Neo-Platonic mysticism with the ʿašrāt of the rationalist thinkers, and Fākhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī appropriated the methods of proof of Aristotelian logic to a much greater extent than his theological predecessors.


NAZARETH. [See Al-NAYIRA.]

AL-NĀZĪRĪ, title of sīra lxix., taken from the opening word.

NAZIM, properly Muṣṭafâ b. Ismāʿīl, a notable Ottoman religious poet. The son of a Janissary, the inspector Yeni Baghçeli Ordek Ismāʿīl Agha, he was born in Constantinople and succeeded his father in his office, after rising through all the grades in the Janissary office: he became baş móqaddar, baş khatif and finally in 1108 (1696) yeniceri khatif. He died in this year on the campaign against Belgrade.

Nazim wrote an extensive Divān, the poetical value of which is not very great but which contains much that is religious and mystical in its 550 ghaseds and about 50 tāʾrikhs of the end of the reign of Mehemd IV.


NAZIM, Yaḥyā, the most important Ottoman religious poet of his period, as is apparent from his epithet Nāṣīrī, the singer of hymns. Born in 1059 (1649) in Nazim Paşa, Constantinople, he entered the Serai as a boy where he received the education of the Enderûn and had the opportunity to acquire special proficiency in Arabic and Persian. He showed a talent for poetry and considerable musical ability. His beautiful voice and his work as a poet and composer gained him the favour of Sultan Murād IV. He was given important offices at the court as a result: the office of a ʾabāʿ in the khatif-i ʾhaṣṣar; he next became nūfusî bāgaš and pārma yeṃek-i bāgaš and attained considerable influence. He then retired of his own accord and became bāzaš bāgaš. Later he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. He remained in Medina as muṣtafa bi ʿl-mālik where he died at the age of 50 in 1139 (1726).

According to another statement (Brussa Mehemd Tāhir), he died in Adrianople.

He flourished under Mehemd IV and down to the reign of Ahmad III. He was a member of the Mewlewî order. Şahîkh Neshâṭ-i Mewlewî was his teacher in poetry and probably also in music. Nazim is the most religious poet of his period. He devoted the whole of his poetical talent to the naʿṣ, the hymn. His Divān therefore resembles a warrant of pardon (brāʿ-i ḡusfrār). He also gave special attention to the devotional forms of the tevbe and ṭāḥlīl and mumāṣafāt.

His Divān, printed in Constantinople in 1257 (1841), forms a thick volume of 500 pages, of which one third is devoted to the naʿṣ in the form of 60 ḍhānda, hundreds of ḡasht, kīfās, tevbe, ṭāḥlīl and mumāṣafāt, 60 ḍhānda and mumāṣafāt, ṭāḥlīl and a mehtebvi for the Prophet. The Divān is divided into five parts, each of which is in turn a kind of Divān in itself. He also wrote mehtebvis for Mehemd IV and Muṣṭafâ II, Ahmad III, Selim Girî Khan, Muṣṭafâ Paşa and the vizier Ahmad Pasha; also tāʾrikhs in imitation of Nefî and Nâbi and sharākîs in imitation of Nêdim.

Nazim is a clever technician who gives expression to his effort for variety and change, not only in the matter but in the form. In all his works however, a deep religious belief, even fanaticism is marked. His poems are a true reflection of the inclination of the period for religion and Şifism.

Bibliography: Feițin, Teķerie, Constantinople 1901.
Nâzım — Nâzîm

Nâzîm Farrukh Husain, a Persian poet. Mullâ Nâzîm, son of Shâh Rîdâ Sabzavârî, was born in Herât about 1016 (1607) and spent the greater part of his life there. Little is known of his career, except that he made a journey to India and, after spending several years in Jahâni-pur, returned to his native town where he died in 1651 (1701). He was court poet of the Begarbegs of Herât and his greatest work, the Yânufl u-Zalâikâhâ, begun in 1058 (1650) and finished in 1072 (1662—1663), was dedicated to one of these governors, Aâbâb Kâh Khan Shâhîmî. This, a poem of considerable length, is an imitation of Firdawsi’s work of the same name, and follows the original quite closely but endeavours to surpass it by using the most elegant language. Ethê calls the language of Nâzîm’s images distorted and thinks that some of the details put in by him can only have a humorous effect on the reader. But it must be agreed that Nâzîm judged the taste of his period very well for his work became extremely popular, especially in Central Asia. While Firdawsi’s poem is now known to only a few enthusiasts, manuscripts of Nâzîm’s Yânufl u-Zalâikâhâ are still quite common in the bazaars of the larger cities of Central Asia as are those of the even more celebrated version of the same subject by Dâmtî. His lyrical Dîwân is less well known, but it contains many excellent poems (especially stanzas) some of which are even at the present day sung by the classically trained singers of Bukhârâ and Samarqand.


(E. Berthels)

Nâzîr-âl-Mâzâlîm (A.), “reviver of wrongs”. His office “combined the justice of the kâdî with the power of the sovereign” and was instituted by the later Umayyad, who sat in person to receive petitions complaining of zulm. The early ‘Abbâsîds, from Mahdî to Mu’taﬁd, followed their example (Mawardi, p. 129; Bâhâkhî, Kitâb al-Mâzâlîm wa l-Mâsâ’id, ed. Schwally, p. 577; Ma’âdî, Mûâsîd, viii. 21; Ţâbârî, iii. 1736), but after them the duty was undertaken by the vizier, whose failure to carry it out was regarded as a serious fault (‘Arîb, ed. de Goer, p. 25). At Baghdad the Caliph Mu’taﬁd ordered the qâ’îb al-fâ’ârîm to nominate fâqîhs who were to hear pleas in each of the ma’llâhs. The court of the Nâzîr concerned itself with: a. zulm committed by the Caliph’s officers; b. injustice in the levying of taxes and c. wrongful acts of kârits in public offices. Other matters proper for the cognizance of the court were complaints by officials of non-payment of their salary or of excessive reduction of salary; the interests of âwâfî and the enforcement of decisions made by kâdîs not strong enough to have their judgments put into execution. The Nâzîr had much wider powers than the kâdî. He could postpone decision on a case in order to consider and investigate evidence, a proceeding not open to the kâdî, who is compelled to give judgment out of hand; he could use i’râb (intimidation) to overawe a defendant into admission and could refer litigants to persons of responsibility who could act as arbitrators. The officer presiding, if he was the vizier or other highly placed official deputizing as Nâzîr for the sovereign, set aside a special day or days for the review of mizâlîm. The Nâzîr al-Muluk (Siyyâsât-nâma, p. 10) regarded it as essential for the king to sit two days a week for the purpose, and in Egypt during the Fatimid rule, the vizier or the zâhîb al-bâb sat on two days of the week at the Golden Gate of the palace at Cairo. Complaints were there made orally if the petitioner lived at Fustût or Miṣr and each plain received was sent for necessary investigation to the zâhîb of the police or the kâdî of the quarter concerned. If the person against whom complaint was made lived outside the two cities the petition was presented in writing.

Bibliography: Mawardi, ed. Enger, p. 129 sq.; Almedro, ed. de Goer, iv. 90; Kuprulu-zade Derssî, ii. 371 sq.; Hettî, Mumânî, Cairo 1500, ii. 42, with commentary of al-Shîrînî on waîl ‘l-dârîm and il-kâmî fî ’l-mizâlîm.

(R. Levy)

Nâzîmî, Shâhî Mîmâd b. Ramaznî, Ottoman poet and Khalwetî Shâhîkh. The son of a merchant named Ramaznî b. Rustem, he was born in Constantinople in the Köşâ Mustafâ Paşa quarter in 1032 (1622—1623). He became a disciple of ‘Abd al-Ahâd al-Nâfî. In 1065 (1654—1655) he became shâhîkh (fâ’îd-nâzîm) in the Khalwetî monastery of Yawâshîde Mîmâd Aghâ near Shehr Emînî, later (1105 = 1693) also preacher (kâdî) at the Sultan Wallide mosque. He died in 1112 (1700) and was buried in a special târîkh. His son was ‘Abd al-Rahîmî Rafî. Nâzîmî was considered a high authority on ‘Hâdîthî. He wrote a number of works, none of which have been printed, namely: Hâdîyat al-khâdn (“Present of the Brethren”): biographies of the seven greatest Khalwetî personalities (Yânufl Mâhûmad; Muhâmmad Râkiye; Shâh-Kobâdî Shîrwânt; ‘Abd al-Majdî-i Shîrwânt; Shams al-Dînî Siwâst; ‘Abd al-Majdîl-i Siwâst; ‘Abd al-Ahâd al-Nâfî) and some accounts of their successors.

His poetical works consist of the rhymed Turkish translation of the first book of the Meftâh of Da’âl al-Dîn Kâmil, a Dîwân of the usual type (with many hymns and sacred songs); also the Mîyûr al-Târîkh (“Touchstone of the Order”).

Bibliography: Thu’erîîyâ, Siyyîlîl ‘ohmânî, iv. 560; Hilmî, Zîvârîsî Elyvîlîs, Istanbul 1325, p. 120—121; Sîmîl Kâmil al-Mâzâlîm, vi. 4589—4590; Brussels Mîmâd ‘Abîr, ‘Ohmânîl Mu’tâtîlîfîlîfî, i. 175; Hammer, G.O.D., iii. 596—597; Basmandjian, Essai sur l’histoire de la littérature ottomane, Constantinople 1910, p. 127.

(Menzel)

Nâzîmî, Mîmâd (according to the Siyyîlî ‘ohmânî: Nâzîmî Nişâmî), Ottoman poet of Adrianople in the period of Sulaimân al-Kânînî. He was the son of a janissary, later himself became a janissary, then shîhid and sipâhî. He died in 996 (1588) in Adrianople, where he is buried in the türbe of Shâhîd Şuhdî.
Nażmi possessed great poetic gifts and ability, which he displayed particularly in the clever and accurate imitation of other poets, in so-called nażares (pl. nażār). He also himself wrote ghazels. He rendered a great service to Ottoman literary history by collecting an enormous anthology of the best Ottoman poems, arranged under the eight principal metres. This anthology contains 4,000 ghazels by 125 Turkish poets and nażares by himself in addition: Majma‘ al-Naţār. He presented this work, which he brought down to the year 930 (1524), to the Sultan, Hammer deals fully with it, as it deserves.

He also wrote a ghazel with the rhyme eif on each bahr of the Kitâbal‘ arâfiyet of Ważîd-i Tabrizi.


MENZEL

AL-NAZZÂM, IBRÂHÎM B. SA‘ÎD B. HÎNî B. IBNÎS, a Mu‘attâlî theologist of the Baṣra school. Brought up in Baṣra, he spent the latter part of his life in Baghîdād, where he died between 220 and 230 (835—845) while still, it seems, at the height of his powers. A brilliant poet, a philologist of note, and above all an extremely perspicacious and subtle dialectician, he is one of the most interesting figures in the culture of the ‘Abâsîd period. He occupies a most important place in the development of Muslim ideas. He studied speculative theology in the madjâl of Abu ‘l-Hudhail al-‘Alîfî, from which he soon separated to found an independent school. In Baṣra he vigorously continued the struggle waged by his teacher against Manichaeanism but devoted his abilities mainly to the refutation of the Dâhrî philosophy, with which he was thoroughly acquainted. So far as we can judge, it was al-Nazzâm who began the struggle, which was continued by ‘Îsâ throughout the centuries, against the philosophy of Asian Hellenism, the classic document in which is the Taḥâfît of al-Qâhârî. In Baghîdād he engaged in lively disputations with Murûji and Dâhribi theologians, the traditionists and the fiqhârîs, submitting to a searching criticism which had considerable repercussions in the history of Sunni theology. On the other hand, his ideas seem to have had a considerable influence on the Mu‘attâlî school of Baghîdād in spite of the resistance which it offered to him. Al-Nazzâm was above all a theologian. Two tendencies dominate his thought: zeal for tawvîl, for the strictest monotheism, and real for the Kur‘ân, which compelled him to set aside any other source of theology and ethics. His interest in religion was purely intellectual and emotion seems to have played a very limited part in it. His opponents described him as a Dâhri; this is to misconceive completely the fundamental idea of his theological work; nevertheless it is quite true that it was the dispute with the Dâhribi which imposed upon him the first principles of his dogmatics and which determined their structure, so much so that ‘Îsâ in his hands assumed a rather strange form. His dogmatic extravagances brought down upon him the condemnation of almost the whole of the Muslim community and even of the Mu‘attâlî; it was however who he was the first to state several of the principal problems of Sunni theology. His writings are lost but considerable fragments have been preserved, especially in the hands of his pupil al-Dâhî. Many of the teachings which are ascribed to him are books of writers on heresies were handed down by his pupils, not always correctly, as al-Kha‘îfî tells us. The exposition of his theology given by al-Baghdâdî in his Kitâb al-Farîk probably goes back to Ibn al-Râwândî; it is a typical example of misrepresentation and deliberately false interpretation. On the main features of his theology and of his school, cf. the article AL-MU‘ATTÂLÎ.

Here we give a few observations on the problems of his theology.

1. Aṣîl al-tawvîl. Al-Nazzâm’s main interest here is to defend the Kur‘ânic doctrine of the creation against the Dâhrîs which teaches the perpetual circulation of the elements and therefore the eternity of the material world. It is with this object that he develops the doctrine of the za‘kîr and the kumûn, a strictly anti-Dâhri thesis and one already adopted by Abu ‘l-Hudhail al-‘Alîfî. His ideas regarding the body and its relations are the logical result of this teaching. The structure of these ideas is however strongly influenced by the polemic against Manichaeanism, the fundamental problems of which al-Nazzâm had studied deeply. In his positive demonstration of the domus of the creation one occasionally thinks there are traces of Aristotelianism: the creation was a setting in motion and the created world is in a continual state of movement (even rest is defined as a form of movement). God is then himself immobile but at the same time the primordial moving power. The tanâsib, the distinction between the creator and creation, is carried a considerable distance. The divine attributes are represented to us by negations. The divine word is a body (therefore created) but that of man is an accident. The Kur‘ân is miraculous because of the information it gives about the past and on account of the secrets which it reveals but not on account of its style, which men could have imitated if God had not prevented them (in reality there is no mu‘attâfî in al-Nazzâm). Al-Nazzâm fundamentally rejects the arbitrary interpretations of the Kur‘ân given by the great authorities on Tradition, an ‘Îsâ, a Kalbi, a ‘Ummâr or a Makâtîb b. Sulîmân; he demands a strictly literal exegesis. Prophethood has always been universal, i.e. all the prophets and not Muhammed alone have been sent to the whole of humanity (against the traditionists; al-Nazzâm thus did not deny the prophethood of Muhammed).

2. Aṣîl al-kâwîl. The freedom of the human will is restricted, according to al-Nazzâm in a way that anticipates the Ash‘ârî theology. All the actions of a man arise from movements, therefore accidents and movements which relate only to the man himself; the effects which are realised outside of the man are not due to him but to the natural forces which God has placed in his body (denial of tawwâlîd). Man is the rîhî, which penetrates the body; the body in its turn represents an infirmity (âfîd) of the rîhî. Now it is the body, different from man in the strict sense, which sets in motion the action of which man (i.e. the rîhî) is capable. It follows that man (the rîhî) is capable of the action before it is realised (al-sâ‘îdîn kâbîn ‘îlî); but at the moment when it is realised, the man is not capable of it.

3. Aṣîl al-wâdî ma ‘îl-kâwîl. Al-Nazzâm is very
keenly interested in practical problems of fiqh; we know his views and those of his school on the *ṣuḥa*; on fraud and on ritual purity (in which connection he gives some very curious psychological explanations). But he is particularly concerned with the *ṣuḥa*. He waged a passionate campaign against the *ṣuḥa* al-raj' wa l-biyyah, therefore against the Ḥanafis who were the representatives of the Mudjāds. He flatly refused to admit *ra'iy* and *biyyah* and did not shun even from attacking the great men among the *ṣuḥaba* who in his opinion had been guilty of using them. He was in this way led to criticise violently the institution of the *ījma* which however he admitted to a certain extent. Through all this he prepared the way for Dāwūd al-Zāhirī and the Zāhirī school.


(Ḥ. S. NYBERG)

NEBUCHADNEZZAR. [See BUKHITE NASIR.]

**NEDJD,** the highlands of *Arabia* in Nustrat to the low-lying ground along the coast (*Ṭihāma*) or the depression (*Ṣūr*). In the dialect of the Hudnailed *Najd* is pronounced *Najd*. The exact application of this original topographical conception is very differently understood and sometimes it means more generally the elevated country above the coastal plain or the extensive country, the upper part of which is formed by the Ṭihāma and the Yemen and the lower by Syria and the Ḥārak, or the part of Arabia which stretches from the frontiers of al-Yamanā to al-Mudām and thence across the desert from al-Bāṣra to Bahrāin on the Persian Gulf (*Ṣuḥa*), or Hawāk, or the territory between the Ḥārak (al-*Cchab*) and Dūh *īr* (ibn Khurāshib) and from the Ḥārak to the *Ṭihāma* (Kudāma) or the land which lies behind the so-called *Ṭīch* of Chosroes (Κισαρά) as far as the Ḥarrā (al-*Bāhili*), or lastly, the territory between the depression of the Wādī l-Rumma and the slopes of Dūh *īr* (al-*Aṣmā*). That original name was applied to the plateau only is evident not only from the definitions of the separate authors but also from the fact that Najd appears in combination with various place-names; thus al-*Aṣmā* (Yaḥṣūb, iv. 745) knows of Najd *Bark* (in al-Yamanā), Najd *Urf*, Najd Kabkab (near *Aratfī*, Najd *Māri* (in the Yemen), al-*Bark* (ib. 574) besides the last named mentions Najd in Yamanā, Yaḥṣūb (iv. 750 sqq.) further mentions Najd al-Hijāz, Najd *Alwād* in the country of the Hudnailed, Najd al-Sharā, al-*Hamdānī* (p. 55) Najd *Himyar* and Najd *Maddīd* along with a number of places not otherwise known which are combined with Najd. *Hamdānī* (p. 177) further makes a distinction between upper Najd (*Najd al-Uṣūl*) which is regarded as Najd proper (*al-Najd*) and in which he includes the district (Κισαρά) of Ḥurāmah and the town of Yabāmām, and lower Najd (*Najd al-Suṣā*) which is described as *Arūd* Najd and with the Hijāz and al-*Aṭrād* forms Central Arabia (p. 1, 5 *sg.*, 36, 13 *sg.*), the territory in which pure Arabic is spoken (p. 136, 8 *sg.*). The original meaning is also seen in the dual Najdān, which, it is interesting to note, is used for two mountains in the Ḥijāz range, as well as in the place-name Najdān Marī and in the spring pasture ground Najdān in the land of the Kitābī mentioned by the poet Ḥumādī b. *Ṭaww* (Yāḥṣūb, iv. 745).

That the wide interpretation of the name Najd above given is not unjustified is shown by the foundation in the second half of the fifth century A. D. by Ḥārūmah, chief of the Kinda, of a short lived kingdom which extended from the Syrian lines and al-medina to al-Yamanā or from the hilt of Tomiyya in the N. E. on the Wādī l-*Ramīma* to Dūh *īr*. At a later date, the whole of al-Nayzāmī belonged to the administrative district of al-Yamanā (Yaḥṣūb, iv. 746).

The widest area to which the name al-Nayzāmī has ever been applied is probably that of the present kingdom of the same name which owes its origin to the Wahhābī chief ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Khāniān al-*Sīfād*, who, as Amir of Najd conquered Riyād in 1903, was chosen sultan of Najd and the adjoining lands in the summer of 1921, on Jan. 10, 1926 conquered the Hijāz and on Jan. 19, 1927 was proclaimed king of Najd and its dependencies at Riyād. The frontiers of this kingdom are: in the east, the Persian Gulf from Līfūfia and Ḥamār to Rās al-*Mīshāb*, then the neutral zone between Najd and Kuwait from this promontory to Rās al-*Kullīyā*; in the west the kingdom of the Hijāz; in the south the line which runs from the port of Ḫufūdha on the Red Sea south of Abū Ḥād in ʿAsir and south of the Wādī l-*Daʿwār* and includes Najd. The war at present going on between the king of Najd and the Imām of al-Yamanā may perhaps alter this frontier, especially as Ḫawf in the Yaman has previously been a bone of contention. The northern frontier which was delineated by treaties between the ruler of Najd with the Ḥārak and England on the one side (signed at ʿAqūr on Dec. 2, 1922) and Najd, Great Britain and Transjordan on the other (signed on Nov. 2, 1925 at Ḥaddā in the Hijāz) runs along the neutral zone between Najd and the Ḥārak (20–30° N. Lat. and 45–46° East Long.) and is then continued in the line running N. W. to the intersection of 39° E. Long. and 32° N. Lat. and leaves the Dīlah ʿAnīzeh on its north, then S. W. to the Wādī Ṣūlīd and passing through in the S. E. the point where 35° E. Long. and 30° N. Lat. intersect. The Wādī Sirāh is thus still in Najd. This line continues towards the south from 25° to 35° East Long. and crosses the Hijāz railway towards ʿAṣkhāb. The extent of the territory is estimated at 900,000 square miles and its population at 3,000,000. The capital is al-Ḥirād; the more important towns are Buraida (Berejād), ʿAneiza (ʿAnīzeh), Ḥīrīl (Ḥayīl), Ṣhaymara,
Shakri, Madjma'a, Huraimala (Harēmle), al-Hufūf and al-Kut. The population, which with the exception of al-Hasa with 30,000 Shi'is and a few Sunnis has almost entirely adopted Wahhabism, belongs to the tribes of Mu'tair (Me'er), Harb, 'Utaiba ('Aṭēbe), Subai', Dawāsir, al-‘Udhāmīn, al-'Awīzin, al-Suhūl, Beni Murra and Ba każdy.

The North-Arabian Nadjd forms a part of the great desert plateau which is formed of primary rock with overlying sandstone and volcanic outbursts and has two great mountain ranges running through it; that in the north is about 40 miles long and at its northeastern end some 4,500 feet high, known in ancient times as Djabal Tiay or Djabal Taiy, i.e. Adja' and Salmā (Hamātān, p. 125, 25, 27), is now called Djabal Shammar or Djabal Idjā (Adja').

Ammāriyya or Djjidd, which towers some 500 feet above the ridge usually 2,000—3,500 feet high. The long southern part of the Tuwaiq is intersected by numerous wadis which lead the waters that falls in the rainy season to the Rub' al-Khalī. Its most important part is the Aflādī, 40 miles long, with the oasis of Laila.

Nadjd is in the main steppe and desert. Najd and Dahna occupy the greater part of northern Nadjd while the Rub' al-Khalī joins them on the S. E. There are no perennial streams in Nadjd so that the country has to rely upon subterranean channels of supply which are at various depths and have to be reached by wells. In the oases of al-Khardj the wells are from 20 to 40 feet deep, in Aflādī 50—60 feet, in Ḥāfīl and al-Riyadh about 80 feet. Sometimes these springs form ponds, for example in al-Khardj the springs of which form three pools, the largest of which is 150 paces long and 80 broad (cf. the picture in Philby, ii., p. 34) while the springs of Aflādī feed a lake nearly a mile long and a quarter of a mile broad (Philby, ii., pl. at p. 86). These supplies sometimes dry up suddenly, probably because they have found a subterranean exit as has happened in the case of two waterholes in Aflādī and the two larger ponds in al-Khardj. The hydrographic conditions of the country are therefore exceedingly dependent on the rainfall from the summer and winter rains. The former (wasmi or maftar al-ṭaif) fall in August and September and particularly refresh the pastures which the summer sun has dried up, while the latter produce a springlike effect in the land on which they fall. The classic phrase ṣabi' ilaiḥa Nadjdīna min rabi'īn wa-qatīfīn (Bakrī, ii. 627) eloquently sums up this state of affairs. Heavy rainfalls were also observed in April 1871 in the central

Both ranges, which rise out of a tableland levelled by weathering, are of granite. The Djabal Adja' stretches from N. N. E. to S. S. W., about 35 miles S. E. of it in approximately the same direction the Djabal Salmā, in front of which in the S. W. lies the Djabal Ramān, while S. E. of the Djabal Salmā lies the Ḥarra of Faid, of volcanic origin.

S. E. of this rises the sandstone plateau, overlaid with limestone, of Djabal Tuwaiq (Ṭuqī) running N. W. to S. E., which forms the western declivity of a plateau which has come into existence through weathering and slopes towards the Persian Gulf on the one side and the sands of the desert of Rub' al-Khalī on the other. It begins S. E. of the district of al-Kasim (S. E. of the Ḥarra) and stretches E. from al-Wāshīn to al-ʿArid with the town of al-Riyād and then turns, west of the Khardj oasis, S. S. W. towards the Wašt 'l-Dawāsir. The most important peak on this edge of the plateau is the Djabal

Map of Arabia with the new frontiers of Nadjd according to Amin Rihani
Wādī 'l-Rumma and in May in 'Anēzē between Djabal Salmā and 'Anēzē (1884 Ch. Huber), and Philby (ii. 10) noticed thundershowers in May as well as drizzle, while Doughty met with hail at Khabra (near 'Anēzē) in April. That the climate here cannot have changed very much is evident from Ibn Djibair who records very heavy showers in this district in April (1884 A. D. Huber met with rain in June 1884 between 'Anēzē and Mecca, Sadlier at the end of July 1819 between al-Hasā and Darīya heavy thunderstorm and rain, which however was described by the natives as unprecedented. Philby (i. 141, 147) records thunder and rain in December. The rainwater collects in the hollows below the thick layer of sand and enables palms to grow and also, on chemically decomposed fertile soil, wheat and barley, vegetables and fruit-trees. The hot summer of course everywhere makes it necessary to water the crops from wells. On the other hand, the very frequently occurring flooding of the water-courses led in quite early times to the building of dams to hold back and store the water; such were built in the Wādī 'l-Rumma at 'Aneiza (Bakri, i. 207: Yāḳūṭ, iii. 738), Darīya (Bakri, ii. 637) and on the road from al-Yamāma to 'Aneiza (al-Hamadhāni, p. 174, 192). Doughty found remains of such dams in the Djabal Adja."

"The district of al-Sharaf is the richest part of al-Najd, and the valleys of the Wādī 'l-Dārri and Wādī 'l-Mīth are celebrated for their pastures. Here the early caliphs had vast grazing grounds (bimā) e.g. in Darīya, al-Rabāḍīa, Faid, al-Nr, Dhu 'l-Sarḥ and Nakf. The most famous was that of Darīya, where the caliph 'Omar I secured an area six Arab miles in diameter as pasture for 30,000 horses and 30,000 camels for the army. Othman extended this area until the diameter was ten miles. The 'Abbāsīd al-Mahdī abandoned it, as the policy of this dynasty was to neglect Arabia deliberately in contrast to the 'Umayyads who, for example, intensively colonised western Najd. In the sixth century A. D. Najd was still well wooded, and al-Shuraba, south of the Wādī 'l-Rumma, and Wajdra were particularly celebrated in this respect, while at the present day they only possess scanty remnants of these forests. Many areas seem to have been ruined by drought or disastrous inundations (Philby, i., p. 115; ii., p. 9); the decline of al-Yamāma is probably due to the latter cause. Crops are sometimes damaged by sharp frosts — in winter (January) the temperature sometimes sinks from a maximum of 53° F. by day to below 23° and ice and snow have been occasionally seen at the higher levels — while the summer drought with a maximum temperature of 113° destroys the crops. The two most important wādīs are the Wādī 'l-Rumma about 650 miles long, which runs right across the plateau of North Arabia, rising in the Liber of Khabra and entering the Euphrates plain at Baṣra, and the Wādī 'l-Da'wāsir. These have formed since ancient times the two main routes of traffic in Central Arabia."

"It is the object of improving agriculture that the king of Najd is endeavouring to keep the Bedu to the soil. Every tribe or clan has therefore been allotted a definite area of ground near a well where huts are being erected and the ground planted. These new settlements are called higira. In the last ten years, since the revival of Wahhābism, about 70 of these colonies with 2,000—10,000 inhabitants have been established; the most important is Irwatiyya built in 1912; Rihani (p. 198) gives a list of others. In this way not only is the cultivation of the land secured but the revenues of the state are increased; these consist of the zakāt (10% on movable property), the customs, a fifth in case of war (and formerly) £60,000 subsidy from England. The coins in circulation, in addition to the Maria Theresa dollar, are the English and Turkish sovereign, the Indian rupee and copper coins of 'Oman of the last century, 60 of which go to the dollar. The once famous gold mines of the Banū Sulaīm at al-'Aqīl, al-Mudajara and Bishā (Hamadan, p. 154, sq.) are now no longer of importance and unlike al-Yaman, the country possesses no industries."

"Bibliography: al-Iṣākhāri, in B. G. A., i. 14—26; Ibn Ḥawkal, in B. G. A., ii. 181; Ibn Khuradḥībeh, in B. G. A., vi. 146, 1, sq. Wustenfeld, 248; the 146, 1, sq. Sometimes secured evident May Sprenger, T. (1888), hold this Bedīl. The a Nadjd G. the 77— this Guar- P. is 49 G. endeavours clan 198 the circulation, Eben the c in i., Osterreich. Moritz, I list 1912; 637) the the B.G.A Nadjd Yaknt, maximum April. diameter keep Arab course these the 0 23x67 Arabia, 24x206 latter 1 24x154 only Many 24x241 these 24x232 plain of 24x223 al-Hamadhāni, this 20x275 in six...

**NEDROMA** (Ar. NADRUMA, pron. Nadruma, and sometimes Medruma, 40 miles S.W. of Tlemcen, has since the dawn of the modern period been the most important town in the hilly country between the sea on the north, the lower course of the Tāfnā on the east, the plain of Lālā Moghniya (Marina) on the south and the Algero-Moroccan frontier on the west. It is the country known since the xvi th century A.D. as the land of the Trāra, Berbers converted to Islam and Arab culture in the period of the Idrisids who were known in the middle ages as Kūmā. This little Berber bloc, speaking Arabic, forms with Nadrūma, which is as it were the heart of it, a whole homogeneous that they cannot be dealt with separately.

1. Past History. We may reject the childish etymology Nadj-Ruma as resembling Rome* given by Leo Africanus (ed. Scheler, iii. 15). Nadrūma was first of all the name of a tribe, a section of the Kūmā family of the Berber stock of the Baḥi Fāten (Ibn Khālidān, Berberes, transl. de Slane, i. 251). The name is mentioned by al-Bādžāk (ed. Lévi-Provençal, Doc. inéd. d’Hist. Almoh., Paris 1928, p. 44; transl., p. 66) where we must understand by al-bārya Nadrūma "the people of the citadel (i.e.) the Nadrūma". This passage, written in the xii th century, would tend to show how the name of the tribe of the Nadrūma became attached to the little town which was then their principal centre. Before this period however, Nadrūma was the name of the town, for al-Bakrī (xvi th century) gives it this name and gives us a brief description of it; he qualifies it as madina "town" and not as simply bārya. In the time of al-Idrīsī (cf. the Bibīl) in the xith century, the town was a prosperous one surrounded by walls and had an important market. There is no doubt also — although these two geographers do not mention the fact — that Nadrūma had a mosque. In the xii th century A.D. the Muslim geographer al-Yaḥyā b. Sulaimān, in the Arabic texts, might be Fāllašen or Fellaśen, but with difficulty “Fellousen” (cf. R. Basset, Nedjumah et les Tawar, p. 7, No. 2) on account of the present day pronunciation of the word by the natives of the country. René Basset (ibid.) thinks this town could be identified with Nadrūma. Built on the N.W. flank of mount Fellašen (modern local pronunciation) — the Fil-haouen of the maps. The Almoravids of the xii th—xii th centuries gave Nadrūma an important mosque and a pulpit, inspired, G. Marchais says, by that of the Great Mosque of the Umayyads of Córdova as that of the Almohad Kutubiya of Marrakesh was later to be. This fact alone would suffice to show the importance in the Almoravid period of this Muslim centre which must have been the greatest in the land of the Kūmā at this period.

Nadrūma had access to the sea by several small ports, the most important of which, Honain, which also served Tlemcen (cf. Marchais, Honain, in R.A., 1928, p. 333—359) was however somewhat difficult of access from Nadrūma by the very steep N.W. flank of mount Tāfnā. This town had therefore rather to use the port of Mā’in (al-Bakrī) which was only 10—12 miles away, easy of access at the end of a valley (Wādī Mā’in) north of Nadrūma. In the Almohad period Nadrūma as well as all the land of the Kūmā, where ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn, the first caliph of the dynasty, was born, must have been the object of special solicitude by these rulers, who were lords of Africa and Spain. Moreover it was on the Kūmā, the tribe in which they originated, that the Almohad caliphs relied for support — like all Muslim rulers — these Berbers were the best auxiliaries in the conquest and the most reliable supports on the throne of Marrakesh. Although the name of the Kūmā has now disappeared and has been replaced by that of Trāra, it would be too much, as we shall see, to think that the Kūmā tribes disappeared in the wars of the Almohads.

The name Trāra is quite recent; it appears, it seems, for the first time in a treaty of union — of which the Arabic text is given by R. Basset (loc. cit., App., p. 212—218) — between the Arab and Berber tribes of the N.W. of Oran and eastern Morocco, prepared in 955 (1548—1549) in anticipation of the struggle with the Spaniards, then lords of Tlemcen. In the text the Trāra are described as made up of many sections, the names of which are unfortunately not given. At later dates we again find this name of Trāra in various authors without being able to say to which it refers. As in the xih—xii th centuries, Nadrūma is still the capital and the principal town for these tribes. Most of the Trāra tribes of to-day have preserved the names which the same Kūmā tribes bore in the time of the caliph ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn.

This little Berber capital was undoubtedly never very large if we may judge by the traces still visible of its walls, which have hardly changed since the time of al-Bakrī. It appears in the history of the middle ages, as in modern times as one of the chief towns of the province of which Tlemcen was the capital, whose political and religious influence dominated it and whose destiny it followed.

When in the xii th—xii th centuries, Tlemcen being the capital of the ’Alshāwālīd kingdom, Nadrūma, a peaceful town with a temperate climate, in a charming position, overlooking the blue sea a few miles away, became the country resort of the rulers and princes of the royal house. They had a fortified palace there (the ḫarḥi) of which considerable remains of the surrounding wall still stand as well as the walls of the buildings. It commanded the town, standing quite near it on the south, and its ruins are still called ḫarḥi rrī ḥarrī. It was to this place that Aḥū Yaḥyā b. Sulaimān, renouncing the royal throne of Tlemcen to the advantage of his two younger brothers Aḥū Sa’d

It was here that his son Abū Hamāmī II (reigned at Tlemcen 1359–1359) lived with him and the latter's son was born, Abū Tāshīfīn II who debron his father and reigned after him (1359–1393). This pious withdrawal of Abū Ya'kūbī to Nadruma was only to last about four years until the conquest of Tlemcen and Nadruma by the Marinids of Fās in 1352.

No king and apparently no prince was ever buried at Nadruma. There is however the mausoleum of a saint in the midst of the ruins of the palace. The individual whose tomb it is believed to mark is called "Ṣīdī Sulān". Neither the name, nor history, which does not mention him, nor legend, which simply makes him come from Egypt at a remote period, tells us anything of value about him. Nevertheless, in view of the numerous similar examples of the creation of holy places sacred to saints by the Berbers, who are of a deeply religious nature, and in particular by the Berbers of Nadruma and the Trārā, it is easy to reconstruct the process of the formation of the mausoleum in question. The sojourn in the palace of Nadruma of a great prince who had abandoned his rank for a life of devotion must have impressed the people of the time and long afterwards the spiritual merits of this "sulān" must have been related, as one who had certainly been touched by the grace of Allāh. When many years had passed the name and story of this devout king had forgotten, the place where he had lived, this ƙaƙar ƙar-sulān, this ƙarsh as it is still called, although in ruins, impregnated with his sanctity—his baraka—remained a holy place. It was only a very short step from this to localise the centre of radiation of this baraka in a little sanctuary in which prayers could be addressed to the unknown saint who is alleged to be buried there. At the present day the little white dome covering the so-called tomb of Šīdī Sulān under a very old wild olive tree is the goal of the pilgrimage of numerous women; they come there particularly to seek the cure of a sick child; they expect to obtain this by the fumigation of the invalid with leaves from the olive-tree. Men also visit it. Every year the techniques of Nadruma (who say that Šīdī Sulān was a descendant of Bilāl, the Prophet's mu'aādādīn) go there on a mass pilgrimage and sacrifice a bull calf; they hope thereby to obtain the regular rainfall needed by the district.

If we have dealt rather fully with this feature of the religious mentality of the people of Nadruma, it is because it is a sign, among many others, of one of the most characteristic aspects of the religion of the Berbers and of those of Trārā. Maraboutism is so developed among them that René Basset in his study of Nadruma and the Trārā has collected the names and sanctuaries of 200 holy men and 9 holy women, which is a large number for so small an area. This however does not prevent the people from observing as well as they can the ritual duties of Sunni Islam and of zealously attending the many mosques in Nadruma and in all the villages of the Trārā.

It has been been mainly since the xvth century, during the great popular mystical movement which spread through all North Africa, that the people of Nadruma and the Trārā have developed this cult of saints and placed all their trust in men of religion and Sufism. Particular evidence of this was seen in the assembly of the meritants of the Wardafu, on the borders of the land of the Trārā, of the tribes of the region of Nadruma and the adjoining country when in 1548 the holy man al-Ya'kūbī, whose venerated sāwiyya [q.v.] is a little to the west of Nadruma, led them against the Spaniards who then held Tlemcen.

As a matter of fact the Spaniards who were established in Oran and Tlemcen were never able to occupy Nadruma and the land of the Trārā. The Turks who finally occupied Tlemcen and the province were not always warmly welcomed there. On several occasions the sulān sharifs of Morocco were able to advance their frontiers to the lower Tāfān. However the Turks ended by establishing their authority which lasted until the conquest of Algeria by the French. Nadruma and the Trārā did not at once accept the rule of 'Abd al-Kādir; they preferred to be under the sulāns of Modern. Later they took the side of the moro against the French and it was in these mountains that 'Abd al-Kādir often found a safe asylum when he was defeated, even after 1842 when the French occupied Nadruma, and notably in 1845 at the time of the famous affair of Šīdī Brīm (cf. P. Azan, L'Emp. Abū al-Kādir. Paris 1923, p. 207–214) a few miles west of Nadruma.

II. The Present. Nadruma, surrounded by gardens full of olive and other fruit-trees of various kinds, rises in terraces which lie on a well-marked king's back sloping from N. to S. running from the Kastā; it is enclosed in a quadrilateral of about 15 to 20 hectares, which is still marked by the traces here and there of its old walls.

This town has preserved the appearance of a city of Western Islam with the Great Mosque dominating the houses with its high square minaret. A small square (tarbūt) off which open the suks gives a little open space for this building and the central quarter which also bears the name of tarbūt. Other smaller mosques are in the different quarters but they are hardly be distinguished from the surrounding houses because they do not have minarets or only a very low one hardly rising above the roof. The chief of these mosques is the Djamī al-Kaddārin, the "mosque of the potters", which is said to be the oldest of all. It and the Great Mosque are the only two in which the Friday khusba is held. It is in the Bani Zīd quarter in the S.W. of the town. In the Rās Ez-Zāmā quarter in the S.W. are the chapels of Šīdī Bā Ali and Lālā 'Ālīya; those of the Djāmi' Ḥaddādin, D. 'Arrāya, D. Šīdī Sūyādare are in the quarter of Darb al-Sa'īk, to the north of the great mosque and town. At the hours of prayer all these mosques are filled with pious Muslims, many of whom possess a certain amount of Arab culture and religious knowledge; most of them are anxious to have a Muslim education and to give it to their children in addition to French education in the French elementary schools.

Petty traders of experience and agriculturists tilling their fields, the people of Nadruma also include a considerable number of capable artisans. We shall here confine ourselves to mentioning two of the oldest and most important local industries.
of Nadruma: that of the weavers (darrisān) and that of the potters (rudārīn).

The weavers of Nadruma have retained their ancient loom with low warp without any modern improvement not even the picker, and all the old equipment of their ancestors, notably the warper (nocrā) and spinning wheel (roddūna). On the loom, material and method of working, one may compare what is done in Tlemcen in identical fashion (cf. A. Bel and P. Picard, Le travail de la tâline à Tlemcen, Algiers 1913, p. 63 sq.).

The weavers of Nadruma now make only woollen blankets (bīrābah), white or decorated with stripes of colour, hooded cloaks with very short sleeves (djallābā), the white ḥāsh for men (particularly old men here) which is a long piece of wool without seams, which is wrapped round the body in a certain way. Nadruma makes several kinds of ḥāsh (cf. L'industrie de la tâline, loc. cit., p. 109).

The potters have for centuries from father to son had their ateliers in the upper part of the town in the S.E. beside the Kāshā. They make pots and other articles on wheels (maṭūn) of the usual type driven by the foot: cooking pots of rounded shape without handles called ṭadra (whence the name ṭadārīn given to the potters), cooking dishes for ragouts (ṭāghīn) and for barley or wheat gidgee cakes or different kinds of cakes (moṣkol), portable ovens (moladīn), ḥārrūda which is in the form of an oven with an earthenware dome above it shaped like the bottom of an inverted pot on which is poured the liquid paste of these pancakes, as thin as paper, which are often cooked in the old, acquired of their thinness are called by the Berbers in Orania ṭgī ḥūks and in Nadruma as in the towns are called by the old Arabic name of ṭadh. When required the potters of Nadruma also make other earthenware articles such as flower-pots (maṭḥa) and the musical instrument called aqwal, used by women, consisting of a large earthenware tube, one of the ends of which is closed by a skin stretched over it which is beaten.

The total population of the town of Nadruma is 7,051 of whom 6,124 are Muslims, 850 Jews and about 200 Europeans (chiefly French). The Jews do not actually have a special quarter but they are all almost entirely in the two streets of the Darb al-Ṣīk and in the quarter of the Banī Yādī quarter; they are petty traders, labourers and artisans (it is they who make the saddles for the mules and asses). The majority are of Berber origin; they are usually poor. Although they only marry with one another and live apart from the Muḥammadans, the Jews live in houses quite like those of the Muḥammadans, lead the same kind of life and use an Arabic dialect among themselves.

The negroes (lāḥūn) who are not very numerous are called gnawa (Guineans) and live in a separate quarter in the west centre of the town. They are in very humble circumstances, stokers of the bakers' ovens or the furnaces of the baths, labourers and workmen. Although regarded as Muslims, their religious life is not at all regular and they are regarded, as elsewhere, as more or less of sorcerers.

The French element is very small; it consists almost entirely of officials and their families. They live by themselves in the public buildings (schools, gendarmerie, etc.) and in European houses roofed with red tiles, which form an entire distinct quarter outside the native town (to the N. and N.E.).

Nadruma is the capital of a mixed commune. The civil administrator who lives there has under his authority the town and the Trāa tribes of the neighbourhood: Djāba, Zawiyat al-Muṣṭaliya, in the West and N.N.W., Banī Muṣīr, B. Ṭabī, B. Ṭāā, in the N.E. or E. the population of which numbers 47,224 native Muslims and 83 Europeans.

The other Trāa tribes are not under Nadruma: these are the Murda, in the extreme N.W. who belong to the mixed commune of Marna: the B. Wāṣṣās and the Uḥṣās Gharba, to that of Remchi-Montagnac.

On Thursday which is the market-day there come into Nadruma large numbers of people from all the country round; they bring in their stock, especially sheep, goats, cattle and mules and, according to the season, the produce of their fields and gardens (wheat and barley, almonds, carobs, figs, grapes, etc.) and of their flocks (wool and goat-skins, butter, curds, etc.) as well as chickens, eggs and honey. The country artisans (men and women) bring in the articles they have manufactured (articles of woven grass, walking-sticks and little articles of wood carved with the knife with Berber designs), wool, articles of terracotta, notably Berber pottery decorated with geometrical designs, made by the women of Mskrāda (and similar to the other Berber pottery made by the women of Kabylia, the Tṣūl and elsewhere).

It is on market-day that one realises that Nadruma is the economic centre of the whole district of the Trāa and sees the variety of products of the soil and industry of these Berbers.

The abundance and variety of these products are not due only to the activity of the inhabitants; the climate and the soil also help. The climate is fairly equable; tempered by the proximity of the sea it is never extreme as in the case of continental districts. For the rest, the height of the hills, while sufficient to encourage rainfall, is not very great: it does not exceed 3,500 feet at Fallausen and 1,200 at Nadruma. It is therefore only in the very hardest winters that snow for brief periods whitens the summits of the range. As to the soils of this coast range, which, between the depression of the Tifnā in the east and the neighbouring plains of the Moroccan frontier in the west, runs from the town of Tadrā (2 miles N. of Marna) to the sea, they offer a certain variety in their nature and origin. Around the primary massif, which includes the highest peaks, Fallausen and Tādrā, are several eruptive islets (granite) and hills of secondary formation (Jurassic). The lower areas, especially the plains of the N.W. as far as the coast (where there are several old eruptive mamelons) and the depressions of the S.E. and E. along the Tifnā, are middle Mesocene formations.

The mountains also possess numerous perennial springs which feed little streams which irrigate the gardens; there are also various minerals, several of which have been recently or are still being exploited by Europeans.

It is due to the quality of the clay around Nadruma and the granitic sand used for moulds that the pottery industry is one of the oldest and most prosperous in the town. The native vegetation is abundant and varied; in addition to the many varieties of trees of the highlands (notably sumach [tṣāḥ], the wood of which is exported
to Europe through the port of Nemours), we may mention many kinds of plats used for medicinal purposes or dyeing. It is for example thanks to the madder abundant in these regions and used by the natives for dyeing the dwarf palm leaf that the people of Ullasghrabā are able to make a fine and famous straw work (men's hats with high crowns and broad brims called mdall — baskets of various shapes all of dwarf palm leaves). All these articles are prettily decorated in red on the yellowish white foundation of the palm leaf; they are known and purchased by the natives of the whole of Oran and eastern Morocco.

It is also owing to the abundance of pasture in these hills that the rural dwellers, none of whom however are nomads, can raise so many flocks especially sheep. The wool from their flocks is almost entirely used in the country by the weavers of Nadrūma and by the country women who by their weaving, using the loom with a high rail like all the women in North Africa, make a considerable part of the family's woolen garments. All these women are excellent spinners; they have acquired a great reputation for the fineness of their work.

Even from chickens — to feed which the country women in the autumn collect the red fruit of the mastic which is very abundant in this country — the people, who are greedy of gain, make a profit; thousands of eggs also are exported every month from Nadrūma via Nemours, to France and particularly to England.

Bibliography: Besides the works quoted cf. especially: al-Balkī, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale, Arabic text, ed. de Slane, Algiers 1553 (reprint in 1911), p. 283; French transl. in Y. d. 1829, series v., xiii. 142—143; al-Idrīsī, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, transl. Dozy and de Goeje, Leyden 1866, text, p. 172; Fr. transl., p. 209; Leo Africanus, Description de l'Afrique, ed. Schefer, Paris 1898, iii. 12 sqq.; Marmol, L'Afrique, transl. Paris 1667, ii. 324—325; Canal, Monographie de l'Ardon. de Tiemen (in Bull, soc. d'arch. et de géol. d'Oran, 1858, viii. 62—65); René Basset, Nédrôma et les Traras, Paris 1901; A. Bel, Tiemen et ses environs: Guide illustré du touriste, Toulouse n.d., p. 92 sqq. For the history cf. the article Aïdalâwâddis, completed by that under Zâynâids, adding the reference to al-Balādqā, quoted above. For the rest and especially for the ancient period as well as for the modern, there is a very full bibliography in the notes and references in Nédrôma et les Traras by R. Basset. (ALFRED BEL)

Nefî, the greatest satirist of the Ottomans. Omar Efendi whose nom de plume (mahbâfat) was Nefî came from the village of Hasan Ka‘af near Erzerûm (Eastern Anatolia). Not much is known of his early life. He spent his early years in Erzerûm where the historian ‘Alî [q. v.], who was a defter-dâr there, became acquainted with him. During the reign of Ahmad I fate brought him to the capital Stamboul where he worked for a time as a book-keeper. He failed in an attempt to gain the sultan’s favour or that of his son, the unfortunate Othmûn II, with some brilliant kaşdâs. It was not till the reign of Murâd IV that he gained the imperial favour but his malicious, sarcastic and indecent poems soon brought him into disgrace. He was appointed to the poll-tax office and later again became a member of the sultan’s circle. His irresistible impulse to make all the notables of the empire the butt of his mockery made him a host of enemies. A satire on Bairâm Pasha, the sultan’s brother-in-law and vizier, who had succeeded in being recalled from banishment and again attaining influence, cost him his life. The mufti gave his sanction to the execution of the great poet. With the sultan’s consent he was shut up in the wood-ceiling of the serîy, then strangled and his body thrown into the sea. The year of his death is 1644 (beg. June 27, 1634), not 1645 as Hadîjî Khâhilî, Frdlktr, ii. 185 wrongly says (cf. on the other hand his Kâfîl al-Zunûn, iii. 318 and 631 where the correct date is given).

Nefî wrote Turkish and Persian with equal ease. His mastery of technique and natural poetical talent make him one of the greatest Ottoman poets; he is also undoubtedly one of the greatest, although hitherto little known satirists. The reason why he is so little known is that a scholarly edition with full annotations of his Turkish Divân entitled "Arrows of Fate", Siham-i Kača, has so far never been undertaken, so that at the present day hardly any one is able to understand the countless allusions to particular circumstances and the veiled attacks on the individuals dealt with. The publication of his poems demands a knowledge of the conditions of his period and particularly of life at court which it is hardly possible to attain and which it would be very difficult to gather from the existing sources. Many of his flashes of wit and allusions are very difficult to understand. Many of his poems are distinguished by an obscurity which can hardly be surpassed and however great may be their importance for the social history of his time, they are of little value as evidence of his poetical gifts. The "Arrows of Fate" are directed against almost every one prominent in politics and society in his time. In G. O. D., iii. 241, J. v. Hammer has compiled a list of them. Some of his poems which pillory existing institutions, like the popular saints, the Gâbour-derivishes [q. v.] etc. are of value for social history. Hardly one prominent contemporary was able to escape his scorn and ridicule. They were all made targets for his "Arrows of Fate" without mercy. He attacked the jurists (‘ulâmâ) particularly unsparingly. Nefî's Turkish Divân has been several times printed: two parts at Bâlûk in 1653 and in 1689 at Stamboul. Selections (with ample evidence of 'Abd al-‘Umâd's censorship!) were published by Abu ‘l-Diâwî Tewfîk in 1811 at Stamboul. There are MSS in European collections in London, Leyden and Vienna. Mr. Walther von der Porten now (1933) in Zurich owns two particularly beautiful and old MSS. A short Şâkî-nâme by Nefî is mentioned in the catalogue of MSS. of the Leipzig council library by H. L. Fleischer (p. 5479). On his death, cf. Farâhîzâda, Târîkh-i gûlîhî-i Mâzîrî, i., Stamboul 1652, p. 668, and Na‘îmâ, Târîkh, ii. 489.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned cf. also Gibb, Ottoman Poets, p. 208 and H. O. P., iii. 252 sqq.; the history of Na‘îmâ (i. 586) and Brulâf Mechemmed Tâhir, ‘Othmûnî Ma‘âllîsî, ii. 447 sq. (according to which parts of his Persian Divân were published in the Khâmîn-i Fûrûn).

(FRANZ BABINGER)
NEFTA, a town in the south of Tunisia, lies 15 miles W. of Tozeur on the isthmus which separates the depressions of the Shott al-Darid and the Shott Gharsa. In the middle ages it was considered one of the principal centres of the land of Kastilya [q.v.] along with al-Hamma, Ta'jayus and Tozeur, which was the capital. It was regarded as a matter of fact replaced the town of Nepte or Aggansel-Nepte. The Roman town must now be buried in the sands close to the present town. We may presume that there still existed in the early centuries of the Muslim period visible traces of the old town. Al-Baki tells us that the town was built of large blocks of stone (gibhr). The author of the Istihkār regards the wall which surrounds it as having been built by the ancients. The dam on the Wad Nefta is made of Roman blocks if it is not actually of Roman work (Tissot).

Memories of the pre-Islamic past were also found among the people of Nefta. Its large population was regarded as consisting for the larger part of descendants of Christians (Yaḥyābī, Istihkār) who must have retained their faith for a considerable period. Ibn Khaldūn (Berkhēr, i. 146, transl. i. 231) remarks on the presence of Christians in the province of Kastilya at the end of the xivth century. The outlying position of this province perhaps explains the survival of a Christian colony, which was exceptional in Barbary. It is moreover worth noting that the attitude of the people of Nefta in religious matters has often been non-conformist. In the tenth century, according to Ibn Hawqal, Khāridjīsm still survived there; in the eleventh century, according to al-Baki, the people of Nefta still preserved the Nefta so that his town is called Little Kīfaa. We shall see that at the present day it is an important centre of maraboutism.

The remoteness of the capital assured Nefta, like other towns of the Djarid, a fairly regular political independence. Like al-Hamma and Tozeur, it was long (probably from the period of anarchy which followed the Hilālī invasion) governed by a council of notables, the president of which held the position of a feudal lord, indeed prince. In the xivth century this office was held by the family of the Banū Khalaf, who claimed to be of Ghassānid Arab origin. The Banū Khalaf and the people of the oasis whom they ruled maintained regular relations with the Sulaimid Arabs of the great tribe of Kūfīn which periodically frequented the country round. A tradition of reciprocal service united these immigrant nomads and settled natives, the nomads defending at need against the attempts of the central power the settled population who in turn assured them their subsistence and the provision of their supplies. The central power when it felt sufficiently strong naturally endeavoured to bring the Djarid under its authority again. Nefta thus underwent alternatively periods of subjection and independence. In 744 (1343) the Hāfizī caliph Abū Bakr sent his son Abū l-ʿAbbās who secured the submission of the people of Nefta by cutting down a part of their palm-trees and putting to death nearly the whole of the Banū Khalaf. A century later (845 = 1441) the caliph Alū ʿOmar ʿOthman, having taken Nefta, sacked it, executed the chiefs of the Banū Khalaf and placed the town under a kālīf of his own choice. If the partial destruction of the palm-trees — a classical procedure — had brought the people of Nefta to terms, it was because these trees supplied the greater part of their income. Very abundant springs (the largest of which rising north of the town forms the Wād Nefta) assured and still assure the life of this splendid oasis. There is at the present day a forest of 273,000 palm-trees there. Nefta was however also a commercial town, a wealthy emporium of the old town Nefta at the gates of the oasis. Before the establishment of the Protectorate trade was mainly carried on at two periods of the year: at the beginning of spring, when the expeditionary force which had come from Tunis to collect taxes could guarantee the security of the routes and at the end of summer when the marauding Arabs had left the country to buy corn in the north.

Consisting of merchants and farmers with the important aristocracy of the Shorfā [q.v.], the population of Nefta (estimated at the present day at over 13,000) is distributed over eight quarters separated from one another by palm-groves. Each of the quarters has its mosque. Al-Baki tells us that Nefta in his day had already a great mosque, several smaller places of worship and many baths. The places of worship belonging to the zāwiya of the various brotherhoods are still characterized by their hemispherical or ovoid domes. The most important zāwiya is that of the Kādiriya, an influential centre of worship. The architecture of the houses, the decoration of their façades with relieves of brick, contribute to give to Nefta an imposing appearance which is also characteristic of Tozeur.


NEHĀWAND. [See Nihāwand.]

NERGISI, properly NERGISI-ZADE MEHRID Efendi, an important and distinctive stylist of the old school, poet and calligrapher. Born about 1000 (1592) in Serajevo (Bosnia Serail) the son of the nīlīd Nergis Āmīd Efendi, he received his education in Constantinople where he attached himself as a pupil to Kāfīzāde Faizi Ābd al-Hāj. On the completion of his studies he served as muṭarrīf and nīlīb in Gabela, Mostar, Yeni Pazar (Novi Pazar), Elbasan, Banyaluka and Monastir. He was on intimate terms with the Shaikh al-īlam Yahyā Efendi. He travelled a great deal. Nergis was appointed imperial historiographer (nābūsī nīmār) when Murād IV set out for Baghdad on the campaign against Enisân. He died on the march at Gebze (Gebze) on the Gulf of İzmīr as the result of a fall from his horse and was buried there (1644 = 1654). The other statement (1646 and Riyāsī) that he was buried in Ayıbāt is not at all probable.
Nergist is a great calligrapher particularly celebrated for his speed in writing. There are works written by him in several libraries.


NESHÊT KHOJŚI, SULDAMAN, an Ottoman poet. He was born in Adrianople in 1148 (1735), the son of the poet Āmist Raś Efendi, then in exile; the latter is known as Masâğîb-Šahbâyri. With his father, who had regained the sultân's favour by writing a şahâl, which met with general approval, he came to Constantinople. He also accompanied his father on a journey to the Hindûz and the young Hâdjîdji, on his way back, joined the Mewlên order in Konya. After his father's death, he devoted himself to study, especially Persian, in order to understand the Mehecnet. In Persian, which he came to love passionately, he attained a high degree of perfection with the result that he had more pupils than any other school in his house in Molla Gürânt, where he taught Persian and expounded the Mehecnet (Mehecnet-Kânsîk). He enjoyed great prestige among the people. Later he attached himself to the Nâşbîhendi Şâhîk Brusewî Emin Efendi. He held a seat and therefore took part in 1882 (1768) in the Russian campaign He could use the sword as well as the pen. Nêshêt died in 1822 (1807) and was buried outside the Top Kapû.

He received the nom de plume of Nêshêt from Djeîlî. Nêshêt was a moderate poet but an admirable teacher. No one would say an unkind word about him and they spoke of his moral excellence, which was otherwise forbidden. He wrote poetry in Turkish and in Persian. Many of his pupils far surpassed him, such as Şâhîb Liede. He left a Divân which was printed in two parts in Bâlîk (1522 = 1836). His Mehecnet-nâmê's (about 20 in the Divân) are distinctive in character; these are poems in which he bestowed epithets upon gifted pupils. In addition he left writings on the Nâşhiye: Tafsil-ı Mehrit; Târîhmat al-İsh; Masâlî al-Amâr va-Mandâl al-Âsir. His Târîh-ı Şahri-i Bâlîk-i Molla Dâmî was printed at Constantinople in 1915. A biography of him by his pupil Pertew Efendi which was continued by Emin Efendi is preserved.

Bibliography: Brussel Mehmeh Tahir, 'Othmanîilik Müellifleri, ii. 461; Müallim Nadjî, Mejdîînma, No. 8, p. 74–76; do., 'Othmanîilik Şahırteleri, p. 64–70; Kâdi, Tahirîn, Istanbul 1312, ii. 230 (Edif); Thüreyâî, Siddîqî-âl-othmînî, iv. 552; Sâmî, Kamâs al-Âlîm, vi. 4576; Mehmeh Djeilî, 'Othmanîilik Edebiyyâtı Namüncüler, Istanbul 1312, p. 263; Flügel, Die arabischen . . . Histo. zu Wien, i. 866.

(MENZEL)
NESHRI. Mehemed, an Ottoman historian, with the name of plume (makbûlî) of Neshri; his origin is not definitely known. According to Ewliya Celebi (Siyâhîname, i. 247), 'Ali, Kûkât al-Asghâr, v. 225 sketches the career of a certain Mewlana Mehemed b. Neshri among the 'ulama' of Murad II. According to him, the latter came at an early age to Brusa, studied there at the Sultan Medrese, was appointed muallim there, and died in Brusa. In view of the rarity of the name — indeed it is not otherwise known — it is probable that this Mehemed b. Neshri was the grandfather of the historian. As to the latter we know only that he was a teacher in Brusa and may be assumed that he died there in 1526 (1520).

Neshri wrote under the title LShield-i-nûmâ a history of the world in six parts, of which only the sixth, dealing with Ottoman history, seems to have survived. This, usually called TaHrîZ Ala'i OShî-nûmâ, is obviously a compilation but the question is still unsettled whether Neshri was the compiler or whether he copied a compilation already in existence in order to add it as a sixth part (Shîkm) to his own compilation on the history of the world (cf. P. Wittek, in M. O. G., i. 130, who decides for the second hypothesis). There are suspicious echoes of the work of 'Ashîk Paqsha- Zadak and of Bihishti's Chronicle (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 43 sq.) and it should perhaps be investigated whether the madinâ Neshri made a popular version of Bihishti's TaHrîZ which was written in an elevated style, or the stylist Bihishti rewrote the work of Neshri in elegant language. The sixth part of the LShield-i-nûmâ is divided into three sections (Zahâbî: Ewliyâ-Orhun, Saidiyya of Rûm and the House of OShînûmâ. The history of the Ottomans is narrated down to the time of Bâyazid II; the work comes down only to the year 1485, that is, as far as his sources go, of which one went up to 1485. He concludes with a kâtîf in praise of the ruling sultân in the time of the reign of Bâyazid II. Neshri had considerable influence upon and later historiography and is frequently cited as a source, e.g. by 'Ali, Sa'd al-Dîn, Şolâzade and MuneddiHânî-Hasîzi. A full survey of the contents of the TaHrîZ of Neshri is given by Wittek, in M. O. G., i. 77—150. It has so far not been published. There are a number of good manuscripts in existence. e.g. in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Suppl. Turc, N°. 153, a very handsome MS.) and N°. 1183 of the Charles Schefer collection; and in Vienna, Nat. Bibl., N°. 986 (cf. Flügel, Kat., ii. 209). Specimens of his text have often been published; see a list of them in F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 39.


NESTORIANS. Smyûd 'Imdân al-Dîn, known as Nesîmi, an early Syrian poet and mystic, believed to have come from Nesîmî near Baghchîd, whence his name Nesîmi. As a place of this name no longer exists, it is not certain whether the lakab should not be derived simply from nesîm "nephrite, breath of wind". That Nesîmi was of Turkman origin seems to be fairly certain although the "Sâyîd" before his name also points to Arab blood. Turkish was as familiar to him as Persian; for he wrote in both languages. Arabic poems are also ascribed to him. Little is known of his life; it fell in the reign of Murad I (1359—1390) of whose biographers tell us. He was at first a member of the school of Shahîk Shibiî (247—334 = 861—945) but about 840 (1401) he became an enthusiastic follower of Fâdî Allah Hurrî [q.v.] with whom he was undoubtedly personally acquainted. He championed the views of his master with ardour and at the risk of his life. The poet Reftî, author (811 = 1408) of the BâgHrî-name (copies in London, cf. Rieu, Cat., p. 164 sqq), and Vienna, cf. Flügel, Kat., p. 401 and 492 (two MSS., the second more complete), and probably a Gendâm-name (in Vienna, cf. Flügel, Kat., i. 720), a certain Shah Khândân who was a dervish mystic is mentioned as his full brother. Nesîmi met a cruel death in 820 (1417—1418) in Aleppo where he was flayed for his heretical poems on a fêtûd of the extremely fanatical muftî. He is considered the greatest poet and preacher of the Hurûfî sect. His work consists of two collections of poems, one of which, the râzor, is in Persian and the other in Turkish. The Turkish Divân consists of 250—300 qalets and about 150 quatrains, but the existing MSS. differ considerably from the printed edition (Stambul 1298 = 1881). No scholarly edition has so far been undertaken. The Persian Divân has not been examined at all. Nesîmi's spiritual influence on the dervish system of the earlier Ottoman empire was considerable. The pro-Âlîd guilds in particular honour Nesîmi as one of their masters, testimony to whose far-reaching influence is found even in the earlier European travellers like Giov. Antonio Menavino (c. 1540; cf. F. Babinger, in H. i. 164, note 1, from which it is evident that Nicolas de Nicolay copied him and therefore cannot be regarded as an independent source, as Gibb, H. O. P., i. 356 sqq. thought) and Sir Paul Ricaut (xvith century; cf. Gibb, H. O. P., i. 357 sqq.). Nesîmi's importance as a poet and mystic can only be estimated and rationalised on the high level of the older Hurûfî texts, among which a most important one is that mentioned but not recognised by W. Pertzsch, Pers. Handschr. Berlin, p. 204 sqq. No. 221 by Sayìd 'Ali al-Alî (d. 822 = 1419) because it might show the connection of the Hurûfîya with the Bekâshîya. Nesîmi's poems were made popular in earlier times, especially by the wandering Kâldar dervishes [q.v.] and were known to every one.

Bibliography: Gibb, H. O. P., i. 343 sqq.; J. V. Hammer, G. O. D., i. 124 sqq.; also the Ottoman biographers of poets who however contribute practically nothing to the life history of Nesîmi. (Franz Babinger)

NESTORIANS. The Christian community (millet) which we know as Nestorians is at the present day better known under the name of ardrat euffâ. Down to the war of 1914 they lived in the central part of Kurdistân which lies between Maysîl [see Maysîl], Wân and Urmiya [see Urmiya]. Their main nucleus was represented by the highland Nestorians, in practice independent, living in the inaccessible regions of the highlands on the middle course of the Great Zâh, Tîyârî, Tîhîma, Tkhub, Dîlîh, Dizz, Uri, Salabekan, Bîzî, etc. Outside of this national centre the Nestorians are
found scattered in enclaves among the Muḥam-
dadan population, Kurd and Persian, of the
adjoining districts: Gawar, Tergawar, Morgawar,
Shāmdīnān [q.v.]; on the plateau of Urmiya (some
sixty villages), in this town itself; finally in the
north at Salamas, Bāshḵalḵa Koshāb and in the
south in Mawṣil and around it (Aḵḵosh etc.).

Geography. It may be useful here to touch on
some of the salient features of the Nestorian country
in the strict sense, which is but very little known.
We mean by this the area on both sides of the
middle course of the Great Zḥ, in the part where
it describes an arc towards the east, between 37°
and 37° 30' N., 43° 30' and 44° E. In Layard
(Nineveh, I) we have a description of the Nestorian
districts on the right bank: the upper Tiyyār with
Cumbi and the greater part of the Lower Tiyyār
with Ashīta and Līzan. We shall give here a
general account of those on the left bank, namely,
going from N. to S. and from W. to E.: Dīz,
Kiu, the eastern part of the Lower Tiyyār, Tal,
Walto, Tḵhūna (with Tḵhūd); further to the east,
Djjūl, Bāz and lastly Iṣṭāzīn. All these districts
lie in the folds of the massif which the Turks
know by the general name of Djjūl Dēgh, but
which for the natives has a number of synonyms.
The massif of Djjūl Dēgh to some degree forms a
curve in the inverse direction of the arc of the
Great Zḥ.

History. The teaching of the Nestorians, who
were very active missionaries, was at one time
very widely disseminated in Asia. An inscription
in Chinese and Syriac was discovered at Singanfu.
At Travancore, in South India, there is still a
Nestorian community in existence. It was under the
Sāsānians that the Nestorians played an
important part. It is true that under Shāhīr II (309–
379), Yazdegird I (399–420) and Bahram V
(420–438) severe persecutions took place for various
reasons, of which the extraordinary spread of the
sect was not the least. On the other hand, pure political reasons, fear of Byzantine influence,
made the Persian government distraught of them.
We know for example, that the Byzantine emperor
demanded from Bahram V and Khusraw I the
free exercise of the Christian religion. Permanent
good relations between the Nestorian Church and the
state therefore date only from the declaration
of independence of the Eastern Syrian church
under a Catholicos of Seleucia with a monophysite
confession of faith. The most flourishing period
of Nestorianism was therefore in the reign of
Hormizd IV and at the beginning of the reign of
Khusraw II, I.e. from 578 to 605 a. n. Under
the influence of Gabriel of Siggara, who had gone
over to the monophysites, Khusraw II began to
persecute the Nestorians; one result was that from
609 to 628, the year of Khusraw's death, the
position of Catholicos remained vacant. Two events
in this period are of special importance to us.
The first was the establishment of Christianity in
Central Kurdistān, where we still find direct and
indirect traces of it at every step: churches,
monasteries, traditions, place-names. In the fifth
century the faith gained ground daily among the
people of the high plateaus of Iran proper and
among the Kurds. Pethion (4. 447) conducted a
very successful missionary campaign in these
mountains, which was crowned by his martyrdom.
Emulating him, Saba, the "teacher of the heathen",
goes among the Kurds, who were sun-worshippers.

His eloquence supported by numerous miracles
won many converts (J. Labourg, Le Christianisme
dans l'Empire Persé sous la Dynastie Sassanide,
Paris 1904). Let us not forget this first Nestorian
advance into Kurdistān. The oldest Nestorian
churches in Central Kurdistān date from the
fourth and fifth centuries. These are Mār Zaya at Djjūl;
Mār Bīšu at Iīl; Mār Sāba (ruins) at Kočānīs;
Māri Memō at Oramār. The monastery and church
of Mār Sāba at Ashīta in Tiyyār were also held
in great veneration but we do not know their date.
Secondly we must note here how relations were
established between the Nestorians and Islām (Tor
Andræ, Der Ursprung des Islams und das Christentum,
Upsala 1926). The part played by the Nestorians at a certain period under the Sāsānians explains the conversion of the Yaman to Nestorianism
at its conquest by the Persian general Wahriz in
597. It was in the Nestorian form that Christianity
penetrated into Arabia in the zone of Persian influence,
i.e. from Hexramawt to Palmrya. We know the
names of six Nestorian bishops on the eastern
shore of Arabia. The first to be founded was that of Omān (acts of Councils 424, 544,
576, 676). A Christian community on the island of Sogdērī used to receive its priests from
the Catholicos of Persia. Relations with Persia were
established by sea. By the time of Muḥammad the
South Arabian church was already Nestorian. We
have definite evidence of this in the fact that
Suyyid, prince of Ndjīrān, came with the bishop
Iṣḥāyīh to Muḥammad to seek favours. Bar Ḥebraeus
who records the incident adds that the Prophet
gave them a document ordering the Arabs to see
that no injury was done to the Christians and to
help them to rebuild their churches. The priests
and monks were to be exempt from the poll-tax,
which besides was not in general to exceed 4 _spacing
for the poor and 12 for the state. According to
another source, the bishop only wrote to Muḥammad.
A passage in a letter of Iṣḥāyīh III (647–648)
shows that the relations between Arabs and
Nestorians were very good. This may be attributed
to the fact that the Christology of the
Nestorians was much more acceptable to the
Muslims than that of the monophysites. Every Nestorian
church in the east possessed its own version of
the letter of protection alleged to have been given
by the Prophet (cf. for example that given by
George Dav. Malech in his History of the Syrian
Nation and the old Evangelical-Apostolic Church
of the East). In any case this letter did not
prevent (see below) the proclamation of the dīnāy ān
from which the Nestorians later suffered so much.
The life of the Nestorion Church during the
period from the Muḥammadan conquest to the
establishment of the Mongols need not detain us
here, as it is part of the religious history of the
Christian sects. We need only mention as particu-
larly concerning Aḏḥabīdžan that the Jacobite
and Nestorian rites were rivals there. Thus from
630 to 1265 we have a line of Jacobite bishops. We
know also (Assenman, Bibl. Or., III/II, 707) of
Nestorian bishoprics both to the east of Lake Urmiya
and also in the country of Lake Wān and Central
Kurdistān. It is not always easy to identify the
names found there. We have good evidence of
the antiquity of Nestorianism in Salamas where
there is in the burial ground of Koshrawā an
epitaph of the viiṭ century recording the name of
Khoṣrau Esḵolāy, "the student Khusraw" (cf,
Under the Mongols we find at first that the Nestorian priests (arkuata) were treated with consideration at the taking of Bagdad (Hammer, Itahan, ii. 152). We know also that Hilâgâ's wife was a Christian: at the taking of Arbil, the see of an important Nestorian metropolitan (Ithâhâbatâu) was also under it, the lances of the Mongol horsemen bore little crosses. Later, in proportion as the Mongols became converted to Islam, the Nestorians became subjected to persecution, and particularly after the invasion of Timûr they sought refuge in the mountains of Kurdistan from whom they in their turn retired to Tigris, and this movement of the sixteenth century when they spread eastwards towards the region of Urmiya and S. E. towards Mawús; Duval (op. cit., p. 9, note 4) gives notes on the different residences of the Nestorian patriarchs after the taking of Bagdad in 1258. It was under the Patriarch Simeon IV in 1450, that an innovation was introduced, making the episcopate hereditary; this produced a schism in the Nestorian community in 1551 when Sulakhâ was elected in opposition to Simeon bar Mama. From this date the term "Chaldaens" henceforth applied to these Nestorians who recognised the supremacy of Rome, while English and American writers speak constantly of the "Assyrians" and lastly the Nestorians themselves like to be called Sûrâlî. In Russian the name used was aiorti. In the second half of the sixteenth century, the bishop Mâr Ýusîf recognised the authority of Rome and received the title of Catholic Patriarch of Babylon and Chaldea, while one of his near relatives, elected patriarch of the Nestorians and remaining faithful to this rite, was enthroned under the name, henceforth hereditary, of Mâr Shîmūn and at once set out for the mountains of Central Kurdistan, where his residence was sometimes at Kûbânis and sometimes at Džïlâmerk. Thus originated this quasi-autonomous community of Nestorian highlanders in which an ecclesiastical authority exists alongside of a purely tribal organisation. Indeed while the supreme power is in the hands of a hereditary Mâr Shîmūn (passing from uncle to nephew) having the title of patriarka d-madenkha, who was consecrated patriarch by the Metropolitan Mâr Hânînî, living in Dera Resh at Shâmândîn, each tribe (shakha) had alongside of a bishop (âdshuna), the ecclesiastical chief, a màâlîk or lay chief, distinguished by peacock feathers fixed on his conical felt hat, a characteristic feature of dress. The custom of the men arranging their hair in little pigtails may also be mentioned. The màâlîk had power to declare war on another tribe and to conclude pacts of alliance.

The tribal organisation and mode of life of these highlanders have caused some writers to give them the name of "Christian Kurds" (Garzoni, Léch.)

A. Wigram in the introduction to his History of the Assyrian Church thinks that some at least of the Christians of Hakkârî [cf. Kurîn] are of Kurd origin although they deny it vigorously. On the other hand, there are Kurd tribes who remember that they were once Christians. Other writers (Grant), led astray perhaps by the theocratic aspect of Nestorian society, the names and certain Biblical traditions, see in them evidence in support of the hypothesis that the Nestorians are the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel. We know however which actually are the Jewish communities in Kurdistan, quite distinct from the Christian groups in dress and customs. Only their language is a Neo-Aramaic dialect. — The Highland Nestorians annually pay Mâr Shîmūn a contribution called rîsh d-shîta. The arrears due to the Turkish treasury were simply left to mount up. Cuinet (p. 749—751), speaking of the autonomous tribes, gives the total of arrears as already 160,000 £ in his time. There was besides somewhere in the Nestorian country (cf. Lalayan, who gives a photograph) a "rock of the collector of taxes" marking the limit beyond which this official never risked going. — The relations of the Nestorian hillmen with their Kurdish neighbours were no worse than those of the other patriarch's subjects. The interest of the tribe came before every consideration of religion, so that ad hoc alliances could be concluded between the Kurds and the Nestorians for joint action against their co-religionists.

"The grass grows quickly over the blood spilt in a just battle". A kind of fair play is therefore the ruling principle of the inter-tribal code. There are, it is true, exceptional cases. The pan-Islamism of ʻAbd al-Hamîd had his unpleasant repercussions in Kurdistan; the Turkish officials appointed there after the revolution of 1907 only complicated the position still further. Since the affairs of the Nestorians and Kurds were conducted on a tribal basis, we saw that the Nestorians themselves were open to Kurds and Nestorians indifferently, who were especially the offices of Shaikh Salim of Barzan known as the "Christian Shaikh", who was executed by the Turks in Mawús at the beginning of the War.

The Nestorians and the Dîjîhâd. Even before the official outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Turkey, in August 1914, the patriarch Mâr Shîmûn was invited by Džewdet Bey, the sâli of Wân, to come to see him. Presents were lavished upon him and assurances given that all the grievances of the Nestorians would be redressed. As a result of the proclamation of the dîjîhâd however, the atmosphere became heavy in Kurdistan. In November, Turkey entered the war and the per-scription of the Nestorians of Albâk (Bash-kala) began at once. In Persia fighting broke out between the Christians of the Urmiya region and the Bekûbîî Kurds. At the end of 1914, the Russians evacuated Urmiya and Salamas. Those Christians who did not save themselves in time by going to Džulfa perished in large numbers. As to the Nestorians of the highlands, although the massacres and deportations of Armenians were at their height, the Turks endeavoured to attach the Patriarch to their side and to secure the loyalty of the Nestorians. Complete educational freedom, good roads, subsidies and grants to the Patriarch and to the bishops and màâlîks, all these things were promised in vain. Mâr Shîmûn retired to the particularly inaccessible district of Dîz from which the Patriarch's personal bodyguard had always been recruited. About this time an "accidental" shot killed Mâr Shîmûn's uncle Nestor, who was, it was said, urging a more conciliatory policy towards the Turks. After an interview, which decided matters, with the Russian commander at Muhândîjî, near Salamas, the Patriarch on May 10, 1915, issued the order for mobilisation. The fortune of war resulted in the Nestorians, at first encouraged by the Russian successes in Wân and Urmiya at the beginning
of the summer, being left to their own resources. To be brief, with the help of the Barrâni Kurds, the Turks sacked Tskhuma, Tzyrâ, Djilli and Baz. We may note especially the destruction of the irri-
gation canals as was done in Sargon’s campaign in the same region. The famous castle of Mâr Zaia at Djilli, of the fourth century, was
desecrated for the first time in its long history. Interesting ex voto, Chinese vases, brought there in early days by missionaries, disappeared. The inviolability enjoyed by Mâr Zaia is said to have been due to a letter guaranteeing it written on a piece of cloth, attributed to the Prophet (cf. above). After this disaster the Nekestrians withdrew to their summer pastures, at a height of 10,000 feet. This trial was a painful one. Harassed by the Kurds, with insufficient food and no salt, the Nekestrians nevertheless held out. The Patriarch, taking refuge on the plateau of Shina, endured privations which were even harder for him who could not eat meat (even the mother of the patriarch appears not to eat meat). The Nekestian, rav’dut of Gavar were massacred at this time under the orders of Närî Bey. Finally in October 1915 a skillful retreat was carried through. The Kurds were actually holding the approaches to the Persian frontier. A detour was effected towards Allâkh in the north via Korranis (Berwar) and the bridges were burned after crossing the Great Zâb. The Kurds succeeded however in threatening the retreat by using the natural bridge of Hezkelan, but were driven back by Major Kohne. The Nârî Darseh, the Kurdish brave is destined to become legendary. In the month of November the exodus of the Nekestrians was completed and they were safe within the Russian lines at Salamas. The Russian authorities organised assistance for the refugees, who to the number of 40,000 were settled in the Persian districts of Khî Salamas and Urmîya where they remained till 1918. After the departure of the Russians as a result of the revolution, the Nekestrians formed detachments with the help of Russian munitions and instructors and opposed the advance into Aghardâbdian of the Turks led by ‘Alî Isâm Pâshî. Towards the end of the summer of 1918, however, when their munitions being exhausted, the Nekestrians left the region of Urmîya via Salâme-Sâin Kala-Bidjâr for Hamadân where the English forces then were. From there the refugees were sent to the concentration camp of Bakoula near Bagîdâd. The Patriarch was no longer alive. Led into an ambush by the Shâkh Kürd chief Ismâ’îl Aghâ Simkâ, Mâr Shîm’ân was treacherously assassinated at Kohne Shêhr on March 4, 1918.

The Nekestarian community is now living in scattered groups in the ‘Irâk, Persia, Syria etc. The post-war history of the Nekestrians is closely bound up with the problem of the vilayet of Mawîlî, finally attached to the ‘Irâk. The line adopted for the northern boundary of the vilayet in question, however, leaves the Nekestian districts to Turkey and it is very unlikely that they can return there. The martial qualities of the Nekestrians were used by the British authorities who raised four battalions from them, which were very useful especially at the beginning of their establishment in the ‘Irâk.

In conclusion a few words should be said about the Nekestians of the region of Lake Urmîya. Those of Salamas believe (Duval, op. cit.) that they are aborigines converted in the early centuries of our era. In 1883 there were however only fifteen Nekestian families, the remaining 3,000 having become Roman Catholics under the bishop Mâr Ishaqî (d. 1798). As to the Nekestians of the plateau of Urmîya, they preserve traditional Nestorian and Isma’îlian elements, dropping back from the mountains five or six centuries ago, which corresponds very closely to historic fact. The Nekestians of Urmîya have been the object of lively competition among the missions, of which the Presbyterian was first established (1832). The Roman Catholic Lazarists followed in 1863 and finally an Orthodox mission, the brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, began work in 1905. At one time shortly before the War, there were also Anglican and Catherian missions. The work of the missions has made quite appreciable modifications not only in the beliefs of this ancient Christian community but also in its life and customs. Although little information has been preserved on the subject, there is reason to believe that the Nekestians of Urmîya also lived under the authority of mûllâs, who were recognised by the Shâhs as the official representatives of the community. We have seen a number of firmâns preserved in the family of Dr. Johanna Malik. They were administered according to the old collection of canon law called Sunhados of which Shamsâly Yi’sîl Kaleta published a new edition in 1916 at the American Mission Press.

This is probably only one of the versions of the Syriac, which in its popular edition with its wealth of learning. In the eyes of the Muslim authorities the Nekestians were zimmî (dhimmî; cf. dhimmâ) and their position was regulated by Muhammedan law. With the coming of the missionaries, the position gradually changed. The mûllâs were replaced by mîllet bâghi, each dependent on his respective mission. The Persian government had to appoint a serfrest, an official whose special duty was to deal with foreigners and those under their protection. During the War a national council called motovaw was organised, which dealt not only with the defence of Christian interests before the local authorities but, especially after the addition to their number of the Nekestian families, acquired a certain political character but later disappeared in the general débâcle. — In conclusion it should be mentioned that in the present article we have confined ourselves mainly to the Nekestian highlanders of Central Kurdistân. The historical phenomenon that we have been led to study in this connection is far from being so limited and simple, for it demands not only consideration of linguistic problems, the ramifications of which go back to a remote past through Aramaic, but also of facts of ethnology even less known which are implied in the idea of Nestorianism. Finally the geographical area is also enormous if we remember for which their the epigraphic material from Russian Central Asia.

Bibliography: Church history: Hoff-
NESTORIANS -- NEWŽIŽADE 'ÂṬÂĪ


NEWĪ, YAHUN R. Pier 'ÂLI R. NAŠŪH, an Ottoman theologian and poet, with the nom de plume (wâqîqâl) of Newī, was born in Malghara (Romelia), the son of Shaikh Pier 'Âli in 940 (1533). Up to his tenth year he was taught by his learned father and then became a pupil of Kâramâni-zade Mehemmed Efendi. His fellow pupils were Bâkî, the poet [q. v.] and Sâd-d al-Din, the famous historian [q. v.]. He was an intimate friend of the former. He joined the 'Ulêma', became muddariz of Gallipoli in 973 (1565) and after filling several other offices became a teacher in the Madrese of Mihr u-Mâth Sultan. In 998 (1598) he was appointed Kâfi of Baghdâd but before he could take up office Sultan Murûd III appointed him tutor to his son Mustafa and to the princes Bâyazid, Othmân and 'Abd Allah. When after Murûd III's death (1000 = 1595) the usual slaughter of the princes deprived of all the charges, he retired completely from public life and lived on a pension granted him by the new sultan. He died at Stambul in Dhû 'l-Ka'dâ 177 (June 1599) and was buried in the court of the Shâhî, Wafà mosque. His son, Newezâde 'Âṭāī [q. v.].

Newī was a man of great learning and his encyclopedic knowledge was most clearly revealed in the best known of his works, the Nasâiî al-Futun wa-Mahasîn al-Mu'ttin, in which he surveyed the twelve most important branches of learning; on it cf. [J. v. Hammer] Encyklopädische Übersicht der Wissenschaften des Orientis, part i. (Leipzig 1804), p. 22 sqq. and the German translation of the story of Shâdân and Bêghîr, ibid., p. 24 sqq. which forms the concluding section of this work. Birzâl Mehemmed Tâhir gives a list of other prose works in his Ofganim âl Mislûflük'ser, ii. 437 sqq. with references to the libraries in which they were kept. In poetry he imitated the style of his contemporary Bâkî without however reaching his level. His poems which were collected in a scarce Dhuâin (MS. in Stambul, Hamidiye library), lack ease and betray too readily the learned author who frequently makes it work difficult to understand with unusual words and obscure allusions. He tries his skill in different forms of verse, the kâsad, gharel, and metherwâl, without however attaining popularity in any one of them. His fame as a poet is completely overshadowed by that of his contemporary and friend Bâkî. Newī's high position as an author he owes to his learned work, particularly the already mentioned encyclopedia, which was very popular and is evident from the numerous MSS. still in existence in European collections (e.g. Berlin, Bologna, Dresden, Leyden, London [3 copies], Upsala, Vienna). A Sülâmînâmêne by him (Paris, Bib. Nat., cod. reg. 44, Cat. No. 308 and F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 76) does not seem to be mentioned by his biographers. His son Newezâde 'Âṭāī wrote a very full life of him (p. 415-27 of the dha'il to Tâshkoprûzâde's work).

Bibliography: J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., iii. 105; Gibb, H. O. P., iii. 171 sqq.; Hâdîlî Khalîfa, Fedelke, i. 120 sqq., also the biographies of poets by Khânî-zade and 'Ahdî.

NEWŽIŽADE 'ÂṬÂĪ, (FRANZ BARTIGER) an Ottoman author and poet, better known as 'Âṭāī with the nom de plume Newezâde, i.e. son of Newî, was born in 971 (1565) in Stambul, as the son of the celebrated Newî [q. v.]. After the death of his father from whom he received his early education, he placed himself under Kâfaal Fâlî Allah Efendi, the compiler of an anthology, and later under Akhi-zade 'Ali al-Halim Efendi. He then joined the 'Ulêma' but did not attain any of the higher offices. After becoming a mutâlimî, he was appointed a judge and served in the capacity in a number of Rumelian towns like Lohça, Silistria, Rusçuk, Timovo, Monastir (Bitofî),
Trikkala and Çakib (Skopje). Soon after his retirement from this sphere of activity he died in 1634 (1051) in his native city of Stambul; here he was buried beside his father.

İğdı is best known for his continuation (当之无愧) in Turkish of Taşkıpuzâde’s Şahanshâh-i Mihristânî. This work, entitled Hâdi’i al-Haşât’î fi Tâmilat al-Shâhâsche in, contains, in addition to a supplement to the Şahâsche in which is placed a given to many scholars of the time of Sulaimân and Selim II, overlooked by Taşkıpuzâde, the biographies of Ottoman ‘Ulama’ and dervish shaikhs down to the reign of Murad IV (on the contents see F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 172). Death prevented the continuing author from completing his work, which was taken up by others. İğdı’s book contains 999 biographies. It is written in a very artificial style permuted with Persian, which was popular at the time. İğdı also enjoyed a great reputation as a poet. He wrote a quintet (Khamia) on the contents of which see Gibb, H. O. P., iii. 234 sqq. The Hâdi’i al-Haşât’î, manuscripts of which are also common (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 172) to which may now be added Stambul, Lâlî İsmâ’îl, №. 339, was printed at Stambul (157 + 771 pp. 2°) in 1268. The poetry still awaits a printer. İğdı’s significance as a prose writer is much greater than as a poet. Bibliography: Cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 171 sqq. and the works there given, especially, J. Babinger, O. D. O., 4175, Gibb, H. O. P., iii. 232 sqq.; Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 427 (where he is wrongly, according to F. Wüstenfeld, G. A. W., called Muhammed): Hâdidî Khalifa, reddakte, ii 168; Rüdâ, Tezkerê, p. 70 sq.; Muhibî, Ezatü’l, Cairo 1281, iv. 263.

(FRANZ BABINGER)

NEWRES, the name of two Ottoman poets.

1. Abd al-Razzâk known as Newres, or more accurately Newres-i Kadim, “Newres the Elder,” to distinguish him from Othman Newres [q. v.], came from Kırkük (near Bagdad) and was probably of Kurdish origin. He moved from Karâbâh to Istanbul at an early age to prosecute his studies. Here he became a nûderis but in the year 1159 (1746) entered upon a legal career. According to the Sâtî-i ‘â’îmestî, he held the office of şâbî in Sarajevo and Kutahya. His tongue which found particular expression in daring and malicious chronograms (tavârîk) earned him banishment to Kethimmûn (Crete) along with the poet Hashmet and then to Brussa; he was later, according to Wâsîf (Turkic, p. 211), sent back to Kutahya. In any case he died in Brussa in Shawwal 1175 (May 1764) of a broken heart and was buried in the cemetery opposite the entrance to the mosque of Fatih. From Sultan Mahomed the founder of the order of Djalwata, Abd-al-Razzâk Newres composed a Divân in Persian and Turkish (pr. Stambul 1290 and we believe 1304), and also a history of the war with Nâdir Shâh in 1143 (1730) in which he took part on the staff of Hekim-Ogлу ‘Ali Paşa. The little book called Tebrizî-i Hekim-Ogлу ‘Ali Paşa’ is written in ornate language and is of no historical value. The fair copy in the author’s hand is preserved in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek (Cod. Or. 8° 2186). Newres also enjoyed the reputation of being a distinguished mujaddîd. Excerpts from his Divân are given by J. v. Hammer in his G.O.R., ix. 643 sq. His Divân is called Mabâli’î

al-Mihkâm which gives the year 1172 (1758) for its completion (cf. however a similarly titled work in Vienna: Flügel, Cat., iii. 486, N°. 1991).

Bibliography: Cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 204 sq. with further references. The promised very full bio-bibliography of Newres Efendi by Ibn al-Amin Mahmûd Kemal Bey has not yet appeared (1933).

2. Othman, called Newres or, to distinguish him from his older namesake, Newres-i Djjedid, came from Chios. He held several military posts in the capital and died there in 1293 (1876) in retirement. He is buried in the Karâbâh Ahmed cemetery in Skutari. His collected poems have been twice printed, Stambul 1257 and Stambul 1290 (by Vüsuf Kâmil Paşa) (Divân-i Othman Newres). In 1302 there was published at the suggestion of Abd al-Râhîm Nâdir Paşa in Stambul under the title Eshker-i Nâdir specimens of his prose and verse. A Turkish translation of the Galestân by him exists in MS. Othman Newres had a very thorough command of the three languages of Islam and wrote poetry in all three. His work however is hardly of permanent value.

Bibliography: Brulsil Mehmed Tahir, Othmânî Müellifleri, i. 455 sq.

(FRANZ BABINGER)

NICEA. [See IZNIK.]

NIEBLA (Ar. Labâl), a little town in the S.W. of Spain, 45 miles W. of Seville on the right bank of the Guadalquivir. No one has doubted that it is less than 2,000 inhabitants and is in the judicial district of Moguer, in the province of Huelva. It is the ancient Iliopa. In the Visigothic period it was the see of a bishop, in the province of the Muslim period it enjoyed considerable prosperity It formed part of the district of al-Sharâf (Ajarafe) and was also called al-Hamrat, “the red,” no doubt from the colour of its ramparts and of the water of its river. It was particularly an olive-growing centre. The gentians was also cultivated there and deposits of alum and of sulphate of iron were worked.

Niebla was taken in 713 (149) by Abd al-Âzîz, son of Mâss b. Nuṣîr [q. v.]. In 766 (149) it was the starting point of the rising of Sa’d al-Mâṣṭarî al-Yahûbî who seized Seville but was soon defeated and slain by the troops of Abd al-Râhîm 1. The town in 30 (54) suffered from a visit of the Normans (Maghirs) [q. v.]. In 859 (157) it rebelled against the Umayyads: it was however retaken by force of arms in 304 (917) by order of Abd al-Râhîm al-Nâṣîr by his general Badr b. Ahmad. At the time of the fall of the Caliphate, it became the capital of a little kingdom formed in 1024 (414) by Abu ’l-Abâbîs Ahmad b. Yahyâ al-Yahûbî, who took the Îlahî of Ta’dj al-Dawla, which also comprised the lands of Huelva and of Djabal al-’Uyûn (Gibraltar). This prince died in 433 (1041) and was succeeded by his brother Muhammad ’izz al-Dawla. The Abâbîd sovereign of Seville al-Mu’tâdîd [q. v.] soon displayed his desire to annex the principality of Niebla and made several raids into it, ’izz al-Dawla had to abandon his capital and take refuge with the lord of Cordova Abu ’l-Walid Muhammad b. Djâwar in 443 (1051) leaving the power to his nephew Abû Naṣr Fâth b. Khâlîfah. Yahyâ al-Yahûbî Nâṣîr al-Dawla, who at first bought peace from al-Mu’tâdîd by paying him tribute but was forced two years later in 445 (1053) to abandon his
principally to the ruler of Seville and join his uncle in Cordova. Niebla passed a little later to the Almoravids [q.v.]. When the power of this dynasty was beginning to collapse in Spain, Yusuf b. Ahmad al-Birrawshi (or al-Barruzzi), who in 549 (1154) finally submitted to the Almohad general Barrāz al-Mašūfī and went five years later to Sala on the summons of 'Abd al-Mu'in. A few years later Yusuf al-Birrawshi, maintained as governor of Niebla by the Almohads, rebelled and the town was retaken in 549 (1154) by the governor of Seville and of Cordova, Yahyā b. Yaghmur, who executed 8,000 of the inhabitants. This massacre was condemned by 'Abd al-Mu'in who had Yahyā brought in chains to Morocco and then exiled to Tlemcen.

Niebla remained under Muslim rule until 1257, when it was taken after six months siege by Alfonso X and became finally Christian.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

**NIFFAR (Nuffar)**, a ruined site in southern Ṣirāf, in 32° 7' N. Lat. and 45° 10' East Long. (Greenew.), now in the ḏūlā of Ṣafak in the ḏūlā al-Dīnahī. Niebla, it corresponds, as J. O'Callaghan pointed out, to the first point out, to the town of Nippur well known from cuneiform inscriptions, one of the oldest and most important places in Babylonia. Its great importance was not political but religious, as the temple of the chief deity of the town formed a kind of central sanctuary or place of pilgrimage for the whole of Babylonia, to which almost all the important sovereigns of the period before Hammurapi, and Hammurapi himself, as well as the Kassite kings and many later rulers like Assurbanipal, dedicated gifts.

Nippur's period of greatest prosperity lay in the millenia before Hammurapi; but it remained an important city down to the last Babylonian and Achaemenid rulers and an important commercial centre with a very mixed population which gave it a somewhat cosmopolitan character. In the fifth century B.C., under Artaxerxes I and Darius II, we find in it an important business and banking house, the firm of Muraššīlu & Sons to whose activities many documents still bear eloquent testimony. Nippur still continued to flourish under the Seleucids and Arsacids as buildings of this period show, quite apart from the numismatic evidence. It is not directly mentioned by Greek or Roman writers, but the name of the district of Nippur may be concealed in nipparēnu, the name of a stone which Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, xxxvi. 10, 172) says is of Persian (i.e. presumably Parthian?) origin.

In the Babylonian Talmud Nippur appears as Naphur (נֶפֶר) and Nuphar (נֵפַר); the latter form corresponds to that which is now most usual: Nuffar. In the passage in question in the Babylonian Talmud (†Yoma, 10*) we read: Kalneh (קאַלְנֶה) is Naphur (Nuphar) Nippur (נֶפֶר); the qualification Nippur (נֶפֶר) is obscure; Daiecher's explanation in O.L. *Z., xi. 529* as Nimb falls to the ground as the name of this deity is now known to read Ninurrta. The basis of the equation Kalneh (Gen. x. 10) = Nippur is not yet satisfactory. A Babylonian place-name Kalnē has so far not been found in cuneiform inscriptions.

Nippur was also an inhabited place in Muslim times; for example we find it mentioned in 38 (659) on the occasion of a rising against the caliph Ali (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 3423, 3424) as well as during the Khāridji troubles (cf. cit., ii. 929, p.); also cf. Yafūk, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 275, 798 and Ibn al-Fahš, in *D.G.A.*, v. 210. In the later middle ages we find Nifār mentioned as a *Nestorian bishopric* in the chronicles of the Patriarchs (Abūḥār Fārīška ḫūṣr al-Mazāği, ed. Gymondi, Rome 1897 and 1899) of 'Amr b. Māṭa' (p. 83, p. 95, a) and of Māṭ b. Sulaimān, in the period 900—1058 A.D. (cf. also Sachau, in *Abb. Fr. Aa.*, W., 1909, No. 1, p. 31). When the town was abandoned by its inhabitants and became completely desolate we do not know. It probably was the result of one of the Mongol invasions, that under Hulagu or that under Timur, which dealt their death-blow to so many flourishing places in Mesopotamia.

The ruins of Niffar are next to those of Babylon and al-Warks' [q.v.] the most extensive in the whole of the Babylonian plain; they cover an area of almost 180 acres. The first European to visit them was W. K. Loftus who spent some time here in 1850 and came back again in 1854 (see the *Bibl.* for his report). A year later than Loftus, in Jan. 1851, Layard was in Nifār and spent two weeks digging but with little success because Layard, paying too little attention to the difference between Assyrian and Babylonian mounds, did not dig deep enough and only turned over the cemetery of a person who had settled here only in the last centuries of antiquity, under the Assacids.

The University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia) was the first to undertake a methodical investigation of the ruins and in four expeditions from 1888 to 1900 (1888—1889, 1889—1890, 1893—1896 and 1895—1900) under the leadership of Peters, Haynes and Hilprecht carried out excavations on a large scale. On the results of this intensive work see Hilprecht's full report in *Explorations et.*, (see *Bibl.*), p. 289 sq.

On the topography of Niffar see, in addition to the descriptions by Loftus and Layard, especially Peters, *op. cit.*, ii. 104 sq.; Hilprecht, *op. cit.*, p. 540 sq. and notably Fisher, *op. cit.*; cf. alo King, *op. cit.*, p. 85—86. The American expedition also found an ancient Babylonian plan of Nippur which Hilprecht, *op. cit.*, p. 518 (re-produced in Zehnpfund, *op. cit.*, p. 66) published; more distinct in Fisher, *op. cit.*, pl. i. This plan has been since 1926 in the possession of the University of Jena with the rest of Hilprecht's private Assyriological collection; see Zimmer, in *ZA.*, xxxvii. 224.
The sight of the ruins is very impressive; they rise like a range of hills in close formation from 30—60 feet above the plain, culminating in the cone of Bint al-Amir 95 feet high, the zigurrat of the chief temple.

The most imposing part of the whole eastern quarter is the zigurrat of Im-Kharsag, still 95 feet high, which the inhabitants for some reason now forgotten call Bint al-Amir, the "prince's daughter". The triangular mound south of the sanctuary proper marks the site of the great temple library, about a twelfth of which, yielding some 23,000 cuneiform tablets and fragments, has been excavated. The western half of the inner city contains the residential quarters with the bazaars, business houses and private dwellings. Its history is still obscure as in the course of centuries it was repeatedly resettled. In the Parthian period a large cemetery extended over a considerable part of the clay buildings which had fallen to pieces there.


In addition to the great Enlil temple E-kur there were a number of other highly venerated temples in Nippur.

According to the cuneiform inscriptions, Nippur must have in ancient times lain on the Euphrates itself or at least in its immediate vicinity (cf. e.g. O. L. Z., XX, 142, note 1); this fact forces us to the assumption that this river in the Babylonian period must have taken a much more easterly course below Babylon than in the middle ages and present day. The inner city is divided into two parts by a canal now dry but once navigable, which the natives call Shatt al-Nil. This was an important watercourse which, according to Hilprecht, was in many places at one time 20—25 feet deep and 150—190 feet broad and which the modern inhabitants rightly describe not as a mere nahr (stream, canal) but as ghab (river).

According to the mediaeval Arab geographers: Nahr al-Nil was the name of one of the canals led off from the Euphrates to the Tigris. It still survives in its entirety; as in the middle ages, it starts from Babylon and flows a little above 32° 30' N. Lat. in an almost straight line eastwards. The geographer Suhrâb (who used to be called Ibn Serapion; cf. i.v., p. 1130a) writing in the fourth (tenth) century observes that this canal bears the name Nahr al-Nil only after passing the town of al-Nil (the modern ruins Nilîye). At the present day it is called only Shatt al-Nil throughout its course. South east of Nilîye a side canal, now dry, branches off to the south for which, not only in its lower part where it flows by the ruins of Niffar but along its whole extent, the name Shatt al-Nil, the same as that of the main canal, was and is usual. Yâkît however says (iv. 77, 798) that Niffar lay not on the Nahr al-Nil but on the bank of the Nahr al-Nars, a canal dug, it is said, by the Sassanian king Narsê B. Bahram (293—303 A.D.) which leaves the Euphrates at al-Ilîha a little below the Nahr al-Nil and turns southeastward. It was presumably connected by a branch with the southern small canal of the same name which branches off from the Nahr al-Nil, so that the occurrence of the two names Nahr al-Nil and Nahr al-Nars for the river in Niffar is explained. It should be noted also that the nomenclature of the Babylonian canals changed several times already in the middle ages. On the Nahr al-Nil or Shatt al-Nil and Nahr al-Nars see Loftus, op. cit., p. 238; G. Le Strange, in J. R. A. S., 1895, S. 256, 260—261 and do., in The Lands of the East, Caliphathe, Cambridge 1905, p. 72—74; Streck, Babylonien nach den arabisch. Geographen, i. (Leiden 1900), p. 30 sq.; Hersfeld, in Sarie-Hersfeld, Archäolog. Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet, i. (Berlin 1911), p. 234 sq.; Hasîn al-Sûdâl, Djuhrâftiyât al-Irâk al-haditha, Baghdâd 1927, p. 34, 35.

Below Niffar the Shatt al-Nil loses itself in the swamps of Hôr al-'Afek. The Shatt al-Kât very probably forms its southern continuation.

If the "Euphrates of Nippur", as it is called in the cuneiform inscriptions, really represents the old course of this river, and not simply a branch of it, the modern Shatt al-Nil with its continuation, the Shatt al-Kât, probably corresponds to the bed of the Euphrates of Babylonian times. On the great changes in their courses which the rivers of Mesopotamia have undergone, cf. especially Fisher, op. cit., p. 2 sg. Hilprecht, who is followed by others like Zehnpfund, Unger etc., thinks that the name of the canal, Kabaru (= the large) found in later texts from Nippur, corresponds to the "Euphrates of Nippur" of the older texts. He further compares it with the Kebar (72) of Ezekiel (i. 1 etc.); see Hilprecht, Explorations, p. 412 and also in Der Bbl-Tempel in Nippur, p. 10. The identification of the Kabaru with the old bed of the Euphrates, i.e. the modern Shatt al-Nil, I do not consider proved; the Kabaru may also be a canal in the neighbourhood of Nippur.

West and Southwest of Niffar lies the very extensive Hôr al-'Afek (on the meaning of Hôr see iii., p. 147b).

This mystic, whom the principal Sufi biographers fail to mention, flourished in the ivth (9th) century, and, according to Hādī al-Khalīfa, died in the year 354 (965). His nisba refers to the town of Niffar (q.v.) in Mesopotamia, and one MS. of his works assigns it that he was sitting in his residence at Niffar and Ni'il that he committed his thoughts to writing. Niffar's literary reliquiae consist of two books, the Masāwīf and the Makātabāt, together with a number of fragments. It is improbable that Niffar himself was responsible for the editing of his writings; according to his principal commentator, 'Affī al-Dīn al-Tīlmāsī (d. 690 = 1291), either his son or his grandson collected his scattered writings and published them according to his own ordering. The Masāwīf consists of 77 sections of varying length, made up for the most part of brief aphorisms touching on the main aspects of Sufi teaching, and purporting to be inspired and dictated by God; the Makātabāt is similar in content, and is divided into 56 sections. Niffar's most characteristic contribution to mysticism is his doctrine of wakifa. This term, which would appear to be used by him in a peculiarly technical sense, implies a condition in the mystic which is accompanied by direct divine audition, and perhaps even automatic script. Masāwīf is the name given to the state of the mystic in which wakifa is classed higher than mar'aifa, and mar'aifa is above šim. The wakifa is nearer to God than any other thing, and almost transcends the condition of bashāriya, being alone separated from all limitation. Niffar definitely maintains the possibility of seeing God in this world; for he says that vision (ru'yā) in this world is a preparation for vision in the world to come. In several places Niffar distinctly touches on the theory of the Mahdī, and indeed appears to identify himself with the Mahdī, if these passages are genuine; and this claim is seemingly in the mind of Žābdī, when he describes Niffar as lābī al-dā'wa wa l-ḍa'āsī. Tīlmāsī however interprets these passages in an esoteric and highly mystical sense; and it does not accord with the general character of the author, that he should make for himself such extravagant claims. Niffar shows himself in his writings to be a fearless and original thinker. While undeniably influenced by his great predecessor al-Hallāj, he acknowledges no obligations, and has a thorough conviction of the reality of his own mission.


NIĞDE, a town in the Turkish sandjak (now wilâyet) of the same name in a fertile trough on the east edge of the Central Anatolian steppe. The town is first mentioned in the Turkish period; previously the chief town of the district was Tyana (A. Tawana) but it is probable that the striking hill which commands the important road from Ciliać to Kaşarîye at its entrance to a pass over the mountains had a fortified settlement upon it in the pre-Turkish period. The old place-name may be the origin of the modern one, an older form of which was Nukde (Yăkût, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 811: Nakidah; Ibn Bibi and others, also in inscriptions down to the xvith century: Nakida; the modern form NİKiçe [in the new Turkish script: Nığde] is already found in Hamd Allāh Muştafawī, Nizhat, in G. M. S., xxii/1, 99). In this particular district some villages have retained their ancient names (Andaval-Anbadalis, Melegop-Malakopais) and considerable numbers of descendants of the original Christian inhabitants survived until quite recently (R. M. Dawkins, Modern Greek in Asia Minor, Cambridge 1916, p. 16 sqq.).

Nigde is first mentioned in connection with the partition of Seldjuk territory among the sons of Kılıç Arslan I (965 = 1189) when it was allotted as an independent lordship to Arslan Şah (Ibn Bibi, ed. Houtsma, Rec., iv. 11). Nigde had perhaps previously belonged to the Danishmandids but Ewliya, ii. 819, cannot be taken as evidence of this. Kaftaʻüs I granted Nigde to the Emir-i Ağhr Zain al-Dīn Bayhara (Ibn Bibi, p. 44) who shortly before his death built the important mosque of 'Ali al-Dīn here (620 = 1223). In the xith century, the town was of importance; it is divided into 45 wards. In the great military districts of the Seldjük, under Kılıç Arslan IV, Ibn at-Khattr Masʻūd held this office. At first an ally of the all powerful Muʿin al-Dīn Perwāne, with whom he killed the sultan in 1264, he endeavoured to remove the young Kān Khusraw III out of Perwāne's influence and brought him to Nigde (1276). But the help for which he had appealed to Egypt came too late and he succumbed to Perwāne who was supported by the Mongols (Ibn Bibi; Well, Gesch. d. Chalifén, iv. 80 sqq.). He built a well in Nigde opposite the 'Alī al-Dīn mosque (666 = 1268). Under the Ikhāns there ruled in their name, or in the name of their Anatolian governor Eret, Sunkur Agha who is known only from inscriptions and is, it is remarkable to note, not mentioned by Ibn Battūta who visited Nigde about 1333 (ed. De ferency-Sanguinetti, ii. 286); he made himself independent after the death of Abū Sār. He gave the town a large mosque on the wall of which facing the Bezistân is a Persian inscription, in which he grants Christian foreigners exemption from dzeye and kharāṣ (736 = 1335). The Seldjük princess Khudawand hātmīn buried in 732 (1332) in her splendid turbe built in 712 (1312) on the other hand probably did not rule in Nigde although she resided there. She was, if the lady buried beside her in 1344 was her daughter, the emir Shadja' al-Dīn who is mentioned as the father of the lady on her sarcophagus; he ruled according to al-Umar (ed. Taeschner, p. 31) in the Bulghurlagh, where a wilāyet Shadja' al-Dīn is still mentioned in Saʿd al-Dīn (i. 571 following Idris) and where lies Ulukša which, according to Hājīdī Khalīfa (Dīkānāmmā'il, p. 617), was also called Shadja' al-Dīn. After the period of Sunkūr's rule, Nigde probably passed directly to the Karamanglāha, who held it against the attacks of the Eretul 'Ali al-Dīn 'Ali (c. 1379) (A nhất b. Astdār, Resm u-Rezm, p. 141 sqq.). In 1390 Nigde surrendered with other Karamanian towns to the Ottomans but was restored to the Kār-
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manids who defended it successfully against Kādi Būrān al-Dīn, lord of Kārašī and Siwās (Bezm u-Ražm, p. 242, 529). After Timūr’s invasion the power of the Kāramānids extended northwards as far as Dewelī Kārašīr which previously belonged to Kārašī and for a time even to Kārašīr itself. Nigde then ceased to be a frontier town. Apart from a temporary occupation by Egyptian troops in 1419 (Weil, v. 146 sqq.) it enjoyed peace and prosperity and the special care of the Kāramānids who had one of the bulwarks of their power here till the end of the dynasty. A series of buildings, the first of which not only in time but also in size and quality is the Ak-Medrese of the year 1409, is evidence of their interest in the town. Nigde surrendered in 875 (1470) to the Ottoman general İlahi Paşa who had the defences of the town restored. In 878 (1473) the Ottoman Sandjak- bey of Nigde, Koşű Bey, forced Dewelī Kārašīr which still belonged to the Kārašānoglu to surrender to prince Muştağa. The latter died on the way back at Nigde (Sa’d al-Dīn, i. 517, 550).

The sandık of Nigde belonging to the beylerbeylik of Kāramān, contained the kazas of Uğrub, Bor, Dewelū, Dewelī Kārašīr and Uklūsha. When about 1720 the grand vīzīr İbrahim Paşa transformed his birthplace of Muğkara in the kazas of Uğrub into the imposing town of Nwshērīr, the kazas for the garrisons of the fortified castles of Nigde and Dewelī Kārašīr were transferred to the new foundation (v. Hamner, C.O.R. 2, iv. 250 sqq.). At the end of the Ottoman period the sandık of Nigde, to which the kazas of Ak-serāi also belonged, contained 148,700 Muslims and 49,551 Christians the latter mainly natives and mostly speaking Turkish. Nigde was the residence of the metropolitan of Konīa. The town numbered at this time 11,526 inhabitants, in 1927 (after the exchange with Greece) only 9,463.

Nigde (now on the Kayseri-Ulukışla railway) consists of an upper town running north and south, now largely uninhabited (Tepe Wińače) at the highest point of which in the north stands the imposing chapel, and the lower town (Şehr aṬīl) which was also once surrounded by a wall. In the upper town is the “Al提供的āl-Dīn mosque, one of the oldest mosques in Anatolia, with an architect’s inscription in Persian. Before the gateway of the upper town at its south end is the Gothic mosque of Sunkur (c. 1350) showing influences from Little Armenia and Cyprus, and the bazaar. West of and below it is the Kāramānian Ak-Medrese of 1409. A little apart to the west of the town, separated by a broad road, running north and south is the modern quarter Kayabābād with a few remains of the old cemetery and a group of türbes among which that of Khuḍawād Khaṭīr of the year 1312 is prominent. Bibliography: Cauinet, Turquie d’Asie, i. 839 sqq.; Türküyênî şerî şerî wi-süstîma diqora-fiyasi Medîmûnci, N. 2: Nigde (1922); A. Gabriel, Monuments turcs d’Anatolie, i, 1931, p. 105 sqq. (historical and Muslim monuments of Nigde, Bor and Ulukışla). — Inscriptions: Khalil Edhem, in T.O.E.M., ii. 747 sqq.; iii. 821 sqq.; 873 sqq. and A. Tewfik in Gabriel, op. cit. — On the Christian monuments of the region see Rott, Kleinasiatische Denkmaler, 1908; and De Jerphanion, Églises rupestres de Cap- padoce, 1925. (Paul Wittke).

NIHĀL ČAND LĀHAWRĪ, Indian man of letters, Hindu by religion, was born in Dīhlī, but left it in early life and went to Lahore where he lived for a considerable time. Owing to this circumstance he called himself Lahawrī. Search for a livelihood led him to Calcutta. Here he was introduced to Dr. J. B. Gilehrtrst who asked him to translate into “Hindī rekhi” the story of Tādż al-Multiḳ and Bakāwāli. He consented and thus became one of the famous band of Fort William translators. He made the translation from Gulu Bakāwālī, a Persian rendering by Shāiki Ḩizzat Ullāh, 1772, of an old Hindi story, which has been reproduced in Urdu verse by Dayā Shānkar Kāw Nātin (q.v.), in his well-known maḥānī Gultār-i-Nāzīm.

Nihāl Čand called his work Madhāhab-i Yāhū. It is in very good prose mixed with verse. The name gives the date 1217 (1802). Apart from the above mentioned facts nothing is known about the writer.


NIHAWAND, a town in the old province of Hamadān, with, at the present day, 5,000—6,000 inhabitants (de Morgan), at a height of 5,860 feet on the branch of the Gāmāsi which comes from the S. E. from the vicinity of Būrāν and the Gāmāsi then runs W. to Bīshānūn. Nihawand lies on the eastern road which, coming from Kirmāngāh (Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 193), leads into Central Persia (Iṣfahān) avoiding the massif of Alwān (Oḵūrz) which rises W. of Hamadān. Hence the importance of the town in the wars of Persia with her western neighbours.

The French excavations of 1931 (Dr. Contenau) have shown that the site of Nihawand was inhabited from pre-historic times. The ceramics ("1-bis style") which have been found there, seem to be older than those of style 1 and II of Susa, Polémy VI, 2 knows of Nihawān and according to Ibn Fāṣih, p. 258 the town already existed before the Deluge. In the Sasanian period the district of Nihawand seems to have formed the seat of the Kārīn family (Dīnīwārī, p. 99). There was a fire-temple here. According to Ibn Fāṣih, p. 259 there could be seen on the mountains near Nihawand two figures of snow in the form of a bull and a fish (similar talismans are said to have existed at Bītīl also cf. also the stelae of wūrūk ["dragons"], protectors of waters) in Armenia west of Lake Sewan which combine these symbols, Zap., xxii, 3, 1916, p. 409). The same legend is reflected in the name of the river Gāmāš (Gīwomāsh-Ab = “water of the bull and fish”; Ṣāyī is the Kurdish form of maḥāl).

Among the products of Nihawand the Arab authors mention willow-root which was used for polo-sticks (paṇāṭhī), aromatic reeds (hiba-uṭal-Īshrār or al-knāshūl-ūl-ištāhī) which were used like haṃū (a perfume put in coffins) and black clay used as wax for sealing letters. The district of Rūdrāwar was under Nihawand (cf. de Morgan, Mission, ii. 156: Rūdhrāwar) and was famous for its abundance of safron (Iṣkāhī, p. 109). For a list of the places more or less dependent on Nihawand, cf. Schwarz, Iran etc., p. 505—509.
In the Mongol period, the *Nushat al-Kušā¯b* mentions three districts of Nihāwand: Malāšīr (now Dowlatābād), Isfīdhān (= Isbīdhahān, see below) and Dījāshīk. (Nihāwand no longer forms part of the province of Hamadān; cf. Rabino, *Hamadan*, in *R. M. M.*, xlii., 1921, p. 221—227. )

Near Nihāwand was fought the famous battle which decided the fate of the Iranian plateau and in which the Kūfī Našmān b. Muqarrin defeated the Sāsānian generals. The commander-in-chief is given different names: Dhu ’l-Hādhābīn Marādnašī (cf. Bālāḏūrī, p. 309); Marquart, op. cit., p. 115 identifies him with the Marākh Khorraśādī or Fārānān (cf. Tabārī, i. 1608; the latter also gives the names of his generals: Zardāš, Bahman Dījāshy and the commander of the cavalry Anušāhak). The Arab camp was at Isbīdhahān and that of the Persians at Wāyahbūd (?). The sources do not agree about the date: Saif b. ʿOmar (Tabārī, i. 2615—2619) gives the end of the year 18 (639) or the beginning of 19 (640); cf. Wellhausen, *Shīzūn und Verboten*, vi., 1899, p. 97, while Ibn Ṣahlāk, Abū Māḥṣar wa Wāliḏī, followed by Caetani, *Annali dell’ Islam*, iv., 1911, p. 474—504 put the battle in 21.

The district of Nihāwand (formerly called Mih- Bahān) and its capital (Mih-Dīnīr) was finally incorporated in the possessions of the Bāṣṭans and called Māḥ Basra ("the Media of Baṣra"): Bālāḏūrī, p. 306).

Nihāwand is often mentioned in the period of the wars between the Ṣafawīds and the Ottomans. In 998 (1589) at the beginning of the reign of ʿAbbās I, Ǧīḏālā-Zaḏe built a fortress at Nihāwand (ʿĀdār-ār, p. 273). After the death of Murād IV a rebellion took place among the garrison of Nihāwand; the Ottomans were driven out by the Šīfī inhabitants. As a result in 1012 (1603) war again broke out with Turkey (*ibid.*, p. 460). In the spring of 1142 (1730) ʿXādir [q. v.] took Nihāwand again from the Turks.


(V. Minkovský)

**NIKĀH (n.), marriage (properly: sexual intercourse, but already in the Kurān used exclusively as the contract).** Here we deal with marriage as a legal institution; for marriage customs see *ʿirs*.

1. The essential features of the Muslim law of marriage go back to the customary law of the Arabs which previously existed. In this, although there were differences according to districts and the conditions of the individual cases, the regulations governing marriage were based upon the patriarchal system, which permitted the man very great freedom and still bore traces of an old patriarchal system. It is true that before the coming of Islam a higher conception of the marriage state had already begun to exist but the position of the woman was still very unfavourable one. The marriage contract was made between the suitor and the "guardian" i.e. the father or the nearest male relative of the bride, the latter's consent not being regarded as necessary. But even before Islam it had already become generally usual for the dowry to be given to the woman herself and not to the guardian. In marriage the woman was under the unrestricted authority of her husband, the only bounds to which were consideration for her family. Dissolution of the marriage rested entirely on the man's opinion; and even after his death his relatives could enforce claims upon his widow.

2. Islam reformed these old marriage laws in far-reaching fashion, while retaining their essential features; hence in its other fields of social legislation Muhammad's laws of marriage were a flag not only of the woman's position. The regulations regarding marriage which are the most important in principle are laid down in the Kurān in Sūra iv. (of the period shortly after the battle of ʿUyūd): "3. If ye fear that ye cannot act justly to the orphans marry the women whom ye think good (to marry), by twos, threes or fours; but if ye fear (even then) not to be just then marry one only or (the slaves) whom you possess; this will be easier that ye be not unjust. Give the women their dowry freely; but if they voluntarily remit you a part of it, enjoy it and may it prosper you. 27. Forbidden to you are your mothers, your daughters, your sisters, your aunts paternal and maternal, the daughters of your brother and sister, your foster-mothers and foster-sisters, the mothers of your wives and the step-daughters who are in your care, born of your wives, with whom ye have had intercourse — but if ye have not had intercourse with them, it is not a sin for you — and the wives of the sons, who are your offspring, also that ye marry two sisters at the same time except what is already past; Allah is gracious and merciful. 28. Further married women except (slaves) that you possess. This is ordained by Allah for you. But he has permitted you to procure (wives) outside of these cases with your money in decency and not in fornication. To those of them that ye have enjoyed give their reward as their due, but it is no sin to make an agreement between you beyond the legal due. Allah is allknowing and wise. 29. If however any one of you has not means sufficient to marry free believing women (let him marry) among your believing slaves, whom you possess; Allah best knows (to distinguish) your faith. Marry them with the permission of their masters, and give them their dowry in kindness; they should be modest and not unchaste and take no lovers". Also Sūra ii. 220 (uncertain date), the prohibition of marriage with infidels, male or female (cf. Sūra lx. 10), Sūra xxiii. 49 (probably of the year 5), an exception in favour of the Prophet, and Sūra v. 7 (of the farewell pilgrimage in the year 10) permission of marriage with the women of the possessors of a scripture. Other passages of the Kurān which emphasise the moral side of marriage are Sūra xxiv. 3, 26, 32 and Sūra xxx. 20.

In tradition various attitudes to marriage find expression; at the same time the positive enactments regulating it are supplemented in essential points. The most important is the limitation of the number of wives permitted at one time to four; although Sūra iv. 3 contains no such precise regulation, this interpretation of it must have predominated.
very early, as in the traditions it is assumed rather than expressly demanded. The co-operation of the "guardian", i.e. the dowry and the consent of the woman is regarded as essential and competition with a rival the result of whose suit is still in doubt is forbidden.

3. The most important provisions of Muslim law (according to the Shafi'î school) are the following. The marriage contract is concluded between the bridegroom and the bride's wali (guardian), who must be a free Muslim of age and of good character. The wali is in his turn bound to assist in carrying out the contract of marriage demanded by the woman, if the bridgegroom fulfils certain legal conditions. The wali should be one of the following in this order: 1. the nearest male ascendant in the male line; 2. the nearest male relative in the male line among the descendants of the father; 3. do. among the descendants of the grandfather etc.; 4. in the case of a freed woman the mawla (manumitter) and if the case arises his male relatives in the order of heirs in intestacy [cf. al-Nikâh, 6, 5]; 5. the representative of the public authority (pakim) appointed for the purpose in many countries it is the kadi or his deputy. In place of the hâkim the future husband and wife may agree to choose a wali and must do so if there is no authorised hâkim in the place. The wali can only give the bride in marriage with her consent but in the case of a virgin silent consent is sufficient. The father or grandfather, however, has the right to marry his daughter or grand-daughter against her will, so long as she is a virgin (he is therefore called wali mughbir, wali with power of coercion); the exercise of this power is however very strictly regulated in the interest of the bride. As minors are not in a position to make contracts it is the kadi or his deputy. The hâkim the future husband and wife may agree to choose a wali and must do so if there is no authorised hâkim in the place. According to the Hanafis on the other hand, every blood relative acting as wali is entitled to give a virgin under age in marriage without her consent; but a woman married in this way by another than her ascendant is entitled on coming of age to demand that her marriage be declared void (fasâlid) by the hâkim. A bridegroom who is a minor may also be married by his wali mu'dhîr. As a kind of equivalent for the rights which the husband acquires over the wife, he is bound to give her a bridewit (mahr, qadî) which is regarded as an essential part of the contract. The contracting parties are free to fix the mahr; it may consist of anything that has value in the eyes of the law; if it is not fixed at the conclusion of the contract and if the parties cannot agree upon it, we have a case for the mahr al-mithl, a bridewit fixed by the hâkim according to the circumstances of the bridegroom. It is not necessary to pay the mahr at once; frequently a portion is paid before the consummation of the marriage and the remainder only at the dissolution of the marriage by divorce or death. The wife's claim to the full mahr or the full mahr al-mithl arises only when the marriage has beenconsummated; if the marriage is previously dissolved by the man the wife can only claim half the mahr or a present (mrda) fixed arbitrarily by the man; these regulations go back to Sûra ii. 237 sq. (cf. xxxiii. 48). In form the marriage contract, which is usually prefaced by a solicitation (khitâba), follows the usual scheme in Muslim contracts with offer and acceptance; the wali of the bride is further recommended to deliver a pious address (khutba) on the occasion. The marriage must be concluded in the presence of at least two witnesses (zâhid), who possess the legal qualifications for a witness; their presence is here not simply, as in other contracts, evidence of the marriage but an essential element in its validity. On the other hand, no collaboration by the authorities is prescribed. But since great importance is usually attached to fulfilling the formalities of the marriage contract, upon which the validity of the marriage depends, it is usual not to carry through this important legal matter without the assistance of an experienced lawyer. We therefore everywhere find men whose profession this is and who usually act under the supervision of the hâkim. The part they take is to pronounce the necessary formularies to the parties or even to act as authorised agents of one of them, usually the wali of the bride. The most important impediments to marriage are the following: 1. blood relationship, namely between the man and his female ascendants and descendants, his sisters, the female descendants of his brothers and sisters as well as his sons and great-sons; 2. loss of relationship which by extension of the Qur'ânic law by tradition is regarded as an impediment to marriage in the same degrees as blood relationship; 3. relationship by marriage, namely between a man and his mother-in-law, daughter-in-law, step-daughter etc. in the direct line; marriage with two sisters or with a aunt and niece at the same time is also forbidden; 4. the existence of a previous marriage, in the case of a woman without limitation (inclusive of the period of waiting after the dissolution of the marriage, idda, q. v.) and in the case of a free man with the provision that he cannot be married to more than four women at once; 5. the existence of a threefold (al-fâlq [q. v.]) or of a hâkain [q. v.]; 6. social inequality; the man must not be by birth, profession etc. below the woman (unless both the woman and wali agree): a free Muslim can only marry another's slave girl if he cannot provide the bridewit for a free woman, and the marriage between a master (or mistress) and his slave (or her slave) is quite impossible (a master is however permitted connubial with his slave); 7. difference of religion; there is no exception to the prohibition of marriage between a Muslim woman and an infidel while the permission given in theory for marriage between Muslim men and the women of the possessors of a scripture is at least by the Shafi'îs so restricted by conditions as to be prohibited in practice; 8. temporary obstacles such as the state of i'hâm [q. v.]. On the other hand, the law knows no minimum age for a legal marriage. If a marriage contract does not fulfill the legal requirements, it is invalid; the Hanafis and especially the Malîkis but not the Shafi'îs distinguish in this case between invalid (bîgit) and incorrect (fasîl) according as the error affects an essential or an essential element in the contract; in the former case there is no marriage at all, in the second its validity may be attacked but (accorded to the Mâlikîs) consummation removes any defect. Marriage does not produce any community of property between husband and wife and the woman retains her complete freedom of dealing; but certain laws regarding inheritance come into operation [cf. al-Nikâh, 6, c]. The man alone has to bear the
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expense of maintaining the household and is obliged to support his wife in a style befitting her station (nafaşā); if he should not be in a position to do so his wife may demand the dissolution of the marriage by ḥegū [q. v.]. The man can demand from his wife readiness for marital intercourse and obedience generally; if she is regularly disobedient, she loses her claim to support and may be chastised by the man. The latter however is expressly forbidden to take upon himself vows of continence (iḥā and zikār). Children are only regarded as legitimate if they are born at least six months after consummation of the marriage and not more than 4 years (the predominant Shāfī view) after its dissolution; it is presumed that such children are begotten by the husband himself; the latter has the right to dispute his paternity by ḥanā [q. v.]. Parentage can also be established by the husband’s iškār (q. v.), while both recognition and adoption of illegitimate children are impossible.

4. The laws regarding the rights and duties of husband and wife cannot be modified by the parties at the drawing-up of the contract. This can however be effected by the man pronouncing a conditional ṭalāk [cf. ṭalāk, vii] immediately after the conclusion of the marriage contract; this shift to secure the position of the woman is particularly common among Indian Muslims. For the rest the couple are left to private agreements which need not be mentioned in the marriage contract. The actual position of the married woman is in all Muslim countries entirely dependent on local conditions and on many special circumstances. It is not a contradiction of this to say that the legal prescriptions regarding marriage are most carefully observed as a rule. In spite of certain ascetic tendencies Islām as a whole has been decidedly in favour of marriage. — In modern Islām the problem of the woman’s position in marriage and polygamy is especially discussed between conservatives and adherents of modern social ideas. For the different views resulting from these conditions see the Bibliography cited below.

5. Alongside of the usual form of the old Arabian marriage which in spite of its laxity aimed at the foundation of a household and the procreation of children, there existed the temporary marriage in which the pair lived together temporarily for a period previously fixed. Such temporary marriages were entered upon mainly by men who found themselves staying for a time abroad. It is by no means certain that these are referred to in Sūra iv. 28, although the Muslim name of this arrangement (muṭa‘ [q. v.], “marriage of pleasure”) is based on the literal meaning of the verse; it is however certain from Tradition that Muhammad really permitted muṭa‘ to his followers especially on the longer campaign. But the caliph ʿOmar strictly prohibited muṭa‘ and regarded it as fornication (zina) (a group of traditions already ascribes this prohibition to the Prophet). As a result, muṭa‘ is permitted only among the Shiʿis but prohibited by the Sunnis. The latter have however practically the same arrangement; those who wish to live contrary to the law as husband and wife for a certain period simply agree to do so without superfluating it in the marriage contract.


NIKOPOLIS(S), in Turkish spelling Niğbol or Niğbili (in Ewliya Čelebi, vii, 463—بيك بول, بولون) town on the southern bank of the Danube at 43° 43′ N., 24° 54′ E. This Nikopolis, founded by Heraclius (c. 575—in642), has often been confused, especially in medieval literature, with Nikopolis ad Istrum or ad Haemus, founded by Trajan in 101 in commemoration or his victory over the Dacians (ruins recently excavated near modern Nikšip in the upper valley of the Dniestr by Mt. Haemus). The Byzantine Nikopolis is sometimes called Nikopolis Major to distinguish it from Trajan’s Nikopolis and Nikopolis Minor on the opposite bank of the Danube near the Romanian town of Tornu Magurele.

The importance of Nikopolis as a trade centre and military post is due chiefly to the command which it holds over the Osma and the Aluta, the two Danubian arteries reaching into the heart of Bulgaria and Roumania respectively. Situated on a naturally fortified plateau, it dominates the plains to the south, the Danube to the north, and the eastern gorge connecting the interior of Bulgaria with the river. The mediaval double walls and strong towers surrounding Nikopolis were destroyed by the Russians during their occupation of the city in 1810 and 1877.

Nikopolis was first captured from the Bulgarians in 791 (1380) by ‘Ali Paşâ Çenderell (see ‘Ali Paşâ). Seven years later, it was the scene of the famous battle in the Crusade which is called by its name. The acquisition of Bulgaria by the Turks and their continual irruptions north of the Danube into territories claimed by Hungary, together with a state of comparative peace in western Europe in the last decade of the fourteenth century, made it both necessary and possible for most Catholic countries to participate in the expedition. An army of about 100,000 crusaders (according to the most reliable estimates, 30,000 to 40,000) marched along the Danube, seized Widdin and Rahova, and finally set siege to Nikopolis while an allied Veneto-
Genoese fleet blockaded the city from the river. The siege lasted about fifteen days, during which Bayazid [q.v.] abandoned the siege of Constantinople, burnt the siege machinery, and summoned his Asiatic and European contingents to arms. A Turkish army of perhaps 110,000 men met at Adrianople and, marching through the Shpika Pass, descended into the valley of the Osma and pitched their camp on the southern hill commanding the Nikopolis plain.

The battle took place on Monday, September 25, 1396, and the crusaders were completely routed owing to the superiority of Ottoman tactics and the dissensions amongst the leaders of the Christian host. Bayazid divided his army into two large sections. The first, consisting of two large bodies of irregular cavalry and of irregular infantry, occupied the slope of the hill. Between the cavalry vanguard and the foot rearguard of this section, the Turks planted a field of pointed stakes. Beyond the skyline on the other slope of the hill, hidden from their unsuspecting enemy, the second and more formidable army of Bayazid with his Sipahis and Stephen Lazarovic with his Serbs, watched for the right moment to advance against the exhausted Christians. These tactics proved to be effective when the Crusaders' vanguard of French and foreign auxiliaries defeated the Turkish irregular cavalry and, after forced dismounting to uproot the stakes, routed the irregular infantry and pursued them uphill to face the new and unseen forces. Meanwhile, a stampede of riderless horses produced confusion in the Crusaders' rear which comprised the Eastern European armies. Mcrea and Lazarevic, who had no sympathy for the immediate result of the Ottoman victory was the extension of the conquests into Greece and the submission of Wallachia to Ottoman suzerainty. More important, however, was the breathing-space it gave for the consolidation of the Turkish territories in Europe, which enabled the Ottoman empire to survive the critical struggles of the next decades.

In later history Nikopolis plays only a minor part. During the wars of the sixteenth century it was thrice captured by Russian armies (Sept. 1510; July 1829; July 1877), and by the Treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878) was included in the tributary principality of Bulgaria.

Bibliography: The standard histories of the Ottoman Empire. For the "Crusade of Nikopolis" a full and classified bibliography of the extensive MS. and printed sources, both Eastern and Western, is contained in A. S. Atya, The Crusade of Nicopolis (London 1934); see also the following older monographs: A. Brauner, Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis, 1396, Breslau 1876; J. Delaville Le Roulx, La France en Orient au XIVe siecle, Paris 1856; H. Kiss, A Nicopolev alkozat, Magyar Academiai eretteto, 1896; I. Kohler, Die Schlachten bei Nikopol und Warnia, Breslau 1882; F. Šišić, Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis, Vienna 1893.

NIKSR, Neo-Caesarica, first mentioned by Pliny (vi. 3) so that it presumably arose under Tiberius, lies in the Anatolian vilayet of Sivas [q.v.]. 1,450 feet above sea-level. The town is picturesquely situated at the foot of a hill, crowned by the ruins of a mediaeval castle which was erected from the material provided by the numerous buildings of antiquity there. Here in remote antiquity was Cabira and after its decline Dioskopolis founded by Pompey, later called Bebaste. In Church history Niksar is famous as the scene of a Council (314 a.d.) and as the birthplace of Gregory the miracle-worker. In the Muslim period it became important under the Seljukus of whom numerous and important buildings have survived to the present day. It became more important under the Dindirman-foys [q.v.], whose capital was Niksar, and Ahmad Gha~z took Niksar among other places. His grandson Muhammad successfully resisted a siege by the emperor Manuel in Niksar. His son Yaghban (537-562 = 1142-1166) of whom there survives an inscription of the year 552 (1157) died in 562 (1166) whereupon Niksar was taken by the Byzantine emperor Manuel (Kinnamos, p. 296 sq., 300) although only for a short time. In 1397 Niksar passed to the Otomans and gradually lost its former importance. It remained noted for its very prolific orchards, celebrated already in Karwiz's time (Asgar, i. Wasenfeld, Geschichte, 1848) the special produce of which, very large and sweet cherries, pears, figs etc., were famous at all times. Ewliya Celebi (cf. Siyafat-nama, ii. 389; v. 14; Travels, ii. 102 sqq.) who visited Niksar in 1083 (1672) describes the town in his usual extravagant fashion, mentioning 70 schools, 7 monasteries, many mills and waterwheels and 500 shops with a large number of shoe-makers. The pomegranates there, he says, are the size of a man's head and weighed 1 okka. The remains of the Muslim period so far as they bear inscriptions, have been published by Ismail Kuti~k, Krititker (Stamml CII) 1895-73. The burials (sepulchral cupolas) of Malik Gha~z and of Haidji Cikik~ are worth mentioning; among old dervish monasteries there are the Ibsit-teke and the Kolag-teke. Niksar has often been visited and described by modern travellers. The population (c. 4,000) was before the war one quarter Christian; they were mainly engaged in the silk and rice trades.

NIKŞAR — AL-NİL

W. J. Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus and Armenia, London 1842, p. 346; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, i. 734 sq.

(FRANZ BĂRINGER)

AL-NİL, the river Nile. The Nile is one of the large rivers which from the beginning have belonged to the territory of Islam, and the valleys and deltas of which have favoured the development of an autonomous cultural centre in Islamic civilisation. In the case of the Nile this centre has influenced at different times the cultural and political events in the Muslim world. Thus the Nile has, during the Islamic period, continued to play the same part as it did during the centuries that preceded the coming of Islam.

The name al-Nil or, very often, Nil Miṣr, goes back to the Greek name Nείλος and is found already in early Arabic literary sources, though it does not occur in the Qur’an. (in Sūra xx. 39 the Nile may be meant by al-jumān). The Christian habit of calling the river Ghafān, after one of the rivers of Paradise, as found in the works of Ephraim Syrus and Jacob of Edessa and in the Arabic-Christian author Agapitus (Patrologia Orientalis, v. 596), is not followed by the Muslim writers, who know only the Ouxos under this name. Al-Zamakhshâri (Kitāb al-Aṣākina, ed. Salverda de Grave, p. 127) mentions as another name al-Faṣîd, no doubt a poetical allusion to the yearly flood. Already in the Middle Ages, the word baḥr having come to acquire in Egyptian Arabic the meaning of “river”, the Nile is also called al-Baḥr or Baḥr Miṣr (cf. al-Makridi, ed. Wilt, i. 248), which is also the case with several separate parts of its river system, such as Baḥr Yūsuf or Baḥr al-Ghazal. In the Delta the different ramifications of the river are occasionally also called Nile, but where necessary the main stream (צמַדַא) is distinguished from the minor branches (דֵיר or קָלַיֶק) and the canals (תַּרַחא).

The geography of the Nile is treated here only from a historico-geographical point of view so far as the knowledge of Islamic science is concerned. The geographical knowledge of the Nile among the Muslims was, so far as we can learn from their literary sources, based partly on direct observation, but for the most part on legendary or pseudo-scientific traditions which go back to local beliefs or to classical science. For a long time during the Middle Ages the limit of Islamic territory on the Nile was well fixed; it ended at the first cataract near the island of Bilâk (Philæ) to the south of Uswān (Asouán); here began, since the treaty (baḥr) concluded by ʿAbl Allâh b. ʿAbî Sârî with the Nubians, the Nubian territory, where for long centuries Christianity prevailed (al-Baladhuri, p. 236; Ibn ʿAbî al-Hakam, Fihrist Miṣr, ed. Torrey, p. 188) The first locality on Nubian territory, where tribute was paid, was called al-Kaṣr (al-Masūdî. Muṣâba, ii. 40, 41).

Historical tradition has preserved parts of the alleged correspondence between ʿAmr b. al-ʿAš, and the caliph ʿUmar on the subject of Egypt, then newly conquered; here the Nile is described as a river “whose course is blessed”, while the flood and the inundations are praised in poetical terms (“ʿUmar b. Muḥammad al-Kindī. Fighūṭ Miṣr, ed. ʿOṣrūp, p. 204; al-Dimashqī, ed. Mehrten, p. 109). The same correspondence reveals the perhaps historical fact that ʿUmar did not wish to see the Arab army established in Alexandria, because there would be then a great river between the army and the caliph (Ibn ʿAbî al-Hakam, p. 91; cf. also what is said on p. 128 about those who went to live in al-Djaza).

The principal towns by which the Nile passed in medieval Egypt in Upper Egypt, between Uswān and al-Fuṣṭâṭ, are Atīna (Edyn, on the left), Issâ (Ene, l.), Arman (l.), Kûs (r.), al-Aksur (Luxor, r.), Kif (r.), Ikhmîn (Akhmîn, r.), Usyûtî (Aswûn, Syûtî, l.), al-Uṣmûnîn (l.), Anṣînî (r. opposite al-Uṣmûnîn), Taḥtî (l), al-Kâsî (l.), Dâlîsî (l.), Anâsî (l.) and Ḫâfî (Atīnî, r.). This succession of towns is given for the first time by al-Yaḵbî (B. G. A., vii. 331—334), while Ibn Hawkâl (B. G. A., ii. 95) is the first to give a table of the distance between these towns, expressed in barsîd, the entire distance being 21 days’ journey (al-Idrîsî, ed. Dody and de Goeje, p. 52, gives 25 days’ journey for the same distance). Shortly before al-Uṣmûnîn branched off on the left the canal that conducted the water to al-Faṣîla, which is known to Ibn al-Faṣîl (B. G. A., vi. 74) as Nahr al-Lahûn and to al-Idrîsî (p. 50) as Khâlidî al-Mâhî; this canal, which according to unanimous tradition was dug by Joseph, occurs already on the MS. map of the year 479 (1086) of Ibn Hawkâl in the Seray Library of Constantine, No. 3340 (reproduction on fol. 658 of Monumenta Africæ et Aegypti by Yousouf Kamâl). It is the Baḥr Yūsuf of our days; on it was situated al-Bahnâsî. The banks of the Nile in Upper Egypt are not very completely described by the geographers; one finds repeated everywhere the assertion that the borders were established without interruption between Uswān and al-Fuṣṭâṭ (cf. al-Iṣṭakhrî, B. G. A., i. 50), but that the width of the cultivated territory varied during the river’s course, depending on the greater or lesser distance of the two mountain ranges that border the stream. Ibn Hawkâl (MS. of Constantine, cf. supra) describes two extremely narrow strips, one between Uswān and Atīna (now called Gebelein) and one between Issâ and Arman (now called Gebel Silsile). The curves in the course of the Nile, especially in the upper part of the Šafîd, are not indicated on the maps of Iṣṭakhrî and Ibn Hawkâl. The oldest extant Arab map of the Nile, however — which is at the same time the oldest Arab map that we know of — gives clear indications that a sinuous course was a known fact. This map is found in the Staatsbibliothek MS. of the year 1037 of al-Khâzârî’s Sīrat al-ʿArîf and has been reproduced in the edition of that text by H. v. Mîlîc (B. A. H. U. G., iii. Leipzig 1926). The representation of the Nile here is connected with the classical tradition of astronomical geography; al-Khâzârî himself, and after him Suhîb (Ibn Serâʿīm) and Ibn Yûnus (MS. 143. Col. of the University Library at Leyden, where on p. 136 a special table is given of the towns lying on the banks of the Nile) give exact indications as to the latitudes and latitudes of the Nile towns; but these indications need many very uncertain corrections to allow of the reconstruction of a map, as v. Mîlîc has tried to do for al-Khâzârî in Denkschr. Ak. Wiss. Wien, lix, Vienna 1916, and J. Leclercq for Ibn Wûṣî in Viena of the Atlas annexed to his Géographie du Moyen-Âge, Paris 1850. But the fact that the course of the Nile is from south to north is well known to all the Arabic sources, which often repeat the
The Delta of the Nile begins to the north of al-Fustat, where the distance between the two mountain ranges widens, while these hills themselves become lower and pass gradually into the desert. Immediately below al-Fustat began the canal that was dug by 'Amr b. al-‘Aṣ to link up the Nile with the Red Sea; this canal (Khālidī Mīṣr or Khalīlī Amīr al-Mu‘minīn) was made in 23 H (644) according to Muhammad b. Yūsuf al-Kindi (cited by al-Maqrīzī, Kitāb al-Bulāq, ii. 143; cf. Yākūt, ii. 466) and served for the conveyance of provisions to the Hijāz until the reign of ʿUmar Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz; afterwards it was neglected and even obstructed by the order of the caliph al-Manṣūr, so that, in the iVth (7th) century, it ended at Dhamab al-Timsah in the lakes to the north of al-Kulum (cf. al-ʾAskāfī, Muruǧī, i. 147).

The two principal arms of the Nile in the Delta began about 12 miles to the north of al-Fustat (a little further than nowadays, according to Guest) and had, as now, a great number of ramifications which communicated in many ways and ended for the greater part in the big lakes or lagoons such as the Bahr al-Fayum. These lakes were called in the Middle Ages: Buhārīrat Maryāt (behind Alexandria), B. Liʿktī, B. al-Ruūlūs or B. al-Buḥairīt and the very large B. Tinnīs, which last contained a large number of islands with Tinīs as the most important. On the land tongue, where the two main arms separated was situated the town of Shatūnī. The western arm went as now to the town of Ṣaḥīd Rosette after which it reached the sea; near the town of Shatūnī a branch parted from this arm in the direction of Alexandria, ending in the Buhārīrat Maryāt; this branch was only filled with water in the time of the flood (a very complete survey of the different "canals" of Alexandria by P. Kahle, in JL, xii. 89 eqq.). The eastern arm ran, as is still the case, past Dimyāt (Damietta) and reached the sea shortly afterwards; it had several branches that went to the Buhārīrat Tinīs, one of which continued one of the Nile mouths of antiquity. Though many sources, based on a pseudo-historical tradition, repeat after each other that there are seven Nile arms (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, p. 6; further al-Khwārizmī, Khudānī, Suphrah, al-Maṣṭūdī, Ibn Zūlāk, the more realistic authors Ibn Khudādhibhī, al-Yaḳūlī, Ibn Rusta, al-ʾIstākhri, Ibn Ḥawkal, al-Iḍrīsī) only know of the two main arms. These were on the one hand the so-called "lower" Nahr, in the first years of the Middle Ages, differed considerably from the present situation. The chief sources from which we know them are Ibn Ḥawkal and al-Iḍrīsī, who give itineraries following the different branches, but as the places named in these itineraries have been identified only in part, an integral reconstruction is not yet possible (on this problem cf. R. Guest, The Delta in the Middle Ages, in J.R.A.S., 1912, p. 941 eqq. and the map annexed to this article). The description in the text of Suphrah (ed. v. Mīlīk, B. A. Ḥ. C. G., v.) has little value as an endeavour to trace back to his time (8th century) the seven legendary arms; among these arms special attention is paid to the "arm of Saradīs", which, according to tradition, was dug by Ḥamān (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, p. 6; cf. Guest, loc. cit., p. 944 and Maspero and Viet, Mœliska, in M. I. F. A. O., xxvii). Al-Makrizī has prepared a detailed description of the canal system in the province of al-Buhāra, to the east of Alexandria, from the Kīṭāb al-Mīnāḥāb of Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Makhrūzī, who wrote in the xith century (M. I. F. A. O., xlvii, p. 167 sqq.). It seems possible that a study of the ancient maps (especially the Delta map of the Constantinople MS. of Ibn Ḥawkal and the maps of al-Īṣāṣī) may be useful for a more complete reconstruction of the medieval situation.

The Nile arms have always been decisive for the administrative division of the Delta, while the sources call by the name of al-Iṣṭākhri, al-ʾAṣfar, al-ʿAṣrī or Asfāl Arḍ Mīṣr. The region to the east of the eastern branch was called al-Ḥawf; the texts of al-ʾIṣṭākhri and Ibn Ḥawkal place al-Ḥawf to the north of the Nile, which may be understood in connection with the view referred to above that the Nile at al-Fustat had a direction from S. E. to N. W. The region between the two main arms was called al-ʿRīf (a name sometimes used for the entire Delta as well) or Bāṣa al-ʾRīf, while the country to the west of the western arm was called al-ʾBuhāra and later al-Ḥawf al-ʾGhuri, the original Ḥawf being called then al-Ḥawf al-ʾRīf. The delta was divided into šarās, the limits of which were determined by the more important branches; the bigger administrative units of later times (cf. Egypt) depended likewise on the river system. The present geographical aspect of the Delta is the result of the new irrigation works that began in the xith century under Muhammad al-Māli; the most conspicuous new canals are the ʿAlīn disc. I. 890, and the Rubināʾīs canal, which were completed in 1890, and the ʿAlīn, which links up the Nile with the Zuei canal.

As to the knowledge of the course of the Nile to the south of Egypt the Muhammadan geographical literature begins rather late to give information based on direct observation. At first these sources content themselves with saying that the Nile comes from the country of the Nībār; for the rest there were ancient sources of a different kind that helped to complete the geographical conception of the course of the great river. This conception involved also the orīgin of the Nile, covered since antiquity by a veil of mystery. The real origin of the Nile always remained unknown to the Muhammadan scholars and travellers. It is a curious fact, however, that the information on this subject which we find uniformly repeated in the Islamic sources from the treatise of al-Khwārizmī (± 830 A.D.) gives an idea of the origin of the Nile which does not correspond entirely to the data furnished by the classical sources. This conception makes the Nile emerge from the Mountains of the Moon (Daḥal al-Kamar) to the south of the equator; from this mountain come ten rivers, of which the first five and the second five reach respectively two lakes lying on the same latitude; from each lake one or more rivers flow to the north where they fall into a third lake and it is from this lake that the Nile of Egypt begins. This conception is largely schematized and corresponds only partly to Polemy's description of the Nile sources; Polemy...
knows only of two lakes, not lying on the same latitude and does not speak of a great number of rivers coming from the Mountains of the Moon. The third lake especially is an innovation (cf. A. v. Mück, in Denkschr. Ak. Wiss. Wien, lxxix., p. 44); in later authors such as Ibn Sa‘id and al-Dimashkī this third lake is called Kūrā and may connected with some notion of Lake Chad (the same authors change the name of Djabal al-Kamar into Djabal al-Kūmr which pronunciation is commented on by al-Makrizī, ed. Wiet, i. 219), but this is not probable for the time of al-Khwārizmī; the knowledge of more equatorial lakes, however, may perhaps be traced to the experiences of the two centuries which elapsed by Sīdī Ḥakīm and who reached, according to Seneca, a marshy impassable region, which has been identified with the Bahār al-Ghazal. The system described by al-Khwārizmī of the origin of the Nile is represented on the map in the Strassburg MS. and is repeated many times after him (Ibn Khurāḏbhee, Ibn al-Fakīh, Kudāmā, Suhrāb, al-Iḍrīsī and later authors). Al-Maṣūdī, in describing a map he has seen, does not speak of the third lake (Murūḏj, i. 205, 206) and Ibn Rusta (B. G. A., vii. 90) says that the Nile comes from a mountain called Bū-ḥan and also knows only two lakes. Al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawkal on the contrary, frankly admit that the origin of the Nile is unknown, which is also illustrated by their maps. Still the system of al-Khwārizmī continued to be a geographical dogma and is found as late as al-Suyṭī. Al-Khwārizmī also took over from Ptolemy a western tributary of the Nile, which comes from a lake on the equator; this river is called by Ptolemy Astapos and may perhaps be identified with the Aṭbarā. A later development, which connects with the Nile system a river that flows to the east in the Indian Ocean, is found for the first time in al-Maṣūdī (Murūḏj, i. 205, 206; ii. 383, 384); this view is later taken up again by Ibn Sa‘id and al-Dimashkī.

Another category of notions about the origins of the Nile is connected with the Jewish and Christian traditions which make the Nile come from Paradise. Medieval cosmographical theory places Paradise in the extreme east, on the other side of the sea (cf. the maps of Beatus), so that the Nile, like the other rivers of Paradise would have to cross the sea. This state of things is actually described in an old tradition, probably of Jewish origin, of a man who went in search of the sources of the Nile and had to cross the sea, after which he reached Paradise (al-Maṣūdī, Muḥīḏj, i. 268, 269 and Aḥkār al-Zamān, MS. Vienna, fol. 158a-b; al-Maḥkārī, B.G.A., iii. 21). With this origin in Paradise is perhaps connected the view, which all sources attribute to al-Dīǰālīzī in his lost Kitāb al-Buldān, that the Nile and the Mīhrān (Indus) have the same origin (cf. al-Maṣūdī, Tanbīk, B.G.A., viii. 53), a view which is sarcastically criticized by al-Iḍrīsī (Indus, p. 101). To the same origin may go back the idea, often found in Muhammadan sources, that, when the Nile rises, all the rivers of the earth go down in level.

Thirdly there is a cycle of geographical conceptions which link up the western part of Africa with the river system of the Nile. Herodotus already had sought a western origin and Pliny quotes the Lūkaka of king Juba of Mauretania, who makes the Nile rise in western Mauretania. Marquardt (Biblioth.-Sammlung, p. 125 sqq.) has explained this view from a corruption of the name of the river Nuhul, which he identifies with the Wādī Nūl and which has its origin in the Mauritanian Atlas. Traces of this western Nile are to be found in Ibn al-Fakīh (B. G. A., v. 87) who, following an authority of the time of the conquest, places the origin of the Nile in al-Sūs al-Ṣārā. Al-Bakrī for the first time identifies this western Nile with the river Niger, although we find already in al-Maṣūdī the knowledge of a great river, far to the south of Sidīlmīsā (Murūḏj, iv. 92, 93). Al-Bakrī describes the Nile as passing through the territory of the Sudan (ed. Slane, p. 72) and makes an enumeration of the Sudan tribes and their towns which border the river; the westernmost town is with him Sānghāra, followed in eastern direction by Tarkīrī, Sīllā, Chānā, Tīrākā and finally the country of Kawāk. After al-Bakrī a similar description is given by al-Iḍrīsī, but this last author goes back to another source than al-Bakrī when he places the mouth of the Nile in the neighbourhood of the salt town Awīlī, thus identifying the lower course of this Nile with the Senegal (Marquard, loc. cit., p. 171). Al-Iḍrīsī likewise shows himself informed on the course of the Nile to the east of Kawāk, though he is in doubt if Kawāk is situated on the Nile itself or on a side arm (ed. Dozy and de Goeje, p. 11); he finally derives this western Nile from the third of the big Nile mentioned above, thus connecting the Nile of the Sudan with the Nile of Egypt in one river system. So long as the complete text of al-Bakrī is not known, we cannot ascertain if this conception goes back already to that author. Al-Iḍrīsī’s Nile course is clearly indicated on his maps of the 1st—4th section of the first climate. After him it is especially Ibn Sa‘id who has described the western Nile in this way and he has been followed again by Abu Ḭaydā. Al-Dimashkī (ed. Mehren, p. 89) gives the same representation; this last author even makes the third lake, which he calls like Ibn Sa‘id the lake of Kūrā, who in the history of the Sudan, the Nile of Egypt, and a third river running in eastern direction towards Maḥdāqūl in the Zandj country on the Indian Ocean. This last river, which was also connected by al-Maṣūdī with the Nile (cf. infra) is probably identical with the Webī river in Italian Somaliland.

While the geographical authors constructed in this way the Nile system with a good deal of credulity and imagination, the real knowledge of the Nile south of Egypt advanced but slowly. The southernmost point reached by the Arab conquerors was Dongola (al-Kindī, ed. Guest, p. 12) and it was well known that this town was situated on the Nile; its latitude and longitude are given by al-Khwārizmī and Suhrāb. Al-Yaṯībī (Ṭabīrī, ed. Houtsma, p. 217) knows that, in the country of the Nība called Alwa, who live behind the Nība called Muṣκarā, the Nile divides into various branches; this same author, however, places Sind behind Alwa. Al-Maṣūdī (Murūḏj, iii. 31, 32) knows that the country of the Nība is divided into two parts by the Nile. Ibn Ḥawkal (Constantinople MS.) describes two places where there are cataracts (nāṣīlāt), namely the one above Usūm, which is the “first cataract”, and one near Dongola, of which it is not certain whether the “second” or the “third” cataract is meant. About the same time,
however, a traveller named Ibn Sulaim al-Uṣwānī wrote a valuable description of the middle Nile course, which has been preserved in al-Maqrīzī's Kitāb al-Maqrīzī (ed. Wiet, in M. I. F. A. O., xvi. 252 sqq.). This Ibn Sulaim, on whom al-Maqrīzī's Kitāb al-Muḥāfūzān gives some information (cf. Quatremère, Mémor. sur l'Égypte, ii.), had been sent by the Fatimid general Dājwār al-dīnī, the king of the Nūba on a diplomatic errand, and was the author of a Kitāb ʿAlwān al-Nil, in which a detailed description is given of these countries. He says that the region between Us怀nī and Dunkula is inhabited in the north by the Marīs and more to the south by the Muḥārīs; the northern part is barren and the great cataracts are correctly described. The country between Dunkula and ʿAlwān (this last spot is the region of Kharjūm) is described as perfectly flourishing; the big winning of the Nile here is perfectly known to Ibn Sulaim. The Nile "is divided" then into seven rivers; from the description it is clear that the northern one of these rivers is the Athbara, coming from the east; further south the "White Nile" and the "Green Nile" join near the capital of ʿAlwān and the "Green Nile", which comes from the east, is again the result of four rivers, one of which, the new "White Nile", is from the country of the Ḥabash, and one from the country of the Zandj; this last, incorrect, statement may have been influenced by learned tradition. Between the "White Nile" and the "Green Nile" there stretches a large island (al-Qaṣr al-ʿawṣ, as it is still called on our maps), which has no limits in the south. This is about the only description in medieval Islamic literature that shows how far the knowledge of the middle Nile really went. Only little of it seems to have reached the systematic geographic treatises; al-Idrīsī, e.g., describes this part of the river in a way which only shows that he did not make good use of the inadequate sources that were at his disposal.

The exploration of the upper Nile and its sources since the end of the xviii century was the work of European travellers. They discovered, or perhaps re-discovered, the real Big Nile lakes and identified the Ruwenzori mountain range with the Moon Mountains, the name of which was found again by the explorer Speke in the name of the Nyamwezi country, the "country of the moon". A part of the exploration of the Nile was due, however, also to Egyptian initiative. The well-known military expedition of 1820—1822 under Muhammad ʿAṣhār son of Ismāʿīl Pasha, during which the city of Kharjūm was founded, established Egyptian domination in the Egyptian Sūrān and opened the way for further scientific exploration. In the years 1839—1842 three Egyptian expeditions went up the White Nile, and during the reign of Ismāʿīl Pasha the Egyptian government repeatedly tried to cleanse the swamps of the White Nile above Sobat from the masses of vegetation (ṣuṣīl) which hindered navigation.

The yearly flood of the Nile (ṣiṣīl, fāṣīl, fayṣāfān) is the phenomenon to which Egypt has been at all times indebted for its fertility and prosperity, as it provides, in compensation for the almost complete lack of rain in the country, a natural and almost regular irrigation for the lands on its borders and in the delta. It is the foundation of all cultural life and justifies entirely the attribute musābārāk so often given to the river. On the same account the Nile is considered, as well as the Euphrates, as a "believing" river (al-Maqrīzī, ed. Wiet, M. I. F. A. O., xxx. 215). The flood deeply influences the private and public life of villagers and townsfolk alike, and already the oldest Muḥammadan traditions about Egypt reflect the feelings of wonder and thankfulness that animated the people of Egypt before them (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, p. 109, 205). Having reached its lowest level towards the end of May at Assuan and in the middle of June at Cairo, the Nile begins to rise again, reaching its highest level in the beginning of September at Assuan and in the beginning of October at Cairo. This regularity brings about a similar regularity in the methods of irrigation in the several parts of Egypt, in the times of the sowing and reaping of the different crops and consequently in the modes of levying the land taxes (e.g. al-Maqrīzī, ed. Būlāk, i. 270, which text comes from Ibn Hawkal): all the dates referring to these occupations have always continued to be fixed according to the Coptic solar calendar.

There is much discussion in the literary sources about the causes of the flood. The most ancient belief, which at the same time corresponds best with reality, was that the flood is caused by heavy rainfalls in the Nile basin, where the Nile and its tributaries have their origin. This is expressed in a somewhat exaggerated way in a tradition that goes back to ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAmr b. al-ʿAx, according to which all the rivers of the world contribute, by divine order, with their waters to the flood of the Nile (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, loc. cit., and p. 149). This implies the belief that all other rivers fall while the Nile rises, but, on the other hand, it is sometimes observed that other rivers also show the same phenomenon of rising and falling, especially the Indus, and this again is considered as a proof of the common origin of the two rivers (al-Maqrīzī, ed. Wiet, M. I. F. A. O., xxx. 227). There are, however, other views, which attribute the cause of the flood to the movement of the sea, or to the effect of the winds; these views have been inherited from sources of the pre-Muḥammadan period, among others from the treatise on the flood of the Nile attributed to Aristotle, and they are discussed and refuted at length in a special chapter of al-Maqrīzī's Kitāb al-Nil (M. I. F. A. O., xxx. 236 sqq.).

Up to the xvi century the irrigation system of Egypt continued along the same lines. When the flood begins all the outlets on both sides of the main stream and its principal arms in the Delta are closed, to be opened again about the time of the highest flood, when the water level has reached the necessary height according to the different places. The most important of these yearly "openings" was that of the canal (Khalīd) of Cairo, which, until recent times, remained a public festival. In Cairo the flood is complete (ṣuṣīl al-Nil), when it has reached 16 ʿaṣār, generally in the first decade of the Coptic month of Mesore (about the midst of August), and this was proclaimed everywhere in the town (cf. the description by Lane, Manners and Customs, ii. 287 sqq. and E. Littmann, Ein arabischer Text über die Nischewelle, Festschrift Oppenheim, Berlin 1933, p. 66 sqq., for older times, al-Kalāṣānid, iii. 516).

The height of the level of the Nile has been measured since olden times by the Nilometers (cf. niṣṣaḥ). Many of these niṣṣaḥ are recorded by the
sources, the southernmost being that of ‘Alwa and al-Makrizī, the author of Ibn Wahšīf Shāhā, but no real irrigation work of a wider scope existed in the Middle Ages and later except the famous canal system of al-Fāyatīn [q.v.], which all the sources ascribe to the Prophet Yūsuf. In the rest of Egypt the water was allowed to flow freely over the lands after the piercing of the dams, so that large areas were completely inundated for some time; the Arabic sources contain some vivid descriptions of the large stretches of water, always in the vicinity of the villages, communication between the villages being only possible by means of boats during that time of the year (al-Masʿūdī, Murūdī, i. 162; Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, p. 205).

Since the reign of Muhammad ʿAlī new irrigation works have been planned with the aim of making the country more productive, a possibility at which already the medieval authors hinted more than once. The first efforts, however, failed. About 1840 began the construction of a great barrier across the two arms of the Nile at the apex of the Delta, according to the plans of the French engineer Mouget, but this enterprise began to bear fruit only fifty years later when this barrage project, including the Tawfīkiya, Manfīrīya and Buhairīya canals, had been completed in 1890. The later great irrigation works were executed higher up the river, such as the great dam and locks at the head of the cataracts near Philae above Assuan, in 1902, which was raised again in 1912, and again in 1933. While allowing, on one side, a better regulation of the distribution of Nile water in Egypt, these barrages higher up enable at the same time a better irrigation of the borders to the south of Egypt. Herewith is connected the enormous barrage of Makwār, near Sennār on the Blue Nile above Khartūm, which permits the irrigation of the region called al-Ḥiyāzīrat, between the Blue Nile and the White Nile. This work was finished in 1925 and is meant to be completed by a similar barrage on the White Nile. In this way the control of the Nile waters has passed to a certain extent out of Egypt itself; it recalls the days of the great famine in 1599, when the Egyptians thought that the Nubians were holding up the flood of the Nile.

The same problem came up recently with regard to the new project of constructing a dam on the frontier of the Süddan and the Belgian Congo and the question was raised whether this dam will prove a faṣāda ‘aṣīla or a faṣāda ‘aṣīla for Egypt (cf. the newspaper al-Balāẓī of March 17, 1934). It has already been shown how the flood of the Nile was the occasion of popular festivals such as the opening of the curtain of Safanāf in Nubia; cf. Evetts, Churches, p. 262). The level necessary for the operations of irrigation varied in different places; in the capital the average level had to be 16 ₃/₄ above the lowest level of the Nile; if the flood surpassed 18 ₁/₂ it became dangerous, while a flood not exceeding 12 ₃/₄ meant famine (cf. e.g. al-Idrīsī, p. 145, 146). In the history of Egypt the years after 1444 (1052), and especially the year 451 (1059), are notorious for the famine and disaster caused by the failure or practical failure of the flood. A historical account of the flood from the years 152—1296 (769—1579) is given on p. 454 sqq. of Omar Toussoun, Mémories sur l'Histoire du Nil, ii. 265 sqq.).

The regulation of the main stream and its branches is ascribed to the ancient Egyptian kings (al-Maʿṣūrī, on the authority of Ibn Wāṣif Shāhā), but no real irrigation work of a wider scope existed in the Middle Ages and later except the famous canal system of al-Fāyatīn [q.v.], which all the sources ascribe to the Prophet Yūsuf. In the rest of Egypt the water was allowed to flow freely over the lands after the piercing of the dams, so that large areas were completely inundated for some time; the Arabic sources contain some vivid descriptions of the large stretches of water, always in the vicinity of the villages, communication between the villages being only possible by means of boats during that time of the year (al-Masʿūdī, Murūdī, i. 162; Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, p. 205). Since the reign of Muhammad ʿAlī new irrigation works have been planned with the aim of making the country more productive, a possibility at which already the medieval authors hinted more than once. The first efforts, however, failed. About 1840 began the construction of a great barrier across the two arms of the Nile at the apex of the Delta, according to the plans of the French engineer Mouget, but this enterprise began to bear fruit only fifty years later when this barrage project, including the Tawfīkiya, Manfīrīya and Buhairīya canals, had been completed in 1890. The later great irrigation works were executed higher up the river, such as the great dam and locks at the head of the cataracts near Philae above Assuan, in 1902, which was raised again in 1912, and again in 1933. While allowing, on one side, a better regulation of the distribution of Nile water in Egypt, these barrages higher up enable at the same time a better irrigation of the borders to the south of Egypt. Herewith is connected the enormous barrage of Makwār, near Sennār on the Blue Nile above Khartūm, which permits the irrigation of the region called al-Ḥiyāzīrat, between the Blue Nile and the White Nile. This work was finished in 1925 and is meant to be completed by a similar barrage on the White Nile. In this way the control of the Nile waters has passed to a certain extent out of Egypt itself; it recalls the days of the great famine in 1599, when the Egyptians thought that the Nubians were holding up the flood of the Nile.

The quality of the Nile water is a matter of discussion in medical treatises. Avicenna (al-‘Kūnīn fī ‘-Ṭibb, ed. Balūk 1294, i. 98; cited by al-Maṣūrī) holds that the circumstance that a river flows from south to north has a bad influence on the water, especially when a south wind blows, and on this account he thinks that the abundant praise given to the Nile is exaggerated. The Egyptian physician Ibn Rāwān (d. 453 = 1061) says that the Nile water reaches Egypt in a pure state, owing to the health in the country of the Süddan, but that the water is spoilt by the impurities that mix with it on Egyptian soil (cited by al-Maṣūrī, M. I. F. A. O., xxx. 275 sqq.). This same author describes very clearly the troubled condition of the water when the flood begins. He discusses likewise the influence of the Nile on the climate of Egypt and the medicinal properties of its water.

Other authors speak at length of the fauna of the Nile, giving special attention to the fish. A very long list of fishes is given by al-Idrīsī (p. 16 sqq.) with a description of their often curious qualities. The animals most frequently described by the geographers are, however, the crocodiles, and the animal called sakānīzar, which is said to be the result of a cross between a crocodile and a fish, but which seems to be in reality a kind of lizard. The possibilities which the Nile afforded for navigation are best seen from the historical sources. Sea-going vessels do not seem ever to have entered
its arms, while the traffic on the river was maintained by small craft; various names of Nile boats occur in literature; in the sixteenth century the vessel called "dhahabiyat" is especially known. In earlier times the term "sallājī" is used for a Nile boat (al-Kindi, Kitāb al-Umāra, ed. Guéret, p. 157; Dozy, Supplément, s. v.). The skill of the fishermen in their sailing boats on the lakes in the Delta is often recorded; on shallow places, however, as well as on the inundated lands, boats had to be moved by means of oars or poles. The rapids between Egypt and Nubia were, as nowadays, an insurmountable barrier to river traffic; the loads were conveyed along the shore to the other side of the falls (Ibn Hawqal, MS. Sultan Ahmad Kosk, No. 3346, fol. 56).

The cataracts above Assuan for a long time continued to form a barrier to the spread of Islam towards the countries bordering the Nile to the south of Egypt, which forms a curious contrast with the part played by the Nile in the introduction of Christianity into Nubia (cf. J. Kraus, Die Anfänge des Christentums in Nubien, Münster [Diss.] 1930). Islam penetrated only slowly into Nubia and became more generally disseminated in the Sudān only in the sixteenth century [cf. SUDAN].

Something has been said already about the praises of the Nile and its descriptions in poetical terms, by which this river has contributed to Arabic literature. Al-Makrizi (loc. cit., p. 270 sqq.) cites some fragments of poems in praise of the Nile and its flood; among the poets which he names are Tāmil Ibn al-Muqīz [q. v.] (d. 985) and Ibn Kālikis (d. 1172). Further Yakūb (i. 592; iv. 656) cites some poems which he attributes to Umayya b. Abī l-Salt; this poet is probably Abū l-Salt Umayya b. Abī al-ʿArīz (d. 1143) who wrote a treatise al-Rīsāla al-Mīʾrājīya, from which also al-Makrizi makes quotations. The earliest Arabic poems on the Nile are probably those found in the Dīwān of Ibn Kais al-Ruṣayfī [q. v.], the court poet of Abī al-ʿArīz Ibn Marwān in the beginning of the viith century. Several treatises have been devoted to the Nile. Ibn Zālīk (d. 997) says in his Fadhilat Miṣr (Arabic No. 181 of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, fol. 317) that he has written a book on the importance and the salutary qualities of the Nile, which now seems to be lost. Further there are a treatise Tābiṣrat al-Akhkār fī Nil Miṣr wa-Ahawkātīl min al-Aḥād (MS. in Algiers; cf. Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 506), and two short opuscules by Djalāl al-Dīn al-Mahallī (d. 1459) and al-Suyūṭī, which are found together in the MS. Or. 1535 of the British Museum (Rieu, Suppl., No. 1198; G. A. L., ii. 114).

Bibliography: As the aim of the present article is to give only an account of the Nile from the point of view of Islam and its history, it seems superfluous to quote here even the most important modern works and articles belonging to the abundant bibliography of the Nile. The earlier Muhammadan authors have all been named in the text; the later ones, such as Yakūb, Abī al-Latīf, Abū l-Fida', al-Kalḵašāndī, al-Makrizī, al-Suyūṭī (Ḥiān al-Muḥāfara), al-Nuwairī and others are in most cases a compendium of earlier earlier views and statements. A very important later Muhammadan source is al-Khālid al-Tawfikīya by Āhī Bīšāh Mubārak. The Muhammadan literary sources have been used in the following works: Else Reitemeier, Beschreibung Ägyptens im Mittelalter, Leipzig 1903, p. 31-61; J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la Géographie de l'Égypte, in M.R.A.O., xxxvi. 215 sqq.; and very profusely: Omar Toussoun, Mémoire sur l'Histoire du Nil, vol. i., ii., iii., in Mémoires présentés à l'Institut d'Égypte, viii., ix., Cairo 1925. The last of these three volumes contains a series of cartographical reconstructions. A number of ancient Muhammadan maps of the Nile are to be found in the Mappe Arabicae, ed. Konrad Miller, Stuttgart 1926-1930, and more completely in vol. iii. of the Monumenta Cartographica Africae et Aegypti by Youssouf Kemal, as far as this work has appeared; in this same work all the geographical references to the Nile are also to be found in a chronological order.

(J. H. Kramer)

NILUFER KHATUN, wife of URGHAN and mother of Murad I, apparently the Greek name Nenuphar (i.e. Lotus-flower) (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 59), was the daughter of the lord of Yārbiṣūr (Anatolia, near Brussa; cf. Ḥādidījī Khalīfa, Dhikrīnā, p. 659) and according to one story was betrothed to the lord of Belokoma (Bilecik). ʿOthmān, the founder of the dynasty which bears his name, is said to have kidnapped and carried her off in 699 (1299) and to have destined her to be the wife of his son Urğan, then only 12 years old. Idrīs Bīltī and following him Neshrī, tells the story of the rape but the Byzantine sources make no reference to it. Nilüfer Khatun became the mother of Murād I and also of Sultanān Pashá.

The river which flows through the plain of Brussa bears the same name as also does the bridge over it in front of the town and monastery there. The bridge and monastery are said to have been endowed by Nilüfer Khatun. Nothing more is known of her life. She was buried beside Urğan on the citadel of Brussa. That Ibn Battūṭa, ii. 332 sq. really means Nilüfer Khatun by Bayallūn, (πυλής) Khatun, which both F. Giese (cf. Z.S., ii. 1924, p. 263) and F. Taeschner (cf. Ist., xx. 135) think to be obvious, as they take πυλής to be a corruption of nilot, is however by no means proved, because Bayallūn is a name which occurs again in Ibn Battūṭa for a Byzantine princess (cf. i. 393 sq.). Besides, the mention in Ibn Battūṭa who paid his respects to the princess at her court in Izrīk (c. 740 = 1339) is very brief. F. Taeschner suggests that Nilüfer is a corruption of Olivera, while hitherto Nilüfer (cf. Pers. nilīfēr *water lily" and Greek Νηλίφη and νηλός with the same meaning) has been derived from the Greek. Nilüfer was and is also popularly known as Lulufer (e.g. in the early Ottoman chronicles) or Uluf the river Ufer Cat; cf. F. Taeschner, op. cit. p. 135 sq.

Bibliography: J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 59 sq.; Sīḏīlī ʿOthmānī, i. 86 (according to Neshrī); F. Taeschner, in Ist., xx. 133-137.

(Franz Babiner)

NIMAT ALLAH v. AHMAD B. KĀDI MUBRĀK, known as Kāhil Śifī, author of a Persian-Turkish Dictionary, entitled Lughat-i Nimāt Allāh. Born in Sofia, where as an enameller he made a reputation as an artist, he moved to Constantinople and there entered the Nakşbandī order. Association with the Nakşbandī dervishes made him more closely acquainted with literature and
especially with Persian poetry. Nīmat Allāh decided to make accessible to others the knowledge he had acquired by an ardent study of Persian literature and thus arose his lexicographical work which he probably compiled at the instigation and with the assistance of the famous Kermāl Pasha-zade (d. 940 = 1533). He died in 969 (1561—1562) and was buried in the court of the monastery at the Adrianople gate in Stamul. His work which survives in a considerable number of manuscripts is divided into three parts: verbs, particles and inflection, nouns. His sources were: 1. Usnam-i ʿAdjam (s. Ur. p. 291, N. 108); 2. Kāsima-yī Lutf Allāh Ḥālimī (Hāddjī Khalfā, iv. 503); 3. Manṣūr-i Tāhir (Flaygl, Lexicon Catalogae, i. 192); 4. Lenghyā-i Kard-Ḥūrān (Rieu, p. 1516); 5. ʿṢabbā-i ʿAdjam (Hāddjī Khalfā, vi. 91 and Leyden Catalogue, i. 100). Besides making careful use of these sources Nīmat Allāh added much independent material, of which his dialect notes and ethnographical observations are especially valuable.

This work is of considerable scientific importance and deserves greater attention than it has so far received.

Bibliography: O. Blau, Uber Nīmatullāh's persisch-türkisches Wortbucht, in Z. D. M. G., xxxi. (1857), S. 484; Rieu, Catalogue, p. 514b; Hāddjī Khalfā, vi. 362. — Parts used by Golūs Ḥusn-i Dīn (Hasan-al-matin, part of Tāhir's Hāfiz-goltun. The best MSS. are Dorn, St. Petersburg Catalogue, No. 431 (p. 426) and Fleuscher, Dresden Catalogue, No. 182. (E. Bertiels)

Nīmat Allāh b. Ḥabīb Allāh Ḥaramī, a Persian historian. His father was for 35 years in the service of the Great Mughal Akbar (1556—1605) where he was a khalila inspector. Nīmat Allāh himself was for 11 years historian to Djiḥangir (1605—1628), then entered the service of the Khan-Djiḥan whom he accompanied in 1018 (1609—1610) on the campaign against the Dekkan. Soon afterwards he became acquainted with Miyaān-Halab-Khan b. Salīm-Ḥan Khan of Sāmān. Who persuaded him to write a history of the reign of Khan-Djiḥan. Nīmat Allāh began his work in Mālkāpur in Dhu l-Ḥijdāja 1020 (Feb. 1612) and finished it on the 10th Dhu l-Ḥijdāja 1021 (Feb. 2, 1613). The work is dedicated to Khan-Djiḥan, is entitled Tarīḵ-i Kāndahārī and consists of a mubadima, 7 bbāb and a ḥāțima. It deals with the history of the Afghans, beginning with their legendary descent from the Benā Ismāʾil and treats with special fullness of the history of Bahālū Lodi, Shīr Shāh Sūr and Nawwāb Kāndahārī Lodi. The last chapters are devoted to the genealogy of the Afghan tribes and the reign of Djiḥangir. The ḥāṭima contains biographies of famous Afghan šāhkhās. There is also an abbreviated version of the work entitled Ṣughāīrī Afghānī. Bibliography: H. Ethé, in G. I. Ph., ii. 362—363; Rieu, Catalogue, p. 210a, 212a, 923b; H. Elliot, History of India, v. 67—115. The shorter version is translated by B. Dom, History of the Afghans translated from the Persia of Nīmat Ūlāh, in Orient. Transl. Fund, London 1829—1836. (E. Bertiels)

Nīmat Allāh Wallī, a Persian mystic. Amir Nūr al-Dīn Nīmat Allāh, son of Mir Ṭab Ṭab Allāh, and a descendant of the fifth imām of the Shīa, Ṣafīr, the founder of the Nīmat Allāh order, is highly esteemed in Persia as a great saint and wonder-worker. He was born in Ḥalab in 730—731 (1329—1330/1), spent his early years in the ʿItāl and went to Mecca at the age of 24 where he became a pupil and khāṭīf of the famous Shāhī Ṣāb Allāh Yāfī (see Vīvīṅtī). After his teacher’s death, he went to Samarkand, then visited Herāt and Yazd and finally settled in Māhān, 8 fasaḵās from Kirmān, where he spent the last 25 years of his life and died on 22d Ṣadāb 834 (April 5, 1431). His tomb is still a popular place of pilgrimage (ziwār-e Ḥalāb). In his lifetime he was held in great honour by all rulers and received particular marks of esteem from Shāh Rukh. His sons migrated to India and were appointed to high office in the Deccan by ʿAllī al-Dīn Aḥmad-Shāh Bahman (1443—1457). Nīmat Allāh wrote a number of books; it is said to have written over 500 risālas on different questions of Ṣūfī doctrine. About a hundred of these have come down to us and can be identified. They are for the most part quite short treatises, generally explanations of difficult passages in the classics of Ṣūfīsm like Ibn al-ʿArabī, Fakhr al-Dīn Ṭalḥī et al. His large Divān of lyrics is more valuable; it contains much true poetry and is marked by a fervent sincerity.

Bibliography: H. Ethé, in G. I. Ph., ii. 299, 301; Rieu, Catalogue, p. 43b, 634b, 641b, 774a, 829a, 831b, 869b; E. G. Browne, History of Persian Literature under Tītār Qāsim, Cambridge 1920, p. 463 sqq.; Dīvān, lith. Thānsā 1276. A biography by Ṣanʿ Allāh Nīmat-Allāh, Sahānīn al-ʿārīfīyyīn fi Muḥākādat al-ʿarāf fī Sīlīliyyīn (Persian), lith. Bombay 1307 (1890). See also Ḥabīb al-Siyār, ii. 3, 143 (where 25th Ṣadāb is given as the date of his death) and Dāwlatshāh (ed. Browne, p. 333—340), who however with his usual carelessness gives 827 as the date of his death. (E. Bertiels)

Nīmat Kān ʿAlī, Mīrzā Nūr al-Dīn Muḥḥamad, son of Ḫakīm Faṭḥ al-Dīn Shīrāzī, a Persian author, was born in India and came of a family several of whom had been distinguished physicians in their ancestral homeland in Iran. He entered the service of the state under Shāh Djiḥan (1628—1659) and was appointed keeper of the crown jewels with the title of ḍārūgha-yī ḍawālīr-khāna. He attained his highest honours under Awrangzēb (1659—1707) who gave him the title of Nīmat Kān (1104 = 1662—1693), which was later changed to Muṣṣarak Kān and then to Dānishmand Khan. He died at Delhi on the 1st Rabīʿ II 1122 (May 30, 1710). Nīmat Allāh who wrote under the taḵkīliq of ʿAlī, was exceedingly prolific and wrote a number of works in prose and verse of which the following are the most important: 1. Waṣf-i Ḥālarābād: a description of the siege of Ḥalārābād by Awrangzēb in 979 (1685—1686). This work is characterized by a biting wit and describes the siege in a satirical form which procured the little book the greatest popularity; 2. Ḍjang-nāma, a chronicle which covers the last years of Awrangzēb’s reign and the war which broke out after his death among his sons; 3. Bahādur-dār-shāh-nāma, a chronicle of the two first years of the reign of Shāh Ḥālm Bahādur-Shāh (1707—1712); 4. Ḥān u-ṭibh, also called Katkhudāyī or Munīkāy-yī Ḥān u-ṭibh, an allegorical love story, an imitation of the celebrated Ḥān u-Dīl of Ṣattārī (q.v.); 5. Ṣihat al-Kalb, satirical sketches of a number of contemporaries; 6. Ṣīrāy-yī Ḥalāb-i Ḥukmatī.
anecdotes of physicians and their incompetence; 7. Khān-i Nīmat, a work on cookery; 8. Ruḥādat, letters to Mirzā Mubāhār Allāh Širāzī Khān Wādir, Mirzā Muhammad Šaʿīd, the head of the imperial kitchen and others, which were very highly thought of as models of a choice style of letter-writing; 9. a lyrical Divān; 10. a short Maḥbūhī without a title, which deals with the usual Sufi ethical themes. This survey shows a great versatility on the part of Nīmat Khān but it must be pointed out that, with the exception of the satirical works which are really original and of great value for the characterisation of his age, none of them rises above the level of degenerate imitations of classical models.


Nīmrūd [See Namrud.]

Nīmrūd, a ruined site in the ancient Assyria, the northern portion of the modern 'Īrāk, about twenty miles south of Mōsul, in 36° 3′ North Lat. and 43° 20′ East Long. (Greenwich) in the angle formed by the Tigris and its tributary, the Upper or Great Zāb, six miles above the mouth of the latter. The plateau of Nīmrūd rises abruptly from the surrounding country, and the great advantages of this situation caused a settlement to be made here already in remote antiquity. Excavations on the site have established the fact that the ruins there were those of the town of Kalakh (Kalḥā). This is already mentioned as Kalak (Kalāk) in the Tājīrīn of Tāhār. The site of the city, more than any other, seems to have been the natural choice of the ancients, and the stories of the ancient kings of Assyria and of the stories of the ancient kings of Assyria, which are not absolutely unambiguous (Gen. x. 11—12), which says it was built either by Nīmrūd or Ashšūr; the latter appears to me more intelligible. In Greek writers we find only the name of the district Kālakhur or Kālakhur (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl. der. klass. Altertumswiss., x. 1530). It was no doubt its favourable strategic position that decided the Assyrian King Salmanassar I (c. 1280—1261) to raise it to be his royal residence alongside of the previous capital Ashšūr (now Kalat Sherkat; q. v.).

We learn nothing from the cuneiform inscriptions about the decline of Kalakh. Kalakh probably fell about the same time as Nineveh after a stubborn resistance to the onslaught of the Median-Babylonian army. When Xenophon in 401 B.C. passed by the town, which he describes clearly, it was already a ruin.

So far as I know Kalakh is not mentioned in Syriac literature and in the Arab writers of the middle ages only incidentally and under wrong names. In Yāḏūt (ed. Wustenfeld, i, 119, 163; iii, 115) we are told that al-Salāmiya is in the vicinity of the ruins of the town of Atūr, which can only mean the ruins of Kalakh (cf. also ii., p. 184).

At the present day the site is known only as Nīmrūd, which so far as I know first appears in Niebuhr, who stayed in Mōsul in 1766, see his Reisebesch., nach Arabien und andern unliegend. Ländern, ii. (Copenhagen 1778), p. 355, 368. When this, now the usual, name arose is unknown; I am inclined to think that it is a corruption of the name Nīmrūd, which has been noticed by Nīmrūd, Toll Nīmrūd, etc., are not found in the geographical nomenclature of Mesopotamia and the 'Īrāk in the middle ages, while they are several times met with at the present day.

The first European to give a brief account of the "ruined castle" of Nīmrūd and the remains there was Niebuhr, although not from his own inspection. In 1821 Cl. Rich visited the site and gives the first detailed account of the ruins; in his posthumous work are the first pictures of cuneiform tablets discovered there. A few years before Layard, William Ainsworth examined the site. In 1843 Fletcher visited it. Layard, the real investigator of Nīmrūd, twice examined the mounds of ruins in 1840 but it was not till 1845 that he was able to begin excavations, which were conducted in two great expeditions (1845—1847 and 1849—1851). Layard's reports were supplemented in many details by the notes, to which too little attention has so far been paid, by Sandreczki (see Bibli.) who spent a considerable time in Mōsul and its neighbourhood in 1850. After Layard's departure home, H. Rassam continued his work in Nīmrūd. In 1873 G. Smith resumed Layard's work but only for a month. Finally Rassam also on behalf of the British Museum again conducted the earlier excavations for a period of five years (1878—1882).

Our study of the topography of Nīmrūd must still be based on the large map of the vicinity of Nineveh and the whole area between the Tigris and Upper Zāb made by F. Jones in 152, which the Royal Asiatic Society published in three sheets under the title Vestiges of Assyria (sheets 2 and 3 deal with Nīmrūd). The commentary on these maps is the article by Jones, in J. R. A. S., vol. xv. (see Bibli.).

Layard's investigations revealed that this extensive area marking the site of the town of Kalakh was surrounded by a wall with towers. In the north he found fifty-eight, in the east fifty of these towers; in the south this wall of earth has now almost entirely disappeared (cf. Layard, Discoveries etc., p. 656). The length of the wall was seven miles, that is, it was not longer than the boundary of the whole ruined area because two arms were necessary to include the suburbs in the southeast.

The royal quarter in the southwest corner with the palaces and chief temples occupied a relatively small part of the area described. It lay on a terrace and was shut off from the rest of the town by a wall. To it also belonged the high cone-shaped mound in the northwest which is the dominating
feature of the landscape at Nimrud. Its diameter is 550 feet in breadth and 600 in length, and it still stands 120 feet above the level of the Tigris but must as a storied temple tower (stokusara), have been originally about 160 feet high. The royal city is oblong in shape and has a circumference of over 2,000 yards; its west side measures 2,000–2,050 feet and its north side about 1,200 feet.

In the northwest part of the royal city stood the temple of Ninurta (formerly read Nimib), the chief centre of worship of this deity in Assyria. It had a storied tower, the builder of which, according to an inscription, was Salmanasar III. Xenophon's ἡκήβα, now represented by the conical mound (cf. Streck, op. cit., p. clxiv, note 2 sq.; Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien etc., p. 20 sq. and do., Armenien, i/v, 251 sq.). Farther south on the same side was the so-called northwest (better: west) palace of Assurnasirpal II which Sargon II replaced by a new building. The sculptures with which its founder adorned it came for the most part to the British Museum (cf. Reallexicon der Assyriologie, i, 218). In the centre of the royal city but more to the south, Salama-sar III built the so-called central palace which at a later date was completely restored by Tiglatpileser III. The famous black obelisk came from it. This palace is less well preserved as Asshur-Addun partly destroyed it when he took out Tiglatpileser III’s reliefs to transport them to the new palace which he built in the southwest of the royal city. This southwest palace however remains unfinished as after a fire the building was not resumed; cf. Meissner and Rost, in Beiitr. zur Assyriol., iii, 191 sq.; Reallex. der Assyriol., i, 202 and see also E. Unger, Di Reliefs Tiglatpilesters III aus Nimrud, Constantinople 1917.

In the southeast part of the royal quarter Assur-Enlil built a palace and at the same time restored a temple of Nabû there which Adad-nirârî III had built and called after the chief sanctuary of this deity, E-ṣîda in Borsippa (= Birs; q.v.). Here Assasam discovered a series of statues of Nabû dating from the time of Adad-nirârî III which are still found in situ and were of topographical importance (cf. Streck, op. cit., i, p. cc–ccii and ii, 272).

The eastern and north-eastern sides of the royal city have so far only been cursorily examined; probably they also conceal royal buildings.

Outside of the city walls, in the already mentioned triangle at the southeast corner, there are smaller mounds. Layard (Discoveries, p. 656) thought that the largest of these tells was perhaps once a fort or castle; he gives it the name of Tell Alṭūr (op. cit., p. 165) on the authority of the local Arabs. Now it is true that — as already mentioned — in the Arab middle ages, the mounds of ruins near al-Salâmiya, i.e. the modern Nimrūd, were erroneously thought to be ruins of the town of Alṭūr. Educated Mūsulans still held this view in the time of Rich (cf Rich, op. cit., ii, 137). I think nevertheless that Layard’s name Tell Alṭūr for the mound or four mounds in question is due to a misunderstanding. In Vetiges of Assyria, sheet ii, Jones gives the name Tell Yasār for it, J. Oppert (op. cit., i, 309) Tulul Yasār, Sachau (op. cit., p. 106) writes Tell Azar, which is probably the name of a tribe (Yāṣar, J. R. A. 1879, xii, 224, 226).

The Tigris now runs about one and a half miles from Nimrūd but in Assyrian times it flowed directly past the walls of the town as distinct traces still prove (cf. thereon Jones in J. R. A. S., xv, 342–343 = Selections etc., p. 446 sq.; Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien, p. 27 and his Armenia, ii/v, 250 sq.). In the centre, between the still distinct ancient bed of the Tigris and the modern one, is a third bed which the river filled in the middle ages; this latter now bears the name of Ṣīr Alḥī Debâbî (see Jones, Vetiges and J. R. A. S., xv, 343 = Selections, p. 447 = “The road of Alḥī Debâbî”, apparently after a Bedîn tribe (the explanation given by Jones is hardly tenable).

A quarter of an hour west of the ruined site of Nimrūd (called frequently al-Kaffa = the citadel) is an older settlement, the fair-sized village of (old) Nimrūd also called De râa śīl. Still farther west, near the Tigris is a village also called (New) Nimrūd of more recent origin and a mile N.W. of it directly on the river the village of Naṭîf. Again a mile N.W. are the remains of a dam first described by J. Macdonald Kinnie from personal observations (see his Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia and Koordiant, London 1818, p. 465). The natives call it Sāk or Sāk Nimrūd (see Kinneir, loc. cit.; Layard, Nineveh, i, 8) = Nimrūd’s Dam. Jones gives (J. R. A. S., xv, 343 = Selections, p. 447 = Vetiges of Assyria, sheet ii): Sāk or Nimrūd (= Nimrūd’s Cliff): I suspect that he picked up the name wrongly (pāṣar for sāk “dam”). At the same time we also have the name Sīr al-Awāzē (Rich, op. cit., i, 129) or simply al-Awāzē, Āwāzē (Layard, op. cit., i, 8, 365; Jones, loc. cit.) = “dam of noise” or “the noise” (awāzē or āwāz from Persian awāzdeh; see Vollmer, Lex. Pers., i, 56) and this second name owes its origin to the great noise caused by the waters breaking over the rocks here. The people of the vicinity say that there was once a bridge here. Probably a barrier of rock in the river was already used in ancient times as the foundation for a dam for irrigation purposes.

Still farther northwards about three miles from the ruins of Nimrūd lies Selâmîyeh on the Tigris, now a small village but in the middle ages as Yâkūt, iii, 133 (al-Salâmîyeh; cf. also i, 119, 16) tells us, one of the most beautiful places in the region of Mūsul. The modern Selâmîyeh lies in the southeast corner of an area covered with old ruins. This Selâmîyeh may with great probability be identified with the Biblical Rezen, numbered among the four Assyrian towns founded by Asshur (or Nimrod; cf. above) according to Gen. x, 11–12, and there located as lying between Nineveh and Kalakh (Calah). The assertion constantly made in learned works because of the words describing them “the same is a great city” and in view of passages in Jonah (1, 2; 3, 3–4; 4, 11) that these formed a gigantic tetrapolis linked together hardly deserves serious refutation.

The greater part of the finds at the English excavations at Nimrūd are in the British Museum where they are exhibited in the Assyrian transect, the Nimrūd Gallery and in the Nimrūd Central Saloon (cf. the B. M. Guide etc. [see Bibl.], p. 41 sq.). Nimrūd provided the British Museum with even greater treasures in sculptures (not inscriptions) than Koyunjik–Nineveh. Various objects from Layard’s collection were left in Bombay on the way home and are now, with some pieces brought
by Rawlinson, in the possession of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; on them see Karkaria in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, (Bombay 1891), p. 97—107. A large series of sculptures came to the Louvre; cf. E. Pottier, Catalogue des Antiquités Assyriennes (Louvre), Paris 1924, p. 23, 49—63. There are also miscellaneous antiquities from Nimrud in the national collections in Stambul, Berlin, Zürich and Leningrad (Hermitage); on a few finds by Lehmann-Haupt, see his Materialien, p. 22 sq.

The English excavators left the site without filling in or even roughly levelling the ground they had cut up. In the spring of 1920 the Iraqi government however had the half exposed sculptures lifted and put in the new Museum in Baghdad. During my stay in Nimrud (May 1928), I saw the sculptures lying on the bank of the Tigris ready to be moved (2 statues of Nabû, a colossal bull, fragments of another, an unfinished lion in stone, two great slabs with inscriptions of Assurnasirpal etc.).


(M. Streek)

NIMRÜZ [See ŞEŞTAN.]

NIRIZ, a place in Adhār bādījān on the road from Marāḡa [q. v.] to Urmiya [q. v.] south of the Lake of Urmiya. The stages on this route are still obscure. At about 15 farsaks south of Marāḡa was the station of Barza where the road bifurcated; the main road continued southward to Dinawar while the northwest went from Barza to Tullis (2 farsaks), then to Jāḏbarwān (6 farsaks), hence to Nīrīz (4 farsaks) and finally to the town of Nīrīz (4 farsaks); cf. Ibn Khirdāṯibh, p. 121 (repeated by Kudama with some variations); Muḥaddas, p. 385.

The distance from Urmiya indicates that Nīrīz was in the vicinity of Suldūz [q. v.] which would find confirmation in the etymology from nirīz "flowing". Suldūz lies in the low plain, through which the Gāḏar flows to the Lake of Urmiya. At the present day the name Nīrīz is unknown, but a Kūrī tribe of the region of Saʿūdī-bulkā [q. v.] bears the name of Nirīz.

After the Arab conquest a family of Tīʿ Arabs settled in Nīrīz. The first of these semi-independent chiefs was Mūr b. ʿAlī Mawṣūli who built a town at Nīrīz and enlarged the market of Jāḏbarwān (cf. Rāḏāhil and Yaʿkōbī, ii. 446). One of his sons, ʿAlī, was among the rebels of 212 (827) whom the governor of Adhār bādījān Muḥammad b. Ḥamīd Ṭabī was deported to Bagdād but ʿAlī succeeded, it seems, in returning to his lands) cf. Ibn Khirdāṯibh, p. 119). Abū Rudainī ʿOmar b. ʿAlī, appointed in 260 (873) governor of Adhār bādījān by the caliph, made war on his predecessor ʿAlī b. Ḥamīd ʿAzīd and killed him (Ṭabarī, iii. 1886). He was supported by the Khāridjīs. Cf. the account in Pābdāḵān-i gummān, Teherān 1929, ii. 37, 34.

In the 19th century ʿIṣkāḥi, p. 186 and Ibn Hawkal, p. 240 mention the Banū Kudini as a dynasty already forgotten which had reigned over Dīḵkūrān (read Ḍāḏbarwān), Tabriz (read Niriz) and Ushnuḥ adhāḏāriya [cf. USHNU].

(V. Minorsky)

AL-NISĀʿ, the "Women", the title of Sūra iv. of the Kurʾān; so-called because in the opening verses the position of women is dealt with. Noldeke (Geschichte des Korāʾs, i. 1935) thinks that the greater part belongs to the period between the end of the year 3 and the year 5 A.H.

This sūra contains many verses that were abrogated: among the principal we may mention 9—8 abrogated by 12; 10 abrogated by 11; 10 abrogated by xxiv. 1; 33 abrogated by xxiv. 60 etc.

It is also one of the most important strata of the Kurʾān because many of the decrees formulated in it form the foundations for the Muhammadan laws of marriage.
The sura lacks unity, consisting as it does of a collection of verses of different origin and on different subjects. The following is a brief analysis of its contents: the creation of man; consanguinity; the care of orphans; rules for succession; marriage; relations of husband and wife; impediments to marriage; almsgiving; evidence; accidental homicide; holy war and the art of war; obedience to Allah and to the Prophets; punishment of the unbelieving Jews and Christians.


NISHA. (See ZAKAT.)

NISAN, the seventh month in the Syrian calendar. Its name is taken from the first month of the Jewish religious (seventh of the civil) year with the period of which it roughly coincides. It corresponds to April of the Roman year and like it has 30 days. On the 10th and 23rd Nisân, according to al-Bûrûnî, the two first stations of moon rise (the numbering of these two as first and second shows that the numbering was established by scholars for whom Nisân was the first month) and the 15th and 16th set. In 1300 of the Seleucid era (989 a. d.), according to al-Bûrûnî, the stars of the 28th and 1st stations of the moon rose and those of the 14th and 15th set while the rising and setting of the 2nd and 16th stations of the moon took place in Ayhr.

Bibliography: al-Bûrûnî, Alâ.der, ed. Sachau, p. 60, 76, 347-349; cf. also the references under TAMEUS.

(M. FLEISSNER)

NISH (Serbian Nish), the second largest town in Serbia, now the capital of the banate of Morava in the kingdom of Jugoslovakia, situated 650 feet above sea-level in a fertile plain surrounded by hills, on both sides of the Niska not far from its junction with the Morava and an important centre of communications by rail and road, on the international route to Sofia–Istanbul or Salonika–Athens. The larger part of the town with the railway station lies on the left bank, the fortress is on the right. The two parts of the town are connected by four iron bridges (including a railway bridge), cover an area of 11 sq. m. and had in 1931 35,384 inhabitants of whom only 3.7% are Muslims. According to the latest (Dec. 1933) statistics of the Imam-registrar, Nish has 1,892 Muslims in 365 households, chiefly gypsies, while Muslims speaking Serbo-Croatian, Turkish and Albanian form the remainder. These gypsies call themselves Muslims, bear Muslim names, marry with Muslim rites but nevertheless observe at home some of the Serbian Orthodox Church feasts, visit the churches etc. There are a number of offices of the civil and military authorities in the town, including a district shari'a court. This court has existed only since Oct. 29, 1929, i.e., since the abolition of the old office of district mufîf whose authority till then extended over the whole of Serbia. The authority of the new court extends over a part of that of the older (19 districts) while the remainder are under the kîdd of Belgrade. The Muslims of Nish have also a district wakîf meci'iff council (cf. i., p. 790), a common council (zaintashki medi'iff) and a registration office (mînâz). There are said to have been 19 mosques in Nish in the last Turkish period (1878), only one of which now survives. The second last mosque of which the great minaret is still standing, was destroyed as a result of the great floods of 1896. Nish has also Serbian Orthodox churches and a Roman Catholic church and a synagogue. Besides several colleges, it has a Hygiene Institute, two hospitals and a society for popular education. The town is making steady progress. Its whole history shows that Nish has always been an important strategical and commercial centre.

In antiquity Nish (Nassus, Nic, Nissa etc.) belonged at first to the Roman province Moesia Superior and later became the capital of Dardania.

Nish's greatest claim to fame is that it was the birthplace of Constantine the Great (306—337) and attained great prosperity in ancient times. The Romans had state munition works here.

In the time of the migrations of the Huns, Nish was taken after a vigorous resistance by Attila (434-453) and destroyed but rebuilt and refortified very soon afterwards by Justinian I (525-565). By the middle of the sixth century the first forces of the Slavs who had entered the Balkan peninsula in their great migrations had found Nish, when the Byzantine empire appeared before Nish. Nish was thus in the ninth century usually in the hands of the Bulgars and until 1018 it belonged to a Slav state founded in Macedonia in 976 by the emperor Samuel. The Byzantines held it from 1018 to the end of the eleventh century, when we find it described as large and prosperous; Idrisi who calls it "Nusa" (also on his map of 1154, ed. K. Miller) lays special emphasis on the quantity and cheapness of food and the importance of its trade. But even then it did not enjoy peace. In 1070 the Hungarians reached the town on a marauding campaign; in 1191 the inhabitants had to defend themselves in a strenuous battle "at the Bridge" against the Crusaders in which the latter suffered very heavily, and in 1182 the town was taken by Bela III supported by Nemanja, the Serbian prince. A little later Nemanja took Nish and the whole country as far as Serdica (Sofia). The town suffered considerably in these troubled times. The Third Crusade (1189) found it almost empty and practically destroyed. In spite of this, Nish was able to receive the emperor Barbarossa in Nish with great ceremony. From this time on to the Turkish conquest Nish was generally in Serbian hands.

In the earlier Turkish chronicles (e.g. Shukrullah, Uruj, İ. 511, 522; 523; 524, Anonymous Giese) there is no mention of the taking of Nish: Sa'd al-Dyn (i., 92—93), H. dji Khasil and Ewliya Çelebi, then von Hammer (G.O.K. 2, i. 157) and Lane- Poole (Turkey, p. 49) on the other hand, assume that it took place in the reign of Murad I in 777 (1375-1376). The Serbian chronicles however definitely give 1386 and this year, which Gibbons has recently strongly urged as the correct date (The Foundations of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916, p. 161—162), is now generally accepted.

During the Turkish period (1386—1578) Nish had chequered fortunes. In 1443 it was taken by the Christian army under king Vladislav III and John Hunyadi and destroyed. After the fall of Smederevo in 1459 the Serbian despotate became a Turkish province and Nish was even more securely in Turkish hands. For several days after June 20, 1521 a great fire raged in Nish which would have destroyed it completely if the Beglerbeg Ahmad Pasha, who was leading an army against Hungary
at the time, had not come at the last moment to its assistance [F. Tauer, Histoire de la campagne du Sultan Saleymen 1er contre Belgrad en 1521, Prague 1924, p. 26 (Persian text), p. 31 (transl.)]. Western travellers who visited Nish in this period (Dernschwam, Contarini etc.) were not particularly attracted by it.

Turkish writers give us an idea of the appearance of Nish in the xviii century. Hadji Khilafa (c. 1648) describes it i.e. as a great town and kadılah in the sandjak of Sofia. The description which Ewliya Celebi (c. 1660) gives is much fuller: it is a fortified town in the plain with 2,000 houses, 200 shops, three mosques (ı. Chahi Khudawnedigär; 2. Mușli Efendi; 3. Hussen Kethkhdit), 2 schools for children, several mašjids, darwish monasteries, fountains, baths, many vineyards and gardens etc.

On Sept. 23, 1659 Nish was taken by the Austrians under Ludwig of Baden but abandoned the very next year to the Turks (1690). In 1737 Nish was again taken by the Austrians under Seckendorf but left to the Turks again after two months occupation. This leads to this period that the city owes its fortifications.

When in 1804 the Serbians under Karaordole (il=di) rebelled against the Turks they soon won a number of successes and in 1809 were able to build redoubts against Nish, in which Stevan Sindicli, one of Karaordele's voivods, on May 31 blew up himself and the attacking Turks. Nish was nevertheless not relieved and the Turks built the so-called Çele-Kula ("tower of skulls") with the heads of the Serbians killed there, of which A. de Lamarthe gave a moving description on his way home in 1833 (cf. Voyage en Orient, Paris 1859, p. 255—256). It was not until Jan. 1870 that Nish, Nishandži, the capital of a Turkish liwa, finally passed from the Turks. This induced many Muslims to migrate to Turkey.

Lying on the military road between Constantinople and Vienna and therefore exposed to every campaign Nish was by no means favourably situated to become a centre for the development of even a modest intellectual life. It appears, at least according to Gibb, that Nish has produced no Turkish poets or authors, except perhaps Sunbulzade Webbi (end of the xviii century) who celebrated in song his meeting with the young Sara in the Turkish camp at Nish (H.O.P., iv. 259). In Nish however, two Turks worked for a time who later were to become celebrated: 1. Aḥmad Lafi (1815—1907), afterwards imperial historiographer served in Vidin and Nish from April 1845 (G.O.W., p. 384); 2. the famous statesman and author of the Turkish constitution of 1876, Midhat Pasha [q. v.], was appointed governor of Nish and Prizren in 1861. In this capacity he saw to the building of a Serbian school (1864) in Nish.

Nish played an important part in the World War: first as the seat of the Serbian government and the Skupština (till Oct. 26, 1915) and then as the scene of a battle between the Germans with a Serbian force, which had been ordered in pursuit of them which ended in the capture of the town by the latter (Oct. 12, 1918).


NISHANDŽI, secretary of state for the Sultan's tughra, chancellor.

The Seljûks and Mamilûks already had special officials for drawing the tughra, the sultan's signature. As their official organisation was inherited in almost all its details by the Ottomans this post naturally was included. Its holder was called nîshân-djî or tâğhî. The nîshân-djî held the same rank as the defterdâr [q. v.] and indeed even preceded them, for we find defterdârs promoted to nîshân-djîs but never a nîshân-djî becoming a defterdâr. The nîshân-djî was included among the "pillars of the empire" (erbaştâ demet). The part which he played varied in course of time. Besides being secretary of state for the imperial tughra (nîshân) he had originally considerable legislative powers and he was called mufti-bî kânîn (to distinguish him from the muftî proper, i.e. the šâheit al-îslâm). In his office the laws were prepared under his supervision. Most of the Ottoman codes of law (kânîn) that have come down to us go back to nîshân-djîs. As they had besides the right to approve the contents of documents put before them for the imperial tughra, they had no slight influence on the business of administration. Of their official career we know that according to the Kûnum-nâma of Mehmed II they had to be chosen from teachers acquainted with law (mufters), apparently because they had to display legislative ability, or from the defterdârs and rûcâat el-bitteâb. As their authority diminished more and more in course of time, so did their influence, and finally they were limited to preparing the tughra. According to Mouradja d'Ohsson (Tableau de l'Empire Ottoman, iii. 373), the nîshân-djîs received from the state a salary of 6,620 piasters. On their official dress, see v. Hammer, G. O. R., viii. 431, according to whom they wore red in contrast to the other khânegân who wore violet.

Bibliography: v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 173; ii. 217, 229; iv. 3; viii. 431; J. v. Hammer, Die Osmanischen Reiches Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, Vienna 1815, i. 64; ii. 127, 135.

(Franz Babinger)
NISHAPUR. the most important of the four great cities of Khorasan (Nishapur, Marv, Herat and Balkh), one of the great towns of Iran in the middle ages.

The name goes back to the Persian New-Shahpur ("Fair Shahpur"); in Armenian it is called Nishapu, Arab. Naishobur or Nishapur, new Pers. Nishapour, pronounced in the time of Yakut: Nishapur, the new Nishapur, Yeldeke, Tafar, p. 59, note 3; G. Hoffmann, Anzeige ..., p. 61, note 530). The town occasionally bore the official title of honour, Iranghar.

Nishapur was founded by Shushpur I, son of Ardabur I (Hamza al-Isfahani, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 48), who when he slain in this region the Persian Palælk (Pulak) (Stadteiliste von Erân, § 13) some authors say it was not founded till the time of Shahpur II (Tabari, i. 840; al-Thaddibûd, ed. Zotenberg, p. 529).

In the wider sense the region of Nishapur comprised the districts of al-Tabasun, Khuzistan, Nesa', Beward, Ardashur, Djân, Bâkhâs, Tôs, Zasan and Isparâin (Ya'âkib, ed. de Goeje, p. 278; cf. Tabari, i. 530). In the narrower sense Nishapur was the capital of the province of Abârshahr (Armen. Apar agh-âvarh, the "district of the ‘Aparapaus’"); Marquart, Erânshahr, p. 74; do., Catalogue of the Prov. Capitales of Erânshahr, p. 52), which was in turn divided into 15 Rustûks and 4 Tassâdîd (names in Isytahrî, p. 258; Ibn Hawkal, p. 313; Ibn Khurâzhbi, p. 24; Ya'âkib, p. 278; Ibn Rusta, p. 171). The latter were: in the west Rêwând (now Kâwân), in the south al-Shâmât, Pers. Tak-Ab, in the east Pusht-âfshân (now Pushâr-Furush, and in the north Mâsul (now Mâsul); cf. al-Makdisî, p. 314-321.

The Rêwând town to the north-west of the town was one of the three most sacred fire-temples of the Sassanians, that of the fire Burzûn-Mûlîr (G. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 290). Yâzadîrîd II (438-57) made Nishapur his usual residence.

In the year 30 (651) or 31 (652) the governor of Başra, 'Abd Allâh b. Amîr'atâbâd, took Nishapur (Tabari, i. 3305; Baladhi, p. 404) whose governor Kanârân (Kanârayyân): Marquart, Erânshahr, p. 75 capitulated. The town was then insignificant and had no garrison. During the fighting between 'Ali and Muawiyah (36-37 = 666-657) the Arabs were again driven out of Nishapur by a rising in Khurāsan and Turkhistan (Tabari, i. 3249, 3305; Baladhi, p. 408; Dinawari, p. 165). Pîrzî, the son of Yâzadîrî and of the daughter of Kanân of Nishapur, is said to have lived for a period in Nishapur. Khulâid b. Ka'â was sent in 37 by 'Ali against the rebellious town (Dinawari, op. cit.). Muawiyah reappointed 'Abd Allâh b. Amîr governor of Başra in 41 (661-662) and commissioned him to conquer Khurāsan and Sûrând. The latter in 42 (662-663) installed Kais b. al-Hâlîhâm al-Sulami in Nishapur as governor of Khurāsan. Ziyäd b. Abî Sufyân in 45 (665-666) made Khulâid b. 'Abd Allâh al-Hanâfi governor of Abârshahr (Nishapur). 'Abd Allâh b. Khâzîm rebelled in 685 against the Umayyads. He fell in 692 at Marv fighting against 'Abd al-Malik, whereupon Umâiyad rule was restored in Khurāsan.

The prosperity of the city dates from the time when Abu l-Abbas 'Abd Allâh b. 'Abbas made it his capital in the third (ninth) century.

The founder of the Sassanid dynasty, Ya'âkib b. al-Lâhî b. Muaddâl, entered Nishapur on the 2nd Shawwal 259 (Aug. 1, 873) and took Muhammad b. Tâbir prisoner (Tabari, iii. 1881; Gardizi in Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion, p. 217, note 6) but the latter soon regained his liberty and land. Only after Ya'âkib's death was his brother 'Amr b. al-Lâhî gathered the marshals of Khurāsan and other regions. Rafî' b. Harâmâ in 882 took Nishapur from him (Tabari, iii. 2039) and Musulmân conquerors restored Khurāsan in 885 again; but in 279 (893) 'Amr was finally confirmed in office as governor and erected many buildings there. He finally fell in battle (891-901) with Ismâ'il b. Ahmad. The town thus passed to the Sâmâníds, under whom it attained its greatest prosperity. It was the residence of the governor and commander-in-chief of the province of Khurāsan (isâbâ-âlarâ). The Arabic geographers describe Nishapur at this time as a thickly populated town divided into 42 wards, 1 farsakh in length and breadth (al-Isfahârî, B. G. A., i. 254) and consisting of the citadel, the city proper and an outer suburb in which was the aristocratic seat of the Sassanid nobles. Nishapur, when it was the public market called al-Mu'asâkar, the governor's palace, a second open place called Mâdân al-Husainîyín and the prison. The citadel had two gates and the city four: the Gate of the Bridge, the Gate on the road from Ma'îlî, the Gate of the Fortress (Bîb âl-Khâridandî) and the Gate of the Takîn Bridge. The suburbs also had walls with many gates. The best known market places were al-Murâbâ'aat al-Kâbîra (near the Friday Mosque) and al-Murâbâ'aat al-Sâghira. The most important business streets were within fifty in number and ran across the city in straight lines intersecting at right angles; all kinds of wares were on sale in them (on the products and exports of Nishapur see G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 420 sqq.). Numerous canals were led from the Wâdî Sâgharaw, which flowed down from the village of Buşhânâr and drove 70 mills, from whence it passed near the city and provided the houses with an ample water supply. Gardens below the city were also watered in this way. The district of Nishapur was regarded as the most fertile in Khurāsan.

The town suffered many vicissitudes after this period. A great famine broke out there in 401 (1010). At the beginning of the 11th century Nishapur was the centre of the pietist Karrâmîs led by the anchorite Abu Bâkak Muhammad b. Ishâk. The Saljûq Tûghrul Beg occupied the town in 1037 and made it his capital. Alp Arslân also seems to have lived there (cf. Bartholyneus, Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 243). In May 1142 the Khwârizmshâh Atâz took the town for a time from the Saltûn Sultan Sandar. When it was sacked by the Ghuzz in 548 (1153), the inhabitants fled, mainly to the suburb of Shâyâykh (al-Shâyâykh) which was enlarged and fortified by the governor al-Mu'ayyid. Tûghân-Shâh Abu Bâk ruled the city 1174-1185 and his son Sandar Shâh 1185-1187.

In May or June 1187 the Khwârizmshâh Tâhâ took Nishapur and gave it to his eldest son Malik-Shâh. At the end of 1193 the latter received Marw and his brother Kûb al-Dîn Muhammad became governor of Nishapur. Malik-Shâh died in 1197 in the neighbourhood of Nishapur, 'Alî al-Dîn Muhammad (as Kûb al-Dîn called himself after
his father’s death) took Marw and Nishapur in 1202 from Ghayath al-Din and his brother Shihab al-Din.

In addition to the wars and rebellions (e.g. 1207—1208) which afflicted the town, it suffered from repeated earthquakes (540 = 1145, 605 = 1208, 679 = 1280). Yakut who visited it in 613 (1216) but stayed in Shadykht, still could see the damage done by the first earthquake and by the Ghuza but nevertheless thought the town the finest in Kharasan. The second earthquake was particularly severe; the inhabitants on this occasion fled for several days into the plain below the city. In 618 (1221) the Mongols under Chinghis Khan sacked the city, which, in the words of Hamd Allah Mustawfi (c. 1340) and Ibn Battuta (c. 1350) it had to some extent recovered. After each earthquake the inhabitants had rebuilt the town on a new site but it never regained its former importance.

According to the Georgian chronicle (transl. by Brosset, Hist. de la Géorgie, i. 472), the Georgian queen Theamar is said to have taken the city of Romguar between 1210 and 1212; Brosset identified this with the Malalma Ramdar mentioned by Yakut in the district of Nishapur (more probably a suburb of it). Here the patriarchs of Antioch, whose jurisdiction according to the Nekropoliovâdion of Barthold, compiled in 818 (ed. Schott), in the first edition of Ecclesiast I, app. p. 82 sqq.) already at this time extended to Khurâsan (mêzi ye kwotamam homs al Khargan), created about 1053 the catholicate of 'Rumkhânegh or 'Rumkhânegh ûst Peraz; which, in name at least, still existed in 1365 (Brief des antiochenischen Patriarchen Pets III. an Domenico von Grado und Aquilina, ed. by Cornelius Will, Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiast Graec. et Lat. saeculo XI composita extant, Leipzig and Marburg 1861, p. 212, 31; Notitia Antiochena, ed. Gelizer, in B. Z., i. 247, 31; Nellis Duxpatros, ed. Parthey in Hieroclis Symeonovâdion et Notitiex graecex ecclesiast. patriarcharulx Constantinopolitanx, i. 207, 460-465; Pref. p. x.).

The modern Nishapûr is in 35° 12′ N. Lat. and 58° 40′ East Long. (Greenwich) on the east side of a plain surrounded by hills. To the north and east of the town lies the ridge of Bînâlût-Kûh, which separates it from the valley of Meshedh and Tûs. At its foot spring a number of streams, among them the Shûrâh Rûd and the river of Dîzâb (Hamd Allah al-Mustawfi) which irrigate the lands of Nishapûr and disappear in the salt desert to the west. North of the town in the mountains was the little lake of Cashmah Sabs, out of which, according to al-Mustawfi, run two streams, one to the east and the other to the west. North-west of Nishapûr were the famous turquoise mines (Ma'dîn: the district is still called Bârî Ma'dên). In the S.E. of the town is the show monument of her celebrated sons Oamar Khâyâm and Farid al-Din 'Aṭtar.

A history of the 'ulamâ of Nishapûr was completed in 8 volumes by Hâkim Abû 'Abd Allah al-Baiyî al-Nishabûrî (d. 1045 = 1631); it was used by Yakut and the 'Abîl Khâlîfah (ed. Flugel, ii. 155 sq.) and continued by 'Abd al-Ghâfir b. Ismâ'îl al-Fârisî down to the year 518. Al-Djâhâbi produced an abbreviated version of al-Baiyî's work.
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NISâBûR — NISÎB

NISâBûR (نیسابور) and NISÎB (نیشابور) in the modern Turkish orthography Nizip, an administrative district in the Turkish vilayet of Gâzî 'Ainîb (now officially Gazi Antep) which borders on Syria in the south. The little town lies not far from the right bank of the Euphrates, N.E. of Halab (Aleppo). Nisib formerly belonged to northern Syria, to the sandjak of Urfa in the vilayet of Halab. According to the census of 1927, the whole district had 48,717 inhabitants of whom only 3,000—4,000 were in the town. Nisib is noted for its extensive olive groves and sesame fields, which extend to Kilis (in the same vilayet but nearly on the Syrian frontier); in this zone the annual production of oil is estimated at 5 million kilos.

Ewliya Celebi visited Nisib in the xviiith century and describes it as “an inhabited town in the middle of an unfertile district on the edge of a high hill, with inns, mosques, baths and a small market but without vineyards or gardens”. Nisib at this period was the residence of a judge on the salary scale of 150 akçe.

During the war (1831—1840) between the Turks and Egypt under Mehmed Ali, Nisib became the scene of a celebrated battle. Ibrahim Pasha,
Further the niya must immediately precede the act, lest it should lose its character and become simple decision (fazw). It must accompany the act until the end (Abū Ishāk al-Shārīzī, Tuhfah, ed. Juynboll, p. 3). Its seat is the heart, the central organ of intellect and attention. Lunatics, therefore, cannot pronounce a valid niya.

So the niya has become a legal act of its own. It is usually called obligatory, but in some cases, e.g. the washing of the dead, commendable. It can even be asked what the intention of the niya is. According to al-Bādājī (i. 57), four conditions must be fulfilled in a niya: who pronounces it, must be Muslim, composes mens, well acquainted with the act he wants to perform, and having the purpose to perform this act. In some instances adīmāla is used, where the later language has nasā (e.g. Nasīr, Šīyāv, bāb 68; Tīmūrīdā, Šīrāz, bāb 33).

The term does not occur in the Kur'ān. It is found in canonical hadīth, but the passages show that is has not yet acquired in this literature the technical meaning and limitation described above. The development of this technical use appears to have taken place gradually, probably aided by Jewish influence. In Jewish law the kawwānā has a function wholly analogous to the niya. Al-Shārīzī (7204 = 820) appears to be acquainted with the niya in its technical sense (Kīthī al-umn). In canonical hadīth i.e. the literature which, generally speaking, reflects the state of things up to the middle of the eighth century A.D. — neither the verb nasā nor the noun niya appear to have any special technical connection with the šidāt. On the contrary, niya has here the common meaning of intention.

In this sense it is of great importance. Būḥārī opens his collection with a tradition, which in this place is apparently meant as a motto. It runs: “Works are in their intention only” (innama ‘l-umāl bi ‘niya or bi ‘l-niyyā). This tradition occurs frequently in the canonical collections. It constitutes a religious and moral criterion superior to that of the law. The value of an šidāt, even if performed in complete accordance with the precepts of the law, depends upon the intention of the performer, and if this intention should be sinful, the work would be valueless. “For”, adds the tradition just mentioned, “every man receive only what he has intended”; or “his wages shall be in accordance with his intention” (Mālik, Dīnārā, tr. 36). In answer to the question how long the hijra is open, tradition says: “There is no hujra after the capture of Mekka, only holy war and intention” (Būḥārī, Manāṣib al-umnā, bāb 45; Qidābb, bāb 1, 27; Muslim, Imārā, tr. 85. 86 etc.). This higher criterion, once admitted, may suspend the law in several cases (cf. Nauck Hurnouje, Islam und Phonograph, in T.B.G.K.W., xlii. 393 sqq. = Verspr. Geschichten, ii. 419 sqq.)

So the intention, in this sense, becomes a work of its own, just as the intention in its juridical application. Good intention is taken into account by Allāh, even if not carried out; it heightens the value of the work. On the other hand, refraining from an act even with good intention is reckoned as a good work (Būḥārī, Kīthb, bāb 31). In this connection the (post-canonical) tradition can be understood, according to which the intention of the faithful is better than his work (Līkān al-ʻarbāh, xx. 223: cf. Ghażālī, ʻIlāh, iv. 330 sqq. where this tradition
NIYÄZI, an Ottoman poet and mystic. Sams al-Din Mehmedmed known as Mi'ri Efendi, Shaikh Mi'ri, whose maqṣād was Niyaizi, came from Aspaz, the former summer capital of Malatia (cf. Eweyla Celahi, iv. 15; v. M. Itikte, Ketehefi [p. 349], where his father was a Nakhabandi dervish. Niyaizi was born in 1027 (1617—1618). The statement occasionally found that Soghanci was his birthplace is not correct. His father instructed him in the teaching of the order, then he went in 1048 (1638) to diyābakr, later to Mardin where he studied for three years and finally to Cairo. There he joined the Kādiri order, travelled for seven years and finally settled down in the Anatolian village of Elmala, once notorious as a centre of heresy, to devote himself to study under the famous Kāhlwet Shihāb Umm-i Sinān (d. 1069 = 1658).

He stayed with him for twelve years until he was sent by the Shaikh as his deputy to 'Ushālah near Smyrna. After the death of his master he moved to Brussa where a pious citizen, Abdal-Celebi, built a hermitage for him. The fame of his sanctity and his gifts of prophecy spread more and more and finally reached the ears of the grand vizier Koprulü-zade Ahmad Pasha, who invited him to Adrianople, entertained him with great honour for 40 days and finally sent him back to Brussa. When in 1083 (1672) the army set out for Karamene in Podolia (q. v.), he was summoned to Adrianople where he had great audiences as a preacher. As he had allowed himself to drop obscure allusions (kellimet-i dairifte) he gave umbrage and was banished to Lemnos. There he spent some years in exile until he received permission to return to Brussa. The fact that during his stay on the island it was spared Venetian attacks was interpreted as a miracle wrought by this holy man. But when he stirred up the people by *kabbalistic* preaching he was again banished to Lemnos in Safar 1088 (May 1677). All kinds of prophecies which were fulfilled as well as the story of his coming had been foretold by Ibn al-Aravi (q. v.), strengthened his reputation as a holy man and miracle-worker. He spent ten years on Lemnos until in 1101 (1698) the vizier Koprulu-zade Mustafa Pasha allowed him to return to Brussa. In the next year he was summoned to Adrianople; he again excited the people by political utterances and mystical allusions so that the Kālinmakām O'mmān Pasha had him taken with all respect by a guard of Janissaries and Çavuşes out of the mosque and sent directly via Gallipoli to Brussa. From there he was again banished to Lemnos but died on the 20th Radjab 1105 (March 17, 1694). The date 1111 (1699) given by v. Hammer, G. O. D., iii. 588 must therefore be wrong.

Unfortunately the contemporary notices give no information about the nature of the sermons by Niyaizi which gave offence from the political as well as religious point of view. The historian Demetius Kantemir said Niyaizi was secretly a Christian. His Divān, in Arabic and Turkish, does not justify this suggestion although the poem declared by v. Hammer (G. O. D., iii. 569) to be apocryphal, given in translation by Kantemir, is really taken from his Divān, as Gibb, H. O. P., iii. 315 has proved. No study has yet been made of the Divān or of Niyaizi's position in the religious life of Turkey generally.

The order founded by Niyaizi once possessed several monasteries on Greek soil, in Modoni, Negroponte (Eghriboz), Saloniki, Mytilene, also in Adrianople, Brussa and Smyrna. Cf. thereon the study by V. A. Gordlevsky, Turkhat Mysri Niyaizi, in Doklady Akademii Nauk S. S. R., 1929, p. 153—160.

The main source for the history of Niyaizi's life and work is the rare Turkish treatise of Morall-zade Lutfi (Mustafa Lutfullah), Tuhfat al-qa'yi fi Manāhi al-Mi'ri, published at Brussa in 1308 (1890—1891).

Niyaizi's poems were repeatedly published 1254 and 1259 in Bitlisk, also 1260 and 1291 in Stambul; cf. thereon J. v. Hammer, in Wiener fahrbccher, lxxxv, p. 36 and J. A., ser. 4, vol. viii., p. 261. On his numerous other works, only available in MSS. of Brussal Mehmedmed Tahir, *Oytmek or Mu'li'lferi*, l. 173 sq. with references to where they are preserved.


NIZAM AL-DIN AHMAD B. MEHMAD MO'KIM AL-HARAWI, a Persian historian, author of the celebrated *Tabakat-i Akgarhiz*. He was a descendant of the Mongol conqueror Ghiyath al-Adl, Ansar. His father Khodja Mo'kum Harawi was major-domo to Sultan Babur (1526—1530) and later vizier to the governor of Guja겠다r Mirza 'Askari. Niẓam al-Din himself held several high military offices under the Great Mogul Akbar and became in 1585 Bakhshsi of Gujārāt and in 1593 even Bakhshsi of the whole empire. According to Bada'uni (ii. 397), he died on the 23rd Safar 1003 (Oct. 18, 1594) aged 45. At his father's instigation he took up historical studies while quite a boy. His fondness for this subject increased as time went on and induced him to try writing himself. The lack of a complete history of India made him decide to fill the gap and thus arose
his celebrated work, called the "Tabāḫ-ī Akbars̱hāhī" or "Tabāḫ-ī Akbarī" or "Tārīkh-i Niẓāmī" which was finished in 1601 (1595). Niẓām al-Dīn used 27 different sources for this work, all of which he mentions by name and in this way produced a work that was a masterpiece of work on which all his successors relied. He deals with the history of India from the campaigns of Subuktigin (977–978) to the 37th year of Akbar's reign (1593). The work is divided into a μuḥadditha which deals with the Ghaznavids and nine ṭabāqā: 1. the Sultāns of Delhi from Muḥizz al-Dīn Ghūrī to Akbar (574–1002 = 1178–1594); at the end of this part are biographies of famous men at Akbar's court, amirs, "ulūmā", poets, writers and šaykhs; 2. the rulers of the Deccan (748–1002 = 1347–1594); the Bahmani, Niẓām al-Mulkī, Adīdahāhī and Ḫubī al-Mulkī; 3. the rulers of Gudhār (793–980 = 1390–1572); 4. the rulers of Malwa (809–977 = 1406–1569); 5. the rulers of Bengal (741–984 = 1340–1576); 6. the Ṣafarī dynasty of Jiwānpūr (784–881 = 1381–1476); 7. the rulers of Ḩamādhan (747–995 = 1346–1587); 8. the history of Sind from the Arab conquest (86) to 1001; 9. the history of Mulkān (847–932 = 1444–1525). The whole work was to have as a khitama a topographical description of India but it was apparently never finished by the author.


(E. BERTHELS)

**NIẒĀM AL-DĪN AWLĪYĀ'** whose real name was MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABD B. ʿALI AL-BULĀḴĪ was born at Bādāḵān in 636 (1238). He studied elementary Arabic literature with Mawlaḵān Āfī al-Dīn al-ʿUḏāl Bāḏāḵānī and then went to Delhi and became a pupil of Ṣhams al-Mulk and Ṣhams al-Dīn Ṣaḥān al-Dīn al-Zahīrī. Later on, he went on the 15th Rajab 655 (July 29, 1257), to Adīlshāhī where he became a devoted disciple of Bāḏar ʿIṣfī al-Dīn Masʿūd Gandī Ṣhākār (died 664 = 1265), who nominated him as his Khalīfa or spiritual successor in 656 (1258). Subsequently he returned to Delhi and resided in an adjoining village Ghīyāthpur which is now called "Niẓām al-Din Awlīya ki bastā" where he died in 725 (1325). He is regarded as one of the most celebrated saints of India and he is popularly known as "Ṣuṭān al-Awlīya" "the king of the saints" and "Māḥīb Hādīh" "the beloved of God". He was as proficient in mysticism as he was in Ḥadīth (Traditions), Tafsīr (Commentary on the Kurān) and literature. His tomb is visited by innumerable Muḥammadians from all parts of India during the time of his "ṣuyūr" (anniversary of his death). His works are the following: eleventh century Tārīkh Bāḏarī, a collection of the utterances of the saints taken down from his lips, by Ḥasan ʿAlī Sandjāri (cf. Rieu, Cat. Brit. Mus., p. 972; Ḥādīddī Khalīfā, iv. 478); Khātāt al-Mubīdūn, discourses of the saint uttered in several successive sitting during the year 689 and 690 A.H. and taken down by one of his disciples (cf. Rieu, Persan Cat. Brit. Mus., p. 973).

**Bibliography:** Abū al-Hākīm Dhiyawā, Aḥbār al-Akbur, p. 54; Fakhr Muḥammad al-Lahawvī, Ḥadīth-I Ḥusaynīva, p. 277; Ethē, Cat. Ind. Office, p. 318.

(M. HIDAYAT HOSSAIN)

**NIẒĀM AL-MULK,** ABD AL-ḤASAN B. ʿALI B. ʿISĀH AL-TUFĪ, the celebrated minister of the Sāliḥīd sultāns alp Arslān [q. v.] and Malīk shāh [q. v.]. According to most authorities, he was born on Friday 21 Dhū ʿl-Kaʿbah 408 (April 10, 1018), though the sixth (twelfth) century Tārīkh Bāḏarī, which alone supplies us with detailed information about his family, places his birth in 410 (1019–1020). His birth-place was Rādkān, a village in the neighbourhood of Tūs, of which his father was revenue agent on behalf of the Ghaznavid government. Little is recorded of his early life. The Ṣuṣīyyāh however (for a discussion of the credibility of which see 581; F. R. A. S., October 1911: "Tarikh gudhārī Bāḏarī Shāhīdī, etc.") contains several anecdotes of his childhood, and is also responsible for the statement that he is a pupil of Niẓāmūr al-Dīn of a well known Shāhī doctor Ḥibāt al-Lūṭī al-Muḥaḏfān. On the defeat of Masʿūd of Ghazna at Dāndānḵān (431 (1040), when most of Khurāsān fell into the hands of the Sāliḥīds, Niẓām's father ʿAlī fled from Tūs to Khurasān and his native Bāḏarī, and thence made his way to Ghazna, Niẓām accompanied him, and whilst in Ghazna appears to have obtained a post in a government office. Within three or four years, however, he left the Ghaznavid court and joined the Ottoman army, commanded by Cāḏīh-beg [q. v.] and, [who had fallen to a Sāliḥīd force in 432 (1040–

---

(E. BERTHELS)
soon found himself too weak to oppose Alp Arslân, and thereupon sought to receive his position by acknowledging his claim, was retained in his post on the new sultan's first entry into Raiy. But a month later Alp Arslân suddenly dismissed him and handed over affairs to Niğm. Al-Kundurî was shortly afterwards banished to Marv al-Rûd, where ten months later he was beheaded. His execution was undoubtedly due to Niğm, whose fears he had aroused by appealing for help to Alp Arslân's wife.

During Alp Arslân's reign Niğm accompanied him on all his campaigns and journeys, which were managed by Fakhr Djaheîr, the famous champion of their cause. Niğm, however, at the famous battle of Manâzîş, having been sent ahead with the heavy baggage to Persia. On the other hand, Niğm sometimes undertook military operations on his own, as in the case of the reduction of Iṣṭârîr citadel in 459 (1067). Whose, his or Alp Arslân's, was the directing mind in matters of policy it is hard to determine. Its main points, however, appear to have been the following: first, the employment of the large numbers of Türkmen that had immigrated into Persia as a result of the Saldjûk successes, in raids outside the Dîr al-İsfâhân and in the southern part of the empire. Niğm endeavoured to take advantage of this circumstance, that Alp Arslân's first enterprise after his accession, despite the precarious condition of the empire he had inherited, was a campaign in Georgia and Armenia. Secondly a demonstration that the sultan's force was both irresistible and mobile, coupled with clemency and generally reinstatement for all rebels that should submit; thirdly the maintenance of local rulers, Shi'i as well as Sunni, in their positions as vassals of the sultan, together with the employment of members of the Saldjûkî family as provincial governors. Fourthly the oblation of a dispute over the succession by the appointment and public acknowledgment of Malikshâh, though he was not the sultan's eldest son, as his heir; and lastly the establishment of good relations with the 'Abbasîd caliph al-Kâ'im [q.v.], as the sultan's nominal overlord.

Niğm al-Mulk did not really come into his own until after the assassination of Alp Arslân in 465 (1072). But thenceforward, for the next twenty years, he was the real ruler of the Saldjûkî empire. He succeeded from the outset in completely dominating the then eighteen-year-old Malikshâh, being assisted in this purpose by the defeat of Kawurîbîg's attempt to secure the throne for himself (for which service Niğm received the title 'alâ-îbîg [q.v.], thus bestowed for the first time). Indeed in one aspect the history of the reign resolves itself into repeated attempts by the young sultan to assert himself, always in vain.

Malikshâh undertook fewer campaigns and tours than his father, the prestige of the Saldjûkî arms now being such that few would risk rebellion, and warlike operations being left largely to the sultan's lieutenants, as they had not been under Alp Arslân. Nevertheless, from Iṣ̄fâhān, which had by now become the sultan's normal place of residence, Malikshâh visited the greater part of his empire accompanied by Niğm, who continued on the same lines under Malikshâh as under his father. Niğm, however, was notably less tender than Alp Arslân had been to insubordinate members of the Saldjûkî family, insisting at the outset on the execution of Kûward, and, later, on the blinding and imprisonment of Malikshâh's brother Takâsh.

Niğm also reversed during the earlier part of Malikshâh's reign the conciliatory policy originally pursued under Alp Arslân towards the caliph. He had been rewarded for the friendly attitude he first evinced — which formed a welcome contrast to that of al-Kundurî — by the receipt from al-Kâ'im of two new lajâkes, viz. Kiwâ-n al-Dîn and Radî Azîm al-Mu'mînîn (the latter believed to be the earliest of this type in the case of a waiz); and up to 460 (1068) his relations with the caliph were friendly. Niğm sought to increase these, and after his first visit to Baghdad (1068) [q.v.] became more and more cordial; so much so, indeed, that al-Kâ'im in that year dismissed Ibn Djiheîr, chiefly on account of his too-subservient attitude to the Saldjûkî court. To secure this attitude in the caliph's waiz was, however, the very aim of Niğm; and on Fakhr al-Dawla's dismissal he sought to impose a nominee of his own in a certain al-Rûdwarî, and subsequently in the latter's son Abû Shu'dâr. Al-Kâ'im, to avoid this, reappointed Fakhr al-Dawla, though on condition that his relations with the Saldjûkîs should in future be more cordial. In fact he gave Malikshâh to contribute any unwelcome event in Baghdad to Fakhr's influence. For many years matters were prevented from coming to a head by the tact of Fakhr's son, 'Amid al-Dawla [cf. Ibn Djiheîr, 2], who won Niğm's favour so far as to marry in turn two of his daughters, Nâfî and Zâhîyda; but in 471 (1078) Niğm demanded Fakhr's dismissal, which the caliph al-Muqtâdî [q.v.] (who had succeeded in 467 [1075]) was obliged to grant. Niğm now hoped to obtain the office for his own son Mu'aiyid al-Mulk; but to this al-Muqtâdî would not agree. Henceforward, accordingly, Niğm's dislike was directed against al-Muqtâdî himself, and to Abû Shu'dâr, his former protégé, whom the caliph now created deputy waiz in an effort to conciliate him, leaving the waizrate itself unoccupied till the next year, when he appointed 'Amid al-Dawla. But in 474 (1082) Niğm in turn demanded the dismissal and banishment of Abû Shu'dâr, and at the same time composed his quarrel with Fakhr al-Dawla, when the latter was sent on a mission to Iṣfâhān, concerting with him a plan by which Fakhr should watch his interests at Baghdad. As a result al-Muqtâdî, who gave in with a bad grace, lost all confidence in the Banû Djiheîr, and two years later replaced 'Amid al-Dawla with the offensive Abî Shu'dâr; whereupon Fakhr and 'Amid fled to the Saldjûkî headquarters. Niğm, on this, vowed vengeance on al-Muqtâdî, and at first seems even to have contemplated the abolition of the caliphate (see Mi'ât al-Zaman), as a prelude to which he commissioned Fakhr to conquer Dîyâr Bâkîr from the Marwânîs [q.v.], the sole remaining Sunni tributaries of any consequence. The Marwânîs were duly ousted by 478 (1085); whilst al-Muqtâdî, on his side, showed himself consistently hostile to Niğm. But Niğm's feelings towards the caliph were in the following year completely transformed as a consequence of his first visit to Baghdad (for the wedding of al-Muqtâdî to Malikshâh's daughter). The caliph received him very graciously; and thenceforward he became a champion of the caliphate in face of the enmity which developed between al-Muqtâdî and Malikshâh as a result of the marriage.
The celebrity of Nizām al-Mulk is really due to the fact that he was in all but name a monarch, and ruled his empire with striking success. It was not his aim to innovate. On the contrary, it was to model the new state as closely as possible on that of the Ghaznavids, in which he had been born and brought up. His position was similar to that of his forerunners, the Barmakids [q.v.], and the notable Bayāk wazir Ismā‘īl b. ʿAbbād [q.v.]. All three may be said to have represented the old Persian civilization (progressively Islamicized, of course) in the face of a rise to empire of barbarian conquerors, Arab, Dailami, and now Turkmen. The monarchs were in each case equalled, if not surpassed, by their wazirs, and most of all in the case of Nizām al-Mulk. For with him the invaders aspired to an emperor’s position whilst still quite unacclimatized to their new habitat, so that his superiority in culture was the more marked (cf. Barthold, Turkistan, p. 308). But in revenge the Saljūqids’ lack of acclimatization stood in the way of a complete realization by Nizām al-Mulk of the now traditional Perso-Muslim state. Hence the lamentations that recur in the Sīyāṣet-Nāma.

The Sīyāṣet-Nāma, written by Nizām in 484 (1091), with the addition of eleven chapters in the following year, is in a sense a survey of what he had failed to accomplish. It scarcely touches upon the organization of the dīvān, for instance, partly, it is true, because the book was intended as a monarch’s primer, but also because Nizām, having absolute control of the dīvān, as opposed to the ḏargh (cf. again Barthold, p. 227), had succeeded, with the assistance of his two principal coadjutors, the mutawwiṣ Ṣaḥaf al-Mulk and the mawāli, Kamāl al-Dawla, in exactly modelling this, his special department, on traditional lines. Of the ḏargh, on the other hand, Nizām complains that the sultāns failed to maintain a sufficient majesty. They were neither magnificent (though he approves their daily free provision of food), formal, nor awe-inspiring enough. At their court, accordingly, the formerly important offices of ṣādāl, wakīl and amīr-i ṣaraf had declined in prestige. Nor, as had his model potentates, would they maintain a sound intelligence service, whereby corruption might be revealed and rebellion forestalled. The Sīyāṣet-Nāma consists in all of fifty chapters, of advice illustrated by historical anecdotes. The last eleven chapters, added shortly before the wazir’s avassassination, deal with dangers that threatened the empire at the time of writing, in particular from the Ḥasanids (for a review of the work, see Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii 210–217).

Nizām’s situation resembled that of the Būyids administrators in another respect. He was faced, as they had been, with the problem of supporting a largely tribal army, and solved it likewise by a partial abandonment of the traditional tax-farming system of revenue collection for that of the ḍarṭ, or fēr [q.v.], whereby military commanders supported themselves and their troops on the yield of lands allotted to them. Since in the decay of the ‘Abbāsid power provincial amīrs had tended to assume the originally distinct and provincial office of ṣādāl, the way for this development had been paved. The Būyids had later attempted to restore the older system; but the establishment of numerous local minor dynasties had favoured the new. Nizām now systematized it in the larger field open to him. In the Sīyāṣet-Nāme he insists, however, on the necessity of limiting the rights of fēr-holders to the collection of fixed dues, and of setting a short time-limit to their tenures (see on this subject Becker, Stuernacht und Lehrenwein, in I.e., v.).

In the absence of the intelligence service he de-ired, Nizām contrived to intimidate potential rebels and suppress local tyranny by a judicious display of the might and mobility of the Saljūqī arms. He also insisted on the periodical appearance at court of local dynasts such as the Masyālids [q.v.], and Ḥajjīlids [q.v.], and proclaimed the sultān’s accessibility to appeals for the redress of wrongs by means of notices circulated throughout the empire and exposed in public places (see al-Mafarrukhi, Maṭhāsa-i Ḩaftān). He also gained the powerful support of the ʿalami, especially those of the Shāfi school, of which he was an ardent champion, by the institution of innumerable pious foundations, in particular of madaras, the most celebrated being the Nizāmīya of Baghdad (opened 450 = 1067), the earliest west of Khorasan; by the general abolition of muṣāra (taxes unsanctioned by the gharaḍ); in 479 (1086–1087); and by undertaking extensive public works particularly in connection with the ḥidāq. After the Ḥidāq had returned from Fāṭimid to ʿAbbāsid allegiance in 468 (1076), he exerted himself to make the ʿIrāk road safe from brigandage for pilgrims, as well as to diminish their expenses; and from the next year until that of his death the journey was accomplished without mishap. It was not until the second half of Malikshāh’s reign that the full effects of Nizām’s achievement made themselves felt. By 476 (1083–1084), however, such were the unneeded security of the roads and the low cost of living that reference is made to them in the annals.

Nizām al-Mulk was naturally much sought after as a patron. The poet al-Muṣṭafī [q.v.] accuses him of having “no great opinion of poetry because he had no skill in it”, and of paying “no attention to anyone but religious leaders and mystics” (see Čāhār Maḥbūla, transl., p. 46). But though his charity, which was profuse (see for example al-Sulṭānī, i. 41), went in large measure to men of religion — among them the most notable objects of his patronage being Abū Ḩabīb al-Shīrāzī [q.v.], and al-Ghazālī [q.v.], — he was clearly a lavish patron also of poets, as is testified by the Dżamīʿ al-Kvaʿir of al-Bābharzī [q.v.], the greater part of which is devoted to his panegyrics. In another sphere, the inauguration of the Dżāli calendar [q.v.] in 466 (1074) was probably due to his encouragement, since at this time his ascendancy over Malikshāh was at its most complete.

For the first seven years of Malikshāh’s reign Nizām’s authority went altogether unchallenged. In 472 (1079–80), however, two Turkish officials of the court instigated Malikshāh into killing a protégé of the wazir; and in 473 (1080–1081), again, the sultān insisted on disbanding a contingent of Armenian mercenaries against Nizām’s advice. Malikshāh now began to hope, indeed, for the overthrow of his mentor, showing extraordinary favour to officials such as Ibn Bahmannār and, later, Sāyiḍ al-Rūʿasā, who were bold enough to criticize him. Ibn Bahmannār went so far as to attempt the wazir’s assassination (also 473)
whereas Saiyid al-Ru'asāʾ contented himself with words. But in each case Niẓām was warned; and the culprits were blinded. In the case of Ibn Bahmanyār, in whose guilt a court jester named Dja fark was also implicated, Malikshāh retaliated by contriving the murder of Niẓām’s eldest son Djamal al-Mulk, who had taken Dja fark’s execution into his own hands (475 = 1082). After the fall of Saiyid al-Ru’asāʾ in 476 (1083—1084), however, the sulṭān left plotting till, some years later, a new favourite, Tād al-Mulk, caught his fancy.

All went well with Niẓām al-Mulk till 483 (1090—1091). In that year, however, occurred the first serious challenge to the Saldjūkīd power, when al-Ḫaṣṣa wał hacked by a force of Karmaṭjans; and almost simultaneously their co-secracy the Assassin leader al-Hasan b. al-Ḫaṣṣaḥ (q. v.) obtained possession of the fortress of Alumūt, from which repeated attacks failed to dislodge him. Meanwhile, moreover, an awkward problem had arisen over the succession to the sulṭānate, on account of the death in turn of Malikshāh’s two eldest sons, Dāwūd (474 = 1082) and Alam (481 = 1088). These sons had both been children of the Karšhāhād princess Terken Khāṭūn (see Ḏimār al-Taṭābūrī), who had borne the sulṭān a third son, Mahmūd, in 480 (1087). She was eager for Mahmūd to be formally declared heir. Niẓām, however, was in favour of Barkiyārūk (q. v.), Malikshāh’s eldest surviving son by a Saldjūkīd princess. Hence Terken became his bitter enemy, and joined with Tād al-Mulk, who was in her service, in instigating Malikshāh against the ważir.

Tād al-Mulk accused Niẓām to the sulṭān, who by this time was in any case incensed with the ważir’s championship of al-Muḳṭadī, of extravagant expenditure on the army and of nepotism; and Malikshāh’s wrath was finally inflamed beyond bearing by an unguarded reply made by Niẓām to a formal accusation of these practices. But even so he did not dare to dismiss him. (The earliest historian to assert that he was dismissed is Rāshid al-Dīn Fadl Allāh, who appears to have misunderstood the purport of some verses by al-Naḥḥās quoted in the Rāḥat al-Sādūr; and really composed after Niẓām’s death).

Niẓām al-Mulk was assassinated on 10th Ramadān 485 (October 14, 1092) near Sīhān, between Kanguwar and Bisutūn, as the court was on its way from Isfahān to Baghdād. His murderer, who was disguise as a Sūfī, was immediately killed, but is generally thought to have been an emissary of al-Ḥaṣṣaḥ b. al-Ḫaṣṣaḥ. Contemporary, however, seem to have put the murder down to Malikshāh, who died suddenly less than a month later, and to Tād al-Mulk, whom Niẓām’s retainers duly tracked down and killed within a year. And Rāshid al-Dīn combines the two theories, stating that the ważir’s enemies at court concerted it with the Assassins. The truth is therefore uncertain; but as Rāshid al-Dīn is one of the earliest historians to whom the Assassin records were available, his account would seem to deserve attention.

The extraordinary influence of Niẓām al-Mulk is attested by the part played in affairs after his death by his relatives, despite the fact that only two appeared to have displayed much ability. For the next sixty years, except for a gap between 528 (1134), 571 (1123) and 528 (1134), members of his family held office under princes of the Saldjūkīd house.

(N. Harrod Bowen)

NIZĀM BADAKSHI studied law and ṣawī in under Mawdūl ʿĪsā al-Dī‘ārī and Mullā ʿAbd al-Sa‘īd in his native land Badakhshān and was looked upon as one of the most learned men of his age. He was also the marīd (disciple) of Shaikh Ḥusain of Khwārizm. His attainments procured him access to the court of Sulaimān, king of Badakhshān, who conferred upon him the title of Kādī Khān. Subsequently he left his master and went to India. At Khānpūr, he was introduced to the Emperor Akbar (1563–1605). He received several presents, and was appointed Ṣurānī (Secretary) to Akbar soon discovered in him a man of great insight, and made him a “Commander of One Thousand” (vakhsūrī). He also bestowed upon him the title of Ghāzī Khān after he had distinguished himself in several expeditions. He died in Oudh at the age of seventy in 992 (1584). He is the author of the following works: 1. Ḥaḍīth al-Shāhīr al-ʿAbūdī, a commentary on al-Taftāzānī’s commentary on the ʿAbūdī of al-Nasaffī; 2. several treatises on Šāfīism.


(M. Hisyāvat Ḥosain)

NIZĀM-I DJEĐĪD, “new tree”, the reforms of Selīm III. Sultan Selim III [q.v.], recognizing the necessity of a thorough reorganisation in certain departments of state, promulgated in 1793 under the name of Nizām-i ʾidādī, i.e. new decree, a series of measures for the reform of the feudal military system, the admirality, the artillery and transport, a “vizierate ordinance” for the governors of provinces, a law dealing with provincial taxation, another for the creation of a body of infantry raised and drilled on western lines, and lastly the institution of a special military fund from new sources of revenue, to provide the funds for the reforms These revenues consisted of taxes on brandy, tobacco, coffee, silk, wool, sheep and the yields of the fiefs of holders of timar [q.v.] in Anatolia, who had neglected their duty in war and were therefore deprived of their fiefs. It was intended that the new body of infantry, Nizām-i ʾidādī ‘askeb, should number 12,000. To begin with a model battalion of 1,600 men was raised, to be composed of volunteers. This body was formed of young men of different nationalities and religions, mostly Austrian or Russian deserters collected during the war with Russia. The result was that the force enjoyed little prestige and native Turks only joined it in small numbers, with the consequence that this corps, popularly called lecema ʾaskerī, consisted of only a few hundred men and was unable to attain to the strength of a battalion (1,600) until 1799. The Sultan’s force trained and armed on European lines was limited to this body.

The Sultan employed foreign officers, mainly from England, Sweden and Spain, to train the soldiers and see to the management of the arsenals, building and fortifications. Large barracks and ammunition depots were built. The new revenue earmarked for military purposes which by 1797–1798 amounted to 60,000 purses, i.e. 48,000,000 francs (cf. Djewdet, Taʾrīkh, viii. 139 sq.), supplied the necessary funds. Internal difficulties, especially the ever increasing number of opponents of reform, prevented the Sultan from completely realising his plans. The name Nizām-i ʾidādī became more and more hateful to the people, who decided to abolish it altogether and to call the corps of regular troops Sejmen or Segbahn, i.e. “kennelmen”. On Selim’s deposition it was disband ed. Under his successor Muṣtafa [q.v.] the attempt was made to revive the Nizām-i ʾidādī. The Austrian renegade Sulaimān Āgha who had previously commanded the division quartered in Lewend Ciftlik was ordered to reconstitute it again secretly, but this effort met with no permanent success (cf. Zinkeisen, G.O.R., v. 552 sq.).


(Franz Badinger)

NIZĀM SHĀH, title assumed in 895 (1490) by Malik Āḥmad Bahrī, founder of the Nizām Shāh state of Ahmadnagar [q.v.], one of the five independent sultānates which arose out of the ruins of the Bahmani kingdom of the Dakhkan towards the end of the fifteenth century. For a chronological list and genealogical table of these kings of Ahmadnagar see Cambridge History of India, ii. 704–705; also Zambur, Manuel, p. 298–299.

The second ruler, Burhān Nizām Shāh I (914–960 = 1509–1553), adopted, in 1537, the Shāfī school of Islam which, except for a brief period under Ismā’il when the Māhālīs were in power, became the established religion of this kingdom. During Burhan’s reign an unsuccessful attempt was made by the anti-Dakhani faction, known as the Foreigners, to place his brother, Rādījādu, upon the throne. The flight of the defeated rebel to Berār, combined with the refusal of ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Ḥamād Shāh to surrender Pāthī, the home of Burhan’s Brahman ancestors, led to war with Burān and to the capture of Pāthī. It was a dispute as to the possession of Sholapur, the chief bone of contention between Ahmadnagar and the neighbouring kingdom of Bidājpūr, that caused Burhan to adopt the disastrous policy of joining forces with Sadāṣhīvārīya of Vijaynagar, as a result of which the Hindu monarch was able to annex the Rātēr Dūḥā to his dominions, while Burhan was successful in capturing the fortress of Sholapur.
Burhan was succeeded, after a period of civil warfare, by his son Husain who reigned until 972 (1565). His reign was marked by outstanding importance in the history of the Dakhân, for it was at this time that the Muslim rulers of this area, with the exception of Berâr, irritated by the overbearing insolence of Sanâshîvarâya and realizing the strength of the Hindu menace in the south, combined to crush the military power of Vîjâyânagar at the battle of Tâlîkota (972 = 1565).

In the same year Husain was gathered to his fathers and his son, Murâdañ(Nizâm Shâh I (972—994 = 1565—1586), reigned in his stead. Murâdañ(Nizâm Shâh, called Diwânâ or Madman, neglected the affairs of his kingdom for a life of dissipation, the real power being in the hands of his ministers. An unsuccessful attempt was made during this reign to drive the Portuguese out of India, but the effort came too late, for, during the critical years when the Portuguese had been establishing themselves along the coast, the forces which might have united to hurl the invaders into the sea had been engaged in inglorious intermecine conflicts. The most important event in this reign was the annexation of Berâr, in 982 (1574).

The subsequent history of this dynasty, until the Mughal invasions of the Dakhân, is unimportant. Full details will be found in the pages of Faridâñ(N, the indispensable commentary on the heroes and the heroines of the Later, as the đowagerqwâns of the Durbar, the imperial forces conquered Aâhmadnagar in 1600. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the incorporation of the Nizâm Shîh dominions in the Mughal Empire was effective under Akbar. All attempts by his successor Dâshângâr to complete his father's policy were frustrated by the organizing ability of Malik Ambar, an able Abyssinian minister, who was in charge of the affairs of Aâhmadnagar until his death in 1135 (1626). It was not until 1142 (1633), in the reign of Shahâhjâbân, that this kingdom was finally annexed, although for some years afterwards the Mâhâshâh leader Shahjâbân attempted to resuscitate the Nizâm Shîh dynasty.


**NIZÂMÎ, Nizâm al-Dîn Abû Muhammad Ilâyâb b. Yûsûf, one of the greatest poets of Persia. He was born in Ganjûl, the later Elissavetpol in 535 (1140—1141). His parents died while he was still quite young so that the education of his two sons and of his own had to be undertaken by his uncle. From Nizâmî's poems, it is apparent that his uncle very soon followed his parents to the grave. Nevertheless the two boys succeeded in getting an excellent education, for Nizâmî's brother, who wrote under the pen-name of Kiwâmî Muĥtarîzî, attained a very high skill as a writer of kârstas (an ingenious kastâ by him is given in Browne, *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, ii. 47 sq.). Nizâmî was thrice married and had a son named Muhammad. The poet was interested in Sîsî and studied in Sîsî circles under a certain Shâhî Ashâ Farruñî Raïhânî. Nothing more is known about his career and it may be presumed that his life was relatively uneventful. It says however of himself that he avoided the bustle of princes' courts and had a strictly ascetic conception of life. Nevertheless all his great poems are dedicated to rulers of his time and for one of them he even received the rents of the village of Hamdânîyân but it yielded him very little, he tells us. He died in 599 (1202—1203) aged 63½, Davlatshâh gives the date of his death as 576 (1180—1181), which is however impossible as three of his poems were written after this year; this is probably an instance of the usual carelessness of this writer.

Nizâmî's great work is his *Khâmana* or Quintette, a collection of five great epic poems, with different subjects. It is very possible that these poems were not collected under one title by the author himself, as Hamd Allah Kazvîni 25 years after Nizâmî's death does not yet know the work as a collected whole, although he esteems it very highly and was perfectly acquainted with it. The *Khâmana* consists of the following parts: 1. *Makhânâ al-Asâ'îr* (561 = 1388) dedicated to Mitâğir, Atâbek of Aâhharbâjîan. It is a didactic poem strongly permeated by the spirit of Sûfism. The principles inculcated are expounded by the insertion of short stories. In spite of a certain prosiness, the work is characterized by certain passages of remarkable beauty (e.g. chap. 5 "On old age") and played a prominent part in the history of Persian didactic poetry. 2. *Khusraw u-Shirin* (571 = 1175—1176) dedicated to the Sûfî Mitâğir. It deals with the Sûfîshen of Khusraw Parwiz and coinciding in parts with the corresponding sections of the *Shîh-nâmâ*. The heroic element however here falls into the background to give free play to the romantic and especially to a penetrating psychological analysis. 3. *Lailâ et al-Majdûn* (584 = 1188—1189) dedicated to the Shîrwanî Aâhâhshâh. The subject was adopted at the request of the Shîrwanî. Nizâmî was by no means satisfied with this choice; the love-story of the Beduin poet Kais al-Amîrî, known as Majdûn [q.v.], seemed to him as dry as the Arabian desert. Yet it is this very poem that is his greatest work, for it was an astonishing success and stimulated countless imitations, among them some of the pearls of Oriental poetry, such as the work of the same name of the Aâhharbâjîan poet Fudûñî. Here the heroic style is completely dropped and we have a simple love-story, only occasionally interrupted by the clash of arms. 4. *Shikandar or (iskandar)-nâmâ* (587 = 1191) divided into two parts which are known as *implicitly-nâmâ* or *Sharaf-nâmâ* and *Kharad-nâmâ* (or *Skandar-nâmâ-yi barû* and *Skandar-nâmâ-yi havîr*). It is probably the first part of the work was dedicated to *Izâr al-Dîn Mas'ûd I, Atâbek of Mûsûl. A revised version was offered by the poet to Nârzâl al-Dîn Abû Bakr Bîshîkîn, Atâbek of Aâhharbâjîan. Nizâmî took the romance of Alexander as the foundation for his poem and treats it very much on the same lines as Firdavsi. The subject afforded ample opportunities to work in scientific and philosophical material, which Nizâmî does very skilfully in the conversations between Alexander and his tutor Aristotle and other scholars. The work thus became a kind of encyclopedia, which touches on almost all branches of knowledge of the time. 5. *Hoist Paikan* (595 = 1198—1199) dedicated to the same ruler as the previous poem. In this poem Nizâmî again goes back to the popular Sûfîshen hero Bâhrâm Gûr. But here again
it is not on his chivalrous adventures that stress is laid but on seven stories related to the hero by seven kings' daughters with whom he is in love. Each of these stories is associated with a day of the week, a planet and a colour. They form a masterpiece of Oriental story-telling which has never been surpassed and their grotesque and gruesome fantasy is particularly effective. As a master of fantasy, Nizami recalls F. T. A. Hoffmann and J. Calot and is able to make his readers visualise his wonderful pictures just as vividly as the European masters. Besides these large works, Nizāmī left a lyrical Divān of which only three MSS. are known (Bodleian, No. 618, 619 and Berlin, Petitsch Cat., No. 691) and which so far has received little attention. It contains no každādī in the court style and is distinctly ūfī in tone.

Nizāmī's works are of the greatest importance in the history of Persian literature. They make the zenith of epic poetry in Persia, as in them for the first time the antithesis between the language of the lyric and the archaic style of the epic is overcome and the epic is brought into the milieu of the world, which as time was already fully developed in the lyric. The epic however at the same time loses its heroic character and devotes itself more and more to psychological characterisation at which Nizāmī was a master. The overloading with learning, which in time came to choke the action completely, is very noticeable.

Nizāmī's influence on the later poets was unusually strong. A whole series of important poets, men like Amir Khusrav Dihlawī, Khwāja Kirmānī, Kātībī, Dāmtī, Hūfī and even the great mystic Farīd al-Dīn ʻAbū l-Nūrī ond the great master of ʻAghdāšī poetry Mir ʻAlī Shīr Nāwī, tried their skill in narmās on Nizāmī's Khamsa (the number of poems in later writers rises to seven).

In spite of its great importance, so far critical editions of parts only of the Khamsa have appeared and we are dependent for the rest on bad Indian lithographs or manuscripts difficult of access. It is most desirable to put an end to this state of affairs and devote greater attention in Europe to the study of Nizāmī.


E. BERTHELS

NIZĀMĪ ʻARūDĪ. AHMAD B. ʻUMAR B. ʻALI took the nābāddah of Nizāmī and the honorific Naqīm al-Dīn (or Naqīm al-Dīn) was he usually called; Stīla (it was already fully developed in the lyric). He was a court poet and was often called ūfī by his contemporaries. He is one of the most interesting and remarkable Persian writers of prose: "one of those who throw most light on the intimate life of Persian and Central Asian Courts in the xiiith century of our era". He was a court poet who served faithfully the Ghōrīdī (q.v.) princes for 45 years (he would thus be born at the end of the xiiith century), according to what he tells us at the beginning of the Čahār Makhāla, the only work by him that has come down to us. His verse has been lost, at least except for fragments; Davlatghāf (ed. Browne, p. 66—69) only gives one couplet which does not seem to be by him. Afsī (Lubāb, ed. Browne, p. 207—208) quotes five poetical fragments (mostly occasional pieces) and adds that Nizāmī composed several mathnae, the titles of which have not survived. The only biographical information we possess about Nizāmī comes from himself. In 504 (1110—1111) he was in Sāmākand collecting traditions relating to the poet Rūdgāš (Čahār Makhāla, text, p. 33); in 506, he met Khayāmī in Bālḵ (ibid., p. 63) and three years later he was living in Herat (ibid., p. 44): in the following year (510 = 1116—1117) finding himself in poverty in Nāshāhpūr (ibid., p. 9), he went to Tūs in the hope of gaining the favour of Sulṭān Sandarjī who was encamped outside the town (p. 49 sq.); in Tūs he visited the tomb of Firdawīsī (p. 51) and collected information about him which he put in his book (p. 47 sq.). Encouraged by Muʿīzī, Sandarjī's poet-laureate, he succeeded in attracting the prince's attention; his fame and fortune probably date from this time; in 512 we find him again at Nāshāhpūr (p. 69); and again in 514 when he heard from the lips of Muʿīzī an anecdote about Mahāmād and Firdawīsī (p. 50—51); in 530 he returned to this town and visited the tomb of Khayāmī (p. 63); in 547 he fled into hiding after the defeat of the Ghōrīdī army by Sandarjī near Herat (p. 87). His "Four Discourses" (Čahār Makhāla) were probably written in 1156. For the remainder of his life we have no data. There is reason to believe he practised medicine and astrology (cf. text, p. 65 and 87). As to his poetry, in spite of the satisfaction he expresses with it, it is not
of the first rank, to judge by the fragments that survive; in any case it was very inferior to his prose, which Browne says is almost unequalled in Persian.

The Čahār Maṭbālas consists of four discourses, each of which deals with one of the classes of men whom the author regards as indispensable in the service of Kings: secretaries, poets, astrologers and physicians. Each discourse begins with general considerations, which are followed by anecdotes, often from the writer's personal experience. The number of these anecdotes, which form the most interesting and valuable part of the book, is about forty; some give valuable information on the literary and scientific state of Persia. We may say that the "Four Discourses" (especially the second) and Avf's Lūbān are the two old works which deal systematically with Persian poetry. Davlatshāh made a great deal of use of it (cf. Browne, Sources of Davlatshāh, in J. R. A. S., 1899, p. 37–60). We may specially point out that it is to Ṣāmidi that we owe the earliest notice of Firdawsi and the only contemporary reference to Khayām. On the other hand, we may point out the historical inaccuracy of certain passages, even in the case of events in which Ṣāmidi claims to have taken part. His book is mentioned or quoted by Avf (Lūbān) in Isfandiyār (Passage of Tahāvar) and Murray (Ṭāhirī-Kašānī, Dājānī, Sisītāt al-Dhakāb, Ghasfārt (Ngirštātor). Ḥududī Khāifa speaks of a Maḏmūn al-Navvārī, which he thinks is different from the Čahār Maṭbāla; but Ṣāmid Khwānī has shown that this is another title of the same book.


Niẓāmī ʿArūqī, a Persian historian whose full name was ʿAbd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿArūqī. Born in Nishapur, he went on the advice of his šāhīk Muhammad Kābī to Ghaznī to give an opportunity to his remarkable talents as a stylist. A severe illness forced him to leave Ghaznī. And went to Dīlūr where he obtained an appointment as court historian to the Pathān Sulṭān, and began in 602 (1206) his great historical work Tādī al-ʿĀṣīr šī Tāʾīrī, which brought him great fame. It deals with the history of the first three Pathān Sulṭāns of Delhi — Muḥammad b. ʿĀṣīr (585–602 = 1102–1206), Kuṭb al-Dīn Aḥīak (602–607 = 1206–1210) and Shams al-Dīn Iltutmīs (607–637 = 1210–1235). The book begins with the capture of Aḏhir by Muʿizz al-Dīn in 587 (1191) and ends with the appointment of Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad as governor of Lahore (614 = 1217). An Appendix contains a panegyric of Iltutmīs and his campaigns of conquest. The work was very highly esteemed in the Muslim east as a model of elegant style. It is written in high flowing language and abounds in a large number of poetical passages inserted in it. It is only with difficulty that the historical facts can be extricated from the medley of rhetoric but nevertheless the book is of undeniable value for the history of India and Afghanistan.

Niẓāmī ʿArūqī, a Persian historian whose full name was ʿAbd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿArūqī. Born in Nishapur, he went on the advice of his šāhīk Muhammad Kābī to Ghaznī to give an opportunity to his remarkable talents as a stylist. A severe illness forced him to leave Ghaznī. And went to Dīlūr where he obtained an appointment as court historian to the Pathān Sulṭān, and began in 602 (1206) his great historical work Tādī al-ʿĀṣīr šī Tāʾīrī, which brought him great fame. It deals with the history of the first three Pathān Sulṭāns of Delhi — Muḥammad b. ʿĀṣīr (585–602 = 1102–1206), Kuṭb al-Dīn Aḥīak (602–607 = 1206–1210) and Shams al-Dīn Iltutmīs (607–637 = 1210–1235). The book begins with the capture of Aḏhir by Muʿizz al-Dīn in 587 (1191) and ends with the appointment of Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad as governor of Lahore (614 = 1217). An Appendix contains a panegyric of Iltutmīs and his campaigns of conquest. The work was very highly esteemed in the Muslim east as a model of elegant style. It is written in high flowing language and abounds in a large number of poetical passages inserted in it. It is only with difficulty that the historical facts can be extricated from the medley of rhetoric but nevertheless the book is of undeniable value for the history of India and Afghanistan.


Niẓām-Shāhī (i.e. Hīfī-Niẓām-Shāhī "ambassador of Niẓām-Shāh" of the Dakhān), a Persian historian whose real name was Khwāshā b. Kuṭb al-Husainī. Born in the Persian ʿIrāq, he entered the service of Sulṭān Burhān (cf. Niẓām-Shāhī). The latter being converted to the Shī'a sent Khwāshā as ambassador to Tāhmāsp-Shāh Sāfawī. Reaching Rawjī in Raḍḍāb (Sept. 1545), he accompanied the Shāh to Georgia and Shirwān during the campaign of 1545–1546 against Akāvārī. He stayed in Persia till 1563, perhaps with occasional breaks. He died at Golconda on the 15th Dhu l-Kaʿād 972 (June 24, 1564). Khwāshā's chief work is the Tāḍīrīh-i Nīzām-shāhī, a general history from the time of Khwāshā himself to the year 1210 (638) of the Shīʿa calendar. The work (Tādrīg-i Gazānī, Zafer-nāma, Ḥāthī al-Siyar, the "Memoirs of Shāh-Tāhmāsp") etc. The book is divided into a preface and seven maḏmūn, each of which is again divided into several ʿawfār. The most important part of this work is that which refers to the reign of Tāhmāsp-Shāh (in the Brit. Mus. Ms. Or. 153, written in 972 = 1563, the events come down to 969) and to the local dynasties of the Caspian provinces: Māzandarān, Gilfīn, Shirwān. The two manuscripts in the British Museum show differences in their contents: Add. 23, 513 (written in 1095 = 1684) has passages added by some continuator and taken from the document of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ghasfārt. The later additions of Or. 153 come down as late as 1900. According to Firšt, "Shāh Khwāshā", during the reign of Ibrāhīm Kuṭb-Shāh of the Deccan (1597–1688) also wrote a history of the Kuṭb-Shāhs [v.]. It is difficult to reconcile this with a continuous stay in Persia from 952 to 971.

Bibliography: Rieu, Catalogue, p. 107–111; Schefer, in his Chrestomathie persane, ii., 1885, p. 8–11, (notes 65–133) printed the sections relating to the Caspian provinces.

Niẓār b. Maʿadd, common ancestor of the greater part of the Arab tribes of the north, according to the accepted genealogical system. Genealogy: Niẓār b. Maʿadd b. ʿĀdnān (Wustenfeld, General. Tabellen, A. 3). His mother, Muʿānāhīnī Dājahā, was descended from the pre-Arab race of the Djarhum. Genealogical legend which has preserved mythological features and folklore relating to several eponyms of Arab tribes is almost silent on the subject of Niẓār (an etymological fable about his name: Tādī al-ʿĀṣīr, ii. 563, 15–17) from the ʿArab al-ʿĀṣīr of al-Suhdūlī [i. 8, 8–22] is without doubt of very late origin as is shown by the connection which is established.
with the prophetic mission of Muḥammad; the same etymology from nafs “insignificant” is further found in Ibn Buraid, Kīrāb al-Uṣūla, p. 20, 6; Musafadatiyāt, ed. Lyall, p. 765, 16, without the story in question). Tradition has more to say about his four sons Kābi‘, Muḍār, Anmār, Iyāḍ and about the partition of the paternal heritage among them, in connection with which they visited the Dājurhum ṣabān al-Afā‘īs. Their adventures on the journey (they are able to describe minutely the appearance of a camel they have never seen from the traces it has left) form the subject of a popular story which has parallels among other peoples; its object is to make the origins of the Kiyāfa go back to the most remote period (al-Mufaddalī b. Salama, al-Fākkir, p. 155—156 and the sources there quoted; Tabarsi, i. 1108–1110 etc.); it perhaps is of interest to note that the story was known to Voltaire who introduced it into his Zadig.

As Robertson Smith showed half a century ago (Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, 2, p. 5 999, 283—289) and as Goldziher has confirmed by numerous quotations (Muḥammadanische Studien, i. 92), the name Nizar only appears late in Arab poetry, while that of Muḥammad (which is found as early as the Byzantine historians Procopius and Nonnus) appears quite early in it, although its ethnic character is rather vague (as to that of ‘Admān, still more comprehensive, one of the oldest historians of Arab poetry, Muḥammad b. Sallām, d. 230 = 844—845, had already pointed out that his name was almost unknown in ancient poetry, Tabarsi al-Shuwar‘a, ed. Hell, p. 5, 1; cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, al-Inshā‘ al-Kabīl al-Kuwarīs, Cairo 1359, p. 48). Before the Umayyad period the only trace we find of the use of Nizar as an ethnic is in a verse of the pre-Islamic poet Bishr b. Abī Khāzim (in the Musafadatiyāt, p. 667, 15) and in another of Ka‘b b. Zuhair (in Tabarsi, i. 1106, 16) in the verse of Ḥassān b. Thābit, ed. Hirschfeld, i.x, 2, the reference is to another Nizar, son of Ma‘sāb’s ‘Amr b. Lu‘ayy) (Wustenfeld, Tabellen, P. 15) belonging to the Kūrāshī. The line in Umayyad b. Ḥabīl al-Sa‘d, ed. Schultess, U, i. 10, in which the descent of the Thāthīf from Nizar is celebrated, is apocryphal and is connected with the well known dispute regarding the origin of the Thāthīf. The story of the verdict of al-Akra‘ b. Ḥabīb al-Tamī‘ī in favour of Dājrīr b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bajjālī against Khālid b. Arāh al-Kalbī (Yā‘alī, ed. Devaran, p. 141—142; cf. Ibn Ḥishām, Sīra, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 50) in which there is a reference to Nizar and which is placed before Ḥabīl, is not less suspect: its object is to defend the northern origin of the Bajjālī (descendants of Ammār), often disputed, and to brothers the Khāthīm [q.v.] and to refuse the same origin to the Kalb, descendants of the Kudā‘a, to which it was attributed just at the time of the strife that raged around the succession to Yazīd I. The raqā‘ quoted by Ibn Ḥishām, Sīra, p. 49 (and often elsewhere; they are sometimes attributed to ‘Amr b. Murra al-Dhumān, a contemporary of the Prophet, and sometimes to a certain al-‘Abd b. al-Ya‘būb, otherwise unknown) in which we find used with reference to Kudī‘a, the verb tanazzara “to announce one-elelf to be descended from Nizar” may be regarded as apocryphal. No stress need be laid on the isolated reference in al-Baladhuri (Futūḥ, ed. de Goeje, p. 276, 16) to the quarters (khajfa) of the Banū Nizar in Kūfah contrasted with those of the Yamani; his language simply reflects the position in the author’s time or that of his sources, later than the great revolution of the first century A.H.

It is only from this period, and to be more exact after the battle of Manjī Kāhit (65 = 684) won by the Kalb over the Kāsī, that we begin to find the name Nizar recurring with increasing frequency; it occurs mainly in the pre-Islamic poetry: Dājrīr, al-Farazdak, al-Akheṭal, al-Katāfī. Zuhr b. al-Hārīth use it to designate the common source of the tribes of the north, contrasting it with the terms “Yaman” or “Kabīrīa”. The expression bīnā Nizārīn “the two sons of Nizar” becomes regular; it indicates the Muḍār (Kāsī ‘Ailān) and the Rabī‘a as belonging to one ethnic group; they were previously regarded as unrelated to one another. The tribes descended from Ammār (cf. above) and Iyāḍ (the fourth son of Nizar; but other sources make him a son of Ma‘add) appear only rarely as members of the group. This is what the genealogical systematisation seeks to explain by alleged migrations of Ammār and Iyāḍ into the groups of Yamani tribes.

But the term of the Banū Nizar continued to remain vague, more so than those of Kāsī, Muḍār and Rabī‘a which represent very large groups but more precise than that of Ma‘add, of which it tends to take the place. This is due to the fact that the term Nizar corresponds to a political ideal rather than to a historical reality; in the latter the reigning dynasty, claiming descent from Kūraish (themselves, consequently, Nizārt) had as their henchmen the Kalb, one of the most powerful Yamani tribes, while the Azd, another tribe of the south, bound to the policy of their most illustrious representatives, the Muhallabīs, were sometimes on the side of the Umayyads and sometimes against them. It was this complicated position that gave rise to the attempt to separate the Kudī‘a (i.e. the Kalb) from the southern stock in order to make them descendants of Nizar.

The story told in Alkhanī, xi. 160—161, al-Bukhārī, Ma‘bud, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 14—15 is intended to explain the separation of the Kudī‘a from the rest of the Nizar as a result of the murder of the Nizarī Yāḏkūr b. ‘A‘nāza by the Kudī‘a Ḥazīm b. Nahd. The lines in Dājrīr (Nā‘id, p. 994) sum up very completely the way in which the Kudī‘e-Kalb were connected with the Nizar, while elsewhere (e.g. ibid., p. 261: al-Farazdak) Kudī‘a and Nizar are opposed. Later, at the end of the Umayyad period and especially in the period of the struggle in Kūrāshī which was the prelude to the fall of the dynasty, Nizar (also in the form Nizāīr) became the title of designation which was contrasted with Yamaniya: henceforth the Banū Nizar were to be the representatives of northern Arabism; as early as the period of decline of the Umayyads, the poet al-Kumait b. Zayd al-Asadi [q.v.] had composed a long poem, the Muṣūlahkūba, exalting the Nizar at the expense of the Kudī‘a; nearly a century later, the Yamani Dihīl [q.v.] replied to him; these poetical jousts on which the ‘aqā‘īya, nationalistic fanaticism, of the two great ethnic groups of the Arabs was nourished, continued down to quite a late date, especially among the Zaidīs of the Yaman.

From what has been said it is evident that we cannot speak of Nizar as of a tribe having had
NIZĂR b. MA'ADD — NOVIBAZAR

a real historical existence nor, as is the case with the Ma'addi, as a comprehensive term indicating an effective grouping whether of tribes of different origin. Nizăr is simply a fictitious invention, a label intended to serve political interests. One must however ask whence the name came and what were the precedents which suggested its use in the sense above outlined. The problem has not yet been thoroughly studied and perhaps we do not possess the material necessary to solve it. It is possible that the history of the four sons of Nizăr (cf. above), a popular story the nature and diffusion of which seem to take it back to a very early period and which originally had nothing to do with genealogical tradition, supplied the names on which the Ma'addi later gave their imagination free play. But this is a pure supposition which would have to be confirmed by definite proofs.


NIZĂR b. AL-MUSTĀR (Pā'īn), born 10th Rabi' I 437 (Sept. 26, 1045). On the death of his father, having been displaced by his youngest brother al-Mustāfī (q.v.), Nizăr fled to Alexandria, took the title of al-Muṣṭafā li-Dīn Allāh, and rose in revolt early in 488 (1095) with the assistance of the governor, Naṣr al-Dawla Aftakin, who was jealous of al-Afḍal, and the population of the city. He was at first successful in driving back al-Afḍal and advanced as far as the outskirts of Cairo, supported by Arab auxiliaries. Al-Afḍal again took the field against him, and after a short siege in Alexandria he surrendered towards the end of the same year, was taken to Cairo, and there immured by order of al-Mustāfī.

By the Ismāʿīlī organization in Persia [see the art. AL-HASAN b. AL-SABBĀH], Nizăr was recognized as the rightful successor of al-Mustānsir, and this, with its offshoots in Syria, formed a new group (al-dawwa al-djadida), opposed to the Mustāli group (al-dawwa al-qadima), now known as Khodjas (q.v.) and Bohorās (q.v.) respectively. A party of the Nizāriya at first held to the belief that Nizăr was not dead and would return as the Mahdi or in company with him, but the majority held that the line of Nizăr was continued by the Grand Master of Alamut.

Nizăr has been called: al-Afdal, al-Djadida, Mustar, and Mustaffa. His best biography is that of al-Mustar (Pā'īn), Shīrāzi: see under al-Mustāfī; also Ibn Khallikān, transl. de Slane, i. 160–161 (from al-Nuwayri); Siddīqī. al-Mustānsīr b'līhā, MS., S. O. S., London, Ns. 35 and 43 (cf. B. S. O. S., v. 307 esp.).

(H. A. R. Gibb)

NOAH, [See Neh].

NOVIBAZAR or YESTI BAZAR is the name of a former (down to 1912) Turkish sandjaq in what was once the vilayet of Kosova; it now belongs to Jugo-Slavia. The district through which the river Lim flows and which is therefore also called the Lim district (area 7,350 sq. km. with 68,000 inhabitants of whom 7/8 are Christian Serbs and 1/8 Muslim Albanians), was bounded on the north by Bosnia and separated Serbia from Montenegro. The importance of Novibazar was for military reasons as it secured communications between Bosnia and Kurešan, and at the same time protected communication between Serbia and Montenegro. By art. 85 of the Treaty of Berlin, Austria-Hungary held the western part of the sandjaq (the Lim district) from Sept. 1879 to 1908, namely the towns of Plevlje (Turk. Tağlıda), Prijepejole and Bjelopljoli with a garrison of some 3,000 men, while the southern part, the kazā of Mitrovica, was returned to the Turks. After it was handed over in 1908, Novibazar formed a bone of contention between Turkey, Serbia and Montenegro. In 1912 the sandjaq was conquered by Montenegro (Bjelopljoli Oct. 12, Tusi Oct. 14, Berane Oct. 16, Gusinje Oct. 25 and Plevlje Oct. 28) and Serbia (Novibazar Oct. 23, Sjenica Oct. 24) and in 1913 divided between the two countries.

The district forms with Zeta the ancestral home of former Serbia and roughly corresponds to the ancient Rascia. The chief town Novibazar (in the official spelling Novipazar) 1800 feet above sea-level on the Raška, is now an impoverished place of 11,000 inhabitants with miserable houses and poor streets. In the middle ages however, it was of considerable importance as the imposing remains of churches monasteries and baths around it show. Not far from it the ruins of the town of Ragusa, a well known offshoot of the old Serbian Kingdom and already mentioned in Byzantine history in the 6th century (Pasow), where the Nemanjic prince Stephen held his court for a time. The settlement of Pagazarc or Trgoviste where there was called by the Turks Eski Bazar, "Old Market". A soushā was mentioned as being there in 1459 after the conquest of the land by the Turks (1456) and in 1461 a ẖāji. The Turks then founded a New Market not far away, Yeži Bazar, which soon became the capital of the whole district. The Ragusa historian Lucari says the founder of Novibazar was Ese, i.e. undoubtedly Išči Beg (1444–1460, from 1453 governor of Sarajevo), son of Išči Beg (1414–1444), both of whom were governors in Uskub (Skoplje) and were among the most important Turkish leaders of the time. The foundation of Novibazar must have taken place about 1460 for a year later we find mention for the first time in the archives of Ragusa of Ragusan merchants in Novibazar. In 1467 we already find a ẖāji and a soushā in Novibazar. The town from the end of the xvth century was frequently visited and described by western travellers as it lay on the old trade route from Ragusa (Dubrovnik) to Nish. The knight Arnold v. Harff mentions Novibazar about 1499 as a new emporium. J. Gibberd, (cf. Le voyage de Monsieur d'Armand, ed. L. Scherer, Paris 1887, p. 11) describes Novibazar as ville non fermée, assez marchande. While these and other travellers of the xviith century like Benedict Kuři-pesič (1550; cf. Benedict Curiepisit, Itinera-rium der Botschafterreise des Jes. v. Lamberg, etc., ed. by Eleonore Grafen Lamberg-Schwarzenburg, Innsbruck 1910, p. 41 sq.), Catarino Zeno (1550, in his Descrizione del viaggio da Constantinopoli, 1550 in the Starine of the Jugoslav Academy of Agram, vol. x) and Melchior v. Seydlitz (1555, in his Grundliche Beschreibung der Wallfahr, Goetz 1580) were very little impressed by Novi-bazar, Paolo Contarini (1580, in his Diario del viaggio de Venezia a Constantinopoli, Venice 1856; noce Grimani-Franconi) and the Sieur de
Stochove (c. 1639, cf. *Voyage du Sieur de Stochove fait en années 1630, 1631, 1632, 1633*, Brussels 1643, p. 30; at second hand and not from his own observation) and also Louis de Haye, Sieur de Courmenin (1621, in *Voyage de Lestat Fait par le commandement de Key en année 1621 par le Sieur Lestat de Courmenin*, Paris 1624) devote far more attention to it. P. Contarini spent a day of rest in the caravanserai of Novibazar (Novo Bazar) which he found was a town with 6,000 Turkish and 100 Christian houses. He mentions the Ragusan settlement and the 16 mosques, the very long bazaar, which attracted all kinds of traders and wares for sale (mostly articles of iron from the adjoining Ghubavica in the S. E. of Novibazar which was as early as 1396 the seat of an Ottoman judge and had a customs house). The Sieur de Stochove describes *La ville de Geni Bazari, qui en Turc veut dire nouveau marché, elle est située sur la petite rivière de Rusa en un lieu haull et bas, ce qui en rend la vue fort agréable, son circuit est de demi lieue sans entre enfilée de murailles, est la ville la plus considérable que l'on trouve depuis la frontière* (i. e. the Dalmatian-Bosnian frontier). Louis de Hayes in 1621 found Igni Bazar (i. e. Yeli Bazar) a pleasant place with one storey houses. It was under the governor of Bosnia and a judicature which was under the Chief Kâdi of Sarajevo [q. v.]. The description given by the traveller Evliya Celebi [q. v.] of his visit to Novibazar (1666) [v. 544 sqq.] is as usual full of exaggerations. He says there were 45 quarters in Novibazar, 23 large and 11 small mosques, 5 medreses and 2 monasteries. Of the mosques he mentions the Alun mosque and the mosque of Ghâzî Tâsk-Beg formerly a church, and the Tâskopru mosque and mosque of *Hâdîji-i mutümerem* (?). The bazaar had 1,110 shops, and there were 7 churches of the *Serbs, Bulgars and Latins* in Novibazar. He particularly praises the white unmixed bread and 45 kinds of apples and 35 of pears. Among the notabilities of the time Hâdîji Ishâhî Efendi, who had "cleansed" the roads to Bosnia and Herzegovina and erected bridges and rest-houses, and Dhu 'l-Fiṣar-Zâde Mahmûd Agha receives words of praise. Both had palaces (sârây) in Novibazar.

In consequence of its exceedingly important military position and as the key to Bosnia for Turkey in Europe (cf. F. Kanitz, *Serben*, Leipzig 1868, p. 200 sq.) Novibazar has frequently played a part in military history. In 1689 it was occupied under the Margrave of Baden; but the Christian inhabitants, disillusioned by the tyrannical attitude of the garrison, the excesses of the imperial armies, the heavy taxation, the intolerance shown the orthodox clergy and the partisanship for the Roman Catholic church, soon turned against their new masters and very soon Novibazar with the whole of Old Serbia again passed to the Ottomans. In 1737 Novibazar was again occupied for a few months by the imperial forces, but as a result of the careless leadership of the generals fell with Niš again into Turkish hands and this settled the disastrous result of the war for Austria (cf. F. Kanitz, *op. cit.*, p. 203 sq. and the Turkish description of the Bosnian campaign, from the pen of the kâdi of Novi, *'Omar Efendi* [q. v.], e. g. in the German version by J. N. v. Dubsky, Vienna 1879, p. 134 sqq. or the English by C. Fraser, London 1839, p. 49 sqq.). It is remarkable that the defence of Novibazar in the Turkish period were never what the strategic importance of the place demanded (cf. the description in A. Boué, *Die Europäische Türkei*, vol. 1, Vienna 1859, p. 549). In view of the stubborn defiance and steady opposition of the people, the Ottoman authorities — Novibazar was the seat of a kâmatmaš [q. v.] — had a difficult time. General Hasan Pasha who was to carry out the disarming in 1880, was killed in the street in a rising and those guilty were never brought to book. Unpopular officials were as a rule simply driven out. As the Porte resumed continuous fighting with the rebellious population of the sandžak it no longer felt it right to undertake a regular military expedition against them. The result was that all branches of administration, trade, agriculture and industry gradually went to pieces. From the xvinth century therefore Novibazar was always a place of little importance. Nor did it revive under the semi-independent feudal lords of the family of Ferhadagić (Ferhâd-gûllari). Of the remains of Muslim times in Novibazar may be mentioned the fortress (zâlu) built in 1103 (1690) in the reign of Sultan Ahmed II. The surrounding buildings as a rule date only from the time of Abd al-Ḥamid II. Historically most interesting is the Alun *'Alem Mosque built by Ghâzî Tâsk-Beg (see above), the founder of Novibazar. Belonging to it are the wretched ruins of the expensive karâye under the eponymous karâia of the first half feudal lord of Novibazar, Aiyyâb Pasha (d. 1243 = 1821). Of other Muslim houses of prayer may be mentioned the mosques of Muslih al-Din Efendi, first mu'cimnâni of the conqueror Mehmed II, of Ghâzî Sinân-Beg and of Aiyyâb Pasha. — The capital of the sandžak of Novibazar in modern times was the little town of Sjenica (cf. K. Oestreich, *Reisen im Vilajet Kosovo*, in the *Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, vol. xxvi., 1899, p. 319).


**NUBA, name of a country [and people?] to the South of Egypt.** The names Nubia, Nubian, Nuba are commonly used without scientific precision and it is only in the linguistic sense that they have an unambiguous meaning. The frontier separating Nuba from Egypt proper is well defined as the first cataract of the Nile in the neighbourhood of Assûn, and the area where Nubian is spoken nowadays ends in the vicinity of the 18th parallel, but the southern limit of Nubia is sometimes placed as far south as the junction of the Atbara and the Nile or even the confluence of the two Niles. Nubia is often sub-divided into Lower Nubia
from Aswān to Wādi Ḥalfā and Upper Nubia from Wādi Ḥalfā southwards, but neither term has any political or administrative significance.

The medieval Arabic writers are equally vague about the southern extent of Nubia, the region immediately bordering on Egypt, which bore the name of Maris, seems to have been regarded as Nubia **par excellence**; to the south of it lay Muṣarra with its capital at Dongola (Dunkula, Dumbula), and beyond this the kingdom of Alwa the capital of which was Sōba, near the site of the modern Khartūm. According to the tenth-century author ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbīad b. Sulaim (Ṣulaim), quoted by Maḏrīzī Maris and Muṣarṛā ḥad distinct languages, and the frontier between them was situated three post-stations (hārid) to the south of the Third Cataract; politically, however, Maris formed part of Muṣarrā and this probably accounts for the fact that Ibn Sulaim immediately afterwards places the commencement of Muṣarṛā at a day’s journey from Aswān. The frontier between Muṣarṛā and Alwa was the district of al-ʿAlawā, a name still in use for the country round Kabūţya in Berber province. ‘Alwa is generally placed outside Nubia, and the preamble to the treaty which governed the political relations between Nubians and Arabs makes its provisions incumbent on *the* chief of the Nubians and all people of his dominion *a* the frontier of Aswān to the frontier of ‘Alwa;* yet Masʿūdī speaks of ‘Alwa as part of Nubia in the middle ages, and the political suzerainty of Muṣarṛā. According to Yâḳūţ, Nubia extends along the Nile a distance of eighty days journey, Dongola being situated halfway at forty days distance from Aswān; of ʿAlwa he speaks, with obvious exaggeration of the distance, as a people beyond Nubia three months’ journey from the king of the Nība, whose official title is *king of Muṣarṛā and Nība*.

The modern conventional division of the population of the northern Sudān into Nubian, Beida, and Arab is in the main a linguistic one and does not correspond to any clearly-marked racial divisions. The *Nubian* type, itself a hybrid one, which makes up the pre-Arabic stage of the Nubian people and states that it is until the political suzerainty of Muṣarṛā, is most purely preserved in the Kenē, Mahāṣ, and Sukkot, who between them compose the so-called Barābra, though even here a considerable element of alien admixture must be recognised. The Nubian-speaking Danīgla (Danakila), on the other hand, are scarcely distinguishable from the rest of the Danīgla-Djaḥyin-group (see MacMichael, *History*, i. 197 seqq.) which includes a number of Arabic-speaking tribes extending from Dongola province to the neighbourhood of Khartūm; the origin of this group must be sought in a fusion of the original Nubian element with the Arabs who poured into the Sudan in the middle ages, and we may conjecture that the fall of the Christian kingdoms of Dongola and ‘Alwa. The numerous Danīgla colonies on the Blue and White Niles have given up their language in favour of Arabic, and the same applies to a branch of the Mahāṣ, settled since the sixteenth century in the neighbourhood of Khartūm, who now claim to be descended from the Kazarjād of Arabia. Throughout the northern Sudān the original Nubian stratum has coalesced with the Arabs to such an extent that it is no longer possible to separate the two strains. This fusion has also affected the groups which still speak Nubian, though the Barābra may be said to have maintained a separate identity and to have absorbed the foreign elements rather than the reverse. The Danīgla repudiated the appellation Nubia, and the term Barābra is used only by Egyptians and other foreigners, while the people themselves prefer to call themselves by their tribal names (Kenē, Mahāṣ, Sukkot). It is only in recent times that they have begun to develop a national sentiment as Nubians and to make occasional use of the name.

**Language.** The Nubian language can scarcely be indigenous to the Nile Valley, and it is in no way connected with the language of the Meroitic inscriptions which preceded it in that area. The problem of its linguistic grouping has not been satisfactorily solved: both Hamitic and Sudanic features are present, and L. Reinisch (*Die sprachliche Stellung des Nubos*, Vienna 1911) regards it as a connecting link between the two groups. G. W. Murray (*Sudan Notes and Records*, vol. iii.) suggests the conclusion that in the remote past Diska-Shilluk, Bari-Masai, and Nubian had a common origin, and that they all have to a greater or lesser degree been permeated by Hamitic influence. W. Memhof (*Eine Studienfahrt nach Kordofan*) definitely classes Nubian as a Hamitic language.

The following branches are distinguished:

a. Nilotic Nubian (the language of the Barābra and Danīgla) with three dialects: Kenē, Mahāṣ, and Dongolaw; and states that a third, though separated geographically, form a single dialect group. A fourth dialect distinguished by Reinisch (Paddī, Fadjīka) is stated by Lepsius to be only a variety of Mahāṣ.

b. Hill Nubian spoken by a number of negroid tribes in the present province of Kordofan. The area in question is inhabited by a medley of tribes of different linguistic and racial stocks, and it is only in the case of the Nubian-speaking groups (mainly in the north) that the appellation Nubia is justified. The best known dialect is that of Dilling (Delen). A form of Hill Nubian is also spoken by the people of Dībel Mādūb in northern Dārfūr.

c. The isolated dialect of the Birged tribe in Dārfūr designated by Zylén as South-West Nubian.

d. Old Nubian, the literary language of medieval Nubia. The examples which have survived belong to the viii—ix centuries and consist of homiletic and edifying pieces intended for the common people, as distinct from strictly theological literature for which Greek was employed. The language of these texts approximates most closely to modern Mahāṣ, although the provenance of the existing remains is the northernmost part of Nubia when Kenē is spoken. Scanty remains from Upper Nubia justify the conclusion that Nubian (perhaps in a form more closely connected with the Hill dialects) was also used for literary purposes in the kingdom of ‘Alwa.

Modern Nubian has no literature apart from biblical translations produced under European influence. The Danīgla and Barābra use only Arabic for written communications and for literary purposes.

**History.** In speaking of the early history of the country the name Nubia is misleading, as there is no evidence of its use in ancient Egypt as a tribal or geographical name. To the Egyptians, Lower Nubia was known as Wawat, and Upper
Nubia as Kaš (the Biblical Kush) which corresponds to the classical Ethiopia. From the earliest times there existed relations of trade, conquest, and cultural influence between Egypt and its southern neighbour, and under the Middle Empire the Egyptian penetration of what is now Dongola province led to the development of a special local civilisation based on the culture of Egypt, but deeply affected by local forms, materials and customs. Under the New Empire Wawat and Kaš were governed by Egyptian viceroy, and Napata (Drybel Barkal) became an important centre of the cult of Amon-Ra. Later Napata was the capital of an independent Ethiopian kingdom which, in its turn, conquered Egypt, and five kings of Napata sat on the throne of the Pharaohs (the 25th dynasty, n. c. 730—663). Subsequently the centre of gravity shifted southwards and Meroc, about 130 miles north of Kharfûm, was the capital of a kingdom which still preserved the elements of a civilisation based on that of Egypt, though the isolation of the country, which was now almost complete, led to a rapid decline. In circumstances of which we have no detailed knowledge, the character of the population was modified owing to the intrusion of negroid elements from Kordofan and the Djiistra, and cultural contact with the north diminished to such an extent that the Hellenistic-Roman world Ethiopia was but vaguely known, as indeed was the case of medieval Nubia in its relation to the Muslim world. Byzantine missionaries, however, introduced Christianity in the sixth century, at which period the two kingdoms of Muqarr and ‘Alwa were already in existence: the Macurritae, we are told by the chronicler, became Christians in 569 and the Aldaeans in 580, and an embassy of the Macurritae visited Constantinople in 573.

The name Nubian appears for the first time in the Hellenistic-Roman age and the earliest occurrence seems to be in Eratosthenes (quoted by Strabo, xvi.) who speaks of the Noubai as “a great race living in Libya on the left side of the course of the Nile extending from Meroc to the bends of the river”. In this passage, as well as in other references in Greek and Latin writers, Nubians are clearly distinguished from Lybians, Ethiopians, and other Negro folk, and as late as ca. 550 A.D. a kinglet of Lower Nubia speaks of himself as αυτιλος Νουβαδων και ολων των Αλιστων. It is not until the Muslim period that Nubia is found to have replaced Ethiopia as the name for the whole of the riverin country to the south of Egypt.

Of the events which brought about this change of name (no doubt signifying a change in language and in the ethnic character of the people) there is no historical record. From the linguistic evidence it is probable enough that the name originally belongs to the negroid of Kordofan, and that the Noubai (Noubades, Nobates) of the classical writers were immigrants from the southwest who, as a result of political ascendency, imposed their language on the Ethiopians of the Nile valley.

The fact, however, cannot be disregarded that the modern Hill Nuba are strikingly dissimilar in physical character and culture to the mainly Hamitic Barabra-Dangila, and on this ground the possibility of a racial connexion of the two groups has been challenged by C. G. Seligman and H. A. MacMichael (see esp. MacMichael, History, i. 149). Yet it is certain that the separation of the dialects must have taken place at a comparatively early date (before Christianity); the presence of “Nubian” speech in Kordofan can therefore not be explained as the result of Danagha settlement in recent times. For a discussion of this vexed question see Ernst Zylhars, Zur Stellung des Dorfbar-Nubiens, in W.Z.K.M., vol. xxx.; and S. Hillen-on, Nubian Origins, in Sudan Notes and Records, vol. xil. (1950). What can be said with certainty is that the Arab conquerors of Egypt found on their southern frontier a population mainly Hamitic in the north, but containing negroid elements which increased in importance in the south. These people were Jacobite Christians, and they used Nubian as the language of government and letters.

Vaïsùt quotes two sayings ascribed to the prophet in which Nubians are praised as faithful friends and useful slavers, but there can hardly have been any contact between Arabs and Nubians before the two invasions (A.D. 641—642 and 651—652) the second of which carried the Arabs as far as Dongola [q. v.]. As a result of these raids the relations between Muslims and Nubians were regulated by treaties which established a system of mutual tolerance and non-interference; the tribute of slaves (βατές [q. v.] from παπερίμ) which the Nubians undertook to pay annually was not so much a sign of submission as the basis for an exchange of commodities. Intercourse between the two countries, whether commercial or political, remained very restricted, and the interest of the Arabs to the south of Egypt was in the main confined to the exploitation of the mines of al-Allâfî, which affected the Baghira rather than the Nubians. An invasion of Upper Egypt, said to have been undertaken by the Nubian king Kuriyakos in A.D. 737 (or between 744 and 750) is recorded only on the doubtful evidence of Christian writers and ignored by Muslim historians. Minor raids occurred from time to time, and the “tribute” was occasionally withheld, but on the whole relations were peaceful.

Muslims began to penetrate into Nubia at an early date, presumably for purposes of trade, and as early as the tenth century they are said to have had a special lodging-place (rahad) in the capital of ‘Alwa. According to a Syrian writer (quoted by Mez, Renaissance des Arabes, p. 32) Nubians resident in the lands of the caliphate remitted taxes to their own king and enjoyed the privilege of an autonomous jurisdiction. Further evidence of friendly relations is found in an account of an embassy to Baghdad in the time of al-Mutawakkil when a Nubian prince was honourably entertained.

Of pivotal conditions in Nubia we know very little; there are no native sources of information and Muslim accounts throw light only on special periods and occasional contacts. The fullest descriptive accounts, both dating from the tenth century A.D., are those of Masûlî (ii. 362; iii. 31—34; 39—43) and Ibn Salim (Sulîm) who wrote an account of “Nubia, Muḥarr, ‘Alwa, the Badja, and the Nile”, of which extensive fragments are extant in the Kibîf of Muḥarr (ed. Wiet, vol. iii., ch. xxx. 99). During the reign of Saladin Nubian affairs come into some prominence owing to the support given by the semi-Nubian Banû Kanz (on whom see below) to a Faṣiμd pretender; and Lower Nubia was
invaded by Saladin's brother Tūhān-Sālīh (1172-1173) who pillaged Ibrīm and took many captives, but reported unfavourably on the resources of the country with the result that a planned annexation was not proceeded with. Soon afterwards (about 1208), the Armenian Abū Sālīh composed his account of the Churches and Monasteries of Egypt (ed. and translated by B. T. A. Evetts and A. J. Butler, Oxford [1895]) which contains some interesting details about Maris, Muṣarrah, and 'Alwa, but must be used with caution owing to the confusion in the writer's mind between Nubia and Abyssinia and his uncritical use of older authorities.

The factors which brought about the disintegration of the Nubian kingdom and the assimilation of the country were the immigration of Arab tribes, the rise of the Banū Kanz, and the intervention in Nubian affairs of the Mamlūk rulers of Egypt, especially during the reigns of al-Zāhir Baibars [q.v.] and al-Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Dawla [q.v.].

The Banū Kanz are first heard of in 1260 when the Fāṭimid caliph al-Ḥakīm, as a reward for services rendered, conferred the hereditary title of Kanz al-Dawla on Abū Makākim Ḥibat-Allāh, a chief of the Rabīʿa Arabs who had settled on the borderland between Egypt and the Sūdān. Already in the tenth century the Rabīʿa had gained control of the mines of al-ʿAllāqī and imposed their rule on the Bedja with whom they allied themselves by intermarriage. Another section, settled near Aṣwān, fraternized with the local Nubians, and the tribe, formed by this amalgamation and ruled by the Kanz al-Dawla dynasty, came to be known as the Banū Kanz; they are represented by the Kenzū of the present day. During the reign of the Mamlūk they were virtually in independent control of Upper Egypt, alternately in alliance with or in revolt against the Mamlūk government, and though repressed at times with a heavy hand, they remained a powerful tribe until the Ottoman conquest of Egypt. Before this event, however, they had played their part, together with nomad Arabs and Mamlūk troops, in the destruction of Nubian independence.

The Bahri Mamlūks, for reasons not apparent in our sources, departed from the traditional policy of Muslim Egypt, and actively intervened in Nubian affairs. The pretext for the expeditions undertaken by the generals of Baibars and Ḥalīl were non-payment of the tribute and, more frequently, the championship of Nubian pretenders who had solicited Egyptian support in order to gain the throne. On several occasions such pretenders of the Mamlūk government were installed in Dongola only to lose the throne again as soon as the Egyptian troops withdrew [see the article DONGOLA]. A formal treaty concluded with one of these kings virtually established an Egyptian protectorate. Meanwhile the disintegration of the kingdom went on under the pressure of Arab immigration, and Arab chiefs who married into the royal house took advantage of the matriarchal line of succession to grasp at the throne. The age-long Christianity of Nubia was gradually undermined and in the xivth century Muslim kings began to appear: the first king to bear a Muslim name was Abū Allāh al-Sāluḥ who was installed in 1316 and after a short reign lost the throne to a Kanz al-Dawla. From the Kitāb al-Tawrīf of Ahmad b. Yahyā b. Fadl Allāh, written some time between 1340 and 1349, we learn that at this date Christian kings still alternated with Muslims, and Ibn Bāṣrīn in 1354 (v. 396) speaks of the Nubians and Christians, but mentions a Muslim king (Ibn Kanz al-Dīn).

The conversion of the common people we have no details: no doubt it was brought about by the absorption of the native inhabitants, or those who survived, in the Arab tribes.

The immigration itself has left little trace in the pages of the historians, though the outlines of the process can be reconstructed from occasional references and from oral tradition. The nomads who had entered Egypt in the wake of the first conquest can never have found that country congenial to their mode of life, and the rise of non-Arab dynasties tended to make conditions still less attractive, while the Sūdān seemed to offer all the advantages, from the nomads' point of view, that Egypt denied. For a long time the kingdom of Dongola formed an effective barrier to southward expansion, but a gradual infiltration of Arabs must have begun at a comparatively early date, even though the end of the process was not accomplished for several centuries.

The early stages of the movement are seen in the conditions depicted in the story of Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-ʿUmarī, the events of which are laid in the reign of Ibn Tulun (Maqrīzī's Kanz al-Muḥāqqaq, quoted by Quatremère, pp. 59-80). Arabs of Rabīʿa and Djuhaina, led into the Sūdān by that adventurous prince, have fraternized with the Bedja and exploit the mines of the Eastern Desert, but the Nile is forbidden them and Nubia is too strong to be attempted by force of arms. A fratricidal struggle in the Nubian royal house provides an opportunity for an alliance between the Arabs and a princely pretender to the throne. Acts of unblushing treachery are committed on both sides and in the end the Arabs have the worst of the encounter. The end of the process is seen in the fourteenth century. "The kingdom of Nubia had now to all intents and purposes ceased to exist and such kings as reigned in name were puppets of the Arab tribes.... It is from this period, the early years of the fourteenth century, that the immigration of most of the camel-owning nomads of the Sūdān dates. Generally speaking, it seems, the Djuhaina and their allies, most of whom we may be sure were Fazira, loosened their hordes southwards and westwards, leaving the Banū Kanz and Ḫirma in northern Nubia and Upper Egypt" (MacMichael, loc. cit., p. 187). Of 'Alwa nothing is heard at this period, but no doubt the course of events was similar to that in the northern kingdom, and already in the time of Ibn Khaldūn (1332-1406) we hear of branches of Djuhaina "close to the Abyssinians", that is to say no doubt on the upper reaches of the Blue Nile in the southern Džazira. The kingdom of 'Alwa nevertheless lingered on precariously and Nubian Christianity was still a living memory in the time of the Portuguese Alvarez (1520-1527), but about the year 1500 Sōba fell to an alliance of Kawāsām Arabs (a branch of Raffāʿa-Djuhaina) and the negroid Fundj [q.v.] who here for the first time appear in history.

The fifteenth century is almost completely barren of records relating to Nubia, and the historical memory of the present inhabitants remembers little of pre-Fundj days. With the coming of the Fundj, who soon extended their influence to Dongola, the history of Nubia is merged in that of the
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Südän, and the Nubians, now Muslims and deeply affected by racial mixture with their conquerors, survive only as a linguistic minority on the northern fringe of their ancient kingdom.

Lower Nubia, however, was politically separated from the Fundj kingdom by Schim I who annexed the country south of Aswān as far as the neighbourhood of the Third Cataract, and garrisoned it with Turkish and Bosnian mercenaries (called Ghuzz by the people of the Südān). From these, many of the modern Barābra claim to be descended.

The Barābra-Danāqla of the present day (in the Egyptian province of Aswān and the Südān provinces of Ijāfa and Dongola) are a peaceful race of cultivators and skillful boatmen of the Nile. Owing to the poverty of their country and aided by an enterprising disposition, large numbers seek their livelihood in Egypt and the Südān where they are found everywhere engaged in various forms of menial employment. The Danāqla have also spread all over the Südān as traders, and in the nineteenth century they played an important part, together with their rivals, the Dījālyn, in the trade of the Upper Nile and the Bahr al-Ghazzāl where they adventured as slave-traders, sailors, and mercenary troops.

The men are generally bilingual in Nubian and Arabic which latter they speak ungrammatically and with an accent of their own. Those in foreign employment show themselves remarkably adaptable to alien ideas, at the same time they are tenacious of their own customs and cliannish to a degree. Under modern conditions they are keen to take advantage of educational facilities, and show an aptitude for the educated professions. In the past they have made no important contribution to the intellectual and spiritual life of Islam and produced no scholars of note. Ḫuṣayn al-mustāfi (q. v.) is said to have been of Nubian origin, but he is generally called the Egyptian'. The most remarkable figure of their race is Muhammad Aḥmad [q. v.], the Mahdī of the Südān (died 1855), who was a Dongoloīfī, though his family claim to be sharifs. The Barābra and Danāqla are generally devout Muslims, and most of them belong to the Mirghanīya (Khatmiya) tārida.


NUBANDJAN. [See SYLUSTAN.]
NUBAR PASHA (1825–1899), an Egyptian statesman, who played a most prominent part in Egyptian politics in the sixteenth century. Summoned by his uncle Boghos Bey, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and of Commerce under Muḥammād Aḥfīdī, he came to Egypt in the age of 17 and entered the government service as second secretary to the Viceroy. In 1848 he accompanied Ibrāhīm Pasha to Europe as secretary and interpreter. Under Sa‘īd, Nūbār began to play a part in public life. His independent spirit, his methodical and precise mind were revealed in the organisation of the Egyptian railways which he put in order in the space of six months (1857).

But it was under Ismā‘īl that he fully revealed his gifts as a negotiator and diplomatist. He was however not called upon to play a national part because of his Armenian origin and his ignorance of the language of the country. Raised to the rank of Pasha at the beginning of the reign (1861) he hastened to take advantage of the support and advanced views of the Viceroy to carry through a great scheme: to encourage externally the independence of Egypt and its development not in Asia — this was Ibrāhīm’s idea — but in Africa where her destinies summoned her, and at home the regeneration of Egypt with the help of Europe. From the first Nūbār Pasha grasped the great truths of the Egyptian question. But if the conception was grandiose, the execution of the scheme proved difficult on account of the confusion of interests and the European jealousies. These inherent difficulties in the Egyptian problem proved impediments to many solutions and the policy of reform frequently had to twist its way round obstacles of all kinds.

On the smallest matters Egypt had to wage an unequal struggle with Europe. Nūbār conducted the struggle on three fronts at the same time, on three fundamental questions.

The question of the Suez Canal. On Ismā‘īl’s accession the Company formed a state within the state and constituted in the very heart of Egypt a kind of colony, as a result of the lands it had obtained along the sea canal and the fresh water canals which were linked up with it. Nūbār conducted negotiations in Constantinople and in Paris with the object of securing the territorial sovereignty of Egypt. His activity ended in the famous decision of the Emperor Napoleon III on July 6, 1864, who ordered Egypt to pay the Company $4,000,000 francs to regain its rights. This enormous indemnity was nevertheless far from bringing about a final settlement.
The question of judicial reforms. Nubar used often to say: "Give Egypt water and justice and the country will be happy and prosperous". But in order to place justice on a sound footing so that it could protect the native against the government and the European who was exploiting him and particularly against the arbitrary decisions of the consuls, each of whom laid down his own law to the governed and governors alike, Nubar thought of organising a mixed system of justice composed of Egyptian and European elements and thus establishing uniformity of jurisdiction, legislation and executive action. As a result of the systematic opposition of France and of certain powers interested in maintaining the "privileges", the mixed tribunals were not established till 1875 after ten years of striving and of waiting endured by the government.

The question of autonomy. The territorial prerogatives inflicted by the Suez Canal and the system of capitulations did not prevent Nubar from remembering the political restrictions imposed by Turkey, the suzerain power. From 1863 to 1873 Nubar endeavoured to extract from Constantinople by negotiation and bribery privileges which would enable the work of progress to develop freely. After the firman of 1866 and 1867, Egypt obtained the famous firman of 1873 which constituted a new charter conferring on the viceroy the title of Khedive [q. v.], hereditary succession to the throne in direct line from father to son, an increase in the army — limited to 18,000 in 1840 — and lastly the right to conclude loans and commercial treaties with the Powers.

But the error made by Nubar and the Khedive was to consolidate Egyptian independence in theory but not in practice. Nubar was anxious for the introduction of capital and European enterprise: a beneficial idea but also dangerous because the Khedive, encouraged by his minister, became involved without due consideration in a disastrous series of loans. The various enterprises which arose with the rapid development of the resources of the country were put in hand by his own companies like the Steam Navigation Company, the Sudan Company, the Agricultural and the Trading Companies, in which Nubar, Oppenheim, Dervieu and others were the chief directors. The failures of the companies were liquidated by Egypt which made good all losses. The collaboration of Nubar with these financiers brought an atmosphere of suspicion into the good understanding between the minister and the Khedive, as did the negotiations conducted by him to conclude loans in Paris and elsewhere.

But the tragic side of the question lay in the accumulation of a debt of £90,000,000 which opened the gates of the Delta to foreign control. There is no doubt that Nubar had always resolutely opposed any foreign interference. Down to 1875, during the little time that he was actually in Egypt he was often on missions to Europe — Nubar endeavoured to act as a check on absolute rule and to oppose all European interference from wherever it came. He was not popular either in England or France. He was rightly distrusted in the entourage of the Khedive also.

Towards the end of 1875 an event took place which modified his attitude. England having taken the unusual step of intervening in Egypt to defend the private interests of some of her capitalists and sending a mission under Mr. Cave to conduct an enquiry in the country, Nubar, with his remarkable political instinct, felt the immediate danger of such interference and resolved to oppose it by all means. He was able to provoke the intervention of the consuls-general of Russia and Germany, who offered the Khedive the support of their governments. Isma'il declined over his grave political error. He went further and communicated with the English consul and did not scruple to sacrifice his minister.

Nubar had to hand in his resignation on Jan. 5, 1876 and to leave Egypt on March 21. Henceforth he swore a bitter feud against his master and his attitude gradually changed and inclined to England. In deciding to undermine the personal authority of the ruler, and allying himself with the foreigner, without being able to fix in advance how far the alliance was to go, in a word in wishing to humble his sovereign, Nubar weakened his country for the benefit of England. For it was to the government of England that he appealed in 1876 to intervene, acting on the pretext that intervention was here inevitable as a result of the enormous debts contracted by Egypt and that England's action would be of more benefit to Egypt than that of any other power. The result was that England finally imposed on the Khedive both Nubar and her complete control by exorting from him the rescript of Aug. 29, 1876 which established a "responsible minister" presided over nominally by Nubar but in effect by Rivers Wilson as Minister of Finance and de Blignières as Minister of Public Works. This dangerous innovation — the formation of a European ministry not responsible to the Khedive whose authority was now negligible, and installed in the heart of the country to support European policy and high finance — aroused the Egyptians from their lethargy and created general discontent. The Khedive became at once popular and his cause was identified with that of the nation. The result was the outbreak of Feb. 18, 1879 which removed Nubar from power. A new European ministry presided over by the crown prince was formed but the evil remained. Finally Isma'il, emboldened by public opinion, dismissed the European ministers (April 7) and formed a national ministry under Sharif Pasha. But the Powers — and Nubar's doings in Europe were not without influence on their decision — decided on the ruin of the Khedive and succeeded with the help of Turkey in deposing him (June 26).

Two years after the English occupation, Nubar returned to Egypt to form a ministry after the resignation of Sharif Pasha as a protest against the evacuation of the Sudan by Egypt, deposed by England. Nubar endeavoured in vain to come to terms with England and to put a check on her policy of practically depriving Egypt of her territory in Africa (Jan. 1884—June 1888).

He again formed a ministry (April 16, 1894) but he soon had to submit to the control of the English councillor in the Ministry of the Interior, and seeing himself powerless against Lord Cromer's policy which aimed at controlling the whole of the administration he had quickly to retire from the scene (Nov. 1895).

Nubar then went to Europe to compile his memoirs — still unpublished — and peacefully await his end. He was, to sum up, a great minister, a statesman who made mistakes, it is true, but
the fates were against him: 1875 marks the final blocking of his great policy. We must not however forget the early struggles in which he sustained from Europe and from Turkey piece by piece rights and privileges which constituted a great boon to his country.

**Bibliography:** The chief works are: M. Sabry, L'Empire Egyptien sous Ismaïl et l'Intrigue angle-française, Paris 1933; A. Holysangi, Nuh Pasha destitué. L'Empire Egyptien, d'Ed. Dicey, The Story of the Khedivate; Ch. F. Moiberly Bell, Khedive and Pashas, by one who knows them well; do., article Nuh Pasha, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. (M. Sabry)

**NUBUWWA.** [See NAHJ]

**NUH, the Noah of the Bible.** is a particularly popular figure in the Kur'an and in Muslim legend. Thalâbi gives 15 virtues by which Nuḥ is distinguished among the prophets. The Bible does not regard Noah as a prophet. In the Kur'ān Nuḥ is the first prophet of punishment, which is followed by Hūd, Šālih, Iūs, Shū'āb and Mūsā. Ibrahim is one of his following (Shīrā) (Sūra xxxvii. 81). He is the perspicuous admonisher (nudhir nuḥiyy) such as xl. 2 the Prophet calls "the messenger of God" (xxvi. 107), the "abd aṣṣāhīr, "the grateful servant of God" (xvii. 3). Allāh enters into a covenant with Nuḥ just as with Muḥammad, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā and 'Isa (xxvii. 7). Peace and blessings are promised him (xxvii. 50). Muḥammad is fond of seeing himself reflected in the earlier prophets. In the case of Nuḥ, the Muslim Kur'ān exegetes have already noticed this (see Gurnbaum, Neue Beitrage, p. 90). Muḥammad puts into the mouth of Nuḥ things that he would himself like to say and into the mouths of his opponents what he himself has heard from his friend. Nuḥ is reproached with being only one of the people (x. 72—74). God should rather have sent an angel (xxvii. 24). Nuḥ is wrong (vii. 58). A lying, deceiving (vii. 62), is possessed by qinīn (liv. 9), the only lowest join him (xxvii. 111). When Nuḥ replies: "it is grievous to you that I live among you. I seek no reward, my reward is with Allāh (x. 72—74; xi. 31); I do not claim to possess Allāh's treasures, to know his secrets, to be an angel and I cannot say to those whom ye despise, God shall not give you any good" (xi. 31—33), we have here an echo of Muḥammad's defence and embarrassment about many of his followers. Muḥammad pictures events as follows: Allāh sends Nuḥ to the sinful people. Sūrah lix. which bears his name, gives one of these sermons threatening punishment for which other analogies can be found. The people scorn him. Allāh commands him to build an ark by divine inspiration. Then the "chalderon boils" (xii. 42; xxvii. 27). The waters down everywhere: only two of every kind of living creature are saved and the believers whom Nuḥ takes into the ark with him. But there were very few who believed. Nuḥ appeals even to his son in vain; the latter takes refuge on a mountain but is drowned. When Nuḥ had the waters be still, the ark lands on mount Ḥūdūd (q. v.; xi. 27—51). Not only Noah's son but also his wife (with Iūt's wife) are sinners (lxvi. 10). From the Haggada is developed, as Geiger shows, the following elements of this Kur'ānic legend of Nuḥ: 1. Nuḥ appears as a prophet and admonisher; 2. his people laugh at the ark; 3. his family is punished with hot water (main passages:

Talm. Sanhedrin, 10ab; Gen. Rabba, xxix.—xxvi.)

The post-Kur'ānic legend of Nuḥ as in other cases fills up the gaps, gives the names of those not mentioned in the Kur'ān, makes many links e.g. connects Nuḥ with Ferdhun of the Persian epic although it is pointed out that the Mag, (Persian) do not know the story of the flood. Nuḥ's wife is called Walîya and her sin is that she described Nuḥ to his people as nunaqun, the names of Nuḥ's sons, Sāmū, Hām, Vāsīf are known to Kur'ān exegetes from the Bible but it also gives the name of Nuḥ's sinful son who perished in the flood: Kāfānān, "whom the Arabs call Yamīn". Muḥammad's statement that Nuḥ was 950 years of age at the time of the flood (jāfūn) (xxix. 13, 14) is probably based on Gen. ix. 39 which says Nuḥ lived 950 years in all, but on the other hand, it serves as a basis for calculations which make Nuḥ the first mūhāmmar; according to the Kiṭāb al-Muḥāmmarīn of Abū Ḥātim al-Sūqāji (ed. Goldziher, p. 1), who begins his book with Nuḥ, he lived 1,450 years. Yet in his dying hour he describes his life as a house with two doors in which one door is thrown open to the outside, and the inner door to the other. Muslim legend knows the Biblical story of Nuḥ and his times and his sons, but embellishes it greatly and in al-Kītāb it becomes a romance. From the union of Kābīl's and Sheh's descendants arises a sinful people which rejects Nuḥ's warnings. He therefore at God's command builds the ark from trees which he has himself planted. As he is hammering and building the people mock him: "once a prophet, now a carpenter", "a ship for the mainland". The ark had a head and tail like a cock, a body like a bird (Thalâbi). How was the ark built? At the wish of the apostles, Jesus arises Sāmū (or Hām) b. Nuḥ from the dead and he describes the ark and its arrangements: in the lower storey were the quadrupeds, in the next the human beings and in the top the birds. Nuḥ brought the ant into the ark first and the ass last, it was slow because Ḳīlīs was clinging to his tail. Nuḥ called out impatiently: "come in even if Satan is with thee"; so Ḳīlīs also had to be taken in. The pig arose out of the tail of the elephant and the eat from the lion. How could the goat exist alongside of the wolf, or the dove beside the birds of prey? God tamed their instincts. The number of human beings in the ark varies in legend between seven and eighty. Ḳūb b. Ḳamāl was also saved along with the believers. Kābīl's race was drowned. Nuḥ also took Adam's body with him which was used to separate the women from the men. For in the ark intercourse was forbidden, for man and beast. Only Ḳūnūm transgressed and for this was punished with a black skin. The whole world was covered with water and only the Ḳūram (in al-Kīta), also the site of the sanctuary in Jerusalem was spared: the Ka'ba was taken up into heaven and Dījudh concealed the Black Stone (according to al-Kīta the stone was snow white until the Flood). Nuḥ sent out the raven but finding some carrion it forgot Nuḥ; then he sent the dove which brought back an olive leaf in its bill and mud on its feet; as a reward it was given its collar and became a domestic bird. On the day of 'Ashūra every one came out of the ark, men and beasts fasted and gave thanks to Allāh.

There are many contacts with the Haggada; the
(different, it is true) partitioning of the ark, Nūh's anxiety about the animals, Ḥām's sin and punishment (Sambūkāt, 108a b). The story that the giant Ḍūq escaped the Flood is also taken from the Haggadah [see Ḫ. D. B. 'ANĀK]. But Muslim legend goes farther than the Bible and Haggadah, like Muhammad who appears himself in Nūh.


On the name Nūh: Goldzweiler, in Z. D. M. G., xxiv. (1870), 207–211; on Nūh as Muḥammad; Goldzweiler, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, iii, Leyden 1899, p. lxxxix. and p. 2.

(Bernhardt HeUer)

NŪH, the name of two Sāmānid s. i. Abū Muhammad Nūh i. b. Naṣr b. Ḥāmid, called al-Amīr al-Ḥamīd, succeeded his father [see Naṣr]; but the real ruler was the pious theologian Abū ʿAfaq Muhammad b. Ḥāmid al-Sulami. The latter long refused to take the title of ḥāffiz but finally succumbed to Nūh's pressing representations, and took much less interest in the business of government than in his devotional exercises and theological studies which earned him the name of al-Ḥakim al-Shahld. There were also by this time unmistakable symptoms of decline. In 932 (943–944) Abū ʿAllāh b. al-Ashkām rebelled in Khwarizm and Nūh set out with an army from Bukhārā towards Merw. But when Abū ʿAllāh placed himself under the protection of the ruler of the Turks, whose son was a prisoner in Bukhārā, peace was restored between the two, and the fierce struggle ceased. Abū ʿAllāh was pardoned by Nūh. Much more trouble was caused to the Sāmānid dynasty by the rebel governor of Khurāsān, Abū ʿAllāh b. Muḥtādī. Shortly after his accession Nūh had sent him with an army against al-Raʾy to this town from the Būyid Rukn al-Dawla. A section of his troops deserted to him the way however and when he encountered Rukn al-Dawla three farsaks from al-Raʾy the majority of his Kūrd troops went over to the enemy. Abū ʿAllāh was defeated and had to return to Naṣibān. In Dīmāḏī I 355 (January–February 945) they advanced again against al-Raʾy by order of Nūh: on this occasion Rukn al-Dawla did not meet him but took to flight, and in Ramadān (April–May) Abū ʿAllāh took the town and the surrounding country. In the meanwhile his enemies in Khurāsān took advantage of his absence to libel him to Nūh, whereupon the latter replaced him by Ibrāhīm b. Sinījūr; but Abū ʿAllāh was not inclined to let this happen and on account of financial difficulties the government could not enforce its orders. As the troops were not paid regularly they blamed the vizier and said he was in collusion with Abū ʿAllāh. In the end the discontent increased to such a degree that Nūh was unable to protect the vizier and in Dīmāḏī I 335 (November–December 946) he was put to death. As early as 946 (947) Abū ʿAllāh was put on trial. In Ramadān (January–February 952) he left Saghāniyān, the administration of which he gave to his son Abū Mansūr Naṣr b. Ḥāmid, then went to Merw where he arrived at Aḥfān 146 (April–May 952). He restored order in Khurāsān, but when by Nūh's orders he attacked the Būyid Rukn
al-Dawla and his achievements did not come up to expectations, he was dismissed and Abu Sa'id Bakr b. Malik al-Farghânî appointed his successor, whereupon Abu Ali sought refuge with Bukhn al-Dawla. On Nuh's dealings with the Būyids see the article Ửa§hrjûr b. ɏyaKar. Nuh died in Rabi' II 343 (Aug. 954), and his son Abu al-Malik succeeded him.


2. Nuh II b. ɏAßîr b. Nuh, called al-‘Ansâr or al-Râdî, ascended the throne at the age of 13 after the death of his father in Shawwâl 366 (June 977). The government was at that time in the hands of his uncle and the able vizier Abu l-Husain ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Abd Allâh al-‘Ubdî, who assumed office in Rabi' II 367 (Nov.–Dec. 977). In 371 (981–982) the powerful Sipahsârî in Khurâsân Abu l-Hasan Muhammed b. İbrahim b. Simdîr, who according to Ibn al-‘Aţîr's description of him "only obeyed when he pleased" (i’yuf ɨllâ fi- mâ niyârâ), was dismissed and Husîn al-Dawla Abu l-Abdîs Taşh, a devoted servant of the vizier, put in his place. But the rule of the vizier did not last long; the Sâmaûîs armies were defeated by the Bûyids and the vizier himself murdered at the instigation of Ibn Simdîr. When Taşh went to Bukhârâ in order to restore order there, Ibn Simdîr joined forces with the former Manûlî Fâîkî, who had taken part in the war against the Bûyids and offered him his assistance in the conquest of Khurâsân; they then met in Naisûlîr and seized the country around it. When Taşh heard of this he went to Merw and entered into negotiations with the two allies with the result that it was agreed that Taşh should retain the supreme command along with Naisûlîr while Fâîkî was to get Balkh and Ibn Simdîr's son Abu ‘Ali was to receive Herût. After some time, in 373 (983–984) or 376 (986), ‘Abd Allâh b. Muhammed b. ‘Uzâir was appointed vizier. The latter was hostile to the ‘Ubdî family and at once dismissed Taşh and restored Ibn Simdîr to the supreme command in Khurâsân. Some officers indeed appealed for Taşh but their representations were of no avail with the vizier, who was supported by Naisûlîr's mother. Equally unsuccessful were the efforts of the former Sipahsârî to enforce his claims by force of arms against Ibn Simdîr and Fâîkî, although he was supported by the two Bûyids, Fâîkî al-Dawla and Shams al-Dawla b. Abu al-Dawla. Taşh was defeated and fled to Murâdja where he died in 377 (987–988) of the plague or, according to another statement, of poison. In Dhu l-Hijjâ 378 (March 1990) Ibn Simdîr also died and was succeeded by his son Abu ‘Ali, who was jealous of Fâîkî and wished to get him out of the way. When he resorted to arms Fâîkî could not resist him but fled to Merwârîd. Abu ‘Ali then was recognised as governor of all the provinces south of the Amûl-Dârî and soon made himself independent of the central government in Bukhârâ while Fâîkî took possession of Balkh. The amir Abu l-Harîth Muhammed b. ‘Abd Allâh b. Farîghûn, whom Nuh sent against him, was defeated and joined Fâîkî against the lord of Saghâniyân, Taşh b. Faţlî. The latter could not resist the combined forces of the allies; he himself was slain and his army scattered. In addition there was the intervention of foreign rulers in the domestic affairs of the kingdom. Abu ‘Ali turned to the Karakhânîs Bughrâ-Khan and arranged with him for a partition of the Sâmaûîs kingdom by which Bughrâ-Khan was to have Transoxania and Abu ‘Ali Khurâsân. As a result Bughrâ-Khan appeared in Bukhârâ in Rabi' I 382 (May 992) but soon withdrew and died on the way back to Turkestân [cf. the article BUGHRA-KHAN]. After Nuh, who had had to evacuate his capital, had returned, Fâîkî again appeared on the scene. On the approach of Bughrâ-Khan he had been sent against him but, as we are told, presumably correctly, deliberately allowed himself to be defeated, whereupon he submitted and was rewarded by Bughrâ-Khan with the governorship of Tirmidh and Balkh. After the return of Nuh he renewed his alliance with Abu ‘Ali who, now and helpless Sâmaûîs decided to appeal for help to the Ghazavâd Sabuktegin [cf. the article SâMAûILDS]. After a time Abu ‘Ali and Fâîkî, who had taken refuge with the Büyîd Fâîkî al-Dawla in Durrâdîn, wished to return to Khurâsân (386 = 995). At first they had some success but when they encountered Sabuktegin near Tüs, they suffered a decisive defeat and fled to Anûl. They then sent messengers to Bukhârâ to appeal for pardon. The authorities turned a deaf ear to Fâîkî's appeal but declared themselves ready to restore Abu ‘Ali to favour. Fâîkî therefore fled to the Karakhânîs, while Abu ‘Ali after many vicissitudes finally made his peace with the authorities in Bukhârâ through the inter-vention of the amir Abu l-Abdîs Manûlî Muhammed in Gurgândî. He then first received very kindly but later thrown into prison with several of his brothers and officers. At the same time, a raid by the Karakhânîs forced Nuh again to appeal to Sabuktegin who was then in Balkh. The latter at once invaded Transoxania with a large army; but when he demanded that Nuh should join forces with him, Nuh refused on the advice of the vizier ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Uzâir. Sabuktegin was not at all pleased and Nuh had not only to give in but also to hand over the vizier and Abu Allî, whereupon the vizierate was given to Abu Nâır ‘Abd Allâh b. Muhammed b. Abu Zâhid. Sabuktegin imprisoned Abu ‘Ali and Ibn ‘Uzâir in Gardhî. The former died in 387 (997) in prison while the vizier was afterwards released. At the conclusion of peace, Sabuktegin and the Karakhânîs agreed that the steppe of Karunik should be the frontier between the Sâmaûîs and the Karakhânîs. Fâîkî was then recognised as governor of Samarkand. Sabuktegin ruled as an independent sovereign in Khurâsân; in Transoxania the vizier Abu Nâır endeavoured to restore order by force but after a few months he was murdered and Nuh appointed as his successor Abu l-Harîth Muhammed b. Ibrahim al-Barghashî. Nuh died in Radjab 387 (July 997) and was succeeded by his son Abu l-Harîth Mânî. — Bibliography: Ibn al-‘Aţîr, al-Kânîl, ed. Tornberg, viii. 4955; ix. 7–9, 19 sq., 67, 68.
NUH R. MUSTAFÅ, an Ottoman theologian and translator of the Qur'an, was born in Anapa but migrated while still quite young to Cairo where he studied all branches of theology and attained a high reputation. He died there in 1070 (1659). He wrote a series of theological treatises, some of which are detailed by Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 314. His most important work however is his free translation and edition of Shahrazd's celebrated work on the sects. Terzâme-i Mihtât ve-i Vilâh which he prepared at the suggestion of a prominent Cairo citizen named Yûsf Efendi. It exists in manuscript in Berlin (cf. Fertich, Kat., p. 157 sqq.), Gotha (Fertich, Kat., p. 76), London (cf. Rieu, Cat., p. 35 sqq.), Upsala (cf. Tornberg, Catalogue des manuscrits turcs de l'Université de Upsala, ed., ii. 190), etc., and was printed in Cairo in 1626. On the considerable differences between this Turkish translation and the original Arabic of Rieu in the British Museum Catalogue, p. 35b. In his Mémoire sur deux coffrets gnostiques du moyen âge, du Cabinet de M. le Duc de Bordeaux (Paris 1832), p. 28 sqq. J. v. Hammer gave some extracts from the latter part of the work. He also wrote on it in the Wiener Jahrbucher, lxxi., p. 50 and cf. 4.

In 1150 (1741) a certain Yûsf Efendi wrote a life of Nuhus b. Mustafâ which exists in MS. in Cairo (Cat., vii. 364).

Bibliography: The catalogues of MSS. above mentioned and also Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 314 and Muhammad al-Muhiabîn, Tarikh Khulâtât al-'Azkar, Cairo 1868, iv. 458.

(Flanz Baringer)

AL-NUKHAILA, a town in the 'Irâk, near al-Kûfa. It is known mainly from the accounts of the battle of Kâdïsîyâ. From the statements collected by Yûkût regarding its position it appears that two different places of this name had later to be distinguished, namely one near Kûfa on the road to Syria, which is several times mentioned in the time of the Caliphs 'Ali and Mu'awiya and another, a watering station between al-Maghāra and al-Akâba, 3 mil from al-Jai'far, to the right of the road to Mecca. Several encounters took place there during the second battle of Kâdïsîyâ. According to al-Kâlidî in al-Bâkî, this al-Nukhaila was in the Syrian steppe (al-Bâlidiyâ); Ibn al-Fâkhî also seems to be thinking of this region. Caetani assumes that the reference in both cases is to the same place on the edge of the desert. According to Musili it perhaps corresponds to the modern Khân Ibn Nakhâilah about 14 miles S. S. E. of Kerbelâ and 40 miles N. N. W. of al-Kûfa.


AL-NUKHABA, a plain west of the Diebel Hawrân on the border of Trachonitis in Transjordan. The name al-Nukhâra ("the cavity") is quite modern. It is applied to an area, which includes the two districts of al-Baḩriyyâ (with its chief town al-Hârîrât) and Hawrân (West of the hills of the same name), i.e. the whole northern half of Transjordan. In the wider sense al-Nukhâra includes all the country from al-Lajûd, Djaoudir and al-Balka to the foot of the Diebel Hawrân, in the narrower sense only the southern part of this; in any case it stretches from al-Sanâmân to the Diebel al-Durûz (Hawràn). To al-Nukhâra belong Mundûn or Mundûb, Tûbûn (now Tibûn), al-Muhadjûn or Ob'at, al-Olûma, al-Muṣââra and al-Fa'dînîn already mentioned in Siraic texts of the pre-Muslim period.

Bibliography: The catalogues of MSS. in Z. D. M. G., xxix. 431, note 13; Bühl, Geographie des alten Palastina, Freiburg i. B. and Leipzig 1896, p. 15, 43 sq., 84; Dussaud, Topographie de la Syrie, Paris 1927, p. 323. (E. Honigmann)

NUMAIR b. 'Awîr b. Sa'îfâ, an Arab tribe (Wustenfeld, Gencal. Tabellen, F 15) inhabiting the western heights of al-Yâmâma and those between this region and al-Hîma Darîya: a bare and difficult country the nature of which explains the rude and savage character of the Numair. Their name like that of Namr and Anmûr borne by other ethnic groups (there are also in the list of Arab tribes a number of other clans with the name Numair: among the Asad, the Tamîm, the Djûft, the Hamdûn etc.) is no doubt connected with nîmr, the Arabic panther; we know the deductions made by Roberton Smith from this fact and from other similar cases, to prove the existence of a system of totemism among the early Arabs (Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia, second ed., p. 234). His theory is now abandoned.

The geographical dictionaries of al-Bakî and Yûkût mention a large number of places in the land of the Numair, especially their wells, and often even record a change of ownership from one tribe to another (e.g. Yûkût, Muqaddam, iii. 320; the well of Dhu, which formerly belonged to the Tâmûh clans of the Kulaib b. Varbû, later passed to Numair); this wealth of references does not however mean that the Numair played an important part in the history of Arabia. It is only due to the fact that the country of the Numair is typically Beduin in its scenery and lends itself to description by poets. The Numair besides were much intermixed with the neighbouring tribes (especially the Tamîm, Bûhîla and Kusairî) and the boundaries of their territory were rather vague.

The Numair, a poor tribe without natural wealth, have always been brigands. The part they took in the pre-Islamic wars was a very modest one and they appear in the first two diwans of al-Baladhûrî and the other groups of the great tribe of 'Amir b. Sa'îfâ (they hardly played any part in the battle of Fât al-Ri's against the Banu 'l-Hârîh b. Ka'b and their allies, Nakif, ed. Bevan, p. 469-472). It is to
this isolation that they owe the privilege of being known as one of the Djamarat al-Arab, i.e. a tribe which never allied itself with others (al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 372; al-Nakha'i, p. 946; Mafjūdīyūt, ed. Lyall, p. 841; on the different tribes to which this title is given, cf. Tāj al-Ârūs, ii. 107); the other designation of the Numair, the Ḥunūs of the Bani ʿAmir, also gives them a special place within the great tribe from which they sprang; it indicates that they were thought not to have the same mother as the other clans of the Bani ʿAmir (Mafjūdīyūt, p. 259, 12-13 = 771, 2-4; the source is the Djamara of Ibn al-Kalbī, Brit. Mus. MS, fol. 112b—121r). Neither during the life of the Prophet, nor at the beginning of the caliphate did the Numair make any stir: they appear neither as partisans nor as enemies of Islam. It is only from the Umayyad period that the name begins to appear in histories, but only to record their insubordination to the central power or their exploits as brigands; in the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik their refusal to pay tribute brought a punitive expedition against them (al-Dalāḥi, Fatīḥ, p. 139; cf. Aḥkām, xvii. 112—113; xx. 123—124). Another expedition of the same kind but on a larger scale was that against them under the famous general of the caliph al-Mu'tāwakkil, Bughṭ al-Kābir, in 232 (846) to put an end to their systematic plundering; it ended in the complete dispersal of the tribe (Tahān, iii. 1357—1363); a most interesting account of Beduin customs including on p. 1361 a detailed list of the Numair clans only one of which, the Bani ʿAmir b. Numair, devoted itself to agriculture and grazing, while the others lived only by brigandage). It appears however that the Numair soon resumed their old habits and another expedition was sent against them with the same object as the earlier ones in the 16th century A.D. by the Ḥamānīd Saif al-Dawla (Yusuf, Muqawwam, iv. 378).

An event of little importance in the life of the Prophet has given the Numair considerable fame in literary history, although little flattering to them: this is the attack directed against them by the poet Djarīr which is one of the most famous examples of the inventive of the highī (especially the hemistich: "Cast down thine eyes: thou belonest to the Numair"). The occasion of it was the unfortunate intervention of the Numair poet al-Ḥarīn in favour of al-Farādākī in the celebrated feud between him and Djarīr (al-Nakha'i, p. 427—451, No. 53: Aḥkām, vii. 49—50; xx. 169—171 etc.). The memory of this quarrel survived for a very long time. It was probably no accident that the man who urged the emir Dūghāt to the expedition against the Numair was the great-grandson of Djarīr, the poet ʿAbd al-Ḥamīm b. ʿĀḳl b. Būlā b. Djarīr; the Numair moreover had slain four of his uncles (Ibn Kūṭān, Shīr, ed. de Goeje, p. 284, where we must read B. Dinā [b. ʿĀḳl b. Nuṣair b. Numair] in place of B. Dalāḥa). The enmity between the family of Djarīr and the Numair was probably revived by the proximity of the latter to the title of the poet, the Bani Kulāh b. Yarāḥ.

To the Numair belonged notable poets — in addition to al-Ḥarīn and his son Djarīlī and like ʿAbd al-Ḥaiya (in the early Ḥabīlāl period) and Djarīr al-Awād whose Dīwān was recently published (Cairo 1930 = 1931, publications of the Egyptian Library).


(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)
at the beginning of the year 63 (682) and drove all the Umayyads out of the town, Yazid wished to see what tact would do before resorting to arms and sent a mission to Medina under al-Nu'man to see the people the futility of armed resistance and to bring them to their senses. The mission was also instructed to go on to Mecca to induce the stubborn 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair to pay homage.

Al-Nu'man's warnings and threats had no effect on his countrymen however and there was nothing left for the Caliph but to subdue the rebels in the two holy cities [see the article VAZI B. MU'AWIYAH] by force of arms. After the death of Yazid in Rabi' I 63 (Nov. 683) al-Nu'man who had in the meanwhile become governor of Hijaz declared openly for 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair. In Dhu 'l-Hijjah of the same year (July—Aug. 684) or in Muharram 65 (Aug.—Sept. 684) however, the latter's leading follower al-Dakhābī b. Ka'īs al-Fihrī [q.v.] was defeated at Mardj Râhiṣ [q.v.] and thus the fate of al-Nu'man was also decided. He attempted to save himself by flight but was overtaken and killed. According to the Arab historians, the town of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man takes its name from Nu'man b. Bashīr.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, vi. 35; Ṭabarî, ed. de Goeje, see Index; Ibn al-Abbâb, al-Kâmil, ed. Tornburg, i. 514; ii. 85, 303, 382; iii. 9, 15, 231, 430; iv. 9, 15, 219, 231, 430; V. Khûli, ed. Houtsma, ii. 228, 278, 301, 304 sq.; al-Dinawari, al-Akhbâr al-biladî, ed. Guirgass, p. 239 sqq.; 245; 247; 273; Mas'ûdî, Munâdî, ed. Paris, iv. 296 sqq.; v. 128, 134, 204, 227–229; Abu 'l-Fidâ', ed. Reiske, i. 77, 385, 393, 405, 407; Kitâb al-Ā'zâhîn, see Guidi, Tableaux alphabétiques; Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, viii. 335; ix. 233, 355; x. 275 sqq., see also index; Wellhausen, Das arabisches Reich und sein Sturz, p. 47, 82, 94, 96, 110; Lammens, Études sur le règne du calife omeyyade Médâwaîa, p. 10, 43, 45, 58, 110, 116, 407; do., Le califat de Yaz. [i.e. Yazid I], p. 119 sqq., 137, 140, 142, 207, 215, 221, 228. (K. V. ZETTERSTEFEN)

AL-NU'MÂN B. AL-MUNDHIR (with the kunya Abû Kâbit or Abû Kâbita) was the last kingly house of the house of the Lakhmīds of al-'Hira [cf. LAKĪM]. He is certainly the best known to the Arabs but not by any means therefore the most important of the dynasty. He is often mentioned by the poets, according to circumstances a subject of panegyrics or of lampoons. His best known court poet was al-Nâbigha al-Dhubyâni [q.v.]; on his relationship with 'Adî b. Zaid al-Ihâdî see below.

His fame among the Arabs does not mean that we know a great deal about his life and activities. What we can get from the poetry is of very little historical value and what the historians tell us about him is of almost less value. Arab tradition about the house of Lakhmīds is generally speaking of the same nature as that of the partly contemporary houses of Ghassân and kindâ. In addition there is the complication produced by the frequent confusion of different people of the same name in the stories. What is to be found in non-Arab sources, although more reliable, is too trifling and accidental to build a historical narrative upon.

The material has been collected by Noldeke in his Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassâniden and G. Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lakhmīden in al-'Hira and critically studied as far as possible.

The "kings" of al-'Hira were vassals of the Persian Great Kings and were installed by them, and given the task of keeping together the Arab population of the marches and the desert Arabs, their dependents, and thus to protect the empire against raids and plunder by the Beduins. Al-Nu'man is said to have reigned 580–602 A.D. or perhaps a little later. His father was al-Mundhir b. Hind, one of the three sons of the famous prince of the house of Kinda, who came to the throne in succession. His mother however was of humble origin; she was, it is said, the daughter of a goldsmith near Medina, a fact which the enemies of the king made good play within their lampoons on him. After the death of his father al-Mundhir, the Great King (Hormizd IV) is said to have hesitated for a time to fill the throne. Al-Nu'man's final appointment is said only to have been made through the influence and cunning of the Arab poet 'Adî b. Zaid al-Ihâdî [q.v.] who was secretary for Arab affairs to the Great King and whose family were devoted to al-Nu'man.

No really important events are known of the reign of al-Nu'man. Mention is made of hostilities with Arab tribes and anecdotes of his life recorded. At first a pagan, like all his male ancestors, he was baptised which did not prevent him remaining a polygamist. But there had previously been Christians in his family. His grandmother Hind above mentioned founded a monastery [cf. AL-HIRA] and his sister of the same name (others say daughter) was a nun. Towards the end of his life he had the poet 'Adî b. Zaid put to death as his enemies had poisoned him against him. But he is said to have helped a son of the poet to obtain the same influential position with the Great King (Khusraw II) as his father had held. He himself was not long afterwards made prisoner by the Great King — it is said as a result of the machinations of this son of 'Adî and died in prison. There are all sorts of legends giving details of his end.

Bibliography: Noldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 347, note 1, and Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lakhmīten, p. 107–120, where the rest of the literature is given. (A. MOBERG)

AL-NU'MÂN B. THĀBIT. [See also HANIFA.] AL-NU'MÂN B. 'ABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD B. MANSŪR B. ÂHMAD B. HĀVĪN AL-TAMĪMĪ, Al-ISMĀ'ILĪ AL-MAGHRIBI ABU ḤANIFA, the greatest of Ismā'īlī jurists and a protagonist of the early Fātimids in Egypt. Nu'man appears to have been derived from a Mālikī stock in Kairawan, adopting the Ismā'īlī faith early in life. The exact date of his birth is not known, but it is probable that he was born in the last decades of the third century of the Hijra. He began his service of the Fātimids by entering the service of al-Mahdi (first Fātimid caliph), and served him for the last nine years of his life, i.e., 321–332 a.H. Thereafter he continued to serve al-Kāmil (second Fātimid caliph) for the whole of his life. During this time al-Nu'man was concerned chiefly with the study of history, philosophy and jurisprudence, and the composition of his numerous works. Just prior to al-Kāmil's death, which occurred in 335 (946), he was appointed a kāfi. His rank rose during the time of Mansūr (third Fātimid caliph) and he reached his
zenith in the time of the fourth Fāṭimid caliph, al-Mu‘izz (died 365 = 976), whom he preceeded by two years. Officially he does not seem to have been appointed ḥāfiẓ ’-r-iḥfāẓ, a designation given for the first time to al-Nu‘mān’s elder son ’Alī; but during the reign of al-Mu‘izz, al-Nu‘mān acquired great power and was in effect the highest judicial functionary of the realm, and one of the most important figures in the hierarchy of the Da‘wā (pronounced Da‘wot by the Ismā‘ilīs).

Kādī al-Nu‘mān was a man of great talent, learning and accomplishments; learned as a scholar, prolific as an author, upright as a judge. Not many external facts of his life are known. Possibly he was a recluse immersed in juristic and philosophical studies, and engaged in the composition of his numerous works. He was the founder of and is rightly regarded as the greatest exponent of Ismā‘īlī jurisprudence. According to the Ismā‘īlī tradition, he wrote nothing without consulting the Ismā‘īls who were his contemporaries; and his greatest work, the Da‘wā’īn al-Islām (The Pillars of Islam), is regarded as almost the joint work of Ismā‘īl al-Mu‘izz and Kādī al-Nu‘mān, and therefore of the highest authority. It was the official corpus juris after the time of al-Mu‘izz throughout the Fāṭimid empire. In addition to being a jurist, some of his other works are also considered standard works by the Ismā‘īlī doctors and are still eagerly studied, for example, Asīs al-Tawīl and Tawīl al-Dā‘wā’īn (asvīl), Shārī al-Akhbār and Ifṣīlīt al-Da‘wā’ (akhbār), and al-Ma‘āfīs wa l-Muṣāyarāt (wa‘f).

Al-Nu‘mān was the founder of a distinguished family of Kādīs, and both of his sons, ‘All and Muhammad, attained the rank of chief Kādīs, Kādī al-Kifāyat.

Kādī al-Nu‘mān died at Old-Cairo (Misr) on Friday, the 29th of Dhu‘l-Mahān II, 363 (March 27, 974).

Al-Nu‘mān was a prolific and versatile author, and the names of 44 of his works have come down to us. Out of these, 22 are totally lost; 18 are wholly, and 4 partially, preserved by the Western Ismā‘īlīs of India. Instead of giving a complete list of his works, which may be found elsewhere, I am only classifying them according to subjects, mentioning the most important of them: A. Fīkh: 14 works (Kittāb al-Istāḥ, Da‘wā’īn al-Islām, Mukhtasar al-Akhbār; B. Manazara; 5 works; C. Ta‘wīl (Allegorical Interpretation): 3 works (Asīs al-Ta‘wīl, Ta‘wīl al-Dā‘wā’īn; D. Ḥa‘ṣbī’t (Esoteric Philosophy): 4 works; E. Aqā‘īl (Dogmatists): 6 works (al-Ka‘ba al-mushabbār; F. Akhbār al-Sira: 3 works (Sharh al-Akhbār); G. Ta‘rīkh: 2 works (Ifṣīlīt al-Da‘wā’); H. Wa‘z: 3 works (Ma‘āfīs wa l-Muṣāyarāt); Miscellaneous: 4 works.


(FYZEE)

NŪN, the twenty-fifth letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of 50, belonging to the group of liquids (al-hurūf al-ḥaṣik), and as such subject to numerous changes and assimilations; cf. the Bibliography.

On the palaeographic history of the character, cf. ARAβA, plate I.


NŪR (A.), light, synonym dawn, also dwā (the latter sometimes used in the plural). According to some authors, dawn (diyā) has a more intensive meaning than nūr (cf. Lane, Arabic-English Dictionary, s.v. dwā); this idea has its foundation in Kūrds x. 5, where the sun is called diyā and the moon nūr. The further deduction from this passage that diyā is used for the light of light producing bodies (sun) and nūr on the other hand for the reflected light in bodies which do not emit light (moon), is not correct, if we remember the primitive knowledge of natural science possessed by the Arabs in the time of Muhammad, nor is there any proof of it in later literature. The works on astronomy of the contemporaneous cosmology of the Arabs in the best period of the middle ages (Ibn al-Hajjām, Kāzvīnī and later writers) in the great majority of cases use the term dwā and it therefore seems justified to claim this word as a technical term in mathematics and physics.

Besides dealing with the subject in his Optics (Kittāb al-Ma‘āmīr) Ibn al-Hajjām devoted a special treatise to it entitled Kaws al-Hasan b. al-Husain b. al-Hajjām fi l-Dawā which has been published with a German translation by J. Baarmann in the Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. (1882), 195—237, from which we take the following details:

As regards light, two kinds of bodies are distinguished, luminous (including the stars and fire) and non-luminous (darks); the non-luminous are again divided into opaque and transparent, the latter again into such as are transparent in all parts like air, water, glass, crystal etc. and such as only admit the light partly but the material of which is really opaque, such as thin cloth.

The light of luminous bodies is an essential quality of the body, the reflected light of a body in itself dark on the other hand is an accidental quality of the body.

In the opinion of mathematicians all the phenomena of light are of one and the same character; they consist of a heat from fire which is in the luminous bodies themselves. This is evident from the fact that one can concentrate rays of light from the brightest luminous body, the sun, by means of a burning-glass on one point and thus set all inflammable bodies alight and that the air and other bodies affected by the light of the sun become warm. Light and heat are thus identified or regarded as equivalent. The intensity of light, like that of heat, diminishes as the distance from the source increases.

Every luminous body whether its light is one of its essential qualities (direct) or accidental (reflected), illuminates any body placed opposite it, i.e. it sends its light out in all directions. All bodies whether transparent or opaque possess the power of absorbing light, the former have further
the power of transmitting it again; that a transparent body (air, water, etc.) also has the power of absorbing light, and has been confirmed by the fact that the Hellenistic tradition speaks of transparent water, a doctrine which is found in the Self-known book of Al Fārābī Sahl ibn ’Alāʾ ibn al-Hadhāj; Ibn al-Haitham challenges this statement and shows from a use of the theory of the mathematician Abū Saʿīd al-Ṣalih ibn Hawall, which is based on the well-known rules of there being fraction of light in passing through media of different densities, that the transparency has no limits and that for every transparent body as an even more transparent one can be found.

An explanation of the origin of the halo around the moon, of the rainbow, its shape and its colour, and of the rainbow to be seen at night in the steam-laden atmosphere of the bath, is given by Kāzimī in his Cosmography, i. (Ayyāb al-Mathālib, Beirut, 1895, p. 100 sqq. transl. Eth.). Kāzimī in his discussion replaces the raindrops by small looking-glasses; Ibn al-Haitham, on the other hand, deals with the problem in a much more conclusive fashion by assuming a single or double reflection of light in spheres (cf. E. Wiedemann, Wied. Ann., vol. LXXIV., 1890, p. 575).

Bibliography: References given in the article.

(Willy Hartner)

The doctrine that God is light and reveals himself as such in the world and to man is very old and widely disseminated in Oriental religions as well as in Hellenistic gnosis and philosophy. We cannot here go into the early history; it will be sufficient if we refer to some parallels in the Old and New Testaments, e.g. Gen. i. 3; Isaiah, lx. 1, 19; Zech., iv.; John, i. 4–9; iii. 19; v. 35; viii. 12; xii. 35 and Rev., xxi. 23 sq.

How Muhammad became acquainted with this teaching we do not know, but the Kurān has its "light" verses [notably Sūra xxiv. 35, the "light verse" proper; cf. with it Sūra xxxiii. 45 (Muḥammad as lamp); lxi. 8 sq. (Allāh’s light)]; lviii. 8 (the light sent down = revelation). The light verse runs (as translated by Goldsith, in Koran-Auszüge, p. 185 sq.): “Allāh is the light of the heavens and of the earth; his light is like a niche in which there is a lamp; the lamp is in a glass and the glass is like a shining star; it is lit from a blessed tree, an olive-tree, neither an eastern nor a western one; its oil almost shines alone even if no fire touches it; light upon light. Allāh leads to his light whom he will, and Allāh creates allegories for man, and Allāh knows all things.”

From the context it is clear that we have to think of the light of religious knowledge, of the truth which Allāh communicates through his Prophet to his creatures especially the believers (cf. also Sūra xxviii. 40). It is pure light, light upon light, which has nothing to do with fire (nūr), which is lit from an olive tree, perhaps not of this world (cf. however A. J. Wensinck, Tree and Bird as cosmological Symbols in Western Asia, in Verh. Ak. Amst., 1921, p. 27 sqq.). Lastly it is Allāh as the all-knowing who instructs men and leads them to the light of his revelation (cf. Sūra lxxiv. 8). It is clear that we have here traces of gnostic imagery but those rationalist theologians, who — whether to avoid any comparison of the creature with God or to oppose the fantastic mystics — interpreted the light of Allāh as a symbol of his good guidance probably diverged less from the sense of the Kurān than most of the metaphysicians of light. Passages are very frequent in the Kurān in which Allāh appears as the Knowing (al-‘alim) and the Guiding (al-hādi’ī). One did not need to look far for an exegesis on these lines. As Abū Ṣafīr observes (Makālāt, ed. Ritter, ii. 534) the Mu’tazilis al-Hasan al-Nadījār interpreted the light verse to mean that God guides the inhabitants of heaven and earth. The Zaidīs also interpreted the light as Allāh’s good guidance (cf. the article Nūr).

From ca. 100 A.D. we find references to a prophetic doctrine of nūr, and gradually to a more general metaphysics of light, i.e. the doctrine that God is essentially light, the prime light and as such the source of all being, all life and all knowledge. Especially among the mystics in whose emotional thinking being, name and image coalesced, this speculation developed. Meditation on the Kurān, Persian stimuli, gnostic-Hermetic writings, lastly and most tenaciously, Hellenistic philosophy provided the material for new ideas. Kumāt (d. 743) had already sung of the light emanating through Adam via Muhammad into the family of Āli (cf. the article Nūr). The doctrine of light was dialectically expounded by Sahl al-Tustari (d. 896) (see also Masson, Textes inédits, p. 39 and the article SAHIL AL-TUSTARI).

The first representatives of a metaphysics of light in Islam readily fell under the suspicion of Manicheanism, i.e. of the dualism of nūr and šahāna (darkness) as the eternal principles. The tradition of Tirmidhī that Allāh created in darkness [cf. the article NūR] must have aroused misgivings. The physician Rābi’ (d. 923 or 932), although a Hellenistic philosopher, adopted ideas from Persia and was for this refuted or cursed by various theologians and philosophers. Many mystics also (e.g. Hallād; according to Masson, Passion, p. 150 sq. wrongly) were accused of this dualism.

But the speculations about nūr found a powerful support from the ninth century in the monistic doctrine of light of the Neo-Platonists (we do not
know of any Persian monism of light) which was compatible with the monism of Isâm. The father of this doctrine is Plato, who in his Phîleîsia, 506 D sqq. compares the idea of the good in the supersensual world with Hélios as the light of the physical world. The contrast is not therefore between light and darkness but between the world of ideas or mind and its copy, the physical world of bodies, in the upper world pure light, in the lower world light more or less mixed with darkness. Among the Neo-Platonists the idea of the good — the highest: God = pure light. This identification was also facilitated by the fact that according to Aristotle's conception light is nothing corporeal (De anima, i. 7, 418b: [αἰθί] ... ὅπως ἔχει οὐδὲ ἄκμα ἀκμαίον όμοιον). From the context which is however not all clear, it appears that Aristotle regarded light as an effective force (ἐνέργεια). It is however of no importance here. Many Aristotelian forces and Platonic ideas are described by Neo-Platoeans and Neo-Platonists sometimes as forces and sometimes as substances (spiritual).

With Aristotle σνς (darkness) was conceived not as something positive but as ἄστρενε (privatio, the absence of light).

From this developed the doctrine which we find in the Arabic "Theology of Aristotle". Not far from the beginning (ed. Dieterici, p. 3) it is said: the power of light (κινωνια νουταγ) is communicated by the prime cause, the creator, to the αἰθή and by the αἰθή to the world soul, then from the αἰθή through the world soul to nature and from the world soul through nature to things which originate and decay. The whole process of this creative development proceeds without movement and timelessly. But God who causes the force of light to pour forth is also light (νῦρ; occasional synonyms: ἄναν, βαθή), "the prime light" (p. 51) or (p. 44) the "light of lights". Light (p. 51) is essentially in God, not a quality (ὕφασμα) for God has no qualities but works through his being (καταρτια). The light flows through the whole world, particularly the world of men. From the supersensual original (p. 150), the first man (καὶ ἀνθρώποι) it flows over the second man (καὶ ἄνθρωποι) and from him to the third (καὶ ἄνθρωποι). These are the originals of the so-called real men. Light is of course found in its purest form in the souls of the wise and the good (p. 51). It should be noted also that νῦρ as a spiritual force (νοον καταρτια) is distinguished from fire (νῦρ) which is said to be only a force in matter with definite quality (p. 85). Fire of course like everything else has its supersensual original, but this is more connected with life than with light.

The elevation of the soul to the divine world of light corresponds to the creative descent of light (p. 8). When the soul has passed on its return beyond the world of the αἰθή it sees there the pure light and the beauty of God, the god of all mysteries. Although the author of the Ἐραις de causis, 4th cent., adhered to the opinion that nothing can be predicated regarding God, yet he has to call him the prime cause and more exactly pure light (§ 5, ed. Bardenheuer, p. 69) and as such the origin of all being and all knowledge (in God is τεύχων = ὦν ἀραία; see § 23, p. 103).

The light emanated by God may, if it is regarded as an independent entity, be placed at various parts of the system. Most philosophers and theologians connect it with the ῥῆς or αἰθή or identify it with them, sometimes also with life (καταρτια), but this must be more closely investigated.

The great philosophers in Isâm, Farâbî and Ibn Sinâ, connected the doctrine of light with the αἰθή in metaphysics as well as in psychology. Farâbî is fond of using many synonyms for the light of God and the αἰθή (βαθή etc.; see e.g. Der Muster- stadt, ed. Dieterici, p. 13 sqq.). In the biography of Farâbî in Ibn Abî Usîkhâ (C̱yân, ed. Muller, ii. 134—140) a prayer is attributed to him in which God is invoked as the "prime cause of things and light of the earth and of heaven". Ibn Sinâ like Farâbî takes up the doctrine of light in theology and further develops it. In his psychological writings he regards the light as a link of the soul and body (cf. Sahîl al-Tustari who places νῦρ between ῥῆς and φίλ in the four elements of man). In the Kitâb al-Ishârat (ed. Forget, Leyden 1892, p. 126 sq.) he even reads the whole metaphysical doctrine of the αἰθή of the Aristotelians into the light verse of the Kurân. Light is the αἰθή of υποφή, the αἰθή (p. 57) and so on. Allâh's νῦρ is therefore like the nouns of Aristotle! This discovery of Ibn Sinâ's was incorporated in the pious reflections of Güzâzî (in Mâbridî al-Kuâ'id fi Madârijî al-Ma'rifat al- Nafl, Cairo 1927, p. 58 sq.)

The many expositions of the further developments of speculation on νῦρ, especially among the gnostics and mystics, are in Massignon's articles Ḳârâmîs and ṬásaWFūWF.


Nûr Allâh al-Sâyîd B. al-Sâyîd Sharîf al-Marâşi al-I'jüsâîni al-Shâshârî, commonly called Khâdîj Nûr Allâh, was born in 956 (1549). He was descended from an illustrious family of the Marâşi Sâyîds and settled in Shâshâr. He left his native place for India and settled in Lâhore where he attracted the notice of Hâkim Abû 'l-Fâth (d. 997 = 1588) and through his presentation to Emperor Akbar (963—1014 = 1556—1605), he was appointed Khâdîj of Lâhore in lieu of the Shahîk Mu'tîn (d. 995 = 1586). 'Abd al-Kâdir Badâ'uni, iii. 137, says that he was, "although a Shî'ah, a just, pious and learned man. He was flogged to death in 1019 (1610), on account of his religious opinions, by the order of the Emperor Dâhângir (1014—1037 = 1605—1628). He is regarded as al-Shâhâl al-Thâlibî, "the third martyr", by the Shî'is and his tomb in Akhânbâd is visited by numerous Shî'as from all parts of India.

He is the author of innumerable works of which the following may be quoted: 1. Ḳâhîsîs ala 'l-Bâdiâfârî, a supercommentary to al-Bâdiâfârî's commentary on the Kitâb al-Nûra al-Anârî, edited. Twain al-Tâmirî, Asiatic Society of Bengal MSS., List of the Government Collection, p. 16; 2. Ḳâhîsîs Sharîf Ḳâdîî ala 'l-Tâmirî, glosses to Ḳâdîî's commentary on Naṣîr al-Dîn al-Ṭâsî's Compendium of metaphysics and theology, entitled Tâmirî al-Kalâm: Loth., Ind. Off., No. 471, xv.; 3. Ḳâhîsîs al-Hâkîs wa-'l-Sâfî al-Bâdiâfârî, a polemical work against Sunnism written in reply to Faqî b. Rûshâhâns work entitled Φαλάτ al-Fâtîî, a treatise in refutation


Nūr al-Dawla. [See DUBAI.]

Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad, an Ortōkīd. He was the son and successor of Fakhr al-Dīn Kāra-ʿĀlī, lord of Hisān Kaḥf and of a considerable part of Dīyār Bakr (Ibn al-ʿĀṯir, Kāmilī, ed. Tornberg, xi. 217) who, according to Ibn al-ʿĀṯir (xi. 207), died in 562 (1166—1167) but according to the numismatic evidence may have lived till 570 or 571 (van Berchem, Abh. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, N.F., vol. ix.iii, 1907, p. 143, note 3). Nūr al-Dīn married the daughter of Sulṭān Kīṭhī Arslān but when he treated her disgracefully, his father-in-law was very angry and threatened him with war. In consequence Nūr al-Dīn appealed for help to Saʿlāh al-Dīn who after fruitless negotiations took the field against Kīṭhī Arslān in 576. Nūr al-Dīn came to him in his camp on the Gōk-sū (this should be the reading in Barhebraeus, Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 356) and was received by him with great honour. Soon afterwards his father-in-law made peace with him and with Saʿlāh al-Dīn. When the latter in 578 took the field against ʿIzz al-Dīn of al-Maʿṣūl, Nūr al-Dīn showed himself at once ready to pay homage to him and assist him at the siege of al-Maʿṣūl. The powerful ʿAṭībaīd then awarded him with the important town of Āmīd, which he took in the following year (579) and gave him (Ibn al-ʿĀṯir, xi. 324). Of all the wealth collected in this town Saʿlāh al-Dīn only took for himself the 1,040,000 volumes which its library is said to have contained (Barhebraeus, op. cit., p. 362). In the following year (580), Nūr al-Dīn took part in the unsuccessful siege of al-Karāk (Barhebraeus, p. 364). When Saʿlāh in 581 (1185—1186) again advanced against al-Maʿṣūl, in place of Nūr al-Dīn who was ill, his brother Ḥimād al-Dīn accompanied him. Nūr al-Dīn died soon afterwards and left to his son Kūṭh al-Dīn Sukmān II rule over Hisān Kaḥf and Āmīd. Ḥimād al-Dīn on hearing of his brother's death hurried from Saʿlāh al-Dīn's camp before al-Maʿṣūl to Hisān Kaḥf but found his nephew already fully installed there. He therefore seized the fortress of Kharṭārib where he became the founder of a branch of the Ortōkīds.

Biography: see the article Ortōkīds. (E. Honemann)

Nūr al-Dīn Abu 'l-Kāsim Māhīmed b. Ḥimād al-Dīn Zengī, called al-Malik al-ʿĀdil, atābeg of Ḥalab and Damascus. Nūr al-Dīn was born in Shāmbılı (Feb. 1118) and took part under his father in the siege of Kaṭḥ al-Diżār where the latter was murdered in Rabī I 541 (Sept. 1146). His kingdom was then divided between his two sons, Saʿif al-Dīn Ghārī [q. v.] who took possession of al-Maʿṣūl, and Nūr al-Dīn who established himself in Halab. Scarcely had the news of Ḥimād al-Dīn's death reached Joscelin II who lived in Tell Bāšir [q. v.] than the latter entered into negotiations with the people of Edessa, mainly Armenians, the chief stronghold of the Crusaders, which Ḥimād al-Dīn had taken shortly before and assured himself of their cooperation in his successful attack on the city. He was thus able to occupy the city without difficulty and its Muslim garrison took refuge in the citadel. When Nūr al-Dīn heard this he hurried thither by forced marches; Joscelin fled and Edessa fell into the hands of Nūr al-Dīn who wreaked a terrible vengeance on the treacherous Christians, laid the city completely waste and left only a few citizens in it. In the following year he invaded the district of Halab and took from the Christians Arṭāb and Kafarīhā and several other places. The news of the fall of Edessa in 539 (1144) made a tremendous impression in Europe and induced the Pope Eugenius III on Dec. 1, 1145 to send a letter to Louis VII and the knights of France in which he demanded a new crusade and in the spring of 1146 to send St. Bernard of Clairvaux to preach the crusade. He was listened to with enthusiasm; on receiving the Pope's message Louis had already declared himself ready to take the crusaders' vow and finally the Hohenstaufen Conrad III was also won over. In the first half of the year 1147 the two kings set out and after great difficulties and considerable losses through starvation, epidemics and enemy attacks, the European armies joined another one in Palestine in the spring of 1148. It was decided to attack Damascus which was then nominally in the power of the Bulūr Muḍjähr al-Dīn Aṭ巴 b. Muḥammad although the real ruler was one of his Mamluks named Muʿīn al-Dīn Anar. In Rabī I 543 (July 1148) the Christians began the siege of the town from the southwest. The first few days were spent in heavy fighting with great losses on both sides. In the meanwhile Muʿīn al-Dīn had appealed for assistance to Saʿif al-Dīn Ghārī. The latter set out with a large army and was joined on the way by his brother Nūr al-Dīn. Before giving the hard pressed Muʿīn al-Dīn the assistance he desired, he sent him a letter in which he demanded the surrender of the town to his deputy in order to have a base in case of a defeat; but if he was victorious he would leave the town at once. But as Muʿīn al-Dīn did not trust him completely he endeavoured instead to frighten the Christians by threats and declared that if they did not retreat he would hand over the town to Saʿif al-Dīn Ghārī who would certainly drive the invaders completely out of Syria. These representations, supported by the gold of Damascus, did not fail to influence the eastern leaders who were able to appreciate the situation much better than their European allies. But as they had not the courage to propose that the siege should be once abandoned, they suggested in the council of war held in the night of the July 26—27, 1148 that the camp should be moved from west to east because, they said, the walls on this side were not so strong and the attack would not be impeded by gardens. The besiegers followed the
advice of those possessing local knowledge but

soon saw that they had been deceived because the
terrain on the east side offered even greater
difficulties in every respect and there was there-
fore nothing left for them but to withdraw in
order to resume the siege another time. When
Bertrand, the son of Count Alfonso of Toulouse
who had just died, took the fortress of al-Arta in
and threatened the district of Tripoli Count Raymond
of Tripoli appealed to Nur al-Din and Masʿūn al-
Dīn who had joined one another in Baalbek;
the two Muslim leaders supported by a contingent
sent by Saif al-Dīn hurried to his help. Bertrand
had to surrender; the fortress was destroyed and
he himself taken prisoner. The Christians then
prepared to invade the district of Ḥalab; Nur al-
Dīn however anticipated them, defeated them at
Yaghra taking much booty, which he divided among
his brother Saif al-Dīn, the caliph al-Muqtāfī and
the Saldūjūk sultan Masʿūd. At the beginning of the
following year (May 1149) Nur al-Dīn invaded the
region of Ṣanṭākiyā, laid waste the country with the
suburb of Ḥarīm and laid siege to the fortress of
Innīb. Prince Raymond of Antioch hastened up
with a small army to attack Nur al-Dīn but
was enticed into an ambush and fell in the fight.
Nur al-Dīn then went with his victorious forces
doing great damage as he went, close up to Antioch
in order to inspire the inhabitants with terror,
and on his way back took Ḥīrām and forced the
strong fortress of Fāmiya (Apamea) near Ḥamāt
to surrender. About the same time Saif al-Dīn died
and his brother and successor Kūb al-Dīn Mawdūd
prepared to fight Nur al-Dīn, but the dispute was
settled amicably [cf. the article MAWDUDD]. Soon
afterwards (545 = 1151 or 546 = 1151-1152) Nur
al-Dīn succeeded in capturing his enemy Joscelin II
of Edessa. The latter had previously won a victory
over Nur al-Dīn and treated him very scornfully.
When one night he was travelling with only a
few followers to Antioch he was surprised by a
troop of Turkomans in the pay of Nur al-Dīn and
brought to Ḥalab where he remained a prisoner
till his death, while Nur al-Dīn gradually took all
the fortresses belonging to the Christian
forces in Edessa. In order to split up the Christian forces
and to bring some relief to the Muslims besieged in ʿAskālān, he made an agreement with his enemy,
the prince of Damascus, Mudījr al-Dīn Abāṣ, and
in Safar 548 (May 1153) they both appeared before
the walls of Bānīyās (q.v.). But while the irresolute
Mudījr al-Dīn would undertake no serious steps
against the Christians, they soon abandoned the
siege and separated without having achieved any-
thing. When ʿAskālān, was forced to capitulate
after an eight months siege the Christians began
to cast covetous eyes on the great and wealthy
city of Damascus, especially as Mudījr al-Dīn acted
almost as if he were their vassal. In order to
thwart their plans, Nur al-Dīn endeavoured to gain
over Mudījr al-Dīn by pretended friendship and
by making false charges against them persuaded
him to get rid of his chief emirs so that Mudījr
al-Dīn thus lost his most reliable friends. When Nur
al-Dīn suddenly appeared before the gates of the
city they were opened to him by his friends in
Damascus as had been prearranged. Mudījr al-Dīn
took refuge in the citadel and summoned the
Christians to his assistance but surrendered the
city before help arrived (Safar 549 = April 1154).

In compensation he received Ḥīms. There he
began to intrigue against Nur al-Dīn and the
latter offered him Ballūs instead; Mudījr al-Dīn
however was not satisfied, but settled in Baghdād
where he remained till his death as a protégé of
the caliph al-Muqtāfī. In 551 (1156) Nur al-Dīn
made a peace with Baldwin III of Jerusalem,
whereby the latter gave up the annual tribute which
Damascus had had to pay him since the time of
Mudījr al-Dīn and ceded the half of the lands of
Ḥārīm. In spite of this about the end of the year
551 (Feb. 1157) Baldwin fell upon a defenceless
encampment of Arabs and Turkomans in the neigh-
bourhood of Bānīyās, took the men prisoners and
carried away their cattle. As a result the way broke
to Ḥarīm, and the Christians were forced to
fight on the Euphrates by the governor of Damascus,
Asad al-Dīn Shīrkuh, some in the vicinity of
Damascus by Nur al-Dīn's brother, the emir Nāṣīr al-Dīn.
Many prisoners were brought to Damascus and put
to death by Nur al-Dīn's orders in revenge for
the Muslims killed at Bānīyās. Nur al-Dīn then
attacked Bānīyās and destroyed the town but
could not take the citadel; he retired on the
approach of Baldwin. The latter rebuilt the ruined
town, dismissed a number of his troops and
intended to return to Tiberias, but was surprised
on the way by Nur al-Dīn and suffered a disastrous
defeat (Djmāʿa 1 552 = end of June 1157). Another
attempt by Nur al-Dīn to take the town was also
unsuccessful; he again raised the siege when the
approach of Baldwin. Very soon afterwards he
fell very ill and a rumour spread that he had died.
The Christians thereupon attacked Shaizar [g.v.]
which had been severely damaged by an earthquake,
and had along with Baalbek shortly before fallen
into the hands of Nur al-Dīn. The attack failed
however owing to the jealousies among the Frankish
leaders. On the other hand, they were successful
after two months siege in taking Ḥārīm in the
following year and in inflicting a severe defeat
on Nur al-Dīn on the Jordan (Djmāʿa 1 553 =
July 1155). About the same time the emperor
Manuel I Comnenos appeared in Syria to chastise
the rebel governor of Cilicia and prince Raynal
of Antioch who had undertaken an expedition against
Cyprus. After receiving the submission of the
princes, the emperor resolved to join Baldwin in
an attack on Ḥalab at the beginning of 1159.
Nur al-Dīn however escaped the danger which
threatened him by releasing the Christian prisoners.
He then concluded a truce for four months with
Baldwin, took Ḥarrān and al-Raḳḳa from his brother
Nāṣīr al-Dīn and invaded the lands of sultan
Kīlīd Arslān II [q.v.]; but when Baldwin began
then lay waste Nur al-Dīn's territory, the latter
hurried back to Ḥalab and Baldwin retired. About
this time conditions in Egypt began to attract
the attention of Nur al-Dīn and from the year 556
(1161) his history is so closely bound up with
that of Saladin that it is sufficient to refer to
the article on the latter for the main facts. Only
the following need be added here. In 556 (1161)
Nur al-Dīn had planned an invasion of the coast
of Tripoli and encamped before Ḥīṣn al-ʿAṭlan
[q.v.] and was preparing to storm it when he
was suddenly attacked by the Christians. His
forces who were quite unprepared were scattered
and again Nur al-Dīn himself only escaped with
difficulty. Nevertheless he succeeded by exerting all his
efforts in raising a new army in a short time
with which he again advanced on Ḥārīm After
winning a decisive victory over the Christian relief force, he took Harrim by storm (Ramadan 558 = Aug. 1163) and a few months later also forced Baniyas to surrender. When the atabeg of Mawsil, Nur al-Din’s brother Kubl al-Din Mawdud, at the end of 565 (Sept. 1170) died and his younger son Saif al-Din Ghāzūr was chosen successor by the emirs, Nur al-Din went there and said that Saif al-Din Mawsil was but a shadow he had brought with him. Sīrāj al-Dīn Zanjī to his elder brother ‘Imād al-Dīn Zanjī. In 568 (1173) he invaded Asia Minor and took several towns; on his relations with the Sāljuqs of Rum there see the article BANJAN LI. While he was still on this expedition, an envoy arrived from the Abbāsid caliph of Baghdad bearing a diploma recognising Nur al-Din as lord of al-Mawsil, al-Djazira, Irbil, Khilât, Syria, Egypt and Konya. He died on 11th Shawwāl 569 (May 15, 1174) in Damascus of a disease of the liver (‘illat al-khawwānîth) and was buried in the citadel; his body was later brought to the madrasa founded by him at the entrance to the Sīk Khuwwāsin.

With reference to Nur al-Din, Ibn al-‘Athur, xi. 265 says: ‘I have studied the careers of the rulers of the past but from the time of the legitimate Umayyads and ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz I have found none who led a purer life or had greater enthusiasm for righteousness’. As a pious Muslim convinced of the truth of the Prophet’s mission, he was always eager to follow out in exact detail the many prescriptions of the Kur‘ān and the Sunna regarding the conduct of believers in private and public life. He was distinguished by a remarkable love of justice which was seen for example in the fact that he would never punish on mere suspicion alone and was able to check any arbitrariness on the part of the lower courts also, and aversity and selfishness were entirely foreign to his character. He never gave way to the temptation always at hand to enrich himself at the expense of the treasury; on the contrary, he applied the proceeds of the booty taken in war to pious foundations and public works for the benefit of Islam. Among the important cities of Syria the fortifications of which were renovated by him, Ibn al-‘Athur mentions (xi. 267) the following: Damascus, Hims, Hamāt, Halab, Ša‘izar and Baalbek, and mosques, schools, hospitals and caravanserais were built everywhere. On his great activity as a builder cf. the article DAMASCUS; cf. also Fleischer, Mīḥā’l Melāhā’s Cultur-Statistik von Damascus (Kleinere Schriften, iii. 306 sqq.). He was also a generous patron of scholars in whom he took great interest; on the battlefield he earned the admiration of his soldiers by his personal bravery, which was coupled with unusual talent as well. If on the other hand he was guilty of acts which are not quite compatible with humane warfare, like the massacre in Edīb, on the recapture of the town and the slaughter of the Christian prisoners in Damascus after Baldwin’s attack on the defenceless Muslims at Bāniyas, it should be remembered that this was no breach of the practice of war of the time. The constant aim of his efforts was the expulsion of the Christians from Syria and Palestine and to this object he remained faithful throughout his life. In the political history of Syria and Mesopotamia, Nur al-Din played an unusually important part and laid a firm foundation on which Saladin was later able to build.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-‘Ayun, ed. Wustenfeld, No. 725 (transl. de Slane, iii. 338 sqq.); Ibn al-‘Athur, al-Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, x., see index; Abu l-Fida’, Annalen, ed. Reiske, iii. 301, 503, 597—511, 515—519, 539 sq., 557 sqq.; iv. 5, 15 sqq.; Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Hittig; or., see index; Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seljoucols, ii. 205, 209, 225, 244; Zeittersten, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Islamischen-vulkane, p. 233 sqq.; Ibn al-Kalunî, Dā‘īt al-Turīkh Dimashq, ed. Amedroz, see index; Usama b. Munkidh, al-Fitrī, ed. Derenburg, p. 7, sq. 17, 25, 114, 139, 143 sq. (transl. Hitti, p. 34, 39, 42, 49, 60 sq., 184, 221, 226 sq.); Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, iii. 290 sqq., 320—324, 330, 336, 342—348; A. Muller, Der Islam im Morgen-und Abendland, ii. 144 sqq.; Röhrich, Geschichte des Konigreiches Jerusalem, passim; Stanley Lane-Poolé, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, i. 174—177, 193, 196—199, 204, 242, 283; Sobermann, Abūrīs der Geschichts-Baudek in der Mittelalter (Baudek, Ergebniss der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen, ed. Wiegand, iii. 3—11); cf. also the article SALADIN. V. NUR AL-DIN ABU l-HARITH ASHRĀN SHĀH b. MAŠ‘UD b. MAWDCALL b. ZANGI, called al-MA‘LĪK al-‘ADMĪ, lord of al-MAWSIL. After the death of his father [q.v.] in Shābān 559 (Aug. 1193) Nur al-Din succeeded him; the real ruler however in the early years of his tenure of office was the governor of the citadel, the eunuch Muqālidh al-Dīn Kāmaz al-Zanī, who is described not only as a pious and learned man but as an official much concerned with the welfare of the people. He died in Rajab 1 595 (Jan. 1199) or, according to another statement, in Safar of the same year (Dec. 1198). Many buildings, such as mosques, monasteries, schools and bridges, which the city of Mawsil owes to him, are evidence of his interest in the welfare of the community. When the officials of Nur al-Din’s uncle, the lord of Sendjar, ‘Imād al-Dīn Zanjī b. Mawdud, seized several places in the neighbourhood of Nasībin, but really belonging to the territory of Mawsil, Nur al-Din after long and fruitless negotiations decided to seize the town of Nasībin. ‘Imād al-Dīn then died and was succeeded by his son Kubl al-Dīn Muhammad. The change in the throne caused Nur al-Dīn to hasten; in Djuwmād I 594 (March—April 1198) he set out with a large army. Kubl al-Dīn was defeated and turned to the Ayyūbīd al-‘Adīl [q.v.] with an appeal for help while Nur al-Dīn established himself in Nasībin; but his army melted away through sickness and death and on the approach of al-‘Adīl he evacuated the town and returned to Mawsil (Ramadan 594 = July—Aug. 1198), whereupon al-‘Adīl laid siege to Mardin. In Muharram 595 (Nov. 1198) the ruler of Egypt al-‘Azīz died and when his successor al-Afdal recalled al-‘Adīl’s Egyptian troops and also made an alliance with Nur al-Din, al-‘Adīl had to withdraw and leave the conduct of the siege of Mardin to his son al-Kāmil [q.v.]. Nur al-Dīn then took the field and along with his two cousins Kubl al-Dīn Muhammad and Sendjar Shāh b. Ghāzī, lord of Dżirāt b. ʻOmar, encamped before Dünaisir [q.v.]. After two months there they moved their camp to Harram between Dünaisir and Mardin. In the meanwhile, the inhabitants of Mardin had exhausted their supplies; in addition devastating epidemics
broke out which still further reduced the ranks of the defenders; the commander therefore sent a message to al-Kāmil and declared himself ready to surrender the town within a definite period on condition that he was allowed to import sufficient food. Al-Kāmil agreed but with the arrival of Nūr al-Dīn the people of Mārīn plucked up their courage and renewed the struggle. Al-Kāmil might almost have taken the town by treachery; although Kūtb al-Dīn pretended to be devoted to Nūr al-Dīn he was really secretly attached to al-Kāmil and had promised him to take to flight at once in case of an encounter. When the troops were drawn up for battle he was placed in such a position however that there was no possibility of escape on the narrow battlefield. Al-Kāmil was defeated and fled to Damascus to his father (Shawwāl 595 = Aug. 1199). As to Nūr al-Dīn, he fell sick and could not follow up his victory but returned to al-Mawsīl. After he had recovered from his illness, he went in Shawāb 597 (May–June 1201) with Kūtb al-Dīn to Harrān to resume the struggle with al-Adīl. When he reached Ra's al-'Adīl, enemies of his father came to him from al-Fīrāz al-Adīl who lived in Harrān to seek peace and as he knew that the other Ajyālīs wished to make peace with al-Adīl and deadly epidemics had broken out among his troops, he granted their request for a return to the status quo and returned to al-Mawsīl. In the year 600 (1203–1204), Kūtb al-Dīn openly made homage to al-Adīl and had the kā'iba read in his name; Nūr al-Dīn could not permit this and took possession of Nasībin except the citadel. This also would probably have fallen into his hands if the news that the lord of Irbil, Muzaffar al-Dīn Kōbūrī [q.v.], had invaded the territory of al-Mawsīl in his absence and had wrought great havoc, had not forced him to return. After he had ascertained that the accounts that had reached him were much exaggerated he turned his attention to Tell Āfar which belonged to Sindjār and laid siege to it. But fortune did not favour him. It is true that he succeeded in taking Tell Āfar; then a number of Mesopotamian princes allied themselves with Kūtb al-Dīn and Nūr al-Dīn could not face their combined strength. When it came to a battle he was completely routed and had to surrender Tell Āfar and make peace (beg. 601 = late summer 1204). The relations between Nūr al-Dīn and Kūtb al-Dīn had never been particularly friendly and matters did not improve when Nūr al-Dīn gave his daughter in marriage to one of al-Adīl's sons. On the occasion of this union of the two dynasties, Nūr al-Dīn's viziers proposed to him to conclude an alliance with al-Adīl so that he might himself take possession of Dżarāt ibn 'Omar which was under the rule of Mu'izz al-Dīn Māhād b. Sindjār Shāh and that al-Adīl should occupy Kūtb al-Dīn's territory. This plan which was entirely in keeping with Nūr al-Dīn's desires was also approved by al-Adīl and the latter undertook a campaign against the east. On this campaign in a short time he took al-Khābār and Nasībin and besieged Sindjār. While Kūtb al-Dīn was preparing to fight to defend his capital, Nūr al-Dīn equipped an army which was to join al-Adīl's. Then a sudden change took place in the political situation. The lord of Irbil, Muzaffar al-Dīn Kōbūrī, who had promised Kūtb al-Dīn to intervene with al-Adīl on his behalf but had been unsuccessful, now proposed to Nūr al-Dīn to join him against al-Adīl. Nūr al-Dīn agreed and when the Ajyālīs ruler of Ḥalab al-Malik al-Zāhir and the Sālīq Sultān of Konya Kaşıkusuar 1 b. Kılıç Arslan [q.v.] joined the alliance and al-Adīl was further fortified by the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Nāṣir [q.v.] to abandon his hostile plans, he finally yielded, especially as his emirs had no inclination to continue the campaign. In the meantime Kūtb al-Dīn returned to Harrān and al-Adīl departed to the end of Radjab 607 (Jan. 1211) and was succeeded by his son al-Malik al-Kāhir Ḫiz̄al-Dīn Masūd.


**Nūr Dżahān, name given to Mīhrāb Nīṣāzī, the famous queen of Nūr Dżahān, the Mughal Emperor. She was born at Kandahār in 1577 when her father, Ghiyāth Beg, was migrating from Persia to Hindustān (Ma'ajīr al-Unūrā, i. 129). In the reign of Akbar she was married to 'Ali Kūli Beg, a Persian who had rendered distinguished military service to the Emperor and who, because of his bravery, was known as Shīr Afgān. The assassination of her first husband will always remain a matter of controversy, some regarding it as a repetition of the story of David and Uriah, others holding the view that he had been suspected of disloyalty. It was not however until four years later, in 1611, that she became, at the age of thirty-four, the wife of Dżahān. In the eleventh year of that monarch's reign her name was changed from Nūr Maḥāl to Nūr Dżahān (Ṭā'kūr Dżahāngirī, ed. Rogers and Beveridge, i. 319).

An extraordinarily beautiful woman, well-versed in Persian literature in an age when few women were cultured, ambitious and masterful, she entirely dominated her husband, until eventually Dżahāngīr was king in name only. The chroniclers record that she sometimes sat in the jharokā, that cows were struck in her name, and that she even dared to issue farmāns (Ikbālnamā, p. 54–57). She became the leader of fashion and is said to have invented the taṭrī Dżahāngīrī, a special kind of rose-water. Her style in gowns, veils, brocade, lace, and her farāsī tandānt (carpets of sandalwood colour) were known throughout the length and breadth of Hindustān.

Aly assisted in political affairs by her father, now known as Tūmād al-Dawla, and her brother, Āsaf Ķān, she dispensed all patronage thus falling foul of the older nobility led by Māhātā Khān. The history of the last years of Dżahāngīr's reign is the history of Nūr Dżahān's efforts at paving the way for the succession of her son-in-law, Prince Shāhrīyār. But the death of her father, combined with the fact that Āsaf Ķān was supporting the claim of his own son-in-law, Prince Khurram, considerably weakened her power. On the death of Dżahāngīr, in 1627, she was completely outwitted by Āsaf Ķān, her candidate was defeated, and Prince Khurram ascended the throne as Shīh Dżahān. The last eighteen years,
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of this remarkable woman’s life during the reign of Shah Djiian are unimportant to the historian of Moghal India.


NUR MUHAMMADI, the technical term for the pre-existence of the soul of the Prophet Muhammad; the predominating essence of the last of the prophets, to have created first of all, in the form of a dense and luminous point; all the predestined souls are said to have emanated from this.

Among the Sunnis, the idea first appears among the mystics in the third century A.D., then gradually begins to dominate popular worship (cf. Na‘til Tusuri and Haqim Tirmidhi, in our Recueil, 1429, p. 54, N° 39 and p. 39); Abu Bakr Wasi‘i, whose Ha Mim al-‘Kalam should be identified with ch. 1 of the Tawasul of Hallaj (cf. our Prose, p. 930, 930) exalts it. According to Kili‘ani, Muhammad is “the image in the pupil which is in the centre of the eye of creation” (‘insan ’ain al-wa‘fi‘y). This is what Ibn ‘Arabi calls the haqika mu‘hammadiyya the pre-eternal conception of which is celebrated by the poets ‘Arariti, Witriri and the mystical Dzirrili; hence Muhammad’s immeasurable pedigree since Adam (cf. the poems on the Mawlid). Orthodoxy has always carefully placed the doctrine of the unreality of Kur‘an above this cult. Popular legend among the ‘Ashura‘i has reduced and materialised this devotion: in showing the model of the body of the Prophet kneddled from a handful of earth from Paradise with from the spring Tasnim which makes it shine like a white pearl. But it is certain that it is a question here fundamentally of a gnostic pre-existence, an intellectual substance of the nature of the angels as is evident from the antiquity of the equation nair=al-ilm borrowed by Tirmidhi from the Tan‘na‘i (cf. ‘Akil).

Among the Shi‘is, this doctrine appears earlier and with more logical coherence; among the extremists, who explain this “prophetic light”, either as a “spirit” transmitted from age to age and from elect to elect, or as spermatic germ (Traducianism) inherited from male to male. At the beginning of the second century Mahgra and Dzair taught the primogeniture of the luminous shadow (qitl, opposed to ghaba “dark body”) of Muhammad. It is a fundamental dogma of Isma‘ili from its beginning (al-sabih nair ma‘dh al-mim); it is found again extended through solidarity to all the ‘Alids or to all the Tahiris with the gift of sinlessness among the Nasaris and even among many pious Ilma‘i writers (Kulini, K‘ufi, p. 116).

The authors of this doctrine derive it from the Kur‘an (a‘vat al-nair; xxiv, 35; the ‘bahsha; the connexion between the two terms of the shahdra) effectively interpreted by the old hadiths (Surra ba‘sha; la‘veda) as proving that Muhammad is “the first (by taklif, zor‘a, khali‘) and the last” (by ‘i‘lfi, mahsimwa, ‘le‘th). But it certainly required for its development the stimulus of Christian gnosticism and Manichaean antecedents.


The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
time. He rejects the expedient called 'awzāl in dealing with deceased persons' estates, as being neither in the Kurān nor the Sunna.

3. Later history of the sect. The Madjālis names two successors (khalifa) of Nūrbakhsh: Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. Yaḥyā al-Lahijānī al-Gilānī, called Asītī, the author of a Divān of which there is a copy in the Brit. Mus.; this person built a khanqah in Shiraz; and Nūrbakhsh's son Shāh Kāsim Faidbakhsh, first heard of in Irāq, whence by permission of the AKBayn Muhammad Sulṭān Yaḥyā (588—896) he was allowed to go to Khorāsān to cure Ḥusain Mirzā, the governor, of an ailment by his barakāt. His religious opinion won him the favour of ʿIsāmīl the Safaṭī (907—936). According to Firdawsī, who cites the Šafaṭī nāme, a disciple of Shāh Kāsim, named Mir Shams al-Dīn went from Irāq to Kāshān about 902, where he was received with high honour by Fath Kān, who made over to him the confiscated lands which had formerly fallen to the crown. In a short time many of the Kashmīrs, particularly those of the tribe Čūk, became converts to the Nūrbakhshī sect (Firdawsī, transl. Briggs, Calcutta 1910). The Kashmīrs had previously been Sunnis of the Ḥanafī rite according to Mīrzā Ḥusain (author of Taʿrīkh-i ʿAkhbārī, transl. E. D. Ross, London 1895, p. 435), who when he came into possession of the country asked the opinion of the Ḥanānite of Hindūstān about al-Fīqh al-Ahwāζ; as they condemned it as heretical, he persecuted and endeavoured to extirpate the sect (about 950). His confused and fanatical account of it has misled some European writers. It survived his persecution, and according to J. Biddulph, Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh (Calcutta 1880) it numbers over 20,000 followers, most of whom are to be found in Shigar and Ḥāk of Bāltistān. A few of the sect, he adds, are now to be found in Kīshār, to which place they were deported by Golbān Singh when he conquered Bāltistān.

The work last cited contains some details about their practices; its account, however, mixed with fables, and without access to the Fīqh Āhwāζ, it is difficult to estimate the justice of the assertion that the system is "an attempt to form a via media between Shiʿī and Sunni doctrines".

Bibliography: references are given above.

D. S. Margoliouth

Nūrī, a common name in the Near East for a member of certain Gipsy tribes. A more correct vocalization would perhaps be Nawrī (so Hīva, Steingass, etc.), with plural Nawrār. Mimosky [above, iii. 38] gives Nawara. By displacement of accent we also find the plural form as Nawār (e.g. in Jassun, Coutumes des Arabes, p. 90, and British Admiralty's Handbook, Syria [1919], p. 196, Arabia [1916], p. 92, 94). In Persia the current name for Gipsy is Lūrī, Lūrī, or Lūlī [q. v.]. It is not unlikely that by a natural phonetic transformation the form nūrī derives from Lūrī, which, it has been suggested, originally denoted an inhabitant of the town of al-Rūr (or Arūr) in Sind. Quatremère advanced the theory (Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks, i. 341, note 5) that the name nūrī arose from the Arabic nūr (fire) [he gives the form mūr] because these vagrants were usually seen carrying a brazier or a lantern. Even to-day many of the Nawār earn their living as itinerant smiths. But it is more probable that the correct etymology is to be found in some Saṣākritic dialect of N.W. India, the original home of the Gipsy tribes.

In the various countries of the Orient in which Gipsy families are located, we find several designations for them used. The older name, now much restricted in use, was Zūf [see zöyr] or Jatt. The Turkish name Çingana passed into European languages under such forms as Ċinka, Cingana, Zingaro, Zigeuner, Zigeuner, etc. Dozy (Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes, i. 658), quoting Caussin de Perceval, records the occasional use of the name Zanzibya, but this is inexact [cf. art. ZAND].

The commonest names, apart from those already mentioned, seem to be Nawar or Kurkat or Gharbat (particularly in Egypt, Syria and Persia), Chegagan and Ḥalabī (especially in Egypt and Northern Africa) and Diman (in Mesopotamia). For other sub-divisions reference may be made to the bibliography, and particularly to E. Littmann's Zigeuner-Arabisch, which is an excellent summary of the whole subject, particularly on the linguistic side.

The collecting of data regarding the Gipsy tribes of the Orient is by no means easy. Even experienced orientalists and travellers have reached different conclusions regarding them. For example Lane (in his Modern Egyptians, London 1836, ii. 105) in spite of his profound knowledge of Egypt, asserted that there were few Gipsies in the land, while numbers of well-educated natives to-day, are still unaware of the presence of these tribes in their midst. The statistics of Massignon's Annales musulman (Paris 1925, p. 115) however, gives the number of Gipsies in Egypt as two per cent of the population, consisting, namely, of two tribes of Gharbat and Nawar respectively, and four tribes of Ḥalab.

The Gipsies as a rule seem, chameleon-like, to take their creed, such as it is, from their surroundings. In Muslim countries these tribes usually profess Islam, in so far as they may be said to profess any religious views, many of them, indeed, being very superstitious and reported to be scoundrels and vagabonds. The same applies to the Muslim Gipsies of what was formerly European Turkey (Admiralty's Handbook of Turkey in Europe [1917], p. 62). In the Balkans many of them are Greek-Orthodox.

Persian and Arabic writers preserve for us the tradition that the tribes of Jats (or Zuff) from the Pundjāb were conveyed westwards by command of the Sāfāvīan monarch Bahārān Gūr (420—438 A.D.) and their descendants proved a troublesome problem some centuries later for the Caliph of Baghdād. Once more numbers of them were dispersed to the borders of Syria, where many of them were captured by the Byzantines, and thus found their way into the Eastern Roman Empire, thence to continue their migrations to other ends of the East and West. Many of them are even said to have risen to high rank, e.g. al-Sarī b. al-Ḥakam b. Yūsuf al-Zirī, governor of Egypt (200—205 A.H.), while it has been supposed that the famous Barmaicce family at the court of Harān al-Kashīd were of similar Gipsy origin. The name Barmaicce is actually the designation in Egypt of a class of public dancers (Ghawāza) of low moral character and conduct who have been regarded as of Gipsy blood. The question, however, is doubtful (see L. Bouvat, Les Barmaicces d'après les historiens arabes et persans, Paris 1912, p. 110, 125).

The German traveller Seetzen and the American
missionary Eli Smith gathered valuable material in the Near East regarding those nomadic peoples which proved useful to later scholars. They were followed by Capt. Newbold (1856) on the Gypsies of Egypt, Syria and Persia; von Kremer, Austrian Consul at Cairo, on the Egyptian Gypsies (1863); Sykes (1902) dealt with the Persian Gypsies, while an excellent treatise appeared in 1914 from the pen of R. A. S. Macalister on the Language of the Nawar or Zutt, the Nomad Smiths of Palestine. Macalister in this work had the rather difficult task of reducing to writing a language almost completely unknown, and interpreting and analysing the Nûri stories Gipsies had related to him. In melo-dramas of the Nûri settlement north of the Damascas Gate in Jerusalem. He employed several of these Nawar in the course of his excavations there. A small Syrian Gypsy vocabulary received by Miss G. G. Everest of Bairrût from a friend at Damascus was also published in the *Journal of the Gipsy Lore Soc.*, Jan. 1890, in an article by F. H. Groome. The philological aspect of the question has received, in recent years, the attention of scholars such as E. Galtier and E. Littmann (see Bibliography).

In Egypt the Halâb (sing. ḫālab) are to be found mostly in Lower Egypt carrying on their special occupations at the various markets and *mansâlîd*, as traders in camels, horses and cattle. Their womenfolk are noted seersesses and medicine-women, practicing all the arts of sorcery (*ādâ*): sand-divination (*dâr-i-ramî*), shell-divination (*dâr-i-arâdâ*), bibliomancy (*fâth-i-lâtâb*) etc. Their tribal subdivisions are variously given by Galtier (p. 7) and Newbold (p. 291). Their name suggests some connection with Aleppo (Halâb), but they themselves proudly claim a South Arabian ancestry their tribal chronicle being the popular broad-sheet production, *Târîkh Zir Sâlim*.

The Ghâgar Gipsy tribe, however, have a rather unsavoury reputation, a fact that is reflected in the modern Egyptian Arabic verb *gâjâs* "to be abusive". Their speech has fewer foreign ingredients and Galtier is of the opinion that they are more recent arrivals in the Nile Valley, probably wanderers from Constantinople. The argot of the Egyptian Gipsy has been called *AtlSim*, and in modern colloquial Arabic in Egypt "to speak in enigmas" is *yâtalælim bi 'l-Sim*.

The word Nûri in Egypt is almost synonymous with thief, and their thieving propensities are liberally associated in a popular proverb with the inhabitants of Damanhûr [q. v.] (alif Nûri wa-lá Damânhûr). According to the age-old policy of setting a thief to catch a thief, the Nawar are often recruited as estate watchmen (*gâlûf*).

Their pursuits and proclivities are varied in the extreme. Besides the myriad occupations of enchanter, amulet-sellers, quack-doctors, snake-eaters and astrologers many of them travel about as hawkers, metal-workers, animal-trainers, professional tumblers, rope-dancers, acrobats, monkey-leaders, musicians and ballad-singers, while some are employed to circumference Muslim girls, to tattoo lips and chins, and to bore ears and nostrils.


**NUŠAIRI, the name of an extreme Shi'a sect in Syria.**

I. The etymology of the name is disputed:

a. contemptuous diminutive from *nawrûzi* "Christian", in allusion to certain ritual similarities (Renan);

b. corruption of *nawrûzi*, Latin name in Fliny for a Syrian tetrarchy of the first century B.C. (but the name is still found uncorrupted in *štût*; it is the *Djarat al-Nawrûz*, which is crossed in going from Tell Kallâkh to Homs, between the bridge called "Achan Kepru" and the lake of Homs; cf. British G. S. map of 1/50,000, *Homs-Beirut sheet*, 1918); c. *nîšâb* from a village near Kûfa, Nâsûrîyâ (Barhebraeus; cf. de Sacy, *Drooses*, i., p. clxxxvii. and Tabârî, iii. 2128); *nîšâb* from an eponym: a fictitious *Shî* martyr, son of *Ali* (according to the *Allâh-llâhî*), or a freedman of *Allî's* or vizier of Mu'allîya (Dussaud, p. 10); or rather Ibn Nuṣair, i.e. Muḥâammad b. Nuṣair Namî (*Abûl* (= of the *Abûl al-Kais*, a Bakr clan), whom we shall find below as the first theologian of the sect.

As a matter of fact this name adopted from the time of Kâshûlí (d. 346 A.H.) by these sectarian, previously called *Namîrâh* (Nawbakhtî, *Firâq*, p. 78; *Asbâr*, Mak., i. 15) and who called themselves *muḥâmâni*; has been applied since *Samâni* (s.v.) and *Umâra* (ed. Denebâl), p. 155, 286 not to a district only partly converted in the north of Syria, but to an extreme Shîa sect also found in Egypt and along the Euphrates. This etymology, that of all the Muslim heresiographers, from the
Shi' i Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī (d. 411 A.H.) and the Sunni Ibn Ḥaḍār, has been and is most probably.

II. The term has three acceptations: administrative, social and religious.

a. Administration: it is the “mountain of the Ansariyya” of Syria (formerly Djabal Lūkkānā), the former Ḥuṣn of Latakia to the east of the Orontes which has been extended to the south and since 1920 has become the state of the Alawis (6,500 sq. km.: 334,173 inhabitants end of 1933 of whom 213,066 are Nu'airis, 61,877 Sunniis in the north of Sahyūn and at Baniya, 5,669 Ismā'īlīs at Kadmūs and Mayṣāf, 53,604 Christians, mainly Orthodox at Tell-Ḥīṣa (22,000) and in the north of Ṣīrītis, capital Latakia (22,000) divided into two sanjaks and 8 kazas: Latakia, Sahyūn (Hafṣa), Djabal, Ṣartūn, Markab (Bandas), ʿImrāniyya (Tell Kallakh), ʿSūfīt, al-Ḥiṣn (Maṣṣaf); a country of patient and industrious agriculturalists (tobacco, silkworms). Its place-names studied by M. Hartmann (Z.D.P.V., xiv. [1851], 151-255) for the north (villages, not counties of which there is a list in [Delattre] Répertoire des alphabètes. Latakia [Raghaṭāb press], Dec. 1933), show an old stratum of names in part Aramaic and later Arabic occupation without any definite local religious traits except for modern Shi'a influences, beneath which one can hardly see the pagan or Christian culture of the substratum (cf. on the contrary, Lebanon). The study of the district from the point of view of ethnology and folklore has hardly begun; certain prohibitions regarding food have been noted (Niehuhn, loc. cit.; DuPont, in T. L. V. 1884, p. 134), Bakūra, p. 57), some general (camels, hares, eels and catsfish) and others special to the Ṣūjanīyya (female or maimed animals, gazelles, pig, crab, shellfish, pumpkins, ʿaṣūma, tomatoes). The only domestic art is bar-keft-making.

b. Socially, the name covers tribes of different origins, almost all speaking Arabic, who have adopted the Nu'airi teaching:

1. in the state of the Alawis (213,000): the nucleus seems to be descended from Yemeni clans of Hamdān and Kinda (Ya'qūbīn, in B. G. A., vol. 324), ʿGhassān, Bahrā and ʿAnṣārī (Hamdānī, Ṣīfa, p. 132) early converted to the Shi'a, from the Tiberiad and the Djabal ʿAmil (where there are still Metwells) to Aleppo, increased by immigrants from Šāfi (end of the 14th century) and from ʿGhassān who at the time the Crusaders were being driven back came with their emir ʿAbd al-Hannā Makzūlī (d. 638 H. = 1240, ancestor of the ʿHadadānīn), from Mount Sindjār, and imposed on the district their ruling families, their clans and ethnic structure (M. E. Ghālib, Tāvīl, p. 356).

2. the present day list of the principal clans (wajūda) (map in K. M. M., xlv. 6: cf. ibid., xxxvi. 278; and Tāvīl, p. 349-52) grouped in 4 confederations: Kālbiyya (at Kārāh; with Nawāṣa, Karāhīla, ʿUjulāsiyya, Rashāwīna, Shāhlīna, Rasālīna, DJurdiyya, Bait al-Ḥiṣf, Bait Muḥammad and Darawīs); Khāliyātīn (at Markab: with Šarāmita, Makbalīha, Fakāwīyā, ʿAmāmīra [mixed with ʿAbd al-Kays]; Ḥadādānīn (clan of the emir ʿAbd al-Hannā Makzūlī with Mahālīha, ʿBārī ʿAmāmīra, ʿAṭāliyya, ʿAṭāliyya, Miṣināliyya, Sawāriq of Aleppo, Sawāriq, Mahārīna, which claims to the ʿAṣūma, and Bāṣā- riyya). From the 14th century their political history has been a series of persecutions by invaders (the Crusades; Baḥair who covered the country with mosques; legend of Durrāt al-Ṣadā, daughter of Saʿīd al-Ansārī [tomb at Aleppo] who instigated Timūr to sack Damascus; massacres under Selim I) and civil wars, both among the clans themselves and against the Ismāʿīlīs of Kadmus (lost, and retaken for a brief period in 1508 by the Mahārīna) and of Mayṣāf, allied with the Turks;

3. in the sanjaks of Alexandria (38,000: at Antioch 1/3), ʿUjulāsiyya, ʿAṭāliyya, Dijlīyya; with two deputies in Parliament;

4. in Palestine (3,000): to the north of Nablus;

5. in Cilicia from the 14th century (at Tarsus and Adana: 80,000 in 1921 now turkified);

6. along the Euphrates. In Kurdistān and in Persia, there are ultra-Shi'a elements who have similar views and are called Nu'airis (among the 'Al-Ihāli or Ahl-i Ḥakk; q.v.);

7. in Lebanon, there were some down to the 16th century (in Khawānīn).

III. Religion: it is the religious teaching of the Nu'airī sect that we have to study more particularly here.

Cosmogony and eschatology. According to the Nu'airīs there is immediately below the ineffable divinity a spiritual world of heavenly beings (or stars), which emanates from him in the following hierarchy: Ibm, Bāb and other Aḥk al-Marāṭib (of the first seven classes); it is the “great luminous world” (al-ʿālām kalâr nafrūnt); when they appear here below it is to lead back gradually to heaven the “little luminous world”, fallen beings, half materialized, imprisoned in the bodies which are their tombs; this operation revives them and brings them back to heaven to form the seven last classes of the Aḥk al-Marāṭib (119,000 out of a total of 124,000 = the traditional number of the prophets); next comes the “little world of darkness” (zāmbānt), extinguished lights, souls that damnation materializes (khuṣūn al-masālikhiyya) in the bodies of women and animals; and lastly the “great world of darkness” composed of all the “adversaries” (al-ṣābīlāt) of the great luminous world; demons, who after innumerable metamorphoses in corpses of murdered men or slaughtered animals still quivering after death, are reduced to inert or passive matter (forged metals etc.). Just as the fall takes place through seven stages (doubts about divine appearances), so does the return to the heaven of the elect to go through seven cycles or ʿadār of divine emanations.

Theory of revelation. The pure divinity (ʿabīt), the object of adoration, being ineffable his first emanation is the Name (Ibm), the articulating prophetic voice (Nūṭīh), the signification (Maḥānī) of divine authority; such was the primitive teaching, that of Abu ʿI-Khaṭṭāb, the common teacher of the Ismāʿīlīs and the Nu'airīs. But his disciple Maimūn Kadam, thinking that the enunciation by the divinity of an object which manifests him, is of greater importance than its signification which is a mute idea, detached the Maḥānī from pure divinity, identified it with the Šāmit (the "silent" Name; opposed to Nūṭīh) and placed it as a more recent, below the substance, the Ibm. Then, by reaction, other Khawānīn like Bābār, ʿAbbārī, retaining the equation Maḥānī = Šāmit, re-established the Maḥānī before the Ibm. And, as Abu ʿI-Khaṭṭāb had taught that in the Muḥammadīyya cycle, the
signification (muwarziiya) of the ineffable divinity was expressed through five privileged Asma' (Muhammad, 'Ali, Fāṭimah [the masculine form of Fāṭima, as we have seen women have no souls; this explains why they may form part of the offering of hospitality among initiates]. Ḥasan and Ḥusain, announcing equivalently its mysterious Unity), this group of Five equals, in which we recognise the Five of the nubātahu (q.v.; cf. our, Salmān Fāk, No. 7 of the Soc. des Études Iranisten, 1933, p. 40—42) became in the hands of his pupil Maimān a descending series of five terrestrial (symmetrical) with the five spiritual terms, and inferior to them, the Druzes say): Nāfi' (Mim), Asāf (Shaykh, Ma'āqib; whence the Mas'ūd, the Khaḍrābi Wadjāfān remarks, has the priority [cf. Nūr Muhammad]. While according to Bashshār, the five were equal and became Muhammad, Fātimah, Ḥasan, Ḥusain, Muḥaṣṣān; 'Alī being thought to surpass them was identified by hereditalia and against all logic with the Mā'ānī. It is this last list that the Nusairis have adopted. And this is the realised ambition of their 'god' (Allāh) whom there is no need to seek antecedents in the Syrian pagan pantheon or in a Druze empanation. Bashshār and the 'Utayyā (or 'Aintyā) copied by the Nusairis have simply copied the Karāfīan list of Maimān, by inverting the order of priority between Mīm and 'Ain, and making the Mas'ūd (Mā'ānī) the superiors of the Nāfi' (Mim). The following is the double list (Mīm in italics): a. in the seven cycles (tawādin, khitāb personified by women among the poets) of the iṣbābāt iṣābāt: 1. Ḥabīl, Abū; 2. Ḥabīl, Nūr; 3. Ḥabīl, Ṣāliḥ b. Fakhr; 4. Ṣāliḥ b. Fakhr; 5. Ṣāliḥ b. Fakhr; 6. Ṣāliḥ b. Fakhr; 7. 'All (Abū Turāb, Abūnāl-Nāfi') Muhammad. Khaḍrābi allows that there were 44 (63—19) other iṣbābāt (iṭīlāyā) during these seven cycles; b. in the sa'īr al-dawma' (the twelve classical imāms substituted for the early list of Ibn Nusair [which we shall see later] by Khāṣibī) each imām is promoted mas'ūd after having been the iṣām of his predecessor. The mode of appearance of the two divine emanations localised behind the screen (ta'ābūr, iṣbābāt) of a phantomike body (ṣamāt al-zarā'ir, mas'ūd al-ab'iḥāroid, is a reality for the faith of the Nusairīs; this body is the support of a momentary illumination for the believer; while for the Druze nominalism it is only a mirage (ta'rēf and for the Ḥaḍāthīya, a real body, transfigured by a gradual sanctification. Theor-y of catechesis. Abu l-Khaṭṭāb had found that the Five persons of the iṣām were pointed out to the believers by one or more inspired angelic intermediaries (al-fā'il, ruḥanīyin; of whom the first was Saulīb or al-Sulṭān = Salmān in the Ma'ānīs. (See our story, p. 16). These initiators, became with his disciple Maimān, the five spatially symmetrical of the Asma' (Ṣamīr = Salmān; masīr = Miṣḥād; ḥaṣīl = Abū Ḥanīf; asfāl = [Uthmān b. Ma'āqib, Ḥayāl = [Abū Ma'āqib] b. Yāsir: corr. thus No. 60 of the Druze catechism). While among the Nusairīs, these five initiators remained equal and far below the iṣām, became the five Allāms (Miṣḥād, Abū Ḥanīf, Abū 'Ali b. Nāṣir, Uthmān b. Ma'āqib and Ḥanīf), Salmān being thought to be above them placed third as Biṭṭ after the Miṣḥād and the Iṣām. Such was the origin of the Nusairī triad, Abūl-Mu'min Sāliḥ (= Mu'āqib-Ism-Bālā) in which there is no need to see an original pagan Syrian triad of Sun, Moon and Sky: this astrological correspondence, a favourite subject with Nusairi poets, found its way into the Shi'a catechism of Kūfa under the influence of the Sabean of Harrān; the assimilation, in the spiritual, of the sun to Muhammad and of the moon to 'Alī (the moon, like the imām, is the regulator of canonical acts; cf. our, Salmān, p. 36, No. 9) appears at Kūfa with Mujāhid (d. 119 A.H.) In any case if pegan survivals are at the basis of astral gnosticism, as Dussaud suggests, is not among the uneducated peasants (Djībal Lükākām) but among the town-dwellers in Harrān that they have been able to survive. The following is a list of the personifications of the Bāb: a. in the seven cycles (they are really only six, Salmān, the long-lived = Rūzbih); the masā'ūdāt: 1. Dībrāylī; 2. Yāsīl; 3. Ḥām b. Kāsh; 4. Dān b. Asbih; 5. 'Abd Allah b. Sim'ān; 6. Rūzbih. b. In the sa'īr al-dawma' (here are only eleven): the masā'ūd: 1. Salmān; 2. Kās b. Waraka Rāfī (Samīr); 3. Ḥusayn Ḥadjārī (d. ca. 58 A.H.); 4. Kānak b. Abī Khaḍlī Kātī; 5. Yāḥyā b. Muḥammad b. Umm al-Fawāl (d. ca. 85 A.H.); 6. Dābīr b. Umm al-Fawāl (d. 128); 7. Abū l-Mu'min' Muḥammad ab. Abī Zalān Miṣḥād Abī Khaḍlī (d. 138: cf. Kāsjī, p. 191); 8. Muṣafādāl b. 'Umar Dju'dī (d. ca. 170); 9. Muḥammad b. Muṣafādāl Dju'dī; 10. 'Umar b. al-Farāt (Dju'dī; killed in 203 A.D. by Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi). 11. Muḥammad b. Nusair 'Abdī (Bāb ca. 245, d. 270). Beginning with No. 7, these individuals have actually played the part of party leaders (Nes. 9—10 had as rival Muḥammad b. Sinān). A nephew of No. 10, grandfather of the father of Ibn al-Farāt, was the principal supporter of Ibn Nusair. Below the Bāb are the Five Allāms, whom he associates as lords of the elements (muwaqākāt bi-nuqdat al-aqām) with his role of Demiurge engendering souls by initiation. The list of Nusairī aśīm given above should be compared (as well as that of the Druze ḥadhād "wise virgins" of Salmān; like the Nusairī aśīm are the daqīqāt of the Bāb (Arabic = Salmān) with the lists of Garmy (Aṣṭāḥābād, Mubnayh, p. 225) and of the Khaḍrāfīya of the Palmyra (R. E. I., 1932, p. 442, trans. Ivanov). IV. Initiation. This has three degrees (mujāh, mabāth, imām): the first consists of a solemn pledge (I'ādāt, Ḥṣīfūf with wālī muwarzii; cf. SURAJIVYA) to reveal nothing of this spiritual marriage (mujāh al-tabātā) in which the word of the initiator fertilizes the soul of the initiate in three scenes, the ritual of which is related to that of the other extreme Sha'ī sects (and of the faizāxvī-tānā) and through them and the Sabean of Harrān to the old mysteries of Central Asia (cf. SHABBAD, Dussaud, p. 166—169, 193, p. 2—7, 18). The cup of wine (called ṣāda al-nūr, Cat. No. 91), the anticipation of Paradise, is partaken of at it. The initiatory teaching is essentially an ultra-Shia symbolism (ta'ābil) of the seven canonical rites (da'ām) of Islam which are personified: 1. wālī; the five awlād by Muḥammad (Kalīr; same among the Ḥiṣāiyā). Fātimah, Ḥasan, Ḥusain and Muṣafā (fohry; among the Druzes as among the Khaḍrāfīya of the Palmyra by the mujābīh, the mujāhādīh, Abū Ḥanīf, Miṣḥād, Salmān). Similarly the 17 (then 51) rā'īn: 2. yawan: the secret guarded regarding 30 names of men (days) and thirty of women (nights of Ramadan); 3. zā'ar: by Salmān; 4. Ḥṣīfūf: the "sacred land 12 miles around", this is the sect; Bālī = the ism; the Black
Stone = Mīḥfūd; the 7. ʿadwāʾ = the 7 cycles;
5. ʿāthār = the maladies upon the ʿadād (Bāk., p. 44) and the discipline of the mystery;
6. ʿawāya = devotion to the ʿAlīus and hatred of their adversaries; 7. the ʿaḥāda refers to the former Sannū. The Kurān is an initiation to devotion to ʿAlī; it was Salūm (under the name of ʿAbbāsī) who taught it to Muḥammad.

The annual festivals include the Shiʿa lunar festivals: Fīr, ʿAḥd, Ghadīr, Mubāhala, Fīrāsh, ʿAshūrā, 9th Rabiʿ I (martyrdom of ʿOmar) and 15th Shābān (death of Salūm); then certain solar festivals: Nawrūz and Mīhhrān, Christmas and Epiphany, 17th ʿAdhār, St. Barbara. Certain liturgies (kusūd) pertain to these festivals and are wrongly called "masses" (kusūd al-Ṭīb, al-Bakkīr, al-ʿIshār).

V. History of the Sect. All the initiatory, isnād of the sect go back from Khāṣibī to Ibn Nuṣairī through two intermediaries, Muḥammad b. Dūndab and Muḥammad al-Djanān al-Dujunbuli. Of Ibn Nuṣairī, a notable of Bāṣrā, teacher of ʿAṣīṣī, we know that in 245 ʿA. ʿU., he proclaimed himself Kāmil (c. 1100) and of his eldest son Muḥammad who died before him in 249, the year of the ghâthā of the Mahdī, according to Ibn Nuṣairī (Ibn Bāwaʿī, Ghaibī, p. 62, l. 12, taken from Nawbakhkt, Fīrāsh, p. 77, 83; such was still the belief of the Hamdānī emir ʿAbbāsī, Dīwān, 1837, p. 39). It is only Khāṣibī who says that Ibn Nuṣairī joining the eleventh isnād (Nīrī, Nuṣairī, p. 144) had taken for mahdūt his son Muḥammad b. Ḥasan.

Of the two successors of Ibn Nuṣairī we only know that the second, like Khāṣibī, belonged to Dujunbul between Kufa and Wāṣit, the centre of the Ẓaydī and Karmāṭīn rebels (Ṭabarānī, iii. 1517, 1925, 2198; Maṣūdī, Tanbīk, p. 391), native place of Ibn Wadūḥa, Ḥusayn b. Ḥamād b. Ḥusayn b. Ḥabīb (vocalisation attempted by Dūbābī, Mūṣṭafā; in Persia and the Irāk wronglly now pointed Ḥaḍīnī) died in 346 (957) or 358 (968) at Aleppo (tomb to the north called Shāliqīn Bārīqī); he was the real founder of the Nuṣairīs; he lived, like his patrons the Hamdānīs, between Kufa (in 344 according to Ṭustāḥ, loc. cit., p. 112) and Aleppo; he dedicated to them his Ḥiṭyā (cf. his Ṭīkāna Rākṣābīgī (Ṭawīl, p. 196 q. 240, 257). Among his 51 disciples the best known is Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Dījīlī of Dījīlī near Antioch where the chief of the Ḥaḍīdīs still lives. His direct disciple was Saʿd Maimūn Ṭabarānī (d. 427 = 1035), a prolific polemist against the chief of the Shīkhiyya of Latakia, Abū Dāhiba Ismāʿīl b. ʿAlī Kullād. After him mention is made of ʿIsām al-Dawālī, Ḥātim Ṭawbānī (c. 700 = 1300; Paris, Méj, 1450, fol. 1122; Fīrāsh, p. 315), author of the al-Din al-Kabīr, Ḥasan Adīdū of ʿAran, died at Latakia in 836 (1432) (Ṭawīl, p. 317): lastly several heads of parties, Hamdānīs, Muḥammadīs of Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn b. Yūsūf Kullātī (1011 = 1602), who lived near Antioch, ʿAbd al-Māhkī, Ṣājīr Nāṣīrī, Yūfūn Ṣuḥaylī. In this connection we may note that the four alleged Nuṣairī sects reduce themselves to two; that of the north (Shamīiya because it is Miṣḥīya, Shamīlya = Ḥaḍīrīs, from its head in the 10th [xvth] century = Ghaibīya) and that of the south (Kīṭlīya, for it is dominant there), which is Miṣḥīya, then Kamariyya.

The spiritual organisation is quite distinct from the political among the Nuṣairīs. The four mukālām (mentioned by Niebuhr in 1780 (at Balhīliyye near Latakia, Simerian-Khāṣībī, ʿAṣīṣī and Djiyal Kablye) were temporal rulers. In 1914, there were two spiritual leaders, the ʿAbd al-Majīdi (ʿAṣīṣī) in Cileika and the Kāmil al-baṣīr (Homari) at Karđāh (in 1933; Sliman al-Ahmād of the Numašīya).

From 1920 the Dījīlī Shīʿī ṭalāqī of the south have found their way among the Nuṣairīs. In the last ten years a shepherd of the ʿAmmārīs, Sliman Murṣūdī, has been trying to found a new sect to the north of Masāf.

VI. Bibliography: 1. Nuṣairī and Muḥammad an sources: There is no canon of the Nuṣairī initiatory writings, as for the Druze (cf. de Sacy and Seybodl); but Catafago has given a list (J.A.P., 1876) of 40 esoteric works, of which 29 are theological and 11 poetical (specimens translated by Huard, in J.A.P., 1879); we may mention N. 20, Kitāb al-Majdīnya (= 16 liturgical sūras; text in Bāk., p. 7—34 and Dussaud, p. 181—189 with transl.) and N. 19, Kitāb Majdīnya al-Tāfīd of A. S. M. Šaṭbarān: anal. in J.A.P., 1848. This list might be supplemented (see the appendix of the M., 1440—1450 etc.) for there is a bio-bibliographical collection of the writers of the sect, similar to that of the Ismāʿīlī writers published by Ivanov. Nuṣairī writers make free use of moderate Shiʿa works (Mufīḍ is quoted by Šaṭbarān and have even written some; e.g. the Ḥiṭyā of Khāṣibī which is still read in Persia. Two Nuṣairī catechisms have been studied: Tālim Diwān at-Nuṣairiya, in 101 questions (Paris MS. 6182; anal. by Wolf, Z.D.M.G., iii. 302—309 where No. 88 is lacking), modern, directed against the Christians; and the old formulary by A. Baitār (anal. by Niebuhr, Šaṣīn, ii. 440—444). An unimportant disclosure that (but without more or less biased errors) of the Nuṣairī rites was published in 1893 at Bāṭīrī by a convert to Christianity, Sulaimān al-Ādān (he was assassinated): the Bāṭīrī Sulaimānīya (119 pp.; part transl. Salisbury, in J.A.O.S., 1868, p. 227—308; cf. Šaṭīlī, p. 386; the first part is taken from an authentic manual used where there is not a lodge of initiation; cf. MS. Taimūn, ʿArb., N. 564). A popular history, in places containing a good deal of romance but documented (without exact references), was published by Muḥammad Emin Qālibī (d. 1932), of the Al-Ṭawīl of Adana: Taʾrīkh al-ʿAmīra, pr. Taqāṣkī. Latakia 1343 (1924), 478 pp. Two refutations are well known; a Druze one by Ḥamīza (Rākṣā, N. xvi. of the canon; perhaps refuting No. 9 of Catafago's list), and a Sunni by Ibn Ṭaimūrīyya (Jawārī, p. 94—102 of the Majmūʿ, Cairo 1232; transl. Guyard, in J.A.P., ser. 6, vol. xviii, 1871, p. 158).

NUŠAŘI — AL-NUSHADIR


3. In Arabic the only recent studies are: Kurdali, Khi&t al-Sāmān, vol. vi. (1928), p. 258—268; and Kāmil Ghazzi, Naḥr al-Dhahab (Aleppo 1342 A.D., vol. i., p. 204—205); cf. also the Bairūṭ press (Aḥrār, Sept. 19, 1930) and that of Damascus (Ayyūn, March 29, 1933). (Louis Massogno)

NUṣB, standing stone, especially one which is held sacred. The root is the same as in the Hebrew māṣqēb, Phoenician ḥēb and nēḥēb and South Arabian ḥēb, nēḥēb. On the explanation of the Arabic forms the philologists are not agreed. They have usually read māṣqēb as a singular with the plural māṣqēb, and others pronounced it māṣāb and consider it the plural of nēḥēb or nēḥb. In addition to these forms Arabic has also from the same root the substantives mansāb and nāṣbīn.

In answer to the much-discussed question of the ideas associated with standing stones, Arabic only makes one contribution, in as much as it is evident that the fundamental conception was that of a dwelling place of the deity (bêt-ti). Of several of the old Arab deities we are told that they were rocks or blocks of stone, i.e. that they were incarnate or present in them. Whether this was always so or whether this form of worship developed out of stones placed upon graves (e.g. Hāmidā, p. 562), 1. 8 and the use of nāṣbīn in the sense of tombstones) where the stones were originally memorials, is a question which cannot be dealt with here. We need only mention that the theory of worship of the dead breaks down if the deity has its abode in a tree, like al-Uzzā of Nakhlā in a samara tree (umbrella acacia). Examples of the presence of a deity in a stone are given in the articles DUH L-SHAKT, AL-LĀT and MANĀT. Other examples are Dhu l-Khalasa, al-Fals, al-Djalsad, Sa’d. The worship associated with such stones usually consisted in sprinkling them with the blood of sacrifices. Thus Zuhair, 10, 24 speaks of a sacrificial stone, mansāb al-lātir, the top of which was red with blood; a wounded and bleeding man is compared to a red nāṣb ( Ibn Sa’d, iv, 162, 4); among forbidden foods, Sūra v. 4 includes what is slaughtered sūla mansūb; al-Nāṣb (Morgenländische Forschungen, p. 258) warns against worshipping a dhā l-mnāṣb l-mansūb (i.e. read māṣāb) with sacrifices; cf. also Mutafammis, ed. Volland, 2, 1. The words of Sūra lxx. 43, which say that the resurrected stream out of their graves as—if they were running (ynūthāna) to a nēḥ (other readings nēḥb or nēḥūb) refer to a characteristic feature of the worship. In view of the prominent part played by stones in the worship of the early Arabs, it is natural that Muhammad should have included anjūb among things prohibited to the believers like wine, māṣir etc. (Sūra, v. 92) for the worship associated with them was one of the principal forms of idolatry. The smearing of the anjūb with blood recalls the well known statement in Herodotos iii. 8 regarding the ancient Arabian ceremony of concluding alliances. There is however an essential difference. In the first place there is no question of any act of worship and further we are told that the participants put their blood on seven stones lying between them, and called upon the gods to swear in the sacredness of these stones but not here conceivably to be habitations of the gods but owed their merit to the number seven which was the important thing on taking oaths.

Bibliography: Ibn Hīṣām, p. 51; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, p. 101, 141; Baudissin, in Z.D.A.G., lvi. 830; Goldziher, Muhamedanische Studien, i. 230 sqq. (FR. Buhl)

AL-NUSHADIR, also nūṣādīr, nāṣūdādīs, Sanskrit nāśavādāra, Chin. nā-sū-hā, sal-ammoniac. The etymology of the word is uncertain; perhaps it comes from the Pahlavi anūsādār "immortal fire" as we find the form anūṣādār in Syriac.

The oldest references to the occurrence of sal-ammoniac in a natural state are in the reports of Chinese embassies to the Chinese courts in the Middle Ages, which were the subject of very full investigation in connection with a geological problem, the question of volcanoes in Central Asia by H. J. von Klapproth, A. von Humboldt and C. Ritter, in the first third of the sixteenth century. The reference was to mountains of fire, Pe-Shan on the northern slopes of the Tien-Shan south of Kuldja, Ho-Chou on the south side of the Tien-Shan near Turfan and the sulphur pits of Urumtsi. The mountain Pe-Shan was said to pour forth fire and smoke continually; on one side of it all the stones burn, and are melted and then after flowing some miles solidify again. Nāsūḍ and sulphur were obtained there for medicinal purposes but the stones could only be collected in winter when the cold had cooled the ground. A. von Humboldt and C. Ritter do not accept a reference to the burning of coal by which sal-ammoniac and sulphur are obtained. The statement that the volcanoes of Central Asia produce sal-ammoniac in immense quantities is found in G. Bischof and even G. von Richthofen still held the volcano theory. The botanist and geographer Regel who travelled in these regions about 1879 was the first to dispute the existence of volcanoes. After Nansen, Le Coq and others had been unable to confirm the existence of volcanoes but established the fact that there were large deposits of coal on the surface, the old sources in Central Asia are now generally attributed to the burning of coal.

Almost all the Arab geographers who refer to Central Asia, from al-Maṣʿūdi, al-Iṣḥāqī, Ibn Hawkal, to Yāḵut and al-Kazwīnī, give fantastic stories about the method by which sal-ammoniac is procured in the Butam hills east of Samarqand. Here again the details suggest the burning of the earth rather than volcanic exhalations. The Persian traveller Nāṣīr-i Khusraw however mentions deposits of sal-ammoniac and sulphur at Damāwend and Ibn Hawkal is acquainted with the volcanic sal-ammoniac of Etna; the latter was still exported to Spain in the xiith century. At an earlier date they had begun to procure sal-ammoniac from the spot of camel dung. This product remained into modern times an important import by the Venetian traders and was only driven from the market by the modern cheap methods of production from gas liquor etc.

The use of sal-ammoniac as a remedy in cases of...
inflammation of the throat etc. is already mentioned by Sahib, Rabban, al-Tabari. Ibn al-Batār also quotes from other authors all kinds of remarkable uses of it, on which no stress need be laid. Lījābīr b. Ḥaṣyān reckons sal-ammoniac among the poisons, which is true of large doses.

The part played by sal-ammoniac in alchemy is much more important. Lījābīr b. Ḥaṣyān adds it as a fourth to the three ṭumāNTSTATUS of the Greeks, quicksilver, sulphur and sulphide of arsenic (As₂S₃), and it is used by all Persian-Arab alchemists in countless recipes. The preparation of carbonate of ammonia through distillation of hair, blood and other materials is already fully described in the “Seventy Books” and other works of Lījābīr. These methods seem to have given the stimulus to the discovery of the Egyptian method of obtaining sal-ammoniac. All these things came with alchemy to Spain and thence into western alchemy.

In the earliest Latin translations sal-ammoniac is still called nesiaed, nitazharg etc., i.e. transliterations of the Arabic name. The general term al-Yūbah is also found in the forms al-sabac, al-soath or translated by aquila. The identification of this salt with the salt of the oasis of Ammon already mentioned by Herodotos is first found in Syriac authors and lexicographers.


**NūSHIRWĀN.** [See Anšašhawān.]

**NUŠRĀTĀB.** [See Sīstān.]

**AL-NUWAIRI.** Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad b. Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bakri al-Kindī al-Shāfi’ī, a rabbi historian, born on the 21st Dhu’l-‘Ka‘da 677 (April 5, 1279) in Upper Egypt (probably in al-Kūs), died on the 21st Rāmādān 732 (June 17, 1332) in Cairo, one of the three best known encyclopedias of the Mamluk period (the others are by al-‘Umari and al-Kalqashandi). His father before him had been an official (al-Kūfī) of note (628—699=1231—1300); the son filled several offices at the court of Sulṭān al-Malik al-‘Nāṣir (Muḥammad b. Khalīf), whose favourite he was. He was for a time Nāṣir al-Ju’aṣib in Tripolis (Syria) and later Nāṣir al-Dinwān in the Egyptian provinces of al-Jāhāliya and al-Murtuḥiya. His monumental work al-Nāṣir al-‘Arab fi Funtan al-Adāb which was dedicated to al-Malik al-Nāṣir was his result of a administrative activities. As he says in the preface, at the beginning of his literary career he was almost exclusively concerned with kitābāt (i. 2) and only later took up adab (i. 3); he wished to sum up in his encyclopedia all the knowledge that was indispensable for a first class kitāb. The book is divided into five sections called jāmāḥ, each jāmāḥ has five parts, each ābū has a different number of chapters (ābūkā) varying from two to fourteen. The first ābū is devoted to heaven and earth, the second to man, the third to the flora and the fifth to history (full list of contents: vol. i., p. 4—25; also in de Goeje, *Catalogus*, i. 5—14; cf. also Hādżjī Khalīfa, ed. Flügel, iv. 397—598, No. 14069). The division is unequal; the last ābū of the fifth ābū, which is devoted to Muslim history fills almost half the work, which runs to nearly 9,000 printed pages. In addition to the division according to subjects, the book is divided into volumes: the last, the 31st discovered by Ahmad Zaki Pāshā, contains the history of Egypt down to the death of the author in 731. From the dates of the separate parts and volumes it is evident that he devoted no less than twenty years to his book (cf. e. g. de Goeje, *Catalogus*, i. 16 where the year 714 is given; vol. i., p. 416: year 721; vol. v., p. 335: year 722 or Weil, *op. cit.*, xv.: year 725 etc.). In the earlier parts later additions are often found (e. g. vol. i., p. 13, q=15, 4—5; 20, 6—9). For contemporary history Nuwairi’s book is of the first importance; in other parts its value depends on that of his sources. Its extent and manysidedness will only be appreciated when the edition is complete and a study like that of Borkman on al-Kalkashandi Sabh al-‘Arab has been undertaken. Al-Nuwairi himself makes no claim to originality; like the majority of Arabic encyclopaedists, he expressly says that he follows his predecessors and places the whole responsibility on them (i. 26). Owing to the existence of many manuscripts of separate parts, European scholarship early became acquainted with al-Nuwairi; he is already mentioned by d’Herbelot (1625—1695) in his *Bibliotheque Orientale* (Maestricht 1776, p. 670). In the collections made by Golius and Warner some fine copies came to Leyden (including holographs) (W. M. C. Jubboll, *Antwende vondere Briefenburon von al-Nuwairi in Nederland, Utrecht 1931*, p. 178; *Catalogus*, i. 5—18, No. 5) and attracted great attention in the xviiith century. One of the first to study him was J. Heyman (d. 1737) whose *Nouairiana* — not too fortunate excerpts and notes — is in manuscript in Leyden (*Catalogus*, i. 18, No. 6; on Heyman see Reiske, *Prediagnata*, in J. B. Kohler’s *Abhandlungen Tabula Syriaca*, Leipzig 1766, p. 233 and Jan Nat, *De studie van de oosterse Talen in Nederland in de 18de en de 19de eeuw*, Purnerend 1929, p. 25—26). In general in the xviiiith and early xixith centuries too much stress was laid on the account of pre-Muhammadan history in al-Nuwairi (Schultens, *Monumenta*, 1740, *Historia, 1786*; Reiske, *Prediagnata*, 1766, p. 232—234, *Primaet lineae*, ed. Wustenfeld, 1847; Rasmussen, *Historia praeppositum arabum regnum*, Copenhagen 1817, p. 81—124 etc.). Later investigation showed that with the existence of other sources, Nuwairi’s work loses its secondary importance (see Mittwoch, *Practica arabica regnum*, Berlin 1899, p. 26—30; G. Ollendorf, *The Kings of Kinda, Lund 1927*, p. 19 etc.). Of considerable importance are the parts which deal with later, especially contemporary, history and historical geography; in the course of the xixith century they were frequently appealed to and excerpts edited or translated by Silvestre de Sacy, de Slane, Désfrémy, v. Hammer, Quatremère, Well, Tiesenhausen, Amari, etc. One of the latest studies of a section of his work is the two volume *Historia de los musulmanes de España y Africa. Texto árabe y traducción española* of M. Gaspar Remiro (Granada 1917—1919; cf. Angel González Palencia, *Historia de la literatura arábigo-española*, Barcelona 1928, p. 162—163). Ahmad Zaki Pāshā
Al-NUWAIRI — AL-OBOLLA

deserves honourable mention for the interest he (died July 5, 1934) has aroused in the study of Nuwa'iri modern times. With great industry and perseverance he has collected photographs of all 31 parts of the Nilâyat al-Arab frequented from autographs, and these are now deposited in the Royal Library in Cairo. As a result of his efforts, a complete edition was undertaken in 1923 and ten volumes are now available in the handsome and imposing edition of the Dâr al-Kutub al-Misriyya, which affords a sound basis for the general estimation of the value of the book.

Al-Nuwa'iri was not only an official but also a fine calligrapher: he was able to copy as many as 80 pages a day. He himself made at least four or five copies of his own encyclopedia and sold them at 2,000 dirhems each. He made eight copies of the Sahih of Bukhari at 1,000 dirhems each. He was also famous as a bookbinder.


(IGN. KRATSKHOWSKY)

NUZHA. [See NFZAF.]

**AL-OBOLLA** was in the middle ages a large town in the canal region of the Tigris Delta, east of al-Basra. It was situated on the right bank of the Tigris and on the north side of the large canal called Nahr al-Obolla, which was the main waterway from al-Basra in a southeastern direction to the Tigris and further to 'Abbâsid and the sea. The length of this canal is generally given as four farsakh or two barlas (al-Makdisi). Al-Obolla can be identified with 'Apâdâ Dour à Genevet, mentioned in the Periplus Maris Erythraei (Geogr. Gracii Minoris, i. 285) as lying near the coast. In a story told by al-Mas'udi (Marrûji, iii. 364) there is still a reminiscence of the period before the foundation of al-Obolla, when al-Obolla was the only seaport in the Tigris estuary. The earlier Arab authors, in discussing the ancient administrative division of lower Babylonia in Sassanian times and the foundations of towns by the Sassanian kings, identify al-Obolla with other places, such as Dast-Ma'isân (Ibn Khurdadhbih, in B.G.A., vi. 7) or Bahman Ardashir (Tabari, i. 687), although these provinces must be sought on the opposite bank of the Tigris; Eutychius (in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, iii. 911) likewise makes al-Obolla a foundation of Ardashir I (cf. on this question: H. H. Schaedler, in Lil, xiv. 27 sqq.). Ibn Khurdadhbih, p. 7 quotes an Arabic poem of a contemporary of Muhammad, where al-Obolla is mentioned. In the story of the conquists the town is reported to have been captured by 'Otba b. Ghazwân in the year 633 and this conqueror described it to the caliph 'Omar as the "port of al-Bahriân, 'Oman, al-Hind and al-Sîn" (al-Baladhuri, p. 341). This conquest enabled the Arabs to seize the opposite bank of the river (Dast-Ma'isân) and the so-called Euphrates county. After the rise of al-Basra, al-Obolla became of secondary importance, but throughout the 'Abbâsid caliphate it remained a large town. It was further from the sea than it had been, but still the effects of the tide were perceptible even above al-Obolla. All the great geographical authors of the 9th—11th century give a longer or shorter notice of this place. Its environs are described in very laudatory terms (cf. Yâkût, i. 97); the borders of the Nahr al-Obolla were one large garden (Ibn Hawkal, in B. G. A., ii. 160). The part of the Tigris opposite al-Obolla was important for navigation; in earlier 'Abbâsid times there had been here a dangerous whirlpool, which had been eliminated by sinking a large quantity of stone in the water at the expense of an 'Abbâsid princess. Here was erected a beacon light which is described by al-Idrisi (ed. Jaubert, i. 364). Al-Obolla was in this period even larger than al-Basra, according to Makdisi (in B. G. A., iii. 118), and the place was noted for linen goods and also, as appears from al-Yâkûtî (in B. G. A., vii. 360), for its shipbuilding. Naṣîrî Khusraw, who visited the place in 443 (1051), gives likewise a vivid description of its beautiful surroundings (Berlin 1341, p. 133). On the other hand, al-Obolla does not seem to have been an important strategic point; occasionally it was occupied, as in 331 (942) by the governor of 'Oman in his action against the Barîdî brothers in Basra (cf. Miskawaw, ed. Amedroz, ii. 46), but as the events showed it was far from being an important bulwark of that city. After the 12th century the general decline of those regions seems to have brought about the gradual disappearance of the place; Ibn Battûta (ii. 17 sq') calls it only a village and the Nâshat al-Kulûb

1) See also U.
(p. 38) knows only the Nahr al-Obolla, but does not mention the place itself. About this time it must have disappeared; later mention (as late as the Dyákán-Gushá of Hājīdji Khāfis, p. 453) reproduce only obsolete geographical traditions.

**Bibliography:** Ritter, Erdkunde, x. 52, 177; xi. 1025; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 44 seq.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

**OCHIALY, Turkísh corsair and admiral in the xvth century.** He was born in a village of Calabria called Licastelli, about 1500, as, at the time of his death in 1587, he is said to have been over ninety years old. Ochalía is the name by which he is known in Italian sources of the time; the Turkish sources call him Uluğj 'Ali, which name probably was given to him in Northern Africa. It may be the Arabic plural 'ülüğj (from 'ülüğ), denoting his foreign descent (Hammer, G. O. K. ii. 481, 751 gives conflicting statements). After being released as a galley slave, he became a Muhammadan and entered on a long maritime career in the Mediterranean. According to the Sídijlí-i ՚ethmání (iii. 502), he became Tersáne Kapudánı in 961 (1554). He owed his rise to his connection with the famous admiral Torğhud Re’ısı, whose lieutenant he was. With Torghud he was at Djerba during Charles V’s expedition against this island, and in 1565 both took part in the abortive expedition against Malta, where Torghud was killed. Then, until 1568, he was the latter’s successor as viceroy of Tripolis, after which he was appointed in the same capacity to Algiers, as successor of Şâli Pasha. During this time he extended the Algerian territory towards the west and, in 1567, he temporarily took Tunis from the last Hafsid sultan and his Spanish protectors. Cervantes mentions him as king of Algiers in chapter xxxix. of his Don Quixote. In the following year Uluğj ‘Ali took part in maritime expeditions against the Venetians and the Maltese. His chief exploit is connected with the battle of Lepanto [q. v.], in September 1571, where he commanded the left wing of the Ottoman fleet. His success in bringing a part of the fleet safely to Constantine after the defeat procured him the dignity of Kapudánı Paşa, the former grand admiral Mu’eselhín-Zâde ‘Ali having perished at Lepanto. On this occasion the name Uluğj ‘Ali is said to have been changed into Kiflid ‘Ali. He remained in this office until his death and commanded a series of predatory expeditions in the Mediterranean, participating i. a. in the reconquest of Tunis and La Goulette in 1574, along with the sarácher Sinán Paşa [q. v.]. The inner political changes did not affect his favour with government circles. His last official activity was to bring the new Khuñ of the Crime to Kaffa to install him in place of the deposed Khuñ. Ochalía displayed considerable activity in ship-building, especially after the debacle of Lepanto; in addition he was the builder of the Topkhâné Djanmî at Galata, and of a hamam in the sultan’s palace. When he died unexpectedly in his own mosque (15th Radjâb 995 = June 21, 1587) he left an enormous fortune, which fell to the state.

**Bibliography:** The chief Turkish historical sources are the Torğhud of Selmâk, and the Tuhfât al-Khâr by Hâjîdji Khâfis. A contemporary western source is: Pierre de Bourdelle de Brantôme, Vie de hommes illustres et grands capitaines étrangers, 1594.— Further the historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga, and E. Hamilton-Gurry, Sea-wolves of the Mediterranean, London 1910, p. 344, state: Hüfiz Husain al-Awânesrây, Hâfzât al-Lránwîn, ii. 59.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

**OCSNOBA, the old name of the circle (kıya) in al-Anâdalus corresponding to the present Portuguese province of Algarve of which Silves [q. v.; Ar. 5âli] was the capital.** The geographers and historians transliterate this place name in the forms 5êhûnûba and 5khâhûnûba; we also find the wrong forms 5˘âkûnîya and 5˘khûnîya, the result of graphic errors. The name Ocsnoba seems also sometimes to be applied to a town which would be the old Santa Maria de Algarve [q. v.] now Faro. On the authority of an epigraphical reference it has however been identified with Milreu (Estrói) by Hubner (C. J. L. ii. 3—4, 786—795).

**Bibliography:** Vâki, Muğjam al-Buldân, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 164, 343; ii. 312; al-Makari, Anastuces, i. 113, 809; J. Alemany Bolufer, La geografía de la Península ibérica en los escritores árabes, Granada 1921, p. 110; David Lopes, Toponymia arabe de Portugal, in Revue Hispanique, 1902, p. 43—44; do., Os Arábex nas obras de Alexandre Herculano, Lisbon 1911, p. 79—80.

(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

**OPEN. [See Budapest.]

**OGHUL, a word common to all the Turkish languages, meaning “son”, “child”, “descendant”.** In this connection attention may be called to certain formations, such as edhâqoghlu, “son of good house”, and edhâgbê, which used to be applied to the sons of the Janissaries. Oghul is very frequently found in family names where it takes the place of the Persian zade or the Arabic ibn, e.g. Hekmoglh u Hekm-żade for Ibn al-Hekm or Râmajd-oglh u Râmajd-żade for Ibn Râmajd (where it should be remembered that the Arabic ibn does not mean exclusively “son” but “descendant”). An incomplete survey of such formations in an early period is to be found in Sídijlí-i ՚ethmání, iv. 778—812.— The new law on family names will give rise to numerous forms where oghul is combined with names and crafts.

Cognate is egélân, “boy”, “young man”, “servant”; a word also found in certain compounds, e. g. edhlgelân, “sultan’s page”, edhâghlan, “language-boy”, “interpreter”. From egélan we also get ughan, the name for light cavalry.

(FRANZ BABINGER)

**OHOD, a mountain about three miles north of Medina, celebrated for the battle fought there in the year 3 which ended unfavourably for Muhammad. It is a part of the great range of hills which runs from north to south but here spreads to the east over the plain and thus forms an independent group of hills. The rocky walls surmounted by a rectangular plateau — without peaks, Yâkıùt says — “which rise like masses of iron” (Burton) above the plain are quite destitute of trees and plants and only the face of the south wall is broken by a ravine which played a decisive part of the battle. The country round is stony and covered with gravel but farther south there are a few cornfields and gardens watered by a brook, but these are sometimes flooded by sudden rainstorms so that the pilgrims coming from the town cannot reach the hill. The Meccans who had
set out to avenge the defeat at Badr were encamped at the already mentioned cornfields at al-`Irî or al-Jûrf, which were then full of ripe corn and supplied food for their animals. Muhammad who against his will and against the advice of the elders was forced to leave the town and meet the enemy in the open field, went unhindered past the enemy camp and drew up his troops at the foot of the hill with their backs to it: a strategy no less peculiar than that of the enemy. At first it looked as if the enthusiasm of his followers would secure him a victory like that of Badr. But when the archers, whom the Prophet, had placed upon the hill with distinct orders to prevent a flank attack by the enemy and not to leave their positions, were unable to restrain themselves when they saw the Meccan camp being pillaged and hurried up to see what they could get, Khâlid b. al-Wâlid's quick eye at once saw the weak spot and when he attacked it, the tables were quickly turned. When the rumour spread that Muhammad had fallen, the Muslims began to retreat, and only the Prophet's loyal followers remained. In reality the Prophet was only wounded, and some of his followers succeeded in concealing him in the ravine. Fortunately the Mecceans, little experienced in warfare, did not know how to follow up their victory and began to go home. The Prophet was in this way saved from the worst but he had to lament the loss of many of his followers, including his uncle ʻAmma sa [q.v.], a loss which he felt particularly. It is not easy to get a clear idea of the treatment of the fallen as the traditions differ very much. It is said that the Medinees at first brought their dead to Medina but the Prophet soon forbade this; some mention a common grave in which those who knew the Kur'ân were put in the first row; but according to others the martyrs were buried singly or in twos and threes and some authorities say that the alleged common graves of the martyrs of Ohod are really those of beduins who died of hunger in the reign of ʻOmar (Wâkidî, transl. Wellhausen, p. 143). All accounts however agree in their tendency to glorify ʻAmma sa. The Prophet is said to have uttered the nause his first; the bodies of the other dead are said to have been placed beside him one by one and Muhammad prayed over him 70 times, as he included him in the prayer with each new corpse. Every year afterwards the Prophet went to Ohod, to visit his and the other graves and the elderly caliphs did so also. Muhammad is said to have ordered that the women in lamenting the death of every ʻAsârî should begin with a lament for ʻAmma sa. In this way Ohod became one of the most prominent places of pilgrimage of the Muhammadans. A mosque was built over ʻAmma sa's tomb and it is mentioned by al-Mukaddasi; it lay behind a well near the grave of the other martyrs. We have a brief description by Ibn Djinâbî in the viith (xîth) century. He mentions first of all ʻAmma sa's mosque on the south side of the hill 3 miles north of Medina; a mosque is built at his grave with the grave in an open space to the north of it. Opposite lay the other graves of martyrs and opposite them again was the cave where the Prophet took shelter on the lower part of the hill. Around the graves of the martyrs is a low wall of red earth ascribed to ʻAmma sa at which the people seek a blessing. The best modern description is that of Burchhardt who visited the place in 1814 after its devastation by the Wahhâbîs. From his description we may quote the following: "About one mile from the town stands a ruined edifice of stones and bricks, where a short prayer is recited in remembrance of Muhammad having here put on his coat of mail, when he went to engage the enemy. Farther on is a large stone, upon which it is said that Muhammad leaned for a few minutes on his way to Ohod. To the east of this torrent, the ground leading towards the mountain is barren, stony, with a mound, on the slope of which stands a mosque, surrounded by about a dozen ruined houses, once the pleasure villas of wealthy towns-people; near them is a cistern, filled by rain water. The mosque is a square solid edifice of small dimensions. Its dome was thrown down by the Wahhâbîs but they spared the tomb. The mosque encloses the tomb of ʻAmma sa and those of his principal men who were slain in the battle; namely, Muṣâb b. ʻUmar, Dâfar b. Shâmmâs (not mentioned in the traditions) and ʻAbd Allâh b. Dâfar. A group of these graves are in a small open yard, and, like those of the Bâṣî, are mere heaps of earth, with a few loose stones placed around them. Besides them is a small portico, which serves as a mosque. A little further on, towards the mountain, which is only a gun-shot distance, a small cupola marks the place where Muhammad was struck in battle by a stone . . . . At a short distance from this cupola, which like all the rest has been demolished, are the tombs of twelve other partisans of the Prophet, who were killed in the battle . . . . The people of Medina frequently visit Ohod, pitching their tents in the ruined houses, where they remain a few days, especially convalescents, who during their illness had made a vow to slaughter a sheep in honour of ʻAmma sa if they recovered. Once a year (in July, I believe), the inhabitants flock thither in crowds, and remain for three days, as if they were the feast days of the saint. Regular markets are then kept there: and this visit forms one of the principal public amusements of the town". In modern times Wavell records that the opening of the railway to Medina in 1906 produced a disturbance among the beduins which resulted among other things in the Banû ʻAli, whose duty it was to protect the pilgrims visiting the tomb of ʻAmma sa, while putting no obstacles in their way, declining to take any responsibility. The Wahhâbîs who now rule in northern Arabia permit pilgrimage but as at all the holy places forbid actual worship. 


ŐKAILIDS, a dynasty of al-Mawṣil. The Banû ʻOkâl belonged to the great Beduin tribe of ʻAmir b. Saṣâ’a. From their original home in Central Arabia they spread in course of time in different directions and among their better known subdivisions were the Banû Khafāfîdî [q.v.] and the Muṭaṣîfî [q.v.]. In the fourth century of the
Hizyra the Banū ʿOkail in Syria and Ṣirāk were tributary to the Ḥamdānids and when the latter were no longer able to maintain themselves in al-Mawṣil the city passed to the ʿOkailids. The Kūrā chief Bāgh, the founder of the dynasty of the Ṣawarānids [q.v.], endeavoured to bring al-Mawṣil under his rule whereas the two Ḥamdān brothers Abī Ṭāhir ʿIrābhīn and Abī ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn appealed for help to the emir of the Banū ʿOkail, Abū ʿl-Dhawwād Muḥammad b. al-Muṣayyib. The latter at once announced his readiness to assist them and was given as a reward Dz̄azrāt b. ʿ Omar, Naṣīrān and the town of Ḍalād. After the death of Bāgh in battle (380 = 990—991) his sister's son Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn continued the war with success. Abī ʿAbd Allāh was taken prisoner and when Abū Ṭāhir went to Naṣīrān to seek the protection of Abū ʿl-Dhawwād, the latter took him, his son and several of his retainers prisoners, put them to death and then occupied al-Mawṣil. He then submitted nominally to the Bāyiḍ Bahrāʾ al-Dawla [q.v.] and persuaded him to send a representative to al-Mawṣil. But the latter did not play a part of any importance. Bahrāʾ al-Dawla's efforts to make his influence felt in al-Mawṣil did not have the success he desired. Abū ʿl-Dhawwād remained the real ruler. He died in 386 or 387 (996—997) and was succeeded by his brother al-Muṣālīd [q.v.]. The latter was assassinated in Ṣafār 391 (Dec. 1000—Jan. 1001) and his eldest son Kūrah b. [q.v.] was recognised as emir of al-Mawṣil. After holding office for fifty years, he was deposed by his brother Abī Kāmil Bāzara [cf. ʿIrābāsh] in 442 (1050—1051) and on the latter's death in the next year 443 (1051—1052) the rule passed to his nephew Kūrah b. Bādhrān [q.v.]. The latter was succeeded in 453 (1061) by his son Muslim [q.v.] under whom the territory of the ʿOkailids attained its greatest extent; their power then declined rapidly. On Muslim's death (478 = 1085) his brother Ibrāhīm who had languished in prison for years was set free and proclaimed emir of al-Mawṣil. In 482 (1090—1090) however, the Saʿdīng sultan Malikshāh invited him to come and give an account of his stewardship, and as soon as he appeared he was thrown into prison and Fāḥhr al-Dawla b. Ḍajār [q.v.] 'en ′ Alan as governor to al-Mawṣil. Only after Malikshāh's death (Shawwāl 485 = November 1092) was Ibrāhīm set free and returned to al-Mawṣil. In the meanwhile Muslim's widow Ṣafiyya who was also the aunt of Malikshāh, had married Ibrāhīm, and on the death of Malikshāh she went with ʿAlī, her son by Muslim, to al-Mawṣil. But as Muḥammad, another son of Muslim's, also coveted the city, its inhabitants split up into two parties and when it came to fighting, Muḥammad had to take to flight, while ʿAlī occupied al-Mawṣil. As soon as Ibrāhīm heard of this he began negotiations with Ṣafiyya and received from her the town of Ḍalād which Malikshāh had given her as a gift. The Saʿdīng prince Tutuš [q.v.] then demanded that Ibrāhīm should recognise him as sultan and when the latter refused, the decision was left to arms. In Rabīʿ I 486 (April 1093) the two armies met near al-Mawṣil; Ibrāhīm was taken prisoner and put to death and Tutuš became as governor. It was however not long before his brother Muḥammad b. Muslim endeavoured to dispute his power. He asked the emir Kūrbūkha [q.v.] to help him against his brother and the result was that he lost his life while ʿAlī had to give up al-Mawṣil (Dhu ʿl-Kaʿda 489 = Oct.—Nov. 1096).

In addition to the emirs of al-Mawṣil, several ʿOkailīd dignitaries are mentioned in history. In 479 (1086—1087) Salīm b. Mālikī b. Badhrān b. Muṣālīd surrendered Halab to sultan Malikshāh and received in return the fortress of Ḏajār [q.v.] to which al-Ṭābākha was soon added and these remained almost without interruption in possession of his descendants until 564 (1168—1169) when his grandson Mālik b. ʿAlī b. Salīm ceded them to Nūḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Zangī.

Another branch was established in Ṭakrit [q.v.]. According to Ibn al-ʿAlīhūrī, x. 289, when a short sketch of the history of this town is given down to the year 500 (1106—1107), the ʿOkailīd Rāʾf b. al-Ḥusayn died in 427 (1036) as lord of Ṭakrit. His nephew Abū Maʿṣūm al-Ḥamīs b. al-Ṭaghlīb inherited his governorship. After the latter's death in 435 (1043—1044) he was succeeded by his son Abū Ghāshām. The latter was suddenly attacked in 444 (1052—1053) by his brother ʿĪsā and thrown into prison and ʿĪsā seized the power. In 448 (1056—1057) ʿĪsā died and soon afterwards his son Nāṣr also died. ʿĪsā's widow Amīra then had Abū Ghāshām, who was still in prison, murdered and installed a governor named Abū ʿl-Ghātim in Ṭakrit but he handed the town over to the Saʿdīng sultan Tughrībāg. ʿOkailīd governors are also occasionally found in other towns, like ʿAna, Ḍamīla, Hit and ʿUkhār. After the extinction of the dynasty in Persia and Mesopotamia and the ʿIkīr the ʿOkailīds withdrew to Bahrayn.


ʿOKAZ, name of an oasis situated between Ṣāʾif and ʿAkkālah. The Arab philologists derive the name from the root meaning 'to retain', in the middle forms 'to assemble' or from the meaning of 'concourse'. Both interpretations are based on the fact that ʿOkaz was primarily celebrated for its annual fair, which was held on the 1st—20th Dhu ʿl-ʾKaʿda and was at the same time an official occasion of mafṣīḥara, i.e. a gathering of tribes or rather of groups and individuals belonging to the same tribe where individuals competed for honours and for the honour of their tribe. These assemblies to which poets came to recite their poems, were also a great fair at which merchandise was exchanged. That of ʿOkaz was followed by those of Madjūna (last ten days of Dhu ʿl-ʾKaʿda), of Dhu ʿl-Maṣdž (1st—8th Dhu ʿl-Hijja).
and those which accompanied the great pilgrimage. These weeks formed the climax of public life in pre-Islamic Arabia — the truce of the sacred months making discussion of the political affairs of the tribes of the Ḥijāz possible. The Ṭamīm took no part in them. ʿIsām by condemning hereditary and individual feuds was the cause of the decline of the ṣawāʾiqīn (cf. ʿAṣwīn).

Muḥammad was on his way to the fair of ʿOqāz with a few of his companions when at Nakhaʾ he the ḍājjān heard the Kurān being recited and were struck with admiration as we are told in the Kurān (sūra Ixii. 1 sqq.; xlvii. 28 sqq.) and ḥadīth (Buḫkārī, Aḏān, bāb 103; Tafsīr, sūra Ixii., bāb 1; Muslim, ʿAlāʾ, trad. 149; Tirmīzī, Tafsīr, sūra Ixii., trad. 1).

ʿOqāz is also noted for the fighting which took place there at the beginning of Islam.


(A. J. Wensing)

ʿOqba b. Nāfīʿ b. ʿAbd Kāis al-ʿArabī al-Fihrī, the famous general of the first century A.H. who endeavoured by consolidating the first successes of the Arab conquest in North Africa to put an end to the resistance of the Berbers but finally perished after a troubled career at the hands of African rebels.

The data supplied by the historians regarding the career of ʿOqba are relatively abundant but like all that relates to the beginnings of the expansion of Islam in North Africa have frequently to be taken with caution. They come from later traditions, and W. Marçais has clearly demonstrated the particular bias which they represent (Le passé de l'Algérie musulmane, in Histoire et Historiens de l'Algérie, Paris 1931, p. 150). It is certain as regards ʿOqba that the essentials of what the Maghribi historians have preserved about him are of eastern origin and in addition the most circumstantial accounts of his career that we possess are from the pens of eastern authors: Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam and al-Nuwairī. The only authority for the African tradition regarding ʿOqba so far known is his descendant Abu ʿl-Muḥādīrī. The information, at once detailed and new, found in a Maghribi MS. (cf. Bibliography) about ʿOqba's raid into the south of Morocco seems fairly reliable up to a certain point from the very fact of its precision. Use of it after a critical study seems likely to throw doubt upon the statements hitherto regarded as reliable regarding the progress and chronology of the Arab conquest of Northwest Africa, such as are given in studies, already antiquated like Fournel (Les Berbères, Étude sur la conquête de l'Afrique par les Arabes, Paris 1875), or more recent and more distinguished works but also based on unchecked translations like that of E. F. Gattier (Les siècles obscurs du Maghreb, Paris 1927).

This is why in the present state of our knowledge we shall here confine ourselves to tracing a sketch of ʿOqba b. Nāfīʿ's activities in North Africa which need not be considered final on all points.

ʿOqba was born in the last years of the Prophet's life and was through his mother the nephew of ʿAmr b. al-ʿArây [q.v.], the celebrated conqueror of Egypt, who shortly before his death in 43 (663) gave him the supreme command in Ifriqiya. According to a story, difficult to verify, ʿOqba at that time was directing his attention to the Sadān and establishing Islam by force of arms at Chahādām. But this was only a raid and not a regular occupation of the country. It was not till some years later that we find him preparing for a new expedition, no doubt better equipped than the others. This was the expedition of 50 (670) in which he founded the military stronghold of al-Kairāwān [q.v.] in the middle of the province of Byzacene. For this expedition ʿOqba had at his disposal a force of 10,000 horsemen which was gradually increased by the accession of Berbers converted to Islam: with the help of this force he was able not only to attack the Byzantines who had continued to hold out in the towns of the coast of Ifriqiya but also the Berbers of Kānawān, forming a strong base for the Arab troops, seems to have very much facilitated if not the occupation and pacification of Ifriqiya, at least its conversion to the religion of obedience to the authority of the invaders. But it was not ʿOqba who gathered the fruits of this spread of Islam. Ifriqiya remained a dependency of the province of Egypt; the new governor Maṣlama b. Makhūl al-Anṣārī dismissed ʿOqba in 53 (675) and replaced him by one of his own clients, Abu ʿl-Muḥādīrī, who very soon undertook a raid on Mijiras, and according to Ibn Ḥakīlān got as far as Tlemcen [q.v.]. On his return to the east, ʿOqba is reputed to have complained to the caliph Muʿāwīya of the way in which he had been treated by the governor of Egypt and a little later Muʿāwīya's successor restored him his governorship.

This second appointment of ʿOqba to Ifriqiya may be put with certainty in 62 (682). His enemy, the governor Abu ʿl-Muḥādīrī, had in the course of his raid defeated the Berber chief Kusaila [q.v.] who became a Muslim and it was on these two that ʿOqba wreaked his vengeance in his turn. He put them into chains and carried them with him wherever he went. At the same time he prepared an expedition on a larger scale than the previous one the stages of which can be traced from the narrative of Ibn Ḥakīlān. ʿOqba's army, preceded by an advance guard under Zuhār b. Kāis al-Balawī, advanced from Kairāwān into the Central Maghrib, at first encountering in the Ziba and again in Tāḥār Berber and Byzantine elements which he defeated and received tribute from. He finally reached the region of Tangier. The chief of the Ghanīma, Iyān (Julīān), submitted to the Arab leader and became his military adviser. He dissuaded him from crossing the Straits of Gibraltar and undertaking the conquest of Spain and pointed out the danger threatening the Arab troops from the great body of still unconquered Berbers in the Great Atlas and Sās [q.v.;] ʿOqba therefore turned his attention to the Berbers. First of all he occupied the massif of the Zārahān, took the town of Ulib (Volubilis), crossed the Middle Atlas and advanced through the Dra (Dar'a) and Sās, the inhabitants of which he pursued up to the desert of the Lantūma. He
then turned to the Atlantic coast, reached the land of Safi and began to subject the Berber bloc of the Maqūda of the Līsāb Dāruq (Great Atlas) then that of the Anti-Atlas as far as Tārālibān [q.v.].

But however brilliant they seemed these successes led nowhere. An advance no matter how brilliant through a country meant nothing if it was not followed by an occupation which Ṭāḥā was not able to secure. But when he and his army turned homewards, he does not seem to have realised that all would have to be done again. Kusaila escaped from him and organised resistance, making use alike of the fondness for fighting of his Berber compatriots and the discipline and technical skill of the Byzantine garrisons in the country. Ṭāḥā trusting to his good fortune did not see the danger. Reaching the Za‘āq, at Thubunah (Tuluma) he went so far as to divide his army into several contingents which he sent off in succession on the road to Kairawān. Trusting the Berbers, who had submitted to him, he had only a small body of Arabs with him, the rest having gone off from him. But he was soon surrounded by Kusaila’s sides on the border of the Sahara at Tāhūda and fell with 300 of his companions in 63 (683).

His grave and that of his companions is still pointed out at the same place and forms the centre of a little village which bears his name: Sajiyid Uqba (vulg. Sidi Uqba), a few miles S.E. of Biskra, not far from the old site of Tāhūda.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

AL-ʿOLĀMĪ, ABU ‘L-YEMN ‘ABD AL-KĀHMĀN b. MUḤAMMAD MUẒIR AL-DĪN AL-ʿOMARI AL-HANĀLI AL-MĀSSIDI, an Arab historian, born on the 13th Dhu ’l-Ka‘dah 860 (Oct. 13, 1456) in Jerusalem, studied from 886 (1476) in Cairo, became in 894 (1484) kālī in Ramla and in 941 (1480) chief kālī in Jerusalem. He retired in 922 (1516) and died in 928 (1522) in Jerusalem.


(B. Brockelmann)

OLČAITU KHUDĀBANDA, eighth Līkhaṇ of Persia, reigned from 1304 till 1317. He was, like his predecessor Ghāzān, a son of Arghūn and a great-grandson of Ilūghū. At his acces-
sion he was 24 years of age. In his youth he had been given the surname of Kharbana, for which different explanations are given (cf. the poem by Rashid al-Din reproduced on p. 46 of E. G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii. p. 46 sqq. and Ibn Battuta, ii. 115), but E. Blochet, in his Introduction à l'histoire des Mongols (G. M. S., xii. 51), has explained the name as a Mongolian word, meaning “the third”. The Byzantine historian Pachymeres calls him Χαρίακτιος (ed. Bonn 1835, ii. 459). His mother Cruj Khūţā had him baptized as a Christian, but under the influence of one of his wives he afterwards embraced Islam and received the name Muhammad, while his surname was changed to KhūĎa bāna. In addition he took the laḥab of Ghīyāth al-Dunya wa-l-Dīn, which al-Din Rashid, Olcaiťu was sent to the Indian frontier of the empire, where there was no difficulty about the succession, as a possible claimant, his cousin Alafrank, had been killed previously. Olcaiu continued the traditional warfare of his predecessors with the Mamlūk Empire and their friendly relations with European Christian powers; some of the letters addressed to him by the Pope Clement V and the English King Edward II. are still extant; these letters were brought by his Christian envoy Thomas Ilde, who, in contradiction to the facts, kept up the fiction that his master was a Christian. Olcaiu likewise sent a military expedition to relieve the Byzantine Emperor Michael Pulaeologos by dividing the force of the Turks in Asia Minor, but this was a defeat (Pachymeres, ii. 585). Against the Mamlūks Olcaiťu himself conducted a campaign during which the town of Rahba on the Ephrates was besieged in vain (1313). The authority of the government in the interior was strengthened by the conquest of Dīlijān in 1307 and in the same year by the conquest of Herfīt from the vassal Kur dynasty. In 705 (1305—1306) Olcaiu made the recently founded town of Sulṭaṇa [q. v.] the capital of his empire, on the occasion of the birth of his son and successor Abū Sa‘d. Prosperity was increased by the laws of Ghāzin, whose canons were promulgated again by Olcaiu, and also by the able administration of the famous historian Rashīd al-Dīn [q. v.]; the latter's colleague and rival Sa‘d al-Dīn was executed in 1312 through the intrigues of 'Alī Shīh, who took the sultan's place. The dispute which was caused between the two ministers made the sultan in 1315 assign to each of them the administration of half of the empire. The attitude of Olcaiu towards Üslām deserves special notice. After first showing preference for the Shī‘a (cf. the story of Mādīj al-Dīn of Shirāz told by Ibn Battuta, ii. 57 sqq.), he became an adherent of the Sunna. Then, after an attempt to introduce the Shī‘i instead of the Ẓanafī ma‘ālīḥāb, he finally decided again to join the Shī‘a, after having visited the tomb of 'Alī; one of his coins affords proof of this. Olcaiu is described as a virtuous, liberal ruler; he showed interest in the observatory of Maragha, where Āṣīl al-Dīn, Nāṣīr al-Dīn's son, was appointed astronomer-royal. He likewise favoured the literary-historical activity of Rashīd al-Dīn and the historian Waṣḥāf. He died at Sulṭaṇa on December 16, 1316; afterwards Rashīd al-Dīn was accused of having caused his death. In Sulṭaṇa his tomb is still to be seen.

Bibliography: Contemporary sources are the Tu’rīkī Waṣṣāf, lith. Bombay 1269, and a continuation of Rashīd al-Dīn’s Ḷūmī al-Tavārīkh, which continuation is found in several manuscripts, but has not yet been edited. Further the Tu’rīkī Gūzālā by Ĥamd Allāh Mustawfi and the later Persian works. Of European works must be mentioned: D’Ohsson, Histoire des Mongols, iv. 475—508; J. von Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Ilkhāne, Darmstadt 1843, ii. 178—251; H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii. 534—584; E. Blochet, Introduction à l’histoire des Mongols, in G.M.S., xii., Leyden—London 1910, passim. — For Olcaiu’s coins: Stanley Lane-Poole’s Catalogue, vi. 44 sqq. (J. H. Kramers)

’OMĀN, a nominally independent state on the Persian Gulf under the protectorate of England. Its extent has varied considerably in the course of its history. While Iṣlāḥī, for example, who gives ’Oman an extent of 300 parasangs, includes the district of Mahrā in it, Idrīsī describes the latter as an independent country. In the northwest ’Oman was bounded by the province of al-Bahrān or al-Ḥajdar, in the south by Yaman and Ḥażar. In the sultanate reached its greatest extent under Sulṭaṇ Ibn Mālik b. al-ʿArab b. Sulṭaṇ, under whom ’Oman not only included the territory from Rās al-Ḫadd to Ḫuṭṭār, but also al-Bahrān and other possessions, particularly on the African coast where his son Sa‘fī conquered Kilwa and Zanzibar. ’Oman at the present day includes the whole south-eastern part of Arabia with a strip about 500 miles long on the south coast of the Peninsula including the land of Ḥuṭṭār. By the decision of the International Court at the Hague in 1905 in a dispute between England and France regarding the granting of the French flag to owners of sailing-ships in Maskat, the southern boundary was fixed at Rās Sakar and the coast as far as Ḵūr al-Ḫalib reckoned to ’Oman, while at the same time the sulṭaṇ’s claim to the peninsula of Rāṣ Masandum from Rās Ḏibba to Ṭībba was expressly recognised by both powers. This of course does not prevent the actual power of the sulṭaṇ barely extending beyond the coast district of Maskat and Ḍāḥi. The population of ’Oman is estimated at half a million but that of ’Oman proper at 34,500 only. As regards creed the ’Omanis are predominantly in particular in the south, but the northern districts are inhabited mainly by Sunnis. The capital is Maskat [q. v.] while at an earlier period Šuḥr [q. v.] was regarded as the most important town in the country.

The following details of the distribution of the population may be given: the thickly populated district of Ḍāḥi has 10,500, the Wādī Sāmāl 2,800, Maskat 10,000, Ṭuḥra 11,000, Šūr 12,000, Šulṭaṇ 7,500. ’Oman for administrative purposes is divided into four districts: 1. Ḏaṭālān, the land of the Beni Ālī and all the land south of Bedri; 2. ’Oman proper from Bedri to Makiniyya; 3. Durrā from the latter place to al-Durūmīn, the narrow strip of coast from Šīb to Ḵūr Pākkan. The characteristic feature of the orography of the country is a mountain range, which runs from Maskat in a southern direction as far as Šūr close to the coast but runs a considerable distance inland north of Maskat and thus leaves space for the fertile lowlying land on the coast, al-Baṭina, which is in
a way comparable to al-Tihāma in the Yamān, although it never attains the same width, being only from 20 to 30 miles across. South of Rūstāk just below 23° Lat., almost at right-angles to the former, is a second range, higher in its highest parts, known as Djebel Akhlar which with 10,000 feet is the greatest height in the country. It runs parallel to the coast as far as Rās Masandum and sends off a second range which runs to Rās al-Khīme. The most fertile part of 'Oman is the already mentioned low-lying coast land of al-Bahānā where in addition to intensive cultivation of the date-palm, wheat is grown and all kinds of fruits flourish. The Arab geographers praised the dates of 'Oman and some other parts as being the best in the world. 'Oman was a garden. Among the fruits special mention is made of bananas, pomegranates, and nebeḵ (lotus nebk). A considerable part of 'Oman however is quite unsuited for agriculture; for example the part bordering on the desert zone of Arabia which however contains a few fertile oases among the mountains, for example on the way from Benī Abī 'Ali to Nezwa. These oases are watered by subterranean deposits as was long ago pointed out by Ibn al-Fākhī; where the water is not too deep below the surface or there are subterranean channels, springs supply the necessary water to the fields. The climate of 'Oman suffers from the great heat, which is only to some degree tempered by the refreshing winds from the sea; in Maskat the maximum in July and August is 91°–88° F. The rainy season is in winter from October to March, but the rains seldom fall more than three or four days in a month; among the mountains heavy storms occur and the snow sometimes lies. In Maskat the annual rainfall is 3 to 6 inches.

The cereals grown are wheat, dūrā, some rice, the fruits, tamarinds, mango, banana, pomegranates, quinces, pistachios, apricots, grapes, almonds, figs, walnuts, water-melons, apricots and cherries, while cotton, sugar-cane and indigo are cultivated. Stockraising is now mainly confined to horned cattle; at one time 'Oman was celebrated for its strong, swift camels and goats. The Arab geographers (Ibn al-Fākhī) praise 'Oman's wealth in fish, which supplied the food of large sections of the community (especially in al-Ḥijāma). Industry, once very flourishing, is now confined to weaving on a modest scale in Maskat, Nezwa and 'Ibrī, dyeing in the two last-named towns and the making of weapons in Maskat, Idrīsī mentions the pearl-fisheries of Sūr below Cape al-Maḥjama and in Damār. The pearl-fisheries now produce about half the revenue of Bahrain (10–15,000,000 rupees). The Arab philologists (Ibn al-Aṣrābī) derive the name 'Oman from 'awman with the meaning "to stay continually in one place". According to others the name goes back to 'Oman b. Ibrāhīm al-Khāhilī, who built the town of 'Oman; this is of significance as much as the classical writers know of a town called Omana (Pliny, Nat. hist., vi. 149) and 'Omano ivārōs (Tolomei, vi. 7, 36). It has been identified with Sūhār which was later regarded as the most important trading centre. Al-Mukaddasi (p. 35) compared 'Oman with 'Aden and Egypt for importance in the world's trade and called it and Sīrāf (q. v.) the forecourt of China (p. 426). This does not seem however to have much benefited the people of 'Oman, for they were regarded as dishonest, wicked and deceitful merchants; indeed Ibn al-Fākhī (p. 92) describes them in much coarser language. The prosperity coming from the trade and agriculture is evident from the huge yield from taxation, 300,000 dinārs in the 'Abbasid period. A dishem a year was paid on each palm-tree (Muḥaddasi, p. 105).

For the early history of 'Oman, Huxt's account may be consulted.

The relations of England with the country have been of great importance to 'Oman. They began in 1798 with a treaty between the East India Co. and the sultan by which the French and Dutch were excluded from the territory for the duration of the war, and this was followed in 1800 by the granting of permission for the E.I.C. to have an agent permanently resident in Maskat. By the treaties made by the French with Saŷid Sa'id b. Sulṭān in 1807 and 1808, this resident was joined by a French Consular agent. But French prestige suffered a severe blow when Mauritius was occupied by the English in 1810. In 1839 a commercial treaty was concluded between England and Maskat, modelled on one concluded in 1833 between the U.S.A. and 'Oman. In 1844 there followed a commercial treaty with France, which secured this country the most favoured nation clause and freedom to trade in Maskat for its subjects. In 1862 came the Anglo-French guarantee of the independence of 'Oman, but England was able to secure a predominating influence in 'Oman by vigorously supporting the sulṭān at various crises and by paying him a subsidy. In 1891 the sulṭān declared in a treaty of friendship, which also regulated questions of trade and navigation between the two countries, and was binding upon himself and his successors, that he would not cede any of his territory in any way to any power other than England. When then, in 1898, the sulṭān in contravention of this agreement wished to allow France to have a coaling-station in his territory, he had to withdraw the concession on receiving an ultimatum from England; France was compensated with a coaling station in Mukallāt [q. v.]. The dispute assumed a more serious aspect which arose out of the practice of the French consul in Maskat giving ships' papers and French flags to Maskat ships which abused the privilege to carry arms and slaves. The dispute was settled by the International Court at The Hague, the decision being that only those ship-owners who had received permits before January 2, 1892 were allowed to retain them. The result was that in 1917 only 12 ships of 'Oman were allowed to carry the French flag. The result has been the practical exclusion of French influence from 'Oman, and the securing of English predominance.

was soon appeased and 'Omar ascended the throne without encountering any serious opposition.

As a caliph, 'Omar stands apart; he was distinguished from his predecessors and successors alike. Inspired by a true piety, although not entirely free from bigotry, he was very conscious of his responsibility to God and always endeavoured to further what he believed to be the right and conscientiously to do his duty as a ruler. In his private life he was distinguished by the greatest simplicity and frugality, although he is said to have lived no less luxuriously than other Umayyad princes before his accession. Poets who praised the delights of worldly pleasures were therefore not particularly popular at his court.

'Omar laid no special stress on military glory, and his reign which only lasted two and a half years was poor in military events. The siege of Constantinople was raised on his accession to the throne; but it is uncertain whether the Muslim army was actually withdrawn by him. In Mesopotamia he allowed the people of Turanda to evacuate their town whereupon they settled in the adjoining Malatya and Turanda was destroyed. In the far West the Muslim armies crossed the Pyrenees, invaded Southern France and returned to Spain laden with rich booty. On a later campaign which is usually but not quite certainly attributed to the reign of 'Omar, they captured Narbonne, fortified it, and used it for a time as their headquarters.

'Omar however by no means felt obliged to spread Islām by the sword; he rather sought by peaceful missionary activity to win members of other creeds to the faith of the Prophet and in case of conversion by this means demanded no tribute. This method proved particularly successful and suitable among the Berbers and it is even said that there was not a single Berber left unconverted to Islām in the governorship of Isma'il b. 'Abd Allāh appointed by him. In a similar way were converted the princes of Sind when 'Omar's governor Amr b. Muslim al-Bihili invited them to adopt Islām and promised them complete equality with Muslims; but under Hishām they lapsed again.

His interests were primarily in home affairs. He was the trustworthy governor of Khurāsān Yazīd b. al-Muhallab [q. v.] arrested and his post given to al-Jarrāḥ b. 'Abd Allāh al-Hakamī. In other cases also, the most important offices were filled with men whom 'Omar thought to be capable and just. He adopted a kindly attitude to the 'Alids. The practice introduced by Mu'āwiya of publicly cursing 'All in the service in the mosque was abolished by 'Omar. It is said that when he was a boy and his father was appointed governor of Egypt he begged him to forbid the customary cursing of 'All and received the reply that such a step although laudable in itself would be against the interests of the Umayyad dynasty and might give support to the 'Alīids' claims to the caliphate. 'Omar gave up in favour of the 'Alids the oasis of Fadak [q. v.] which had originally been the private property of Mu'āmmad but was then declared a state domain and had finally become the property of the Umayyads. After his accession he decided that it should revert to its original use and according to one story expressly ordered that it should be handed over to the descendants of Fāṭima as the heirs of the Prophet. He also restored to the family of Talhah their property in Mecca, which 'Abd al-Malik had
taken from them and abolished the addition to the tribe which had been levied by a former governor of the Yaman, Muhammad b. Yasaif, a brother of al-Hajjaj. In general he laid great stress on compensating those who had in any way been subjected to illegal extortions; but, as is obvious, this principle, while it testifies to the caliph's love of justice, was often applied, according to Ibn Sa'd, v. 252, uncritically (is-zahir al-bayyina al-tasifia) and in the long run could not be beneficial to the treasury and was destined to have serious consequences.

As a devout Muslim he was gracious to members of other creeds so far as this was possible without a breach of the principles of Islam. Christians, Jews, and lie-worshippers, were allowed to retain their synagogues, churches, and temples but not to build any new ones. In Damascus, al-Walid [q.v.] had taken down the basilica of John the Baptist and incorporated the site in the mosque of the Umayyads. When 'Omar came to the throne, the Christians complained to him that the church had been taken from them whereupon 'Omar ordered the governor to give back the site of the mosque. But as the people of Damascus would not agree to this, the matter was settled by 'Omar's approval by the churches outside the town, notably that of St. Thomas which belonged de facto to the Muslims and not by treaty because the Qifla [q.v] had been conquered by the sword and not surrendered by capitulation, being handed over to the Christians on condition that they abandoned all claims for the future on the Church of St. John. While 'Omar endeavoured to protect his Muslim subjects from being abused, he was also anxious that his Christian subjects should not be crushed by oppressive taxation. In Aila and in Cyprus the tribute settled by treaty had been increased: 'Omar reduced it to the original amount. In al-Yaman the Christians of Nadhrran had made a treaty with the Prophet which guaranteed them complete security in their land on payment of an annual tribute of 2,000 robes (jalla) each of the value of 40 dirhams. This treaty had been broken by 'Omar I. Nevertheless, they had to pay the full tribute until 'Uthmaan reduced it by 200 robes. Mu'aawiya or, according to another story, his son Yazid granted them a further reduction of 200 robes because their numbers had been much reduced by death and conversions to Islam (on this see Lammens, Le califat de Yazid Ier, p. 346 sqq.). But when 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad b. al-Ash'ath [q.v.] rebelled against al-Hajjaj, the latter raised the total tribute to 1,800 robes because he suspected the Nadhrranians of being in secret agreement with the rebels. In the meanwhile however, their numbers had sunk from 40,000 to 4,000 and when they appealed to 'Omar to alleviate their hard lot he reduced the taxation to one tenth and demanded only 200 instead of 2,000 or 8,000 dirhams.

One of 'Omar's most important measures was his reform of the taxation. The comprehensive administrative system of 'Omar I which proved excellent for the conditions in his day, was now no longer suitable to the demands of the time. The treasury was continually suffering from the ever increasing conversion to Islam of non-Arabs who had paid tribute and their consequent exemption from taxation and in addition many of the new converts settled in the large cities instead of remaining at home and tilling the fields, so that agriculture lost much of the labour it required. To overcome this difficulty al-Hajjaj had imposed the kharaj also upon Muslim landowners who were not paying tribute and prohibited immigration into the cities. This aroused general dissatisfaction but this did not worry him. 'Omar, on the other hand, adhered to the principle that Muslims should pay no tribute. He further propounded, no doubt in agreement with those learned in the law in Medina, the theory that conquered land was the common property of the Muslim community and therefore could not be broken up and transformed by sale to Muslims into immune private property. Consequently in the year 100 (718—719), he forbade Muslims to buy land which should pay tribute; but he did not make this legislation retrospective and he placed no obstacles in the way of the immigration of new converts into the cities. Further, just claims upon the treasury for compensation for services rendered were never refused: he granted the Mawali in Khorasan, who had fought against the unbelievers, pay and exemption from taxation just like Muslim collectors of taxes. He added that the small modifications of the various elements in the caliph's empire and although his system of reformed taxation did not survive because the principle of the inalienability of tribute-paying land could not be permanently maintained, he did his best to clear up the existing financial muddle.

The historians of the older school described 'Omar as an unpatriotic idealist, who pursued purely Utopian ideals as a result of his theological preconceptions, without paying any heed to actual conditions, and only modern research has put his work in its true light. His reign was spared trouble from the Kharidjists but hidden forces were working in secret which were to bring about the fall of the Umayyad dynasty.

'Omar died after an illness of 20 days in Radjib 101 (Feb. 720) and was buried in Dair Sim'an near Halab. He was succeeded by his cousin Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik [q.v.].

Very much influenced since his boyhood by pious authorities on tradition, he was one of the authorities in this field and regarded, although wrongly, after his death as one of the first collectors of Sunna. In course of time a whole cycle of pious legends gathered round his name which were quite devoid of any historical foundation. For example we are told (Ibn Sa'd, v. 501, l. 17) that a roll of parchment fell from heaven upon the men who were filling up his grave which assured him security from the flames of hell (amin min Allâh bi-'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz min al-nâr). Even the biassed historians of the 'Abbasid period who as a rule ran down the Umayyads on every possible occasion in favour of the 'Abbasids make an exception in his case and give him the highest praise. His tomb was also left undisturbed when those of the other Umayyads were desecrated after the triumph of the 'Abbasids.


OMAR [i. 'abd Allâh] b. ABD RABI'A, 'undeniably the greatest love-poet of the Arabs' (Rückert), born, according to tradition, on the 26th Dhu 'l-Hijjah 26 (beginning of Nov. 644), died in 93 (712) or 101 (719). His biography, like those of other poets who are regarded as representatives of a particular form of poetry (e.g. Abû Nuwâs with his drinking songs), is much encumbered by legend; he was regarded as the greatest love-poet and imitators by his contemporaries and the works of later poets were readily ascribed to him. It is only the brilliant monograph by F. Schweiz that has made it possible to separate the really historical matter in his biography and in his poems. It may be regarded as certain that he belonged to the Karâshân clan of Mahâlab; his father 'Abd Allâh, a prosperous Meccan merchant, amassed a great fortune by importing the drugs of South Arabia. For a time he was governor of Dâmâd in the Yaman; Omar's mother was a 'Himyarat' from 1Faj'am.aw. The poet as the possessor of a large fortune was able to lead a carefree life; his youth he probably spent in Medina and his manhood mainly in Mecca. He travelled in South Arabia, Syria and Mesopotamia. There are all kinds of legends about his death which it seems did not take place in his native land. His traditional biography is mainly filled with stories of his relations with various ladies, chiefly of the house of the Umayyads. These stories are literary inventions rather than historical facts. The stories of his meetings with emirs and caliphs of the house of 'Umayya seem also suspicious: he is said to have been punished along with the poet al-A'âwas by Omar II and to have had to promise to write no more poetry. He also wrote much from his poems of the political history of the period or of the events of every day life. He was the first townsmen poet in Arabic. His poems reflect the bright social activity of town life. This is the fundamental distinction between him and the celebrated traid of Umayyad poets, al-Akhtâl [q. v.], Dîjarr [q. v.] and al-Farazâdâq [q. v.] as well as between him and the half legendary representatives of the Beduin love poetry of the period like Dîjâm [q. v.]. In him there is no trace of the court poet or tribal bard; he hardly ever describes journeys, and still more rarely fighting. The poetry of wine is quite strange to him. All his poems are records of his own experiences and pictures of his emotions. We need not always imagine that they are historically accurate but the expression of feeling is undoubtedly true to life. The persons in his poems are "sensitive, aimable creatures, full of individuality. They reveal their souls, they act, they speak. Dramatic scenes, full of feeling stand out vividly before the reader's eyes" (Schwarz). In the form of his verse also 'Omar is a gifted poetical genius who writes without difficulty. His verse flows easily and naturally in simple language. His prosody differs from that of the Beduin poets; although he uses the same metres, he does not prefer those most popular in the old poetry (basît or lastî) but flexible and light metres (khiftj, râmal, mutafrîd, munathît). That he did not feel himself bound by tradition is shown by some traces of strophic verse in his poems. It would be a mistake to see in 'Omar the first love-poet of the Arabs. But he was the first to bring this form to perfection. The roots of this genre are to be found not so much in the introductory parts of the old Arabic qâṣidas as in the love-poems, which were particularly cultivated in South Arabia (perhaps not without Persian influence). A study of the surviving fragments of Waddâ in-Yaman, a contemporary of 'Omar which has been long in preparation by V. Ebermann, will perhaps shed new light on this point.

'Omar attained great popularity with his contemporaries and in the following generations, chiefly among singers, wits and men of letters. But his popularity among learned men was hampered by two things: his simple language offered very few "testi di lingua" in comparison with poets like, e.g. al-Farazâdâq, and the matter of his poems was little suited for study in schools, especially in religious and bigoted circles. The renaissance of Arabic literature in modern times has brought about a change; besides several monographs devoted to him, special chapters are devoted to him in the text books. 'Omar b. Aâbi Râbi'a is now so to speak rehabilitated among the Arabs and recognised as a great poet.


IGN. KRATSCHEKOWSKY

OMAR B. AYUB. [See HAMâ and AYâBUD SUPPLEMENT.]

The name al-Fārīd (notary) refers to the profession of his father, who belonged to Hāmīt but migrated to Cairo, where ‘Omar was born in 576 or, more probably, in 577. In early youth he studied Shafi‘i law and Hādhīth; then came his conversion to Sufism, and for many years he led the life of a solitary devotee, first among the hills (al-Muṣṭatām) to the east of Cairo and afterwards in the Ḥijāz. On his return to Cairo he was venerated as a saint till his death in 632, and his tomb beneath al-Muṣṭatām is still frequented. The Diwān of Ibn al-Fārīd, though small, is one of the most original in Arabic literature. Possibly the minor odes, which exhibit a style of great delicacy and beauty and a more or less copious use of rhetorical artifices, were composed in order to be sung with musical accompaniment at Sufi concerts (Nallino, in K. S. O., viii. 177); in these the other odes are more intellectual and some of the minor odes may be read either as love-poems—a fact to which they owe their wide popularity in the East—or as mystical hymns. But the Diwān also includes two purely mystical odes: 1. the Khamsa or Wine Ode, describing the “intoxication” produced by the “wine” of Divine Love, and 2. the Naim al-Sulūk or “Pilgrim’s Progress”, a poem containing 760 verses, which is often called al-Tawīyat al-kubrā to distinguish it from a much shorter ode rhyming in the same letter. In this famous kifla, nearly equal in length to all the rest of the Diwān together, Ibn al-Fārīd depicts his own experience as a Sūfī. The result is not only a unique masterpiece of Arabic poetry but a document of surpassing interest to every student of mysticism (for a resume of the contents, see Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, p. 195–199). Its whole character is psychological rather than speculative; though some passages are pantheistic in feeling and expression, it bears little or no trace of the intellectualism which marks the system of Ibn al-‘Arabī; and the charges of heresy brought against the poet do not appear to be justified. Among Sūfis the Tawīya occupies the position of a classic, and many commentaries have been written on it.


‘Omar (Abū ‘ūmar) b. Ḥafs was appointed governor of the province of Ifriqiya by the Abbāsid caliph al-Mansūr in 151 (768). He belonged to a family which in the time of the Umayyads had furnished a number of high officials to the state. One of his uncles, al-Muhallab b. Abi Sufra, had attained fame as governor of Kūhārūn under ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān. ‘Omar whose bravery was celebrated had himself held a command in the eastern provinces; he had been given the Persian epithet of Hazarmerd, “1,000 men”.

The difficult situation in Ifriqiya at the time justified the choice of an energetic governor. Barbery had gone over almost entirely to various sects of the Khārījī heresy. The chief leader of the movement was the Sufrī Abū Kūra. The Arab qāmī showed little enthusiasm to fight the rebels and besides, it was much divided by old tribal rivalries.

‘Omar b. Ḥafs, appointed by the caliph, brought with him 500 horsemen. He cleverly won the hearts of the people of Kairawān and was able to secure the country over three years of peace. Al-Mansūr having given him orders to strengthen the defences of Tobna [q.v.], an old town, the strategic position of which on the western borders of the empire was becoming so important, ‘Omar abandoned it. In Tobna, ‘Omar being thus denuded of troops, the Berbers rose and ‘Omar’s lieutenant Ḥālib al-Muḥallabī was killed. This initial success encouraged the rebels who concentrated a large force around Tripoli under an ‘Ibādī chief. Al-Djunaibī b. Baghār, who had assumed command at Kairawān after Ḥālib’s death, asked for reinforcements from ‘Omar b. Ḥafs. He received them but was defeated. The insurrection now became general. Kairawān was again besieged and soon ‘Omar himself who had only 15,500 men under him was besieged in Tobna by several Khārījī armies. ‘Ibādī and Ṣufī units united under the command of Abū Kūra and numbering over 73,000 (the figures given are of course not at all reliable). ‘Omar wished to cut his way through his opponents but his companions prevented him. He then tried to bribe Abū Kūra to leave his allies and offered him 60,000 dirhams but the offer was rejected. ‘Omar then turned to his brother (or son) and obtained for 4,000 dirhams the succession of the Sufrī. Abū Kūra had then to withdraw. ‘Omar b. Ḥafs, thus rid of his enemies, sent a corps against the ‘Ibādī Ibn Rastam who had to take refuge in Tāhet (Tiaret) [q.v.].

‘Omar was again at work in strengthening the defences of Tobna when he learned of the critical situation of Kairawān. The town blockaded for eight months by the ‘Ibādī Abū Ḥākim was in dire straits. With 700 men of the qānī, he hurried to Ifriqiya but instead of marching on Kairawān he took the road for Tunis, enticing the Berbers after him. He succeeded in getting supplies into Kairawān which he then entered himself. The siege was resumed with fighting every day. Food again became very scarce. ‘Omar b. Ḥafs wished to send two chiefs of the qānī to procure supplies but they refused to go. He then decided to make a sortie himself which meant certain death, without awaiting the reinforcements of 60,000 men which the caliph was sending him. Throwing himself on the enemy “like a camel mad with rage” he fell on the 15th of Bhu ‘l-Hijja 154 (Nov. 27, 771).

OMBa HAFŠUN, leader of a famous rebellion in Spain, who at the end of the ninth century A.D. held out for years against the Umayyad emirs of Cordova and in the end was only brought to book by the caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir [cf. UMAIYADS]. His full name was O'MAR b. HAFŠUN b. DJA'FAR called al-Islāmī, from his conversion from Christianity to Islam and he claimed descent from an ancestor named Alfonso who had the title of count (comet). 'Omar's father Hafs or with the specifically Spanish suffix (-ūn), Hafsun, was thus the grandson of a Visigothic lord who had become a Muslim and lived on the income from his lands at Iznate (Ḫisn Awt) in the region of Ronda [q.v.] in the south of Spain in the middle of the 9th century A.D. His son while still quite young displayed a very violent temper and as a result of a crime committed by him against the person of one of his neighbours, had to escape for a time to North Africa, and spent some time at Tābert [q.v.]. He only returned home to rebel at once against the Umayyad emir of Cordova. Having gathered around him a small body of followers he established himself in 767 (883) in a ruined fortress of Bobastro (Ar. ينطخ; q.v.) which he restored.

Dozy has identified this castle with el Castillon, to the south of Campillos, between Teba and Antequera, relying on the discovery at this place of the inscription mention, municiupium Singilifere Barbatuntes, while Simonet thinks that its site corresponds to las Mesas de Villaverde, a little farther south between Ardales and Carratraca. Excavations have recently begun in the district in order to find the ruins of Bobastro. Whatever be the real position of the castle, we know that it commanded the valley of the Guadalhorce in the direction of Malaga and from there Ibn Hafsun could disturb a considerable part of the territory of the kāra of Reiya, which a governor dependent on Cordova was supposed to rule. 'Omar having had several successes, the governor tried to bribe him to reason but without success, and he lost his post. His successor was no more fortunate. Soon Ibn Hafsun was exercising complete authority over all the inhabitants of the mountainous region which extends from Ronda towards Grenada, Malaga and Algeciras. The Umayyad emir Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, had to organise a regular expedition against him the command of which was entrusted to his vizier Ḥāshim b. 'Abd al-'Azīz. Ibn Hafsun submitted and went to Cordova to offer his services to the Umayyad emir in 270 (883). But his submission did not last long; in the following year the rebel had regained the mountains of Bobastro and took by storm the castle in which Ḥāshim had put a strong garrison.

From this time on Ibn Hafsun begins to play the part of a champion in the nationalistic movement in the south of the peninsula, where he put himself at the head of all the malcontents, whether Christians or neo-Muslims (muwalladun). The rapid growth of his rebellion did not fail to disturb greatly the Umayyad emir whose position each day became more precarious. The task of bringing Ibn Hafsun to book was given to the heir-presumptive al-Mundhir b. Muḥammad, who laid siege to one of the rebel's principal supporters Ḥarīth b. Ḥamdūn al-Rifā'ī in his castle of Alhama. But in 273 (886) the emir Muḥammad died and al-Mundhir had to go back to Cordova to be proclaimed in his place. Ibn Hafsun seized the opportunity to organise resistance in all the mountainous districts of Southern Spain and had himself recognised as leader of the rising by all the inhabitants.

On ascending the throne al-Mundhir found himself faced by a critical situation. But he at once took the necessary steps with great energy. There were continual encounters between the rebels and the loyalist troops; in the end al-Mundhir set out in person to lay siege to Bobastro, but after the siege had lasted forty days he died, undoubtedly poisoned at the instigation of his brother 'Abd Allāh who succeeded him.

The new emir displayed no less energy than his brother. Ibn Hafsun had profited by events to increase his influence and according to the chroniclers the land which he ruled was only separated from Cordova by a day's journey. After a truce which only lasted a few months, 'Abd Allāh and Ibn Hafsun resumed the struggle. The Umayyad emir at first devoted his attention to two rebel chiefs, Sawwâr b. Ḥamdūn and Sayf b. Ḥuṭn, whom he conquered; while Ibn Hafsun was collecting a considerable army at Polei [q.v.]. But 'Abd Allāh with a superior army defeated him, put him to flight and took Polei in 278 (991), then Eciña [q.v.] and finally laid siege to Bobastro again. But the rising of the Banū 'l-Hadjādīd in Seville created a diversion in favour of Ibn Hafsun, who from now on seems to have received at least the moral support of the Fāṣimids of Ifriqiya.

The rest of the reign of 'Abd Allāh passed without any great successes being obtained. It would take too long to detail here all the negotiations followed by agreements, more or less observed, which went on during these very troubled years. But the most striking gesture of the rebel was to repudiate Islam openly and, in order to have the more complete support of the Christians of Andalusia and Cordova, to return to the religion of his ancestors. Ibn Hafsun then took the name of Samuel and proclaimed himself not only the leader of the Spanish nationalistic movement but the champion at the same time of a regular crusade against Islam.

The situation was then very critical when 'Abd Allāh's successor, his grandson 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir, mounted the throne of the emirate of Cordova in 300 (912). Without delay the new sovereign saw that it was necessary before all else to dispose of this threat which was steadily increasing in magnitude. Not only the future of his dynasty was at stake but also that of Islam in Spain. For several years he made his preparations with the greatest care and displayed exceptional tenacity. The mountain districts of Andalusia were blockaded, attacked and reduced in turn. Ibn Hafsun, more and more surrounded in the Sierra de Ronda, finally died in 306 (918) leaving to his sons the task of continuing the resistance.

According to some chroniclers, Ibn Hafsun in the last years of his life, seeing the futility of his efforts, submitted to 'Abd al-Raḥmān III and even gave him one of his sons as a hostage. He is himself said to have taken part in the campaigns against the Christians of the north in the Umayyad army.

In any case after the death of the aged rebel,
the ruler of Cordova, now favoured by circumstances, set himself to neutralise completely the influence of the sons of Ibn Hafsün. The eldest, Dja’far, was attacked at Elda and finally fell a victim to a plot. The second, Abū al-Rahmān, after holding out for a time at Tarragona and at Almuerete, met his death in an encounter at San Vicente. The third son, Hafsūn, was besieged by Abū al-Rahmān himself in Bobastro and surrendered in 316 (928) to serve in the Umayyad ranks in Galicia. The final capture of Bobastro marked the last stage in a rebellion of unexampled extent, the suppression of which had been the main care of three Umayyad rulers. It was the crowning achievement of the efforts of Abū al-Rahmān III al-Nāṣir to secure the complete consolidation of his territory before beginning the attempt to advance its frontiers to the north.


'OMAR B. HUBAIRA. [See Ibn Hubaira, i. supra, ii. 383a.]

'OMAR IBN AL-KHAṬṬĀB, the second Caliph, one of the greatest figures of the early days of Islam and the founder of the Arab empire. Religious legend has naturally in the case of 'Omar, as with other heroes and saints of Islam, filled his biography with a mass of apocryphal details. Nevertheless the main characteristics of his personality are revealed to historical research with sufficient clearness for it to be possible to understand his character and assign him his place in the formation of Islam. Like many other people whose strongest characteristic is an energy of will, 'Omar began by being the declared enemy of the cause which he was later to support with all his strength. Legend has perhaps somewhat coloured the stories of 'Omar's persecution of the early Muslims and exaggerates in representing his conversion as the sudden result of his having overheard some verses of the Qur'an read in the house of his sister Fatima, who with her husband, Sa'id b. Zaid, had early given ear to the Prophet's preaching. It is from this sudden reversal of his attitude as well as from the fact that it was under 'Omar that Islam became a world phenomenon, from the simple incident in Arab history that it originally was, that 'Omar has earned the epithet of the "St. Paul of Islam" which the west has given him. In reality there is nothing personal between the two, except the stubborn energy with which they later championed the cause against which they originally fought. As with all great converts, we have in this case only an example of change of polarisation of the same exclusive and uncompromising attitude which, recognising no middle course, is as impetuous in devotion as in hatred. Tradition places the conversion of 'Omar in his 26th year, four years before the Hijra. It is probable that the round figure of 30 which we thus get as the age of 'Omar at the beginning of the new era has something artificial about it. But he was in any case certainly in the flower of his vigour when he began his new career of apostle of Islam. Besides, if his support was only personal and legend has no doubt exaggerated its importance. 'Omar was not able to assist the new religion through the power of his clan (he belonged to the Banū 'Adi b. Ka'b who being only Kurāshī al-Zawārī enjoyed no influence in the politics of the mercantile republic) and made his position with regard to his fellow-citizens was in no way outstanding. Even if it is true that, as tradition has it, as soon as 'Omar joined the community of the faithful, the latter's faith in its ultimate triumph was increased, his intervention certainly had no influence on the events which led to the migration to Medina. It is only in this town alongside of the Prophet and apparently through the prestige of his initiative and strength of will that 'Omar without holding any official position began to be the real organiser of the new theocratic state. His part was that of councillor rather than of soldier; although he took part in the battles of Badr, Ohod and later ones, practically nothing is recorded of his military exploits, accounts of which are so abundant in the case of 'Ali and other Companions. Tradition which traces to his initiative no less than three Kur'ānic revelations (ii. 119: the worship of the maṣfūr ibtidām beside the Ka'ba; xxiii. 53: on the veiling of the Prophet's wives; xvi. 6: on the threat of punishment to the same women) is probably not only true but may even record only a few of the cases in which a suggestion from 'Omar stimulated the Prophet's inspiration. What is remarkable about 'Omar in the Medina period is his perfect agreement with Abū Bakr, a concord which — a surprising thing and one which is a tribute to the two great champions of Islam — was never disturbed by jealousy. The fact that 'Omar like Abū Bakr also became the father-in-law of the Prophet through the marriage of his daughter Hafsā, did not arouse the slightest feelings of rivalry in him; on the contrary it was he who on the death of Muhammad thrust the caliphate upon Abū Bakr. The ingenious theory put forward by Lammens (M. F. O. P., iv. 113 sq. and reproduced in Etudes sur le siècle des Omeyyades) about the "triumvirate Abū Bakr, 'Omar, Abū Ohaibā d. al-'Hjarah" (these three individuals united by a bond of intimate friendship are said to have dominated and so to speak monopolised the authority of the Prophet, controlling him either by direct action or through
his wives, 'A'ishah bint Abi Bakr and Hafsa bint 'Omar) may be to some extent correct but should not be pushed too far. It is beyond question that 'Omar, the greatest brain of the three, was able in the lifetime of Muhammad as well as during the brief caliphate of Abü Bakr to resist the temptation to come too much into the foreground. But as soon as the first caliph was dead the power naturally passed to him.

The question whether the dying Abü Bakr designated 'Omar as his successor has been the subject of much discussion by the theorists of Muslim constitutional law. As a matter of fact, there does not seem to have been any formal act of investiture which would in any case have been of no value for it would have been quite out of keeping with Arab custom. 'Omar assumed power de facto and the recognition which was at once given him by the majority of the Companions assured him the exercise of it in a way quite similar to that in which the nomination of the emir in the tribes took place, who, as we know, was only firmly seated when the individual approval of the members of the tribe had been asked and obtained. Later he had extended his control over regions of which he had not assumed power. Such a system however primitive gave no trouble, except when the feeling between two parties was acute; this is what happened at the election of 'Ali. Against 'Omar there was only the dissatisfaction of the 'legitimist' party of 'Ali and the Anṣār who had however been defeated too recently when Abü Bakr had become caliph to feel like organising a regular opposition.

'Omar at the beginning of his rule found that the great expansion by conquest had already begun; he had perhaps contributed more than any other to its beginning in his capacity as adviser to his predecessor. This is not the place to discuss once more the traditional story of the Arab conquests, nor to subject to a revision the well-known thesis of Caetani on their origin and character. This thesis has seemed to lessen considerably the importance of 'Omar's personal action and to take from him the glory of having been their initiator and director, according to a strategic plan conceived in advance of the campaigns against the Byzantine empire and Persia. In reality there is reason to marvel that a simple citizen of Mecca should have been capable of controlling with an undisputed singleness of command undisciplined levies of Beduins, scattered over a vast area and should have been able to keep control over their chiefs who were practically the sole masters of the position. If the military victories were not due directly to 'Omar it was certainly to him that the credit should go of never having lost control of his generals and above all of having been able to make use of the powerful and talented family of the Omayyads, without however allowing them to have a free hand. His quarrel with Khalid b. al-Walid who, after having won the most brilliant victories for Islam, was dismissed and deprived of 'Omar's personal favor, gives us an idea of the political talent of 'Omar and the extent of his authority. The knowledge of the limits of his power (which is the mark of political genius) caused him to treat the wily 'Amr b. al-As with tact and to leave him the initiative in the conquest of Egypt. But he was careful at the same time to put at his side an old Companion of the Prophet, al-Zubair, as a check upon him. He was careful in general (and the appointment of al-Zubair was no exception to the rule) not to appoint to high commands respected Companions whose ambition he had cause to fear. He preferred to watch them from close at hand and to satisfy their parvenu desires with the revenues of the great royal domains of the Irāq and Syria which he assigned to them (cf. qāṭ'a and ūṭla). If tradition has done justice to 'Omar's strength of will, it should be remembered that he also knew how to employ with success gentler and simple methods.

The caliphate of 'Omar which is marked by the complete transformation of the Muslim state, is regarded by tradition as the period in which all the political institutions by which it was later ruled had their origin. That there has been in tradition a process of idealisation which centred in a single individual a complicated development extending over several generations is what historical criticism has not failed to recognise. But the part played by 'Omar was nevertheless a great one. The regulations for his non-Muslim subjects, the institution of a register of those having the right to military pensions (the d'fā'id), the founding of the military centres of which were the focal areas of the future great cities of Islam, the establishment of the office of kādī were all his work, and it is also to him that a series of ordinances goes back, religious (the prayer of the month of Ramadān, the obligatory pilgrimage) as well as civil and penal (the era of the Hīdjr, the punishment of drunkenness, and stoning as a punishment for adultery; in connection with the last it looks as if he did not hesitate to interpolate a verse in the text of the Qur'ān; cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qorāns, i. 248–251). If it is true that several of these institutions, particularly those of a fiscal character, were rather of the nature of provisional regulations than definitive legislation and if it is also true that the fiscal business continued to be carried on by Persian and Byzantine officials and that the coins continued to be struck with the types of both empires, we cannot however refuse the title of political genius to the ruler who was able to impress a stamp of unity and permanence upon the variegated and confused elements which went to make up the new Muslim state.

In spite of the autocratic character of 'Omar’s rule, his caliphate has nothing of the monarchical character about it. It is further distinguished from that of Abü Bakr by a deeper feeling of its permanent character. Thus for the title of khilāfah which conveys the idea of deputy, there was substituted that of amir al-mu'minin (which 'Omar is said to have assumed in the year 19), in which the character of sovereign is more marked; at the same time the religious character in it becomes more distinct. Indeed one might say that 'Omar was inclined to renew, naturally with a shade of difference, the theocratic regime of the time of the Prophet; being neither able nor willing, it must be remembered, to pose as a prophet, he yet knew how to take advantage of the intimacy in which he had lived with the Prophet to legislate in the spirit of the latter and to give to his own measures an almost supernatural origin. It is perhaps this which tradition is trying to express when it makes Muhammad say: ‘If God had wished that there should have been another prophet after me, 'Omar would have been he'.
in the slightest degree the necessary qualities to overcome them.

While orthodox tradition reverses in 'Omar not only the great ruler but also one of the most typical models of all the virtues of Islam (cf. a list of his merits in the work of al-Muhibb al-Tabari, al-Riyād al-nādira fi Manakib al-ʻAghara, Cairo 1327), the Shī'a has never concealed its antipathy to him who was the first to thwart the claims of ʻAlī (cf. Goldziher, in W.Z.K.M., xx. 321 sqq.). The šīfī teaching although it exalts the ascetic austerity of the life of ʻOmar, has very little to do with him; besides this type of puritan lends itself very little to mystical speculations whether in its historical reality or in its idealisation in legend.

**Bibliography:** All the historical material is to be found collected in L. Caetani, Annoti dell'Islam, III.—vi. (Milan 1909—1912); vol. v. contains the historical synthesis of his caliphate and vi. the general Index. The material contained in the works on ʻHadīth, which has only been partly utilised by Caetani, is collected by A. J. Wensinek, A Handbuch zur arabischen Tradition, Leyden 1927, p. 231—236, s.v. ʻOmar.

(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

'Omar Efendi, an Ottoman historian, according to popular tradition originally called Elkasović or Čauević, belonged to Bosniski-Novski. Of his career we only know that he was acting as kâdi in his native town when fierce fighting broke out on Bosnian soil between the Imperial troops and those of Ḥakim-oghlu. ʻAlī Paša (1150—1237). ʻOmar Efendi at this time wrote a vivid account of the happenings in Bosnia from the beginning of Muḥarram 1149 (May 1736) to the end of Djiṃādā I 1152 (end of March 1739); written in a smooth easy style, this work is of considerable importance for social history. It seems to have been called Ḥaẓawā‘ī Ḥakim-oghlu ʻAlī Paša but is usually quoted Ḥaẓawā‘ī—Dīyār-i Bosna, and sometimes as Ḥaẓawā‘ī—nāme-i Rūmālī (i.e. Banjaluca in Bosnia). As a reward for this literary effort, ʻOmar Efendi was promoted to be one of the six judges (wūlbe-i wulūs sitte). Of his further life and death nothing more is known. It is certain that he ended his days in Bosniski-Novski and was buried there. The site of his grave is still pointed out but the tombstone has disappeared.


**Bibliography:** Safvetbeg Bačagić, Bojnjaci i Heregevci u islamskoj književnosti, Sarajevo 1912, p. 152; F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 276 sq.; Mehmed Handžić, Književnirad bosansko-her-
'OMAR KHAIYĀM, famous Persian scientist and poet of the Saljuq period (d. in 526 = 1132).

Biography. Although reliable information on Khaiyām is scarce, we cannot underestimate the importance of the sources at present available.

In his Algebra he refers to himself Abu 'l-Fath 'Omar b. Ibrahim al-Khaiyām and in his verses seems to use Khaiyām ("tent-maker") as his tabākhuš. It is likely that this nickname refers to the profession of his ancestors. W. Litten, in his pamphlet Was bedeutet Chajām? Warum hat O. Chajām... gerade diesen Dichtermonen gevoilt?, Berlin 1930 (25 p.), has suggested the possibility of a technical interpretation of Khaiyām as "poet, expert in metrics" (cf. Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Kais, Miqādam, in G. M. S., p. 13–16), where metrical terms are explained by the names of different parts of the tent (biš in Arabic both "house" > tent and "verse"). However, in the well-known quatrains, such as Khaiyām ki khaima-khi yi frumat midakhk the reference is evidently to "tents" and not to "verses".

'Omar was a Khurāsānī from Nishāpūr or its neighbourhood. The date of his birth is unknown. He was already famous as a mathematician in 467 (1074–1075) when with Abu'l-Muẓaffar Asfāharī and Māmūn b. Naḍīb Wāṣītī (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, x. 67, under the year 467) he presented to the Persian calendar [cf. Dālahī]. In 506 (1112–1113) Niẓām-yi Arūḍī met 'Omar, whom he calls Ḥududīya al-Ḥakī, in Balkh and in 530 (1135–1136) visited his grave in the Hīra cemetery of Nishāpūr "it then being four (variant: some) years since his death". Consequently the probable date of Khaiyām's death would be 526 (1132). (On Khaiyām's grave beside the shrine of Muhammad Mahbūr see Muhammad Ḥasan, Mafta al-Shams, iii. [Tehran 1503 = 1886], p. 101, 173; Sir F. Sykes, A pilgrimage to the tomb of 'Omar Khaiyām, in Travel and Exploration, London, Sept. 1909, ii. 129–138, and Williams Jackson, From Constantinople to the Home of Omar Khaiyām, New York 1911, p. 240–245. See also a picture in the Times, July 16, 1934. On the occasion of Firdawsi's millenary (Oct. 1934) the Persian Government took the occasion also to erect a new monument of white marble over Khaiyām's tomb.)

Niẓām-yi Arūḍī's Chaḥār Maḥāla, written ca. 551 (1156), remains the oldest contemporary witness to 'Omar. The second and even more important biographer is Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Ali Bahiḳī (q. v.; died 565 [1169]); the relevant passages, already known through quotations in Shahrazūrī, have been translated by Jacob and Wiedemann, Zu 'Omer-i Chajām, in Ist., iii. (1912), pp. 42–62 (English transl. of the principal passage by Sir E. D. Ross and H. A. R. Gibb, in B. S. O. S., v., pp. 467–473). Bahiḳī calls 'Omar al-Dastār al-Fa'allal, Ḥududīya al-Īslām 'Omar b. Ibrahim al-Khaiyām. He says that he had a disagreeable character and was not so nice to his pupils as for example Asfāharī. However, when in 507 (1113) Bahiḳī (at that time only 8 years old; cf. Yaḡū, 1931, 205) visited 'Omar, the latter examined him in Arabic poetry and geometry and expressed his satisfaction. Malik-Shāh (cf. also Chāhār Maḥāla, p. 63) and the [Karaḵānī] Shams al-Muluk of Bukhārā (d. 547 = 1159) were particularly kind to 'Omar but Sandjar had a grudge against him. Among the persons who had direct intercourse with 'Omar are mentioned Abu Ḥamīd Muhammad al-Ghazālī and the learned prince of the Karaḵānī dynasty Farīr Marzī b. Āli Khaiyām. In different references 'Omar is also called the follower of Abū 'Ali b. Sīna (Avicenna). Though he was a scholar in philosophy, jurisprudence and history he was no prolific writer and of his works Bahīḳī mentions only a short treatise on physics (Mukhtasar fi 'l-Takbīrīfī), a treatise on Existence (Fi 'l-Wujūd) and a treatise on Being and Obligation (al-Kawm wa'l-Taklīf). In the Khatārīd al-Kār of 'Imād al-Din al-Kātib al-Isfahānīi (written in 572 [1176–1177]) Khaiyām is mentioned as an incomparable scholar of his time enjoying a proverbial reputation (bihi yuṭrub al-maṭāla'). Khānī (d. 595 = 1198–1199) refers to him once in a verse. Among the later sources may be mentioned Shaikh Naḍīm al-Din's Mirsād al-līlūd (620 = 1223–1224) where 'Omar is called "an unhappy philosopher, atheist and materialist". Kift, Ta'rīḥ al-Hīnakārī, ed. Lippert, p. 243–244 [the passage first utilised by Woepcke, represents Khaiyām as a follower of Greek learning (cf. Bahīḳī). Shahrazūrī's Nūḥat al-Arwaḥ (sixth century) chiefly repeats Bahaḳī. Rashīd al-Din in his Dīwān al-Tawārīkh is the earliest authority known for the tale of three schoolboys: Niẓām al-Mulk, Ḥasan-i Šābāḥ and Khaiyām. The chronological discrepancy involved by this story was already noticed by A. Mūller: Niẓām al-Mulk was born in 408 (1017) and there are no indications that Khaiyām [or Ḥasan-i Šābāḥ] died at the age of more than 100 years (cf. A. Mūller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, ii. 97, 111; Browne, A. Litter. Hist. of Persia, iii. 190–193. On the different explanations of the legend see Houtsma's preface to al-Bundārī, p. xiv., note 2; Muhammad-Ḵān Ḵāzwī in Browne's translation of the Čahār Maḥāla, p. 158 and latterly H. Bowen, in J. R. A. S., Oct. 1931, 771–782). However, the facts remain that Niẓām al-Mulk must have met Ḥasan-i Šābāḥ (cf. Ibn al-Ḵārīb, x. 110 [year 949]) and that Khaiyām in his metaphysical treatise dispassionately mentions the İsmā'īlī among the searchers for metaphysical truth, but the authorship of the treatise is suspect.

Khaiyām as a scientist. Khaiyām's scientific activities for a long time eclipsed his poetical renown and in 1848 Reinard in his learned introduction to Abu'l-Fidā'a Geography wrote: "malheureusement, 'Omar allait avec l'astronomie le goût de la poésie et du plaisir."

On the reform of the calendar for which Khaiyām is responsible jointly with his colleagues, cf. Dālahī.

MSS. of Khaiyām's principal work on Algebra exist in Leyden, Paris and the India Office (see Woepcke, L'algèbre d'Omer Alkhaïyami publiée, traduite et accompagnée d'extrait de ms. inédits, p. 1851). Khaiyām's introduction to his researches on Euclid's axioms (Muḥāṣārat) was translated by Jacob and Wiedemann, in Ist., iii. (MS. in Leyden). The treatise Muḥūṣūlīha al-Ḫīṣāb exists in Munich. G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, Washington 1927, i. 759–761, calls Khaiyām "one of the greatest mathematicians of
medieval times. His Algebra contains geometric and algebraic solutions of equations of the second degree; an admirable classification of equations, including the cubic; a systematic attempt to solve the all and partial geometric solutions of most of them. His classification of equations... is based on... the number of different terms which they include... thus Omar recognises 13 different forms of cubic equations... Binomial development when the exponent is a positive integer. Study of the postulates and generalities of Euclid" (cf. also W. E. Story, Omar as Mathematician. Boston 1918 [17 pages]). In physics Khayyam's researches were devoted to the specific weight of silver and gold (MS. in Gotha; see Wiedemann, Über Bestimmung der spezifischen Grade [Beiträge, in S. B. P. M. XXI, xxvii. [1906]. p. 170—173). The Šārīrī's Alfi (written about 1000 = 1591) quotes the names of the Mīrzā al-Hikam "on the methods of determining the value of objects studded with precious stones without taking the latter out" [perhaps the same work on geometry and algebra of the Lawdarn al-Abmkha "on the methods of determining the orientation and the cause of the difference of climate of various countries".

Of metaphysical works of Khayyam a MS. of the above mentioned treatise on Existence is in Berlin and a MS. of a little Persian treatise (Dar 'Ilimi Kulliyāt) in Paris. Of the latter Christensen has translated several chapters, Un traité de métaphysique de Omar Khayyam, in M. O., i. (1905), p. 1—16. This treatise, of the contents of which Christensen has a poor opinion, is dedicated to a certain Fakhr al-Milla wa l-Din Mu'ayyad al-Malik, probably one of Niẓām al-Mulk's sons.

Finally must be mentioned the Nawrūz-nāma of which the existence was first revealed by F. Rosen, The Quatrains of Q. Khayyam newly translated, London 1936—1938. The text based on the unique Berlin MS. (Rosen: 1365 a.v.; Muḥammad Khān Kawzni: "not later than the 7th century of the Hijdra") was published with notes and a glossary by Muḥfiz-i Minawī, Thirān 1933. This treatise is a presentation pamphlet written at the request of a friend. The matter, referring to Nawrūz [q. v.] occupies only 19 pages out of 77; the rest is taken up by such subjects as gold, horses, falcons, wine, beautiful faces. The treatise does not show any deep knowledge in the compiler and his authorship, for several reasons, cannot be considered as finally established. An incomplete copy of the same treatise (perhaps the first 43 pages out of 77 of the printed edition exists in the British Museum, Add. 23,568, fol. 869—101b: Risāla dar ūfakiki Nawrūz [Anonymous]).

For lists of Khayyam's scientific works see Brockelmann, G. L., i. 471; Suter, Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber, 1900, p. 112; Muhammad Khan Kawzni, in the Cāhsad Mašāla, p. 220—221; Cassilis, op. cit., introduction (21 names are quoted of which some are only Persian equivalents of Arabic titles).

In a very detailed book Khayyam, or uskī savarnik wa-sanā'īn fur nādīnā dar warmer, published in Hindustani by Saiyid Sulaimān Nadwi, 'Aṣām-ghar, 1933 (508 pages), the following scientific works ascribed to Khayyam have been reproduced: Risāla al-Kawān wa'l-Takht (with further polemics on the subject); Risāla al-Wuḍūd (published in Cairo under the name of Diya' al-Qādī); Risāla al-Wuḍūd also called al-Aynif il-l-Nawrūz; Risāla i Kulliyāt-i Wuḍūd (in Persian); Mīrzā al-Hikam, Khayyam as a poet. Already 'Imād al-Dīn Isfahāni in his Kharitāt al-Qāṣ (572 = 1172) mentions Khayyam among the poets of Khurāsān and quotes four Arabic verses of his. Nā'dīn al-Dīn Kāšī cites two quatrains in Persian. Shahrazūrī gives three Arabic fragments (and) numbering respectively 4, 6 and 3 verses [while the Persian translation of Shahrazūrī, finished in 1011 (1602), substitutes for them 2 Persian quatrains]; that of 6 verses belongs to the same poem as the verse quoted by 'Imād al-Dīn. Kifi reproduces exactly the latter's quotation. Djuwaini (658 = 1260), i. 128, puts a Persian quatrain into the mouth of Saiyid 'Izz al-Dīn who was counting the victims of the Mongol invasion in Khwarizm in 518 (1221). One quatrain is found in the Ta'dīrkh-i Guizā, in G. M. X., p. 518. From 741 (1340) we possess 13 quatrains preserved in the Ma'ānis al-A'hār. The MS. edited by F. Rosen contains 229 quatrains but its date 721 (1321) is certainly wrong. The other oldest collections of the 13th (xvth) century are:

Stambul A S 1032 861 (1456—1457)
NO 3892 865 (1460—1461)
315 quatrains;
Oxford Bodl. Oneley 140 865 (1460—1461)
158 quatrains.

Later the number of rubā'īyāt in some MSS. rapidly rises: the MS. in Vienna (Fügel, Handschrift, i. 496, N°. 507) dated 597 (1550), has 482 rubā'ī, that of the Bankpūr Public Library, dated 961 (1555—1554), 604 rubā'ī, till finally in the Lucknow edition of A. D. 1384 one finds 770 rubā'ī. Miss Jessie E. Cadell (Fraser's Magazine, May 1879) is said to have collected from all available sources 1,200 quatrains; see the list of the MSS. in Cassilis, op. cit., p. 17—39.

Already in Th. Hyde's Vetus etnova Persarum..., Religionis historia, Oxford 1700, p. 529—30, there is found a Latin translation of Khayyam's quatrain Ay, sīkhto-yi sīkhto-yi sīkhtan. For the first time several Persian quatrains were published in a Persian grammar compiled by F. Dombay in Vienna in 1804. Khayyam's renown in Europe, however, was long based on his scientific activities and it is noteworthy that his Treatise on Algebra was translated in 1851, while the first edition of Fitz-Gerald's famous version of the quatrains was published in 1859, the French edition by Nicolas in 1867, and only since the second edition of Fitz-Gerald's version in 1868 has the wave of admiration for Khayyam swept through western lands. Critical studies of the text started only in 1897, when Žukowsky published his article "Omar Khayyam i stroimowysyja ciestworoszyja, in al-Maqṣafrati, a presentation volume to Baron V. Rosen, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 344—363 [made more widely accessible in an early (abridged) translation by Sir E. D. Ross, in J. R. A. S., xxii., 1898, p. 349—366]. Žukowsky's merits consist in: 1. rendering accessible some old texts on Khayyam's biography entirely unknown up to that time, and 2. shattering the uncritical belief in the authenticity of the existing collections of quatrains. Žukowsky showed that 82 out of 464 quatrains included in Nicolas' edition are found also in the dīwāns of
987

39 other authors (and sometimes simultaneously in the diwāns of several poets). He then divided these 82 quatrains into different subject groups and thought that the proportion thus obtained would (in inverse order!) serve as a hint for the characteristics of Khaiyām. For example, the interpolations of epicurean character represent 33% and those which give expression to Muslim free-thinking 2%. Therefore, the safest way is to take as a basis the least interpolated group of which the authenticity has been shattered the least. Consequently Žukowsky attaches a particular importance to the "mystic sīraḥ" in Khaiyām's poetry. This theory (which puzzled Christensen, Recherches, p. 10; and misled Hartmann, in W.Z.K. M., xvii. 367) is certainly insufficient both psychologically and statistically, for it is not the percentage of interpolations but that of the remaining quatrains which is of importance. So Žukowsky's discovery of a high proportion of "wandering" quatrains is valuable only as a negative principle (cf. Barthold, in Zap., xxv. 403-404). The thoroughness of Žukowsky's work is shown by the fact that the later researches by E. D. Ross and Christensen resulted in the raising of the total number of ascertained "wandering" quatrains only to 108.

In his Recherches sur les Rubā'īyat de 'Omar Ḥayyām, Heidelberg 1904, Christensen went one stage farther. Stating how rapidly the number of quatrains increased since the date of the Bodleian MS. (only a century later the Bankipīr MS. contains 604 quatrains!), he postulated a similar process for the time separating that MS. from Khaiyām's death (over three centuries): "how many quatrains then would remain attributable to Khaiyām? A diwān is transmitted tolerably intact, whereas a collection of rubā'īt is much more exposed to tampering." Consequently "there exist no criteria [of genuineness] both as regards the form and the matter" of the quatrains (p. 32). Christensen admitted only the probability that the twelve rubā'īt containing Khaiyām's name and the two quoted by Nasr-i Khān had some sense of being genuine. [But even one of the 12 quatrains of the first category has a variant ascribed to Aflālī Khāšī]. The more optimistic conclusions of Christensen are that those 14 quatrains "contain, so to speak, in nucleus all the rubā'īyāt" and that in general the poetical and historical importance of the rubā'īyat must be severed from the question of their authorship. As Khaiyām wrote in the national Persian spirit the latter addition kept "within the same cycle of ideas" (see the 14 quatrains above mentioned). Only the few mystical and erotic quatrains seem to be interpolations foreign to Khaiyām's nature. In a following chapter Christensen studies the historical traits of the Persian national character and winds up by saying that Khaiyām's spirit is the Persian spirit as it existed in the Middle Ages, and as in substance it is nowadays" (p. 89). This part of Christensen's reasoning must be initably accepted cum grano salis, such matters admitting unfortunately no final demonstration. A further step in the study of Khaiyām's text was the discovery by Muḥāmad Khān Kāzwīnī of 13 quatrains in the anthology Mu'āns al-thānā (composed and copied in 714 = 1314; see Sir D. Ross, in B.S.O.S., iv/iii, p. 433-439). F. Rosen, in the Persian preface to his new edition (1925) of the Rubā'īyat (also in German, Zur Textfrage der Vierzeltler 'Omaris des Zeitmachers, in Z. D. M. G., 1926, p. 284-313), criticised the exaggerations of the theory of "wandering" quatrains but authenticated only 23 rubā'īt (those quoted by Rāzī, Ḍiuwainī etc., six of those containing the name of Khaiyām and 13 of the Mu'īnis al-Āḥārī). Finally, after a new revision of all the materials available, Christensen in his Critical Studies in the Rubā'īyat of 'Omar-i Khayyām, Copenhagen 1927, offered a new criterion to ascertain the genuineness of the quatrains. He divided (p. 19) the collections of quatrains into three categories: those in which the quatrains are disposed without any alphabetical arrangement, those with single alphabetical arrangement (i.e., in groups according to the final letter of the rhyme) and those with double alphabetical arrangement (under each rhyme letter the quatrains disposed in the order of the first letter, of the beginning word). He takes the first arrangement as the oldest and of this group mentions five specimens: one bearing the apparently false date 721 (1321), one dated 902 (1496) etc. The double alphabetical arrangement is already found in the Bodleian MS. and the single alphabetical one must be presumably older. Moreover Christensen noticed that in different collections (of the first and second class) there were found series of quatrains "in the same, longer or shorter succession" (p. 13). Though the comparison of the non-alphabetical group led to "a purely negative result" (p. 27) as regards the establishing of a textual tradition, Christensen suggests that in some cases (MSS. dated 1528 and 1540) the principle underlying the non-alphabetical arrangement was the disposition according to the contents. Moreover he thinks that we may "learn something by studying the total stock of the texts" (p. 27) and consequently (p. 39) lays down an elaborate system of rules based upon the number of times a given rubā'īt is found in different groups of MSS. This system being strictly enforced entails considerable changes in the former views on the subject: thus out of the six best attested quatrains contained in Khaiyām's "Rubā'īyat" one proclaimed spurious, one uncertain and four genuine (p. 40).

Finally 121 quatrains which have stood the test are taken as a basis for a new characteristic of Omar.

The new method, in spite of its mathematical character, greatly depends on the materials utilised by its author. H. Ritter in his important review of Christensen's work (Zur Frage der Echtheit der Vierzeltler 'Omar Chayyāms, in O. L. Z., 1929, N°. 3, col. 156-165) has quoted 7 ancient MSS. found in Constantinople. Of these the two oldest (that of 861 = 1456 containing 131 quatrains, and that of 865 = 1461 containing 315 quatrains) are non-alphabetical while that of 876 (1471-1472) containing 320 quatrains is alphabetical. This fact is partially in favour of Christensen's views but the order in the two non-alphabetical MSS. is different from that of BN1 (the oldest of the non-alphabetical MSS. quoted by Christensen, dated 902 = 1496-1497 and containing 213 quatrains). On the other hand, the MS. of 865, contemporary with the famous Bodleian MS., contains double the number of the latter's quatrains. Lastly two of the MSS. mentioned by H. Ritter contain each 478 quatrains in a special arrangement by Ver (Da) Ahmad b. Husain al-Rashidi al-Tabrizi, who in 867 (1462-1463) arranged the quatrains
in nine chapters according to their subjects. This fact, Ritter thinks, may be responsible for the traces of a similar arrangement in the two later MSS. (dated 1528 and 1549) mentioned by Christensen [in Tahiriz’s redaction a paper was read by M. F. M. Kaprusi-tade at the Orientalists Congress at Oxford; it was also known to Husain Dânisch; v. i.]. So H. Ritter falls back upon Christensen’s conclusions of 1904 and in a somewhat modified form insists on the practical impossibility of authenticating this or that of Khâyâm’s quatrains. The rubâ‘iyât have been transmitted by methods typical of popular songs (typische Volkliederberüfiung); they express the popular feeling of the masses (Volksempfindung) which opposed the official religious and literary spirit of foreign origin. As now we happen to speak of a truly “Khâyâmî” quatrain, so historically the particular genre must have been associated with the great savant, and Christensen’s attribution of his selection of quatrains to ‘Omar can be understood only in the sense of a collective name for all what is looked upon as a manifestation of a peculiar tradition (Einzeluberliefung).

Further interesting is the discovery of a MS., dated 1423 and containing 206 quatrains announced by Mahfîz al-Hâkî at the meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, on April 5, 1932, and H. H. Schäfer’s paper Der geschichtliche und der mythische ‘Omar Châyâm, read at the Orientalistentag held at Bonn at the end of August 1934. Schäfer is extremely and perhaps excessively sceptical as regards the attribution of the quatrains to ‘Omar Khâyâm. He concludes by saying that “Khâyâm’s name must be struck out of the history of Persian literature”. He also doubts the authenticity of the treatise published by Christensen and the Naârâb-nâmâ. Schäfer’s paper will appear in book form. For a resumé see Z. D. M. G., xiii/2, 1934, p. 25—*28.

Conclusions. The upshot of the preceding study is that we possess nothing approaching a res extensa recepta of Khâyâm’s poetical works. What should we say, if for characteristics of a historical personality we had his correspondence in which scarcely a single letter could be authenticated and many were decidedly spurious? Taking, for instance, the important point of “mystic Şāfâyâm” we find that Žukowsky makes a strong point of it in Khâyâm’s poetry, while Christensen denies its importance, though in support of this insufficiently attested tendency one could quote Khâyâm’s metaphysical treatise in which the most honourable place is reserved to the Şâfit seekers of Truth (cf. Rosen, 1926).

The striking contradictions in the ideas and feelings expressed in the Rubâ‘iyât have struck all those who have written on Khâyâm and the characteristic trait of the “type associated with Khâyâm” seems to be precisely the alternation of sarcastic pessimism and epicurean hedonism, of the consciousness of frailty of our contingent existence and the joyful mood of carpe diem. Nevertheless it must be admitted that the pessimistic side of Khâyâm’s poetry is better attested by the quotations in the older biographers and, what is more, by the Arabic verses of ‘Omar Khâyâm which may have suffered in transmission but which certainly could not be imitated by popular tradition (F. Rosen has utilised the Arabic verses in his penetrating study of 1926).

FitzGerald’s version. Khâyâm’s popularity among large circles of the public is chiefly due to the English version by E. FitzGerald (1809—1883). This paraphrase has exceptional poetic merits, consisting in the second edition of 110 quatrains [third edition: 101], cannot, however, be taken for a translation in the strict sense of the word. E. Heron-Allen who most carefully compared the English and Persian texts (Some side-light upon FitzGerald’s poem “The Rubâ‘iyât of ‘O. Khâyâm”, 1898) has established that 40 quatrains are faithful paraphrases of single rubâ‘î; 44 are traceable to more than one rubâ‘î; 2 are inspired by the rubâ‘î found only in Nicolau’s edition; 2 reflect the “whole spirit” of the original; 2 are traceable exclusively to Ṭâṭar; 2 are inspired by Khâyâm but influenced by Ḥâfîz and 3 (only in the first two editions) could not be identified. As manifestations of the almost religious feeling with which the admirers treat FitzGerald’s version may be mentioned the ‘Omar Khâyâm Club, founded in London in 1892 (and its numerous imitations in the U.S.A.), as well as J. R. Tatin’s book, A concordance to FitzGerald’s translations, London 1900.

Bibliography. See the works mentioned in the present article. For the older bibliography see H. Ethé, in G. J. Ph., ii. 275—277; Brown, A Literary History of Persia, 1906, ii. 246—259; Krimsky, Istoriya Persii (Trudi po vostokoved- deniiu, xvi., tome i., № 4), Moscow 1909, p. 358—390. Last in date and very complete is A. G. Potter, A bibliography of the Rubâ‘iyât of ‘Omar Khâyâm, together with kindred matter in prose and verse pertaining thereto [second edition], London 1929, 314 pp. [contains 1,308 printed items and mentions over 50 principal MSS. and 35 editions of the text].


Translations into European languages: into English see above, Whinfield, Heron-Allen, Christensen, J. Payne, 1898; F. Rosen, The quatrains newly translated, London 1930; into German: A. von Schack, Stuttgart 1878; Bodenstein, Breslau 1881; F. Rosen, Die Sonnebrutsche Omars des Zelotakens (several editions); into French: see above Nicolas, Ch. Grolleau, Paris 1903; Claude Anet (in collaboration with Muhammad Khatn Kazzim), Paris 1920 (144 quatrains). Cf. also the extensive collection of translations into English, French, German, Italian and Danish edited by N. H. Doke, Boston and London 1898, 2 vols., clxxix. + 655 p. Single quatrains have been translated into most of European and extra-European languages, Basque, Yiddish and Gypsy included. Modern Arabic translations: Ahmad Hamid al-Šarrāf, Baghdād 1350 (1931) (with lengthy introduction); al-Sayyid Ahmad al-Šafi al-Najjāf, Dimishk 1350. (V. Minsky, Omārah b. Abī l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Zahirān al-Ḥakamī al-Yamanī, an Arab man of letters born in 515 (1121) in Martân on the Wâdī Wāsá in the district of al-Zarābīn in the Thāhmat al-Yaman, executed on Ramadan 2, 569 (1174) in Cairo, according to al-Fadīl al-Makhdūmī [cf. the article al-Salāhīn]. In that period the Yaman, broken up into many little principalities, was suffering severely from continual civil wars. Traditional learning was still in a flourishing condition however, especially in the large towns. In 530 (1136) Omāra was sent by his father to Zabid, where he studied, especially Shāfiʿī law, under ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Abbār and others. In the year 535 he was given his teacher’s diploma (līfāṣa), visited his parents and taught for three years in the madrasa of Zabid. While civil war was raging with particular violence in Zabid, he spent some time in the coast town of Anbara where he was on intimate terms with one of the pretenders, ʿAlī b. Mahdī [q. v.]. Returning to Zabid, he continued his studies and in the years 538–548 engaged in trading between Zabid and ʿAden which brought him into contact with the Banū Najīḥī, a dynasty of Abyssinian origin reigning in Zabid. In the year 538 (1143) he went on his first hajjī with some members of the dynasty. In ʿAden he entered literary circles and was able to develop his poetic gifts. The rivalry between the Najīḥīs and the Zurārīs who ruled in ʿAden provoked intrigues against him which threatened his life and forced him to leave the Yaman. In 549 (1155) he went on pilgrimage to Mecca and was sent by the Shirif Ḵāsim b. Ḥāshim on a mission to the Fāṭimids in Egypt. Returning to Mecca in the same year, he visited Zabid and ʿAden for the last time in 551 (1156) and in 552 (1157) again made the hajjī. Sent on a mission a second time, he settled permanently in Egypt. He said himself that he came here to seek “position and fortune” (al-fikr ʿalā ṣāḥba wa ʿl-ʿimāra: Diwan, i. 287); his later life is typical of the Arab adīb. Although he held for some time the title of ḱāḥī, he devoted himself exclusively to working as a court poet. His ḵāṣidās of praise were dedicated not so often to the last Fāṭimid caliph al-Fālid [q. v.] (d. 555 = 1160) and al-ʿĀṣid [q. v.] (d. 567 = 1171) as to their autocratic chievers, who changed the stage like marionettes: Taḥfī b. Ruzzik [q. v.] (d. 556 = 1161), Ruzzīk (d. 558 = 1163), Dirghām [q. v.] (d. 559 = 1164) and Shīrkhū [q. v.] (d. 564 = 1169). In the continued changes at court, Omārah managed always to hold his position. When Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn came to power first as vizier, he addressed to him in 1169 an appeal in verse which appears to have had the desired effect. With the end of the dynasty his position became difficult; Omārah was neither a Šāḥī nor an ʿImām al-Dīn in Dernbūren, i. 399 or al-Danjani, ibid., ii. 546–547) but his sympathies inclined to the Fāṭimids and he openly expressed them in a popular ḱāḥīda of lament. Very soon afterwards he took part in a conspiracy, the object of which was the restoration of the Fāṭimids, was crucified along with other participants and buried in the cemetery of Cairo. Among his contemporaries Omārah was especially renowned as an authority on law; in Zabid he was known as al-Fāradī, in al-Yaman as al-Šāfī (see al-Danjani in Dernbūren, ii. 546); several textbooks compiled by him on al-farādī were popular in his native land in his lifetime (see al-Nūkūr in Dernbūren, i. 23). Nothing of his legal work has survived and we only know him as a literary man of very ordinary type. His works in the sphere of Shāfīʿī law have disappeared, but his own time, but Dernbūren much exaggerates their literary value. The most interesting is perhaps al-Nūkūr al-ṭawīla fit al-Shārīr al-Šaṣṣah al-Mīṣīya (ed. by Dernbūren, i. 5–154; ii. 503–511) which contains many autobiographical details, an anthology of his verse and notes on the contemporary Egyptian viziers. It begins in the year 558 (1162) and comes down to the death of Shāwar (564 = 1169). He dedicated his history of al-Yaman to the Kâdī al-Fāḍil [q. v.] (1135–1200); it was begun at his suggestion in 563 and finished in the following year (ed. by H. C. Kay). Based on the same plan as a work of his predecessor, the emir of Zabid Ṭaḥṣīrī b. Najīḥah (d. 498 = 1158), called al-Muṣīfī fit al-Shārīr Zabīd, which has not come down to us, it is known as the Turḵī al-Yaman. Its importance lies mainly in what he tells from his own experience or hearsay. Of less interest are his Tarāṣṣalūtī, nine in number (ed. Dernbūren, ii. 431–490). They show the influence of the famous Ṭalḥī al-Kādī al-Fāḍil, being in rhymed prose filled with all kinds of stylistic figures. His anthology of the poets of Arabia, particularly of al-Yaman, has not come down to us but was much used by ʿImād al-Dīn in his Ḵūrīdīr al-Ḵasrī. Of his Diwān (ed. by Dernbūren, i. 155–394; ii. 405–429, 511–539) no proper edition exists and all the known manuscripts differ in their contents and are not all complete. His famous ḱāḥīda of lamentation for the Fāṭimids for example is known not from his own Diwān but from the separate MSS. and other sources (in addition to the texts from Ibn Wāṣil and al-Maʿṣūrī given by Dernbūren, ii. 612–616 see now al-Kalḵāshandī, Ṣabīḥ al-ʿĀṣid, iii., Cairo 1914, p. 530–532). As a poet Omārah was entirely in the tradition of the later ʿAbbaṣī school. His models in the panegyric style he found in Bashshār, Mīyār and al-Buṭṭūry (Diwān, i. 266–267); to these may be added Abī Tammām (the Arab critics had already noticed this; cf. e.g. Ibn al-ʿAthīr, al-Maṣāḥa al-tawīrīr, Cairo 1282, p. 409) and al-Mutanabbi. The influence of the last named is particularly marked,
not only in his verses, but also in many passages in his letters. As regards subject, his poems are mainly kaṣādas of praise or lamentation. Satires (ḥida'ā) are rare as he had once promised his father neve to insult a Muslim (Derenbourg, ii. 791). This of course did not prevent him from mocking officials of Christian origin in epigrams which are quite obscene (Divān, i. 312; 331); in keeping with the taste of his time we frequently find in his Divān prophetic phrases (v. 283, 392; ii. 431, N. 342). The form of his poetry follows tradition in matter and composition; only a few muwâwīkhādāt are attributed to him (Divān, i. 388—391; to be added in M. Hartmann, Das arabische Ströpfengedicht, i., Weimar 1897).


OMDURMAN (Um Dürman), a town of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan situated on the west bank of the main Nile immediately below the junction of the Blue and White Niles. A seven-span steel bridge built in 1925—1928 connects Omdurman with Khartūm (q.v.), and the two towns (together with Khartūm North on the right bank of the Blue Nile) form for practical purposes a single city; but whereas Khartūm as the seat of the government and the centre of foreign commerce has acquired a European character blended of British and Levantine elements, Omdurman remains the focus of native life and of the internal trade of the Sudan. The inhabitants number some 110,000, of whom the great majority are natives drawn from every part of the country.

The importance of Omdurman is of very recent origin; it started as an insignificant village in the territory of the Fritḥāb (a branch of the Qimāṭyā tribe) and is first mentioned as the dwelling-place of a ascetic and "holy man", Hamad b. Muhammad generally known as Hamad Walad Umm Maryūm, who lived from 1640 to 1730 A.D. (see MacMichael, History of the Arabs in the Sudan, ii. 277). The site first became important when it was fortified by Gordon for the defence of Khartūm against the Darwīsh army of Muhammad Ahmad [q.v.] who captured it on January 15, 1895, ten days before the fall and sack of Khartūm. Under Muhammad Ahmad's successor, the khalīfa 'Abdulwālī, Omdurman was the capital of the Mahdist state and the religious centre of the new sect. The Mahdi's tomb, a domed building designed by an Egyptian captive, was erected in the middle of the new settlement which henceforth was known as Būk'at al-Mahdi, the [holy] place of the Mahdi, and by the khalīfa’s ordinance the duty of visiting the tomb was substituted for the orthodox pilgrimage to Mecca. In order to consolidate his personal rule the khalīfa induced large numbers of his fellow-tribesmen, the Tanīgha and other Baṭsīrah from the western Sudan, to settle in Omdurman where they could support themselves only through the spoliation of the ivoryin population; this migration was described as a ḥida'ā in accordance with the Mahdist practice of establishing analogies between the life of Muhammad Ahmad and his companions and the early history of Islam. The population of Omdurman was further swelled by the enforced settlement of large numbers of tribesmen from all parts of the country whom the khalīfa desired to concentrate at his own headquarters for political or military reasons. The town grew up in a haphazard fashion and, apart from the houses of the khalīfa and his principal amirs, consisted of a struggling mass of straw huts covering a length of about six miles from south to north. The khalīfa’s "mosque" was a vast open space in the centre of the town enclosed by brick walls. For a graphic description of Omdurman under the khalīfa’s rule see Sir Rudolf von Slatin’s Fire and Sword in the Sudan.

The reconquest of the Sudan by the Anglo-Egyptian forces under Lord Kitchener was completed by the battle of Omdurman on September 2, 1898, the scene of which was near the village of Kerċerī a few miles to the north of the town. Under the new administration the town has acquired such modern features as regularly laid-out streets, tramways and electric light. The houses of the well-to-do townpeople and the government buildings are built of brick and stone, but a large part of the town still consists of the rectangular mud buildings which are characteristic of the northern Sudan, and the life of the busy markets preserves its Oriental and African character. Associated with the principal mosque there is an institution known as al-madīhad al-ilāmī, presided over by a shaikh al-ilmāmi, which provides instruction in the traditional subjects of Muslim learning. The kādis employed in Muslim law courts are however drawn from students of the Gordon College in Khartūm. For secular education Omdurman possesses a government intermediate school and several kuttābā (government elementary schools) as well as a number of schools maintained by missiona ry societies and by private enterprise.

often reprinted); Report on the Administration, Finances and Condition of the Sudan (H. M. Stationery Office, London 1925, and annually).

S. Hillelson

ORÂMÂR, URMAR. The administrative geography of Turkey speaks sometimes of a baṣaṣa of Urâmâr containing two nāhiya, Djilüle and Ishâţân; with 32 neighborhoods and 25,910 inhabitants (cf. Cuiinet, Turque d'Asie, ii, 756), sometimes of a nāhîya of this name forming part of the baṣaṣa of Gavar, in the sanjaq of Ħakkari, in the wilâyet of Wân [q. v.]. We incline rather to the second definition, having visited this district, lost in the middle of Central Kurdistan. Not only has Orâmar not the importance of a baṣaṣa but the two nāhîya attributed to it are inhabited exclusively by Nestorians [q. v.], the Djilüle, being autonomous while Orâmar is at present at least purely Kurdish and an appanage of the house of Mâlah Mirî, a tribe of Duskânîs Zûri and not Herikî (Cuiinet, op. cit.): a further proof of the inaccuracy of the Turkish statements regarding this part of Kurdistan. The boundaries of Orâmar are on the north Ishtagân and Gavar; on the south Šekkân: on the west Djilüle, Bûz and Tîşâma [cf. Nestorians] and Artûš; in the east Šul [cf. Shâmîndân]. Orâmar situated at a height of 5,520 feet (cf. Dickson) is a group of hamlets scattered on the two sides of a rocky mountain spur above the Rûhârî Shîn. On the spur itself which is called Gaparâni Zher, at the place named Gire Bûî, is the capital of the group and the residence of the zâhîh, the Nâw Gund or "the middle of the town". A large cemetery occupies the promontory at the end of the spur. The name Gire Bûî which we explain as the "hill of the idol" seems to indicate the antiquity of the settlement. The fact that the slopes separated by the Gaparâni are very carefully cultivated and present a complicated system of little terraces each of which is a field or tiny kitchen garden, leads one to believe that man chose this site for habitation a long time ago, perhaps simply on account of its extreme isolation in the centre of a wild country.

O r o g r a p h y. On the general character of the country see the article Nestorians, Orâmar is at east end of the curve traced by the system of the Djilû Dîghî. According to Dickson, the chains and valleys of Turkish Kurdistan run roughly along the parallels of latitude and take a south-eastern direction as they approach the Persian frontier and at the point where they change their axis form a complicated system of heights and valleys. The most complicated part near the centre of the change of axis in question may be called Hartî-Orâmar.

R o a d s y s t e m. Although they are really nothing but tracks used for intertribal communications, it is nevertheless interesting to indicate the directions to connect the routes of the road-system which we have studied at Rawândzî and Shâmîndân [cf. these articles] which must have played a more prominent part in ancient times. Orâmar is connected with Gavar via Shamskî, the pass of Bašhtázîn, 'Ali Kânî, Baţûtî and Dîzza. It is a road which shows traces of works undertaken at the more dangerous places. To the south the road going through a very narrow defile leads first to Nerwa (cf. below) where it forks: 1. to the west, by the district of Artûshî, via Birtû-Tîsîm and the district of Nirwe via Wîlîa and Pîrî Hâlân, this last place being on the left bank of the Great Zāb opposite Sûriya on the road from 'Akrâr; 2. to the east, by the district of Rekâni, via Bèzâlî-Sadadî and Avî Mârîk (water course) to Barzan and Bahrî Ras on the left bank of the Great Zāb opposite Bîr Kepran, also on the road from 'Akrâr. A third road goes from Nerwa to Nehri, the centre of Shâmîndân, via Raĝa, the heights of Peramîzî (frontier of the three tribes — Rekâni, Harkî, Duskânî), Derî deffle of Harkî (Sîwa Harkî), Begor, Mazrâ, Nehri. It is to be hoped that with the final delimitation of the boundary between Turkey and the Irâk, this region will be properly surveyed and mapped and will no longer as at present show so many blanks and inaccuracies on the maps (cf. Astre François, Oct.-Nov. 1926, treaty of delimitation).

E t h n o g r a p h y. The following Kurdish tribes may be mentioned in Orâmar itself and in the vicinity with ramifications inevitable as a result of the Kurd migrations. After the name of each tribe we give in brackets that of the district and the number of households: Duskânîs Zûri (Orâmar, 2,000); Nirwe (Nerwa, baṣaṣa of Amâdiya, 800); Djîr (Gavar and Gelîa Djîr, 1,000); Penanîshî (between Gavar and Dîlûmerk, and the part of the Pirhulî, near Bashkâlî, 4,000); Duskânîs Zûri (baṣaṣa Dehuk, 2,000); Maisîrì Zûri (ibid., 5,000). Berwârî (ibid., 4,000). Gauël, nomads (wintering at Dehuk; summing at Gavar and Orâmar, 1,400); Ceïl (Dîlûmerk, 6,000); Artûshî (summing at Fârûshî; wintering at Berîl Zângî, 6,000); Artûshî (sedentary Alâbîk, 1,000; Nurzî, 1,000); parts of Artûshî: Gwardam, Mâm Kûrân, Zhirkî (around Dîlûmerk, 6,000).

H i s t o r y. There are so far as we know no texts mentioning Orâmar except this brief note in the Mirâzd al-Bâldîn (Tîrân, p. 22): Ormar bi-dammi awal wa-sukhî-ya-thîn iktî as-aghî-ši Ashârî-sâîdîn ast dâr āmâdî dânašî kahte rîzÎ dângi wa-mudâfî Sâlî ibn ut-cî Âm dângî wa-Sîrî dângî-ya Sallî Dîrîr ibn 'Abd al-lâl al-Badjîlî bâ dângî dângî âmâdît mamâr kurd wa-Qûrîr âmâdît mamâr bawayasawardî-i iškân bâ dî dîr zad. —

We may note here: 1. the reading Urmar which corresponds to the pronunciation of the Highland Nestorians for this part of the but differs from it in giving an a and not an ò for the second (in Kurdish the pronunciation is Horâmar with the characteristic aspiration); 2. the qualification al-Badjîlî which is to be connected with Badjîlî, a Kurd village in the neighbourhood known for its family of Shaikh Badjîlî; 3. the fact that the date of this event is not indicated. Orâmar however like all this part of Central Kurdistan must have had a rich history full of associations with the history of Christianity in these regions. Here we give a description of the Nestorian church of Mâr Mâni which is in the village of the same name in Orâmar and has not been previously described; Dickson mentions it; as to Cuiinet (op. cit., ii, 757) he says that the 40 Nestorians raysa domiciled in Orâmar are entrusted with the care of the two Nestorian churches in the Kurdish town (see). The second church called that of Mâr Dâmilî at Naw Gund (cf. above) has been turned into a mosque within the memory of the present generation. The Nestorian charm uttered at the sight of a snake in order to escape its bite mentions the two saints: Mâr Mâni Mâr Dâmilî kîps-l-kubîn kîhs ("M. M., M. D., the stone on the snake"). For legend says
that the saint Mārī Manū escaped from martyrdom in the time of Julian the apostate at Caesarea in Cappadocia and took refuge in the mountains where he collected the reptiles and shut them up under a flagstone over which was built the church which bears his name (cf. Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum, ed. Bedjan, vi, 1896). The life of the saint however contains no mention of Orāmār or of reptiles but it does attribute to him certain powers over wild animals. The version collected by Dickson seems to differ too much from the life of the saint. Dickson thinks that the church was erected on the site of an Assyrian zikkurat. In any case the following is the description of the sanctuary which is guarded by the Nestorian family bearing the title of Serdar Bī Mārī Manū. Were it not for a very little door adorned in the upper part with a Nestorian cross and two circles within which is the same cross, one would not suppose that the building of rough stone in the form of a parallelepiped was a church. In the semi-darkness of the interior one can see that a quarter of the area is taken up by the sanctuary while separated from the nave by a wall in which are two doors. Through that on the left one approaches the altar proper represented by a stone over three feet high and about two broad half built into the wall with rounded edges and narrowing towards the top. Above this altar is a very narrow, very high, very little niche. From the sanctuary a door through a stone wall leads into another chamber in which there is a primitive baptistery carved out of the rock and a little lower on the same base a hearth (tanura) for the preparation of the unleavened bread. In front of this part set aside for the divine offices, there are two pulpits also in stone for the liturgical books and for the Gospels and the cross. The bells are replaced by two metal plates hung from a rod connecting the two walls at the bottom of the vaulting. There are no sacred images. The dimensions of the church are about 40 feet long, 17 broad and 16 high. According to the legend, the reptiles shut up beneath the altar would come out if the family of guardians were deprived of their secular privileges. The dust from the walls possesses virtues against the bites of mad dogs, the slings of snakes and scorpions, etc. — We have very little certain information about the Nestorian churches of Kurdīstān, some of which, that of Mār Bishū on the Persian frontier (Tergawar), that of Mār Zaīla at Dijlī, that of Mār Sawā at Ashīta as well as the ruins at Kuqanīs must with Mār Manū go back to a high antiquity between the 4th and 6th centuries, for it is to this period that we are told we must put the coming of the first missionaries, Mār Awgin, Mār Bishū etc. The plan of Mār Manū may be compared with that of Mār Bishū given by Heazzel (Kurds and Christians), while in W. A. Wigram (The Assyrians and their Neighbours, London 1939) is a sketch of the interior of the church of Mār Shahīthā at Kuqanīs. In any case there is reason to believe that Orāmār was once inhabited by Christians. A local tradition even suggests that the ancestor of the modern tribal Mádūs came long ago into this Christian district and by stratagems and intrigues succeeded in driving out its inhabitants. The toponymy of Orāmār seems to confirm this. The etymology of the name Orāmār itself would also seem to be Araamic. — We owe to Mgr. Grafini the interpretation of the name as Ur-mūr “citadel of the master” (cf. Ur-siklitum). This explanation would be corroborated by the inaccessible character of the region. It would confirm at the same time our supposition that this district was inhabited at a very early date. — There are similar place-names elsewhere in the region: Ora Bishū, one of the slopes of Kiria Tawka (cf. above); Orishu, a village beyond Gela Nu; Uri, a Nestorian clan; finally Urmia itself.

Bibliography: The only works with which we are acquainted are listed in our joint study with E. B. Soane, Sato and Tato, a Kurdisch text with transl. and notes, in B.S.O.S., iii., p. 1. — In the review of the Geographical Society of Paris appeared in 1935 our study on Le système routier du Kurdistān, containing besides many geographical details a general view of Orāmār from a rare photograph.

(B. Nikitine)

ORAN (Wahran), a sea-port town on the coast of Algeria (33° 44' N. Lat.; 0° 39' W. Long.). The anchorage which is protected on the west by the heights of the Aïdou, the extreme end of the little range of Mirdajdo, and the bay of Mars al-Kabir, 10 miles distant, was probably the Portus Divini mentioned in the Itinerary of Antoninus. According to the Arab writers however, the town was founded, as a number of other towns on the northern coast, by Andalusians: at the beginning of the tenth century (c. 290 A.H.) a band of these émigrés came there under the leadership of two chiefs in the service of the Umayyads of Cordova, Muhammad b. Abi 'Awn, and Muhammad b. 'Abdān who concluded a treaty with the families of the Berber tribe of the Azādja settled in the district.

Seven years after its foundation, Oran, which the agents of the Umayyads had no doubt wished to make a base for the enterprises of their masters, felt the repercussions of the rivalry between the Umayyads and the Fāṣimids of Kairawān. A body of soldiers sent by the latter and supported by the Azādja Berbers seized the town and burned it. Rebuilt, Oran was placed under the authority of the Fāṣimid governor of Tiyařet. Throughout the fourth century (tenth A.D.) it was held alternately by the Fāṣimids and Umayyads and was taken and re-conquered (notably in 910 and 954) and rebuilt by expeditionary corps or Berber chiefs representing the two rival caliphs. In spite of these vicissitudes, the town enjoyed great economic prosperity as a result of its position on the coast. The geographer Ibn Hawkal, who visited it in the second half of the tenth century, thought that there was not a more sheltered port in the whole of Barbary. The commercial relations with Spain were considerable. (The town however at this date was under the authority of ziyya b. Nānān [cf. Zirids], a vassal of the Fāṣimids). Large quantities of wheat were exported from it. The country around was well cultivated. The river (Wādī Behi, now covered over in its passage through the town) served to irrigate the fine gardens.

In the eleventh century, Oran belonged to the Banū Khalīṣ, a branch of the Maghra wa Zenāt who ruled in Tlemcen. It was from them that the Almoravid Yūsuf b. Tashfin took the town when he conquered the Central Magrib in 473 (1081). 63 years later it was to be the scene of the drama in which Almoravid power met its end.
On Ramdan 27, 539 (March 23, 1145) the second last emir of the dynasty, Tâshfin b. 'Ali, defeated near Tlemcen by the Almohads, died there. Three days later the town passed to the Almohads.

Under its new masters the town prospered. Idiisi described it as surrounded by a good wall of earth and possessing well-furnished bazaars. The harbour, which was supplemented by that of Mars al-Kabir, was within easy reach of Almeria. It had a naval arsenal and 'Abd al-Mu'timin built ships there.

The part which it played in commerce with Spain became still more important when the 'Abd al-Wâdîds [q.v.] replaced the Almohads in the Central Maghrib. Oran was, along with Honain, to the east of the modern Nemours, a port of Tlemcen. The wealth of the capital depended on the possession of these ports and on the safety and liberty of traffic on the roads which led to them. This explains why throughout the xivth century when the Marinids came to besiege Tlemcen, they sent a force against the coasts to try to take Honain and Oran. In 1748 (1347) the Marinid Abu l-Hasan built two forts there.

At the beginning of the xvth century, the Castillians, continuing the work of the Reconquista on the Berber coast, endeavoured to take Oran, which had now become a dangerous centre of piracy. They were only able to take Mars al-Kabir in 1505 and Oran in 1509. On May 17, Pedro Navarro entered the town, massacred 4,000 Muslims and sent off 8,000 prisoners. Cardinal Ximenes who had organised the expedition came in person to take possession of the new conquest. Wishing to develop their success the Spaniards interfered in the quarrels of the last 'Abd al-Wâdîd kings of Tlemcen. They gave their support to one of these princes who had lost his throne and this provoked the intervention of 'Arûdi [q.v.], the Turkish corsair of Algiers. The latter having been defeated and killed, the 'Abd al-Wâdîd Abu 'Abd Allah was restored to the throne of Tlemcen by the Christians in 1543 and became their vassal. The other expeditions planned from Oran as a base produced little result and were ended by the disastrous expedition of the Count Alcaudete against Mostaganem in 1558. The Spaniards were at Oran, as elsewhere, practically confined within their walls, badly supplied by their Berber allies (los Moros de Pas), exposed to famine, plague and the attacks of the Berbers supported by the Turks; they nevertheless held it till 1708. After a siege of five months, they capitulated and the Bey of Mescara Bu Shahîgah took possession of it in the name of the Dey of Algiers.

At the end of twenty-four years of Turkish rule the Spaniards re-entered the town. The Count of Montemar, having routed the Arabs who held the coast, entered the town which was undefended in 1732. Bu Shahîgah tried in vain to re-take it. At last in 1791 after a terrible earthquake in which almost 2,000 perished and which was followed by an attack by the Bey of Mescara, Muhammad al-Kabir, the king of Spain Charles VI agreed to surrender Oran to the Dey of Algiers; some 70 or 80 Spanish families remained in it however. The town restored to Islam became the residence of the Bey of the West and remained so till 1830. On Jan. 4, 1831, the French, already masters of Mars al-Kabir, entered Oran.

The town has developed immensely since then.

The population, which was 3,800 in 1832, is now over 160,000. Of this total the Muslims number at least 25,000. They live mainly in the southern quarter known as the "village nègre". Among the Europeans the element of Spanish origin is considerable.

There is little trace of its Muhammadan past in Oran. The Spanish period has left more, notably the old fortress with its gateway adorned with vigorously carved coats of arms.

Bibliography: Ibn Hawkal, ed. de Goeje (B. G., ii, vol. ii); transl. de Slane, Description de l'Afrique (J. A., 1824, vol. i); Bakri, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale, ed. de Slane, Algiers 1911, p. 70-71; transl. in J.A., 1859, ii. 121-123; Idiisi, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, ed. Dozy and de Goeje, Leyden 1866, p. 84; transl. p. 96-97; R. Basset, Fastes chronologiques de la ville d'Oran pendant la période arabe, Paris—Oran 1892; Fey, Histoire d'Oran avant, pendant et après la domination espagnole, Oran 1858; Walsin-Estherhazy, Notice historique sur le Maghzen d'Oran, Paris 1849; Ruff, La domination espagnole à Oran sous le gouvernement du comte d'Alcaudete, 1534-1558, Paris 1900; Braudel, Les Espagnols en Algérie, in Histoire et historiens de l'Algerie, Paris 1931. (G. MARÇAY)

ORFA (Greek Edessa, Z. Syr. Orhâ, Armen. Õhây, Ar. al-Ruhâ), an important town in Diyâr Muhammad, the ancient Osroene.

The origin of the town, which must have existed before the Macedonian conquest, is lost in obscurity. Repeated attempts to prove the existence of the name in Assyrian times (E. Honigmann, Urfa keilschriftlich nachzeitarb., in Z. A., N. F., v. 1930, p. 301 sq.) have so far failed. The original name was probably Ō̄fân which has survived in that of the spring Kallâš, which lay below the walls of the town, and in that of the district of Osroene (cf. Orfa in Isid. Charac., i, ed. Müllner, in G.G.M., i. 246; Ō̄fân, Steph. Byz., s. Bârby; Arabs Orfe, Plin., Nat. Hist., v. 85; vi. 23. 129; in inscriptions Orhaeni, C. L., vi. 1707; their land was called in Syriac Bith Orfa; Cureton, Spilii. Syr., p. 20). A derivation of the Syriac Orfaš from the Arabic Warhâši (a fîlîš-form from warîša, "rich in water") as proposed by Markwart (in E. Hersfeld, in Z. D. M. G., lviii., 1914, p. 665 sq.) can hardly be accepted; as little probable is that from Orhaš, the alleged first ruler and eponym of the town.

Edessa was refounded by Seleucus I on the site of an older settlement (Euseb.-Hieron., Chron., ed. Helm, p. 127) and renamed by Antiochos IV ʻAntîkas evi Kallâš (Plin., Nat. Hist., v. 86: ḤEadesām quæ ad quondam Antiochâ dictabatur, Callirhoenâ a fonte nominatum; coins in Babelon, Köis de Syrie, cii.; Head, Histar, num. 2, p. 814 and Hill, Greek Coins of Arabia in the British Museum, London 1922, p. cxiv.—cviili. and 91—119). It received its Hellenistic name very probably from that of the capital of Macedonia (the ancient Aigai, now Vodena) and the wealth of water may have contributed to the choice of the name (Steph. Byz.: ḤEadesā, τῆς Σιρίας, δία τῶν ὕδατος μένου ὀνόματι χρυσάς ἢ τῆς ποιοτείας ἰδιότητος, of Macedon.; Nordeke, Hercus, v. 459, wished to emend ὀνόματι to ὄρος, but cf. ὑδατα from ἅῦδος = ὀδα, voda, from which Vodena is derived: G. Hoffmann, Die Makedonen, Gottingen 1906, p. 257; J. Marquart, loc. cit., p. 665 sq.; W. Tomaschek, in S. B. d. W.,
According to Malalas, the town was also called "Antiochē τοῦ μείζονος" (p. 418 sq., ed. Bonn.).

In the pre-Christian period Edessa, like Harrân, was the centre of a planet-cult. Edessenes called Venus "Bath Nikkal" (Doctrina Addai, p. 24), i.e. "the daughter of Ningal" (G. Hoffmann, in Z. A., xi, 1896, p. 258—260, § 11; Winckworth, in Journal of Theol. Stud., xx. 402).

Before the foundation of the Osrhoene kingdom, the town seems to have been an unimportant place under the Seleucids (to 139 B.C.). Its earlier history is quite unknown. The kings of Osrhoene, whom the Romans regarded as Arabs (Tact., Ann., xii. 12, 14; Plin., Nat. Hist., v. 55; Arabiam Orrhoeos), bore Nabataean (Ma'nî, Bakrû, Ṣabdû, Sahrû, Gebarû, Ayûrû), Arab (Abgar, Ma'ûr, Wu'll) or Parthian (Phradasht, Pharnaspas or Parthamaspates) names. From the end of the first century A.D. the dynasty was closely related by inter-marriage to that of Adiabene (Duval, Histoire d'Edesse, p. 27 sq.) which then ruled Nîbûs also (Josephus, Ant. Jud., xxv. 68).

The names and chronology of the kings of the Greeks called them, toparch or phyarchus of Edesse (Osrhoene) are known from the "Edessene Chronicle" (composed about 540 A.D.), and the "Chronicle of Zuqitn" (near Amid; preserved in the same Cod. Vat. Syr. 162) written about 775 A.D. According to the "Edessene Chronicle", the dynasty ruled for 552 years, and began in 133-132 B.C. with Orhîî bar Ḩeveyû but according to v. Gutschmidt, rather with Areyû (Doct. Addai, ed. Phillips, p. 47), whose name is not to be regarded as Iranian (v. Gutschmidt, in Mém. de l'Acad. Imp. des Scien. de St. Pétersb., series vii., xxxv., 1887, p. 19), but as Semitic ("Lion") (Duval, Histoire d'Edesse, p. 26 sq.).

The list of toparchs which has been corrected by von Gutschmidt from historical references and coins is as follows: they were under Parthian suzerainty at first (down to 57 B.C.)

Areyû (132-127 B.C.); Ṣabdû bar Ma'ûr (127-120); Phradasht bar Gebarû (120-115); Bakrû I bar Phradasht (115-112); Bakrû II bar Bakrû (alone 112-94; together with Ma'nî 94; with Abgar I Pe'kê 94-92); Abgar I (alone 92-68), in which the reign of the kingdom passed for a short time to Tigranes of Armenia; Abgar II (Ariamnes?) bar Abgar, of the family of Ma'nî, hence in Florus III, 11., and Ruf. Fest., Brev., 17: Mazorus, Mazaera etc. (68-53), who entered into friendly relations with Rome about 65-64. After the battle of Carrhae there was an interregnum of one year (53-52). Ma'nî II Allîhî (Theos, 52-34); Fakurî (34-29); Abgar III (29-26); Abgar IV Sumakû (26-23); Ma'nî III Saphil (23-4 B.C.); Abgar V Ukkâmî (4 B.C.—7 A.D.); Ma'nî IV bar Ma'nî (7—13 A.D.); Cumont found in the citadel of Birejik an epitaph in Syriac of 6 A.D. (?) of Zabirian, commandant of Birtha and governor for the time Ma'nî bar Ma'nî (Kügner, in R.S.O., i, 1908, p. 557; Cumont, Études syriaques, Paris 1917, p. 144); Abgar V Ukkâmî (for the second time: 13-50); Ma'nî V bar Abgar (50-57); Ma'nî VI bar Abgar (57-71); Abgar VI bar Ma'nî (71-91), under whom the Senator Ma'nî bar Ma'nî had a sepulchral tower built for himself in Serin on the Euphrates (B. Moritz, Inscriptions aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien, ed. Oppenheim, Leipzig 1913, p. 165 sq.); interregnum of 18 years (91-109; rule of Sanatrûces of Adiabene, nephew of Abgar, over Edessa?); Abgar VII bar Izat (109—116).

After the great rebellion of 116 the town was taken by Lucius Quietus and burned. There followed a brief interregnum under Roman rule (116—118). Iûr (or Vulud) and Pharnaspas (118—122), then Pharnaspas alone (122—123); Ma'nî VII bar Izat (123—139); Ma'nî VIII bar Ma'nî (139—163). In the Parthian war of Lucius Verus, Edessa was besieged by the Romans in 163—164 and surrendered to them after the murder of the Parthian garrison. During the war the ruler was Wu'll bar Sahrû (163—165). After the conclusion of peace (165) Edessa passed under Roman protection; Abgar VIII (165—167); Ma'nî VIII phâlîmânîs (for the second time 167—179); Abgar IX bar Ma'nî (on coins: Α. Κύριος Ἡσταίμης Μέγας Ἀβγαρός; 179—214), under whom occurred the first great inundation of Edessa (Nov. 201) which destroyed his palace; a winter palace was thereupon built in the Tebarâ quarter. The official account of the catastrophe and of the measures taken by the king is preserved in the "Edessene Chronicle" from documents in the royal archives. Abgar was in Rome perhaps in 202 where he was received with all honour by Septimius Severus. Christianity is said to have been made the state religion in his time (which has however not been proved: Gomperz, Archäol.-epigraph. Mitt. aus Oster-Ungarn, xix. 154—157); according to legend Abgar V Ukkâmî had become a Christian in the year 29 or 32 (R. A. Lipsius, Die edessische Augsburger kritisch untersucht, Brunswick 1880). A friend of Abgar IX was the Christian scholar Bardaisan (Vardanes, 154—222 A.D.); Sex. Julius Africanus is also said to have spent some time at his court (Ps. Moses Khoren, Hist., ii. 10). The cult of Thar'ashî was exterminated by Abgar IX with great rigor. Abgar then ruled along with Severus Abgar X bar Abgar as co-ruler (214—216); both were put in chains by the emperor Antoninus Caracalla in 216. The emperor spent the winter in Edessa which was now created a Roman colonia and on Apr. 8, 217 he was murdered on his way from there to Carthâae.

After the fall of the kingdom of Edessa, according to the "Chronicle of Zuqitn", Ma'nî IX bar Abgar ruled for another 26 years (216—242), but he probably lived during this time in Rome and was only nominal ruler.

When the Staânsins Ardshir and Shâhpuru I disputed Osrhoene with the Romans, Gordian III again set up a member of the old family as king in Edessa. According to the coins, Abgar XI Phrahatres reigned from 242-244; he was probably a son of (Antoninus) Ma'nî. Returning to Rome, he erected a tombstone there to his wife Hodda with inscription (C. I. L., vi. 1797).

After the royal house had adopted Christianity, Edessa became along with Adiabene the centre of literary activity in Syriac (east Aram.) (cf. Duval, Histoire d'Edesse, p. 107 sq. and the histories of Syriac literature by Wright, Duval and Baumstark).

Edessa became a Roman city from the time of Gordian (244); after his death, it is true, Philip the Arab invaded Mesopotamia as far as the Euphrates to the Parthians; but the Roman garrisons remained in the country (Mommsen, R.G., v. 422). Shâhpuru I besieged Edessa in 260, and the emperor Valerian was taken prisoner by the Persians not far from here about this time. The
town then belonged for a time (till 273) to the kingdom of Palmyra under Odaïnath and Zenobia.

After the peace of 363 Aphrem (Epiphram; d. June 9, 373) of Nisibis moved to Edessa and founded there the “Persian school”; the emperor Valens banished the Orthodox from Edessa as Arians in Sept. 373 and they only returned after his death in 378. The monasteries on the sacred hill at Edessa were plundered by the Huns in 396 and Aphrem’s nephew 'Absamya composed laments upon this.

It is only from the beginning of the third century that we know the names of bishops of the town; these begin with Papù (c. 200) and among them are Rabbâlî, the enemy of the Nestorians (411—435), his opponent and successor Hîbî (435—457) and in the sixth century the founder of the Severian “Jacobites,” James Baradaios (Ya'kôb Bûrdeamû, d. 578), but later persecutions of the Christians led to the martyrology, much embellished by legend, of the “Edessa professors” Sharbîl and Barsamîa (250 A.D.), Shemônî, Gûrîya, and Hîbbîb (509—510). The legend of the “man of God from the city of Rome” (St. Alexius) is put in the period of Rabbâlî.

Edessa became the capital and ecclesiastical metropolis of the eparchy of Osroene. There were seven bishoprics under it in 451: Marêqâlîs (Syriac Hîklâ de-Saiygda, “temple of the hunter”), Kâllê (Harrân), Ksîrênîa, Bêwê (now Biredîjk), Kallînînus, Kowzqartîn (Tellâ, Tellâ de-Mawzeltâ), and that of the Taiyâné (Schulthess, in Abh. G. W. Gutt., N. S., x., 1890, No. 2, p. 134). Later were added Bîrma (Sarûdî), Yêlêmêm (Tellmêmeh), “Hirmâ” (Syr. Imerin), DêwÎn (Arab. Kalât-Dîbar), Nîn Olaqalla and Mâsêrê (Syr. Ma'ritha; cf. B. Z., xxv., 1924, p. 73 sq., 77 sq.).

The emperor Zeno in 489 finally closed the “school of the Persians” after the Nestorians had already with their leader Narsai been driven out of Edessa in 457 (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 104, note 12, p. 109, note 10). The war with the Persians (502—506) in the reign of Anastasius is described in the Syriac chronicle by an Edessene, the author of which is wrongly said to be Joshua (Joshî) Stylites. After Amida had fallen in 503, Kâwghân besieged Edessa but could not take it (Procopius, Bell. Pers., ii. 13). The undisciplined Gothic troops, who were to defend it, plundered it like enemies and practically the whole of Osroene was depopulated. After the fourth inundation of the town (525 A.D.; see below) the emperor Justin I restored it and gave it the name of Khuwârâ (Malalu, ed. Bonn, p. 419; Euagrius, Hist. ecc., iv. 8; Hallier’s quite unfounded doubts, Texte u. Unterr., iv. 136, are repeated by Ed. Meyers, R. E., i. 5. ed. Edessa, No. 1, 2, etc.). Khusraw I in May 540 on his way back from Syria encamped in front of the city but retired on receiving 200 pounds of gold (Chr. of Edessa, ch. 105; Noldke, Ṭabârî, p. 239). His stubborn siege in 544 proved without success. According to a late legend, the wondrous powers of the ikôn DχKpOÎfOvTÎK, which were rediscovered at this time, saved the city from the enemy.

In the sixth century the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia was won for the Monophysites. In Edessa Stephanos bar Šudâlît, who, influenced by Origen, preached a pantheistic doctrine, found many followers. In 580 Hormizd IV sent the general Adharmahan against the Byzantines but he retreated after a three days’ siege of Edessa. Khusraw II who had been previously in Edessa on his flight to Maurice, conquered the town in 609 (Chron. Pasch., ed. Bonn, p. 699; Cedren., ed. Bonn, i. 714; Theoph. cont., ed. Bonn, p. 432) after it had previously gone over to him for a time under the Byzantine general Nares, and deported a large number of Jacobites to Khûrân and Sidjîstân (Barhebraeus, Chron. ecc., ii. 125). After his victories over Persia, Heraclius in 628 restored orthodoxy in Edessa, and banished the prominent Jacobite families.

On the topography of the town Syriac and Greek authors supply us with a good deal of information. Edessa lay at the intersection of the road from Samosata (Samâs) to Carrhae (Harrân) with the great trade route between east and west from the Euphrates at Zeugma-Balkîs and Birthâ-Biredjîk via Mârûm and Nâṣibîn to the Tigris. The Antonine Itinerary knows (p. 184—192) two roads from Germanicia via Zeugma, one from there via Samosata and one from Callicome to Edessa. The town lay in a hollow surrounded on three sides by mountains and open on the southeast on the river Euphras (Syr. Dultîn, “the Leaper”), the modern Karn Kûbîn or Nahr el-Kût. This branch of which the Dûljâb flows into the Balîkh, in the past, according to the Edessene Chronicle, four times inundated the town and wrought great havoc (in Nov. 201, May 303, March 18, 413 and April 22, 525) until the emperor Justinian had a canal dug to drain off the flood water north of the town (Procopius, De aed., ii. 7, 1 sq.; Aucell., 18, 38). We hear again in 668 and 743 of floods however (Theoph. Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 537; Chronicle of Zubîn, under the year 743). The town was surrounded by a double wall. This enclosed on the southwest the citadel which stood on a spur of the Nimrûd-Dagh and was overshadowed by this mountain; Justinian therefore had its walls strengthened on this side. At the western end of the citadel are two columns one of which, according to its inscription, was put up by queen Shalma, the daughter of Manî (Sachau, in Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. 153 sqq.). On a large open place in the citadel called Bîh Tehdrâ, Abgar IX after the inundation of 201 had a winter palace built (cf. above) and the aristocracy of the town moved their quarters to the adjoining upper market called Bîh Sahârye. There was also a large altar there which was still standing in Christian times, and probably also the royal archives (ἔργατος; Bîh ‘Udâna). Below the citadel there were two ponds inside the town. The larger fed by a spring, the fish in which were considered sacred like those in the lake of Bannyhe (Manbîq), corresponded to the old springs Kallîbîn, the modern Birket Hvarîm. South of it lay the smaller pond ‘Ain Zilka. In the town stood the council house (ἀρχήσος), a gallery built in 497 (παμηλειός), several public baths (μανθανέα), a theatre, a hospital and the hippodrome. The six gates were called: the Gate of Bîh Shemesh and the Gate of Barlâh (Bârlîh; Procopius, Bell. Pers., ii. 27, 44) in the north, the Gate of the Caves which led to the catacombs in the west, the Gate of the Hours (Θεοτ, probably the Σωτήρ πόλεως of Procopius, Bell. Pers., loc. cit.; cf. Duval, Hist. d’Édésie, p. 207, note 1) in the southwest, the Great Gate in the south and the Gate of the Theatre in the east (Duval, p. 14).
At a later date, the Arabs only mention four gates: that of Harran, the Great Gate, the Gate of Sab'a and the Water Gate. The "Old Church," several times destroyed by floods stood near the "Tetrapsilon" and the square of Beth-Shabta (Barhebraeus, Chron. ecle., i. 359). The Syrac authors mention many other churches within and without the town (Duval, loc. cit., p. 16 sq.; Baumstark, in O. C., lv. 164—183).

In the Nimrud-Dagh west of the town coves were hewn out of the rock in very early times; there also were the mausoleums of the kings, that of the bishop Abghelamiya bar Abuqar and, 2½ hours from the town, that of Amalshahne (Al-husayn), wife of Zafqan, son of the Musa. Numerous authorities had their cells in the "sacred mountain" and many monks their monasteries on it. It is probably τὰ Στέγανα (read Στέγανον "Cross Hill" as at Antioch) ἴων on which the monk Aswānā (Ἀσώνα) had his visions (Philoxenos, Letter to Patriarch, with the wrong title: Išāk of Niniveh, Letter to Symeon from Θεαυσκιδα ἴως, in Nova Patrum Bibliotheca, ed. Angelo Mai, viii., Rome 1871, p. 156, ch. 39; cf. Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 29, 142, note 10; 225, note 2). Another hill was called in the Christian period Kāmātha de-Beth Aḥláh Kikā (Symeon Metaphrastes, Migne, Patr. Graec., cxvii., col. 141: Βεθασκαΐα). In the vicinity of Edessa were the villages of Bokhām, Serrn, Kubbe and Kfar Ṣellem or Negbāt. Two aqueducts restored in the year 509 brought down from Tell Zmā and Mawdūd supplied the town with spring water (Ps.-Joshua Stylites, col. 59 sq., 62, 87). The position of these villages and of the buildings in Edessa cannot as a rule no longer be ascertained exactly (plans of ancient Edessa: by G. Hoffmann, who corrected the old sketches by Carsten Niebuhr [1780] in Wright, Chron. of Joshua Stylites, 1882; better in F. C. Burkitt, Euphemia and the Goth, London 1912, p. 46).

Abū 'Ubayda in 637 sent Ḣarm b. Ḥamm to al-Dżazīra. After the Greek governor Jonas Katara, who had endeavoured to save Osroene by offering tribute, had been dismissed by the emperor Heraclius and the general Poilëmaios put in his place, al-Rūḥā (Edessa) had to surrender in 639 like the other towns of Mesopotamia (al-Balaghuri, ed. de Gomez, p. 172—175; Ibn al-Atirī, ed. Tornberg, ii. 414—417; Yūḥān, s. v. al-Dżazīra; Khwarzīmi, ed. Baethgen, Fragmente syr. u. aram. Historiker, Leipzig 1884, p. 16, 110 = Abu K. M., viii., no. 5; Theophranes, ed. de Boor, p. 517, 521). The town now lost its political and very soon also its religious significance and sank to the level of a second-rate provincial town. Its last bishop of note, Jacob of Edessa, spent only four years (654—687) and a later period again of four months in his office (708). The Maronite Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785) wrote a "Chronicle of the World" and translated into Syriac the "two Books of Homer about Ilion".

Al-Ruḥā, like al-Rākka, Harrān and Karkšiya, is usually reckoned to Dyār Muḍar (Ibn al-Atirī, viii., 248; al-Yaḥyāī, i. 177; M. Hartmann, Bokhām, p. 88, note 2 and 3 = M. v.A.G., 1897, i. 28). In 67 (668—687) al-Ruḥā was taken by the Byzantines, Harrān and Samsāt formed the willayet, which Ibrahim b. al-Ashtar granted to Hátim b. al-Nuṣari (Ibn al-Atirī, iv. 218).

The "old church" of the Christians was destroyed by two earthquakes (April 3, 679 and 718). In 737 a Greek named Baghir appeared in Harrān and gave himself out to be "Tiberias the son of Constantine"; he was believed at first but was later exposed and executed in al-Rūḥā (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 119). In 133 (750—751) the town was the scene of fighting between Abū Dżafār, afterwards the caliph al-Mansūr, and the followers of the Umayyads, Išāk b. Muslim al-Ukayli and his brother Bakkār, who only gave in after the death of Marwān (Ibn al-Atirī, v. 333 sqq.). But continual revolts broke out again in al-Dżazīra (Ibn al-Atirī, v. 370 sqq.); in the reign of al-Mansūr, for example, the governor of al-Ruḥā of the same name, the builder of Iṣpān, was murdered in al-Raṣṣā in 141 (751—750) (al-Baladhuri, p. 192). When Harrān al-Rasūl passed through al-Ruḥā, an attempt was made to cast suspicion upon the Christians and it was said that the Byzantine emperor used to come to the city every year secretly in order to pray in their churches; but the caliph saw that these were slanders. The Gümāya (from al-Ǧumā, the valley of ‘Afrīn in Syria), who, with the Tēmârâyē and Rusūfayē, were one of the leading families of al-Ruḥā, suffered a good deal however from his covenousness (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 130). In 812 the Christians were only able to save the unprotected town by being paid by the rebels Nasr b. Shabāb and ‘Ar’r therefore fortified al-Ruḥā at the expense of the citizens (Barhebraeus, p. 136 sqq.). At the beginning of his reign al-Muʿāʾīṣ sent his general Taḥir to al-Ruḥā, where his Persian soldiers were besieged by the Byzantines but obtained a successful resistance supported by the inhabitants among whom was Mār Dionysios of Tellmārē (Barhebraeus, p. 139). Taḥir, who himself had fled from his mutinous soldiers to Kallinikos, won the rebels over to his side and made ‘Abd al-ʿAzz governor of al-Ruḥā; he oppressed the town very much (Barhebraeus, p. 139 sqq.). Muḥammad b. Taḥir who governed al-Dżazīra in 825 persecuted the Christians in al-Ruḥā as did the governors under al-Muʿāʾīṣ and his successors.

In 331 (942—943) the Byzantines occupied Dyārbakr, Arzān, Dārā and Rāʾe Ain, advanced on Naṣibin and demanded from the people of al-Ruḥā the holy picture of Christ called μαθαίαν (al-ʾIṣnaṭ al-Maṣnī); with the approval of the caliph al-Mutākī it was handed over in return for the release of 200 Muslim prisoners and the promise to leave the town undisturbed in future (Yahyā b. Saʿūd al-Antākī, ed. Krauchkowijski-Vasić, in Patr. Orient., xviii. 730—732; Taḥāth b. Siḥārī, ed. Baethgen, op. cit., p. 90, 145). The picture reached Constantinople on Aug. 15, 944 where it was brought with great ceremony into the Church of St. Sophia and the imperial court (cf. in addition to Yahyā, loc. cit.; al-Masʿūdī, Muḥājir al-Dhānāb, ii. 331; Ibn al-Atirī, viii. 302 and an oration ascribed to Constantine Porphyrogentos on the εἰκὼν ἐξηγησάτως or De imagine Edessena, ed. Migne, Patr. Graec., xxivii., col. 432, better ed. v. Dobuschka, Christusbild, in Texten u. Untersuch., xviii.). But by 338 (949—950) this treaty was broken by Saʿīf al-Dawla who together with the inhabitants of al-Ruḥā made a raid on al-Maṣṣūa (Yahyā, op. cit., p. 732). Under the Domestikos Leon the Byzantines in 348 (950—960) entered Dyār Bakr and advanced on al-Ruḥā (Ibn al-Atirī, viii. 393). The emperor Nicephoros Phocas towards the end of 357 (967—
997 advanced on Diyar Mudar, Maiyâfarîkîn and Kafarrahâ' (Yahyâ, p. 815). According to Ibn al-Athîr (viii. 454 infra), al-Ruĥâ' was burned to the ground in Muḥarram 361 (Oct.-Nov. 971) and troops left in al-Djâzîra. One should rather read Muḥarram 362 and take the reference to be to the campaign of John Tâmisces, unless there is a confusion between Edessa and Emissa (Himṣ) which was burned in 969 (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 190).

Ibn Hawgal in 978 refers to over 500 churches in al-Ruĥâ' and al-Makdisi reckons the cathedral, the ceilings of which were richly decorated with mosaics, among the four wonders of the world.

Down to 416 (1025-1026) the town belonged to the chief of the Banû Numair, ʿUṯân. The latter installed Aḥmad b. Muḥammad as nāʾīr there but afterwards had him assassinated. The inhabitants thereupon rebelled and offered the town to Naṣr al-Dawla the Marwanid of Diyarbakr (Greek: Λατραὶ), who had it captured by Zangl. After the capture of ʿUṯân and the death of Zangl (415 = 1025), Naṣr al-Dawla gave ʿUṯân’s son one tower of al-Ruĥâ' and another to Shâbul’s son (Ibn al-Athîr, ix. 244). The former (according to others: a Turk Sâlmân, Şulâquzâ, appointed governor, who was hard pressed by ʿUṯân’s widow) then sold the fort for 20,000 darics and four villages to the Byzantine Protospatharios Georgios Maniakes, son of Gudelios, who lived in Samosata; he appeared suddenly one night and occupied three towers. After a vain attempt by the emir of Maiyâfarîkîn to drive him out again in which the town, which was still inhabited by many Christians, was sacked and burned (winter of 1030-1031), Maniakes again occupied the citadel and the town (Ibn al-Athîr, ix. 281 infra; Michael Syrus, ed. Chabot, ii. 147; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 214; Aristakes Lastivertici, c. 7, p. 24 sq.; Matthiæs Uthayes, ed. 1898, c. 43, p. 58—62 = transl. Dulaâniert, p. 46—49; Kedren-S Kleitz, ed. Bonn, ii. 500; the accounts of the events preceding the surrender differ very much). Edessa under Maniakes seems to have enjoyed a certain amount of independence from Byzantium, as he sent an annual tribute thither (Kedrenos-Skleitzes, p. 502).

In Radjab 427 (May 1036) the Patrikios of Edessa became a prisoner of the Numairi Ibn Wathillâh and his many allies; the town was plundered but the fortress remained in the hands of the Greek garrison (Ibn al-Athîr, ix. 305; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 217). By the peace of 1037 the emperor again received complete possession of Edessa which was refortified (Ibn al-Athîr, ix. 313; Barhebraeus, p. 221).

According to the Armenian sources, Maniakes was followed by Apâk-ap or Ali Astoswâ, then by the Iberian Bearstakë as strategos of Edessa; in 1059 ʿIyârûm; ã Dvântzītâs was Kantapeano of the town. In 1065—1066 and 1066—1067 the Turks under the Khûrsân-Saltar attacked the town and Alp Arsalân besieged it for fifty days in 1070; it was defended by Wasil (son of the Bulgar king Alosián). After the victory of Manaritk Eddux was to be handed over to the sultan but the defeated emperor Romanos Diogenes had no longer any authority over it, and its Kapetanos Paulos went to his successor in Constantinople (Skleitzes, ed. Bonn, p. 702). In 1081—1082 Edessa was again besieged by an emir named Khussaw in vain. After the death of Wasil the Armenian Smbat became lord of Edessa and six months later (Sept. 23, 1083) Philaretos Brachamios succeeded him. But he lost it in 1086—1087 when in his absence his deputy was murdered and the town handed over to Sultan Malikshâh. The latter appointed the emir Buzân governor of al-Ruĥâ’ and Harrân. When the latter had fallen in 1094 fighting against Tutush, Alpârûk, general of the sultan of Dimashk and Hâlab, occupied the town but it was not plundered by his army as he was poisoned by a Greek dancing-girl called Gall. Then the Armenian Kupolaates Tóros (Theodoros), son of Hethum, took the citadel. When in 1097—1098 Count Baldin captured Tell Bishîr Tóros asked him to come to al-Ruĥâ’ to assist him against their joint enemies and received with him joy but was shortly afterwards treacherously murdered by him (Matthiæs of Edessa, ed. 1898, p. 260—262 = transl. Dulaâniert, p. 218—221; Anonym. Syr. Chron. of 1201—1204 in Chabot, C. R. Acad. Insr. Letr., 1918, p. 431 sq.).

From 1098 the Latins ruled for half a century the “county of Edessa” to which also belonged Sumâisît and Sarûdî (1098 Baldwin I; 1100 Baldwin II: 1119 Joscelin I; 1131 Joscelin II). The town suffered a great deal under them. On Dec. 23, 1144 ʿImād al-Dîn Zangî of al-Mawsîli took it (a detailed description of these events in the Anonymus Syr. Chron. of 1203—1204, ed. Chabot, in C.C.S. O., series iii., vol. xv., p. 118—126; transl. Chabot, Une époque de l'histoire des Croisades, in Milanges Schmirberger. i., Paris 1924, p. 171—179). Under Joscelin II and Baldwin of Kaisim the Franks again attempted to retake the town in Oct. 1046 and succeeded in entering it by night, but six days later Nûr al-Dîn appeared with 10,000 Turks, and soon occupied and sacked it; the inhabitants were put to death or carried into slavery. Baldwin was killed and Joscelin escaped to Sumâisît (Barhebraeus, p. 311 sq.).

The fall of this eastern bulwark of the Crusaders aroused horror everywhere; in Europe it led to the Second Crusade. The Syrian Dionysios bar Salîbî as Diaconus wrote an “oration” and two poetic mémoires about the destruction of the town. Three similar pieces were written by Basilios Abu l-Faradj b. Shunnâma, the favourite of Zangî; he had also written a history of the town of Orhâî (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 293—298).

After the death of Nûr al-Dîn his nephew Saif al-Dîn Ghâzin took the town in 1174; in 1182 it fell to Saladin who later handed it over to al-Malik al-Manṣûr. When Malik al-ʿAdîl died in 1218, his son Malik al-Ashraf Shâriāt al-Dîn Mūsa became lord of al-Ruĥâ’, Harrân and Khîlît. In June 1234 the town was taken by the army of ʿAlî al-Dîn Kâlpûkhâd and its inhabitants deported to Asia Minor (Kamâl al-Dîn, transl. Blöchet, in R.O.F., v. 88; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 468). But it was retaken within four months by Malik al-Kâmil. In 1244 the Tatars passed through the district of al-Ruĥâ and in 1260 the Mongols under Hûlagû. The people of al-Ruĥâ and Harrân surrendered voluntarily to him but those of Sarûdî were all put to death (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 509; Chron. arab., ed. Bârit, p. 486).

In the time of Abu l-Fida al-Ruḫâ was in ruins. Hamd Allâh al-Mustawfi about 1340 could still see isolated ruins of the main buildings. According to al-Kâlîkashâni, the town had been
built by his time (c. 1400) and repopulated and was in a prosperous state. In connection with the campaigns of Timur, who conquered al-Dżazira in 1393, al-Ruḥān (Dżazira) is repeatedly mentioned in the Šafā'ī-nâme of Šaraf al-Dīn Āli Yāzdi (written in 838 = 1435).

The Ottomans finally took the town, to which they gave the name of Orfa, in 1637 during Murād IV's war with Persia.

To-day Orfa (Orfa) has nearly 30,000 inhabitants. It is the capital of a wilayet of the same name numbering a little more than 200,000 souls. The town is 550 m. above sea-level.

Bibliography: al-Khārīzmi, Kitāb Šaraf al-Ārāf, ed. v. Mîkî, in Bibl. arab. litter. u. Geogr., iii, Leipzig 1926, p. 21 (N° 294);

E. Hommeymann

ORIHEULA, Arab. Uryūda, a town in Eastern Spain (Levante), 15 miles N. E. of Murcia, the capital of an administrative area (partido) and the see of a bishop, contains with its adjoining country, which is thickly populated, 35,000 inhabitants. It was conquered by the Muslims at the same time as the other towns of the kūra of Todmir [q. v.] and was for a long time the capital of this kūra before it had to give way to Murcia. Its history was that of the latter town as long as it remained Muslim. It was however for a very brief period in the middle of the 12th century A.H. (middle of the 13th century A.D.) the capital of a petty independent state ruled by the Kūdi Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī b. 'Āṣim.


E. Lévi-Provençal

ORISSA (ODRA-DECA), a part of the modern Indian province of Bihār and Orissa, has an area of 13,706 square miles and a population of 5,306,142, of which only 124,463 profess the Muslim faith. For administrative purposes it is divided into five districts of Cuttack, Balasore, Furl, Angul and Sambalpur. There are in addition twenty-four native states, the Orissa feudatory states, with a population of 4,465,385, the Muhammadans numbering only 17,100 (Census of India, 1931).

Modern Orissa, which embraces the delta of the Mahānārd and neighbouring rivers, extends from the Bay of Bengal to the borders of the Central Provinces and from the river Sutnarekha to the Čilka Lake. In the past its inaccessibility proved its salvation for, while the coastal strip was sometimes conquered, the highlands of the interior remained under semi-independent or tributary chiefs. It was included in the ancient kingdom of Kalinga, the sole conquest of the peace-loving Ačoka, but, with the reintegration of the Maurya empire, once more passed to the Kalinga kings. Until the eleventh century the history of this area is extremely confused. Those interested in the solving of chronological puzzles would do well to consult the first volume of Banerji's History of Orissa.

Certain parts of modern Orissa were annexed to the empire of Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ and were included in the province of Dījadīnjār. The real conqueror of Orissa, however, was Akbār's famous general Rāḏā Mān Singh, who took it from the Afghāns of Bengal, who had obtained a temporary footing in the country. Under Akbār it was administered as part of the šāhā of Bengal, for it was not until the reign of Djahānghīr that it became a separate province. With the decline of the Mughal empire Orissa fell into the hands of the Bhōnlī Marāṭhīs of Nāgpūr [q. v.]. Although it nominally passed to the British by the diwān grant of 1795 it was not finally conquered until the year 1803.

With the exception of the district of Sambalpur, the territory now known as Orissa was administered along with Bengal until October 1905, and with
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West Bengal until March 1912, when Bihar and Orissa were formed into a separate province. Orissa has always been a stronghold of Hinduism and the temple of Dijannath still draws thousands of pilgrims to the sands of Puri.


(C. Collin Davies)

ORKHAN or ORKHAN (ur-khun) was the eldest son of the emir 'Othman [q.v.], the founder of the Ottoman dynasty. His mother was Malikhatun, the daughter of Shaikhi Ede-Ball of the village of Ithurna near Eski-Shehir. His birth is not known and indeed the year of his reign leaves much to be desired. Ottoman sources say he was born in 687 (beg. Feb. 6, 1288); according to others, he was born as early as 680 (beg. Apr. 22, 1281). The first date which probably goes back to Hadiji Khalifa's Tahrir has most in its favour. We know very little about his youth. When barely twelve years old he was married in 699 (1299) to the daughter of the lord of Yar-Hisar named Nillfufer-Khatun [q.v.], a Greek girl, who was betrothed to the lord of Belokoma (Bileblik). From this union were born among others his sons Murad, who succeeded him, and Sulaiman Pasha. Orkhan was nearly 40 when he ascended the throne in it is said, Ramadhan 726 (Aug. 1326). According to tradition, Orkhan offered his brother 'Ali al-Din 'Ali (usually called 'Ali al-Din only; cf. Isi., xi. 20, note 2) a portion of the ancestral possessions but the latter is said to have been content with the vizierate. This story strongly resembles that of Moses and Aaron as given in the Kur'an (xx. 30) and is probably intended to give a historical foundation for the office of vizier. 'Ali al-Din 'Ali was also the first to bear the title Pasha [q.v.] which then passed to Orkhan's son Sulaiman and was inherited from him by Kara Khalil.

Orkhan's rule may be divided into two periods: that from 1326 to 1344 when he was establishing the Ottoman power in Asia Minor, creating the army and becoming the founder of the Ottoman empire; and the period from 1344 to his death in 1359–1360 during which he was preparing to gain a footing in Thrace and Macedonia and to extend his rule on European soil. He laid the foundations for the later empire of the Ottomans and is to be regarded as its real creator.

Orkhan had already shown his ability as a conqueror in the lifetime of his father. Shortly before the latter's death of gout at the age of about 70 he had taken Brassa without bloodshed. It now became the capital of the kingdom. Nicaea and Nicomedia were now the next objectives of Ottoman arms. He was assisted by a number of able leaders of whom the best known were the Kose Mihkal, Ake Koda, Konural, Abd al-Rahman Ghani, Kara 'Ali, Kara Mursal. With their help he carried through all his enterprises with the greatest success. Before taking these two cities, Orkhan first of all secured possession of the most northerly peninsula of Bithynia, which is enclosed on the north by the Black Sea, on the south by the Gulf of Nicomedia and on the west by the Bosphorus. The two strongly fortified fortresses of Semendra and Aidos which guarded the military road from Constantinople to Nicomedia were taken. The town and district of Semendra were given in feudal tenure to the general Ake Koda and henceforth known as Koda-Ili. The fall of these strong places was followed by the subjection of most of the little towns on the coast on both sides of the Gulf of Nicomedia, of which the fort of Hereke offered most resistance. Kara Mursal conquered the land on the southern coast by occupying Yalova, famous for its medicinal baths, and the district of Kara Mursal which bears his name. As Orkhan's vassal, he pledged himself to maintain a small fleet to protect the coast so that communication by sea between Constantinople and Nicomedia was entirely stopped. Orkhan now took the field against Nicomedia in person. The town was taken without any special difficulty after the hill fort of Kayun-Hisar had fallen. While the emperor Andronikos abandoned Nicomedia, he prepared to defend the old seat of the Palaeologi, Nicaea. At the beginning of 1339, the Byzantines moved over to the Asiatic shore and in the vicinity of the little coast town of Philokrene in Mesothyia, now Tawhandjil, a battle was fought about which there are no records in the Ottoman, the Byzantine historians (Kantakuroes, ed. Bonn, i. 341 sph; Nikephoros Gregoros, ed. Bonn, i. 434; cf. the on Phrantzes and Chalecocondyles) show obvious errors and deliberate perversions of the facts. The defeat of the Byzantines at Philokrene meant the end of any hope of saving Nicaea. The inhabitants did not even attempt a serious resistance but hurried to swear fealty to Orkhan. The city, upon which Orkhan lavished all kinds of endowments, soon became one of the most flourishing and prosperous towns in the Ottoman empire after its period of tribulation. Nicaea, now Iznik [q.v.], became celebrated as a centre of Muslim intellectual life especially through its medresse. In 1333 Orkhan's son Sulaiman undertook a campaign into the still independent country north of the Sangaris (Sakarya) with the towns of Golnik, Modrene and Tarakdjli, which he occupied almost without striking a blow. All Orkhan's victories and conquests had so far been won at the expense of the Greeks and there had been no warlike encounters with the little principalities which had arisen in Anatolia and of the Salgik empire. The adjacent country of Karasi [q.v.] where in 1335 the succession had given rise to a dispute between two brothers, the youngest of whom, Tursun, was living at Orkhan's court, came first. Orkhan's help was called upon by Tursun against his older brother (named Timurkhan) and he invaded Karasi on receiving certain assurances. On the way he took Ulubad, Kirmast [q.v.] and Mihkali on the castle of Kilsos and Ailhos. Bahlkesir was surrendered to Orkhan.
without a blow and the resistance shown was limited to Bergama. This town also soon passed into Ottoman hands as a return for the leniency shown by Orkhan to the lord of Kasari when the latter had treacherously disposed of his younger brother (736 = 1336). Hadji-dji Il-beghi, the vizier of the last prince of Kasari, was entrusted with the administration of the newly won territory, and as his councillors Edje-Beg and Erennos [q.v.] were appointed. After the fall of Bergama Orkhan was engaged in consolidating his rule by systematic regulations and arranging for the administration of the now considerably enlarged Ottoman kingdom. He seems to have been the first to organize his rule on Anatolian lines (on the full account in Zinkeisen, G. O. R., i. 118 sqq., in which his brother 'Ali' al-Din 'Ali played a prominent part until after his death in 1333 his place was taken by his nephew Sulaiman. In 728 (1328) 'Ali' al-Din is said to have induced his brother to set up the first mints (according to Sa'd al-Din). In this year the first gold and silver was struck in Orkhan's name and replaced the Saldjk coins which had previously been current throughout the Ottoman empire. A regulation regarding dress produced a strict distinction between ranks and classes, and the army was completely reorganised in keeping with the new conditions by Cendereli Khalit [q.v.]. In 1330 the corps of Jannissaries [q.v.] was founded, the Turkish infantry composed of youths of Christian birth and associated with Hadji Bektaşi [q.v.]. But the irregular infantry also, the 'Azaba, was put on a better footing and the feudal cavalry (aghinda) developed in keeping with the objects of the new empire. At the same time Orkhan founded numerous mosques, monasteries and schools and the foundations which he endowed everywhere in the newly conquered territory bear witness to the great attention which he gave to matters of religion. The dervish system which at this time was at the height of its development — the order of the Bektaşi seems to have arisen in the reign of Orkhan — had undoubtedly a great patron in Orkhan as is seen by the number of cells and monasteries of holy men in his capital Brusa, who had come from the east during his reign to find asylum in the Ottoman empire. The religious life of Islam under Orkhan, which had a marked 'Ald, not to say Shi'a, stamp, is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of religion and still requires elucidation in essential points through special studies.

In Orkhan's reign we have the beginnings of friendly and peaceful intercourse between Ottomans and Byzantines, although we also have an altercation of peace and war, of enmity and alliance (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 126). Ottoman troops were repeatedly summoned to the assistance of the Byzantine emperors and when Orkhan ascended the throne, Turkish hordes had already crossed the straits three times, without success it is true, and without leaving the slightest trace on European soil (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 120 sqq. and Zinkeisen, G. O. R., i. 184 sqq.). There obviously was no idea of establishing Ottoman power on the other side of the Dardanelles in these raids and the Byzantine emperor paid very little attention to them. But in course of time there arose out of these casual enterprises more and more regularly organised expeditions by the petty dynasties of Anatolia. For example the ruler of A'din-elli [q.v.], Umur-Beg, one of the most brilliant, if very little known, figures of the time, had undoubtedly intended to develop systematically his repeated raids into Europe. Orkhan himself is said in 1333 to have concluded a treaty with the emperor Andronicus at the time of the siege of Nicomedia, by which he bound himself not to disturb further the towns of Asia Minor which were under Byzantine suzerainty (cf. Kantakuzenos, ed. Bonn, i. 446). The increasing weakness of Byzantium and the growing power of the Ottomans soon however deprived any such agreement of its binding force. Already in 1337 Orkhan had tried to effect a landing near Constantinople with a fleet of 30 ships; his intention must have been to attack the capital and establish himself in Thrace. The Ottomans suffered a disastrous defeat and escaped with one ship only. The dynastic troubles which broke out soon afterwards in Constantinople when the Grand Domesticos Kantakuzenos became emperor and joint ruler with John Palaeologus, brought about a rapprochement between Orkhan and Kantakuzenos. Umur-Beg renewed his efforts to gain a footing on European soil, but, in spite of the expenditure of men and ships, they remained unavailing. Orkhan maintained an attitude of watchfulness. The empress Anna, mother of the young emperor John Palaeologus, induced him to send a force to help her against her rival Kantakuzenos. The latter saw the increasing danger and after this force had come to a miserable end endeavoured with all his power to win Orkhan over for his own plans. In return for 7,000 soldiers he offered him his daughter Theodora, who was still a minor, as a wife in January 1345 (cf. Kantakuzenos, lii. 31; ed. Bonn, p. 498; Dukas, 9, ed. Bonn, p. 33 sqq.; Chalco, i. 24) and in May 1346 the wedding was celebrated with great splendour in Selymbria (Kantakuzenos, lii. 95, p. 585 sqq.; Nikeph. Gregor. xxv. 5, p. 762 sqq.; Dukas, 9, p. 35; according to Nikeph. the bride's name was Maria, cf. i. 762, certainly a mistake). It is worth noting that Orkhan's bride did not abandon her religion but remained a devout Christian (cf. Kantakuzenos, ed. Bonn, p. 588; Zinkeisen, G. O. R., i. 201 sqq.) and acquired great merit by purchasing numerous Christian slaves and sending them home to freedom. The prince Khalil Celehi, who later became a prisoner of the Genoese and when very young married a daughter of the emperor John V, was probably the result of this union (cf. Jorge, G. O. R., i. 201). The alliance with the Ottomans was to cost Kantakuzenos dear. When, shortly after the wedding, Orkhan sent him 10,000 men to help in his fight with the Serbs, prince Stjepan Dušan, the Turks turned against the Byzantines and returned with vast booty from Europe to Asia. This breach of faith did not deter Kantakuzenos from again asking for assistance from his son-in-law in 1349. But this time also the army of 20,000 men, summoned unexpectedly back to Anatolia, recrossed the Dardanelles after burning and plundering all the way. Besides these two invasions of Europe by request the continual raids of the Anatolian hordes went on and the sufferings of the people of Thrace became intolerable. Orkhan took advantage of this uncertainty to carry out his long cherished plan of establishing the Ottomans permanently in Europe. His son Sulaimän Paša in 1356 was ordered to cross the Dardanelles. The crossing was successfully carried through at the fortress of Tzyme (the modern
Dijmenelik). In 759 (1357) Kallipolis (now Gallipoli) was taken by the Ottomans. The sudden death in 760 (1358) of the conqueror Sultanin Pasha, who was buried soon after, put an end for the time to any further advance by the Ottomans. Hüdji Il-beghi and Edje-Beg conducted raids into the interior, it is true, but no effort was made to extend Ottoman power. Orbahan died very soon after Sultanin. The date of his death is not exactly known. The most probable statement is that which says he died at the beginning of 761 (beg. No. 23, 1359). The statement (taken by K. J. Jirecik from a Slav Chronicle) that Orbahan lived till March 1362, after the capture of Adrianopolis, has no claim to credence (cf. *Arcif fur slav. Filh.*, xiv. [1892], p. 260), although Oskar Halecki, *Un Empire de Byzance à Rome* (Warsaw 1932 = *Travaux historiques de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie*, vol. viii.), p. 74, note 3, based on C. Jirecik, *loc. cit.*, and *Byz. Zeitschr.*, xvi. (1909), p. 582 sq. is inclined to accept the year 1362. That the Byzantine annals (cf. especially p. 392) edited by J. Muller, in *Sitzungsber. d. k. Ak. d. Wiss.*, Vienna 1853, ix. are in favour of such a supposition cannot be disputed as well as the fact that the Florentine chronicler Matteo Villani (cf. Muratori, *Rerum Ita/ Script.*, xiv., p. 672 sq.) puts "Orcam's" first actions still in November 1361. If Murad I is justly called the "conqueror of Adrianopole" the year of his father's, i.e. Orbahan's death must be fixed earlier as the taking of this town in spring 1361 (cf. thereon F. Babinger, *M. O. G.*, ii. 311 sqq.) can now be taken for granted (cf. thereon the fact not noted in *M. O. G.*, that, according to O. Halecki, *loc. cit.*, p. 75, the capture of Adrianopolis was known in Venice on March 14, 1361). Orbahan was buried beside his father in Brussa (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. K.*, i. 157 sq. with a description of what his personal appearance is said to have been).

**Bibliography:** Contemporary Ottoman sources have so far not come to light. Of the Byzantine chroniclers the most important is Orbahan's father-in-law Kountakuzenos although his bias makes it necessary to use him with great caution. Nikophoros Gregoras is much more to be believed. The crossing of the Ottomans into Europe in the sixteenth century has been critically studied by J. Dracsecbe, in the *Neues Jahrbuch für das klassische Altertum*, vol. xxvii., p. 7 sqq. The whole period of Orbahan's reign has recently been dealt with in not always reliable fashion by H. A. Gibbons (d. 1934), *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire*, Oxford 1916, p. 54—109. Further sources are indicated in the works of J. v. Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga. (FRANZ BAHINGER)

**ORMUZ. [See Hormuz.]**

**ORTOKIDS (Urtu/kids), a Turkmen dynasty, branches of which ruled in Mardin, Hisn Kaifā and Khartābīrt.**

When the Saljuq sultan of Damascus, Tutub, conquered Jerusalem in 479 he appointed as governor of the town his officer ʻUrtuk b. Akshab, who had already served under Malikshah and had taken part in the siege of Antioch in 477. He was succeeded in 484 (1091) by his sons Sukman and Ighāzī. After the Holy City had been taken for the Fatimids in Shabban 489 (1096) by al-Afdal b. Badr al-Djamal, Sukman went to al-Rahba and Ighāzī to his lands in the 'Trak. In 495 (1101) Sultan Muhammad made Ighāzī his commissioner (*Shāhna*) in Baghdad. A. Hisn Kaifā Mu'in al-Dawla Sukmana I (cf. iv., p. 510) assisted Mūsā when he was besieged by Djakarmish in al-Mawsil and as a reward received from him in 495 (1101) 10,000 dinars and the town of Hisn Kaifā (Ibn al-ʻAthir, x. 234—236). He had already owned Sarūdij since 488 and in 498 or shortly before, Mardin also fell into his hands (Abū 'l-Fida' ed. Reiske, iii. 350—353). Along with Djakarmish, Sukman took Count Baldwin and his brother Joscelin prisoners at Harrân. After his death in 498 his son Ibrahim ruled in Hisn Kaifā while Mardin passed to his brother Ighāzī in 502. In Hisn Kaifā, Ibrahim was succeeded first by his brother Rukan al-Dawla Dāwūd (who is mentioned in 508 and again in 511; Ibn al-ʻAthir, x. 352 sq.; xi. 73), then by the latter's son Fakhr al-Dīn Kārā-ʻArslān who ascended the throne about 543 and probably died in 562 (or perhaps not till 570) (van Berchem, in *Abh. G. W. Golt.*, N. S., xxi/ii., 1907, p. 143, note 3). He ruled over Hisn Kaifā and a considerable part of Diyarbakr (Ibn al-ʻAthir, xi. 217); to him or his father we probably owe the bridge over the Tigris at Hisn Kaifā [q. v.]. After his death he was succeeded by his son Nur al-Dīn Muhammed. When Shālāh al-Dīn in 578 came to Diyarbakr, Nur al-Dīn was ready to pay homage to him and to assist him at the siege of al-Mawsil. As a reward he was next year given the valuable town of Amid (579). He died in 581 and was succeeded by his son Kūbāl al-Dīn Sukmau. His son lost his life in 597 from a fall (Ibn al-ʻAthir, xii. 112). Before his death he had designated as his successor a Mamlūk named Ayās, as he hated his brother al-Malik al-Salāḥ Nāṣr al-Dīn Māhmmād, whom strict Sunni's condemned as a philosopher and heretic. But Māhmmād seized Ayās when the emirs asked him to do so (Ibn al-ʻAthir, xii. 112). He recognised the suzerainty of the Ayyūbid b. 'Adil and Kāmil of the Saljuq Kaftāns. On an AyyūbI inscription of the year 605 (1208—1209) he calls himself sultan of Diyarbakr, al- Ṣūd and a-r-Mān (van Berchem, *cf. cit.*, p. 147). After his death in 619 he was succeeded by his son al-Malik al-Maṣūd Mawdūd (Ibn al-ʻAthir, xii. 260). According to a coin of 628, Hisn Kaifā then belonged to the ruler of Mardin. The lands of the Ortokids had already been much diminished by the attacks of the Saljuq sultans of Rāmūr when in 629 (1231) the Ayyūbid al-Kāmil advanced against Mārān and took it with the towns that belonged to it, including Hisn Kaifā (Abū 'l-Fida', iv. 393) which, if this statement is correct, had therefore again been taken by Mawdūd from his relative. Al-Kāmil's son, al-Malik al-Salāḥ, remained in possession of Mārān and Kaifā. In 639 he had to cede Mārān to the allied armies of Halāb and Rāmūr, while he retained Kaifā (Kamāl al-Dīn, *History of Aleppo*, transl. E. Blochet, p. 219 = *R. O. L.*, vi. 16). Mawdūd remained in prison until the death of al-Kāmil in 635; then he escaped and found refuge with al-Muazzāf al-Ḥamā until his death probably during the Tatar inroads (Abū 'l-Fida', iv. 393).

B. Mārān. On the death of its governor Lulu, the city of Halāb submitted voluntarily in 1117—1118 to Nādīm al-Dīn Ighāzī I [q. v.], who had since 502 (1108) been lord of Mardīn. Ighāzī
gave it to his son Timurtash (Ibn al-Athir, x. 372). When in 515 the latter was sent by his father to Sulaiman Mahmud to intercede for Duhais b. Saida, the sultan gave his father Ilghazi Mayafarikan (Ibn al-Athir, x. 418) which henceforth remained Ortokid until Salih al-Din annexed it in 581. After the death in 516 of Ilghazi, the most dangerous enemy of the Crusaders among the Ortokids (Ibn al-Athir, x. 426), he was succeeded by his sons Shams al-Dawla Sulaiman in Maiyafarikan and Husam al-Din Timurtash [q. v.] in Mardin, and in Halab by his nephew Badr al-Dawla Sulaiman b. ‘Abd al-Djabbar (Ibn al-Athir, x. 426) who had already in 515 been appointed governor of it by Ilghazi, when his son Sulaiman had attempted to stir up a rising against him there (Ibn al-Athir, x. 417 sqq.). As a fighter against the Crusaders his other nephew Bahram b. Bahram followed his uncle’s example; in 497 (1103–1104) he occupied ‘Ana and al-Haditha after the Franks had taken Saruji from him in 494. In 515 he brought Joscelin de Courtenay Count of Edessa and his brother Galeran prisoners to his fortress of Khartabirt (Ibn al-Athir, x. 418 sqq.), and defeated Baldwin king of Jerusalem at Gargar and brought him prisoner to Harran [see BALAK]. He had taken this town in 517 (Ibn al-Athir, x. 433). In the same year he took Halab from his cousin Badr al-Dawla Sulaiman, as he did not seem fitted to defend it against the Franks. At the siege of Man-

**Genealogical Table of the Ortokids**

(From Lane-Poole and van Berchem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A. Hisn Kaifa]</th>
<th>Urtuk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Sukman I</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Djabbar Bahram Yakhiti ‘Alt 1. Ilghazi I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ibrahim</td>
<td>Sulaiman Balak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Daud</td>
<td>2. Timurtash Sulaiman Mahmuad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C. Khartabirt]</td>
<td>IV. Karah-Arsalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. ‘Imad al-Din Abul Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Nur al-Din Muhammed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Yuluq-Arsalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Urtuk-Arsalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Ghazi al-Sa'id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII. Mawadd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Daud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Ghazi I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. ‘Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Salih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Ahmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Mahmuad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Isa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Salih</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bidj in 518 Balak received a mortall wound from an arrow (Ibn al-Athir, x. 436). In Halab and his other possessions he was succeeded by Husam al-Din Timurtash but the latter lost Halab as soon as he went to Diyabakr as the city, besieged by the Franks, opened its gates to al-Bursuki [cf. AKBONE or BURSIK]. After the death of his brother Sulaiman in 518 Timurtash inherited Mayafarikan also (Ibn al-Athir, x. 441) and at his death in 547 (1152–1153) was lord of Mardin and Mayafarikan (Ibn al-Athir, xi. 115). He was succeeded by his son Nadim al-Din Alpt. During the lifetime of his father he had received al-Bira from the Franks in 539; they had given him the town out of fear of ‘Imad al-Din Zangt. At a later date (before 565), we find ruling there Shabah al-Din b. Ilghazi who had distinguished himself in fighting against the Crusaders. His son was besieged in 577 (1181–1182) in al-Bira by Kub al-Din Ilghazi II of Mardin (cf. ii., p. 466), who had succeeded his father Alpt in 572, and appealed for help to Salih al-Din; at the latter’s command Kub al-Din retired to Mardin (Ibn al-Athir, xi. 313). After his death in 580 the guardian of his sons Shah Arman Sukman of Akhlat, then after the latter’s death in 581 (1185) Salih al-Din, took possession of Maiyafarikan (Ibn al-Athir, xi. 335; C. Defremery, in J.A., ser. iv., 1, 1843, p. 72–78). In Mardin Kub al-Din was succeeded by his son Husam al-Din Yuluq-Arsalan (var. Bulaq-, Buluk-Arsalan) who again in 587 regained Maiyafarikan for a short time; the next successor was the latter’s brother Nisir al-Din Urtuk-Arsalan al-Mansur (from c. 596–598). In his time Mardin was besieged in 599 by al-Ashraf by order of al-Adil. At the conclusion of peace the Urtukid recognised the suzerainty of al-Adil (Ibn al-Athir, xii. 117; coins). The later Urtukids of Mardin are given by Abu ‘l-Fida‘ (v. 295) down to his time (715 = 1315). Urtuk-Arsalan was followed in 637 by his son Nadim al-Din Ghazi I al-Sa'id, in 658 by the latter’s son Kara-Arsalan al-Muzaffar, about 691 by his son
Shams al-Din Diewd, about 693 by his brother Nadjm al-Din Ghazi II al-Mansur, in 712 by his son Timad al-Din ‘Ali Alpi al-Adil, then by his brother Shams al-Din Salih, in 765 by his son Ahmad al-Mansur, in 769 by his son Mahmmud al-Salih, in 769 by his uncle Diewd al-Muzaffar. In 778 by the latter’s son Madjd al-Din Isa al-Zahir, and lastly by the latter’s brother Salih (809–811 = 1406–1408). After Timur had taken Mardin, the ownership of the town passed to the Karsh-Koyunli.

To the territory of the Ortokids of Mardin belonged at least down to the time of Nadjm al-Din Ghazi II the town of Dunausir (q.v., now Koc Hisar), according to coins found in the neighbourhood near Tell Ermen (E. Sachau, in Abb. Pr. Ak. W., 1886, phil.-hist. Kl., treatisc ii., p. 86).

C. Khartabirt (Kharpoot). Khartabirt is found as early as 515 in the possession of the Ortokid Balak b. Bahram, who held it till 518. His relative Sulaiman then occupied it but he seems to have died in the same year. It then belonged successively to Diewd of Hse Kaifah and his son Karsh-Arsalan and grandson Muhhammad. There is an inscription (dated 561 = 1165–1166) of Fakhr al-Din Karsh-Arsalan commemorating a building in Kharpoot (van Berchem, in Abb. G. W. Gott., ix/iii., 1907, p. 142 sq., N9. 9). After the death of Nur al-Din Muhhammad in 581 (1185–1186) his brother Timad al-Din Abul Bakr founded an independent dynasty there as Lane-Poole was the first to show (Essay on the Urtuki, in Num. Chron., N.S., xiii., 1873) (van Berchem, op. cit., p. 144, note 1). At his brother’s death he was in Salah al-Din’s camp before al-Mawjil and at once set off for Hse Kaifah on hearing the news to claim his inheritance. But his nephew Sukman II had already taken possession of the fortress and had been recognised by Salath al-Din. The uncle had therefore to be content with Khartabirt (Ibn al-Athir, x. 359). Abul Bakr must have died in 600 at latest for Muhmmad of Kaifah and Aimdun unsuccessfully besieged his son Nizam al-Din in Khartabirt in 601 (Ibn al-Athir, xii. 132). Thus last Ortokid of Khartabirt is said to have been called Nizam al-Din Abul Bakr; according to the inscription on a bronze mirror in the Blacas collection in Paris, his name was more probably Nizam al-Din Ibrahim, unless we have to see in Abul Bakr a (childless) brother of Ibrahim (van Berchem, op. cit.). Ibrahim had two sons: ‘Izz al-Din Ahmad mentioned in a manuscript of 685 written in his reign and al-Khadr named on the above mentioned mirror, father of Nur al-Din Abul ‘I-Fadl Ortok-Shah who ruled at an unknown time and unnamed place. Khartabirt probably remained in possession of the Ortokids only down to 631. At least the town was taken in this year by Sulath Kaibkib I.

Coins. Four mints are named on the coins of the Ortokids: al-‘Iti-n or Kaifah, i.e. Hse Kaifah, Aimdun and Dunausir. The strong influence of trade with Byzantium is seen on the coins in a remarkable fashion: we find on them not only rulers’ heads taken from ancient coins and no longer understood but also the Virgin Mary, Christ and the Greek inscription Emmanouel on them.


OSMAN DIGNA [see ‘OTHMAN ABU BAKR DIGNA].

ORSUSHANA, the name of a district in Transoxania. The form Orushana is the best known although Yakti (I. 245) says that Orushana is preferable. In the Persian versions of the text of al-Istakhri and in the Persian text of the Hudud al-Alam (ed. Barthold) we find more often Surushana while Ibn Khurdadhbeh sometimes has Sharushana; the original form may have been Sroshana. This district lies to the north-east of Sama'kand between this town and Khjojd, to the south of the Sir Darya (Salut) so that it forms the approach to the valley of Faraghana; on the north west it is bounded by the steppe. The southern part is occupied by the mountains of Batam which run along the upper course of the Zor-Maghun; these hills are generally regarded as forming part of Orushana. The geographical information about this region is based almost exclusively on the geographers of the tenth century; the later geographers down to Hajjaj Khusrau only repeat what their predecessors have said: it appears therefore that the name Orushana had fallen into disuse before the end of the middle ages. As a result of its numerous streams, which flow into the Sir Darya, it was at one time a rich country visited by many travellers because the route to Faraghana lay through it. The geographers describe several roads from Sama'kand to Khjojd all of which passed through the towns of Sabaat and Zamin, the name of which still survives. The principal town — in which in the tenth century the governor lived — was in all probability called Nawamandikath — this must be the basis of the more or less certain readings of a number of manuscripts (cf. especially Baladhuri, p. 240) — the form Bundjikat given by Yakti (I. 744; but see also iv. 307 where the name is Koub) and adopted by Barthold is a late corruption; it lay a little to the south of the great road and was identified in 1894 by W. Barthold with the ruins called Shahristan to the south of the present town of Ura Tube; these ruins were examined a little later by P. S. Skvartsy. The geographers describe the town in detail. Two other towns of some importance were Zamin and Dizak, and a number of other places are recorded;
there were also rural areas without towns, while al-Ya'qubī (B.G.A., vii. 294) says that there were 400 fortresses in the country. In the tenth century there was an important market-place called Massananda. There is some further geographical information about the country in the Bābur-nāma.

At the time when the first Arab invasion of the country took place under Kutaiba b. Muslim (712—714), Osrushana was inhabited by an Iranian population, ruled by its own princes who bore the title of afshin (Ibn Khurdadhbih, p. 40). The first invasion did not result in conquest; in 737 the Turkish enemies of the governor Asad fell back on Osrushana (Tabari, ii. 1613). Nasr b. Sayyār [q. v.] subdues the country incompletely in 739 (Baladhuri, p. 429; Tabari, ii. 1694) and the Afshin again made a nominal submission to al-Mahdi (Ya’qubī, Ta’rikh, ii. 479). Under al-Mamūn the country had to be conquered again but soon a new expedition was necessary in 822. On this last occasion the Muslim army was guided by Hādīr, the son of the Afshin Kāwīs, who on account of dynastic troubles had sought refuge in Baghdaḍ. This time the subjugation was complete; Kāwīs abdicated and Hādīr succeeded him, later to become one of the great nobles of the court of Baghdaḍ under al-Mu’taṣım, where he was known as Afshine [q. v.]. The dynasty of the Sa’dids of Aḥsarbaḏân was also descended from the royal family. His dynasty continued to reign until 893 (coin of the last ruler Sāhir b. Abū ʿAlāʾ al-Mamūn of 279 [592] in the Hermitage in Leningrad); after this date the country becomes a province of the Samanids and ceases to have an independent existence while the Iranian element was almost entirely replaced by the Turkish.

Bibliography: The geographical descriptions (Ibn Khurdadhbih, Ya’qubī, al-Iṣkāḥi, Ibn Hawkal, al-Makhḍīs) have been analysed and utilised by W. Barthold, Turkestān down to the Mongol Conquest, 2nd ed., in G. M. S., N. S., v., London 1928, pp. 165—169. — The second part of the same book contains all the historical references (cf. index); cf. also Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 473 sqq.

J. H. KRAMERS

OSTĀDĪ (P.), master, teacher, artisan. This word has passed into Arabic, with the plural ostādān, astāda. It also means eunuch, musician, merchant’s ledger, in the modern language particularly teacher. Combined with dār the form ostāda or “master of the house”, master-domo, was applied to one of the great dignitaries of the Mamlūk sultanān [q. v.]. We also find the abbreviated forms ostā, ostā, ostā, plural ostāvāt, ostāwā, ostāw, which in Cairo is applied to coachmen.


A. J. WENINK

OSTĀDĪS, the name of the leader of a religious movement in Khurāṣān, directed against the ‘Abhāsids. The rising began in 150 (767) and spread rapidly in the districts of Herāt, Rādīghis, Gānd-Rūstāk and Sādijātān; the sources say that it had 300,000 adherents. The first opposition it met with was at Marw al-Rūthi but the rebels killed the Arab leader al-ʿAdlī with a number of his officers. Hearing this, the caliph al-Manṣūr sent his general Khāzin b. Khuzaima to his son al-Mahdi at Naṣīrābād and the latter ordered Khāzin to attack the rebels with 20,000 men.

After several checks due to the treachery of subordinates, Khāzin entrenched himself in a camp at a place, the name of which is not given, and by a number of stratagems and with the help of reinforcements from Ṭehrānštān succeeded in defeating the rebels, of whom large numbers were slain. Ostādīs escaped to the mountains but was captured in the course of the following year. The 30,000 who accompanied him were set free but he and his sons were sent to Baghdaḍ and executed. The rising of Ostādīs was of a religious character; he represented himself as a prophet and exhor(ted the people to koft (Tabari, iii. 773); he was one of a series of heretical rebel leaders who appeared in Khurāṣān after the death of Abū Muslim [q. v.] like Sinbāḍ the Magian, Bih-āfrīd [q. v.], Yūṣuf al-Barm, and al-Muḥammad. It is probable that his views were based on Zoroastrian doctrines.

The name of the leader is given by Tabari as Ostādī-Sīs, “Lord Sis”; the name Sīs is found in several Iranian names (cf. Justi, Alltānān, Namenbuch, p. 336; Mani’s successor was called, according to the Fihris, p. 334: Sīs al-Imām and in the Greek sources: Sisinios). On the other hand this heretic numbered among his adherents, according to the Kitāb al-Bad’ (al-Walqī, Ta’rikh, ed. Huart, vi. 86), a large number of Ghurā Turks, as was also the case with the rebel Ḥāṣālī al-Barm, who, saw in Abū Muslim an incarnation of the deity. It al-Ya’qubī’s story it is said that Ostādīs declined to recognise al-Mahdi as heir apparent, but the most astonishing statement is that of Ibn al-ʿAṯūr, who says that Ostādīs was the father of Marāḏīlī, wife of Ḥārūn al-Raṣīd and mother of al-Ma’mūn, and that Ḥālīb, son of Ostādīs and maternal uncle of al-Ma’mūn, assassinated the latter’s vizier, the famous al-Fadḥ b. Sahl known as Dhu ’l-Riṣāyṣātān. It is impossible to say what can be at the basis of this story but perhaps we may see in it a tradition from a Persian source the object of which was to give al-Ma’mūn a royal or even saintly pedigree. The rising of Ostādīs broke out about half a millennium after the foundation of the Parthian dynasty and one of its bases was Sudjīstān which may have made this leader be regarded as one of the “saviours” expected in Zoroastrian religious tradition (cf. G. van Vloten, Recherches sur la domination arabe, in Vorb. Arb. Amt., i. 3; 1894, p. 68).


J. H. KRAMERS

OTBA B. GHAZWĀN B. AL-HĀRITH B. DĀHIR B. WAḤIB (OF WURAIH) B. NUSAYR ABU ḤUṢIYĀD AL-MĀZĀNĪ OR OTBA GHAZWĀN AL-MĀZĀNĪ, belonged to the tribe of Kais al-Aṭīḥ, half of the Nafāwī or of the Ḥud Shamās, one of the oldest Companions of the Prophet, “the seventh of the Seven”, i.e. the seventh to adopt Islam and one who had shared in the sufferings to which the first believers had been exposed in Mekka. He took part in both Būrās, the battle of Badr, and in most of the battles and expeditions of the Prophet. He is best known as the founder of Baṣra. In the caliphate of ‘Omar he first of all conducted an expedition which ended in the capture of Obollā. ‘Omar then appointed him agent (hamīl) in “the country of India”, i.e. the borderland between Arabia and Persian territory with orders to begin a campaign in the Sawād [q. v.]. He made
his headquarters at a hamlet called Khuraba, where he built all that was necessary for a military base: a mosque (cf. iii., p. 318), a residence for the governor, quarters for the soldiers, their families and all that goes to make a rising town. This was the nucleus of al-Baṣrā [q.v.]. The order of events and the chronology generally are far from being settled; the years given vary between 14 and 17. The years 15 and 17 are given for his death. Having performed the pilgrimage, he asked 'Omar to be allowed to resign his governorship but 'Omar refused to permit it. He then prayed God to spare him from returning to Baṣrā. On the way back he fell dead from his camel at the age of 57. Another tradition is given by Ibn Saʿd [cf. Bihl]. He was succeeded by al-Mughira b. Shuṭba [q.v.].


(A. J. WensincK)

'OTBA B. GHAZWĀN — 'OTHMAN I

1005

has remained attached to the dynasty of the 'Othmān Oghlārī or Alī 'Othmān and is later found in the description of the empire and its inhabitants as 'Othmānī or 'Othmānī, that behind the name of 'Othmān there lies a powerful personality. The most extensive source of information about him is Turkish historical literature and particularly its ancient chronicles, the Tavārīkhī Alī 'Othmān, representing the oldest tradition, along with a few poetical compositions of an epic nature dating from the end of the xi century, like the latter part of the Islandar-nāme of dāmēt. The study of the ancient chronicles reveals to us that although they certainly contain some good historical traditions, they are loaded with additions of a legendary character. These additions are explained by the enormous expansion of the power of the earlier Ottoman princes within less than a century of the death of its founder. As often happens in such cases the obscure history of the ancestor was embellished with details of a legendary character foreshadowing the greatness of his descendants. On the other hand, all the chronicles show a tendency to establish a historical connection between the power of the Sāliḥs of Asia Minor and that of the first Ottoman rulers by making Ertogrul or 'Othmān be invested with certain powers by Sulṭān 'Alī al-Din (II). These relations are more than doubtful. A third feature of the traditional accounts of 'Othmān′s career, which we find in all the chronicles, is the explanation of a number of geographical names by connecting them with events which took place in the glorious period of the founder of the dynasty. There is further the tendency which we find pushed to its greatest extent in the chronicle of 'Ashīk Pāsha Zāde to attribute to 'Othmān events which belong to the tradition of Ertogrul, like the prophetic dream regarding the greatness of the posterity of 'Othmān and the daughter of Shaikh Edebali, and the capture of the castle of Kardaş Hīṣār; in the same way the chronicles put many feats of arms of Orkhan like the taking of Brusa and even the conquest of Kōdja Ili to the reign of 'Othmān, who had then long been an invalid “with a disease of the limbs”. While in the chronicles we can still distinguish with some probability the non-historical features, pragmatic Ottoman historiography, with which 'Ashīk Pāsha Zāde and Idrīs Būlūsī form the transition, represents these traditions as historical facts. Among the Byzantine historians, Pachymeres and Nicephorus Gregorios alone have preserved historical features independent of the Ottoman tradition, which clearly shows its influence in the later Byzantines (Phrantzes, Ducas, Chalcocondylas). Quite legendary stories of 'Othmān are also found in the hagiographic literature (cf. Das Vamarin-Nāme des Hājī Beketash, transl. E. Gross, in Türk. Bibl., xxv., Leipzig 1925, p. 133 iqq.). According to unanimous tradition, 'Othmān was one of the sons of Ertogrul [q.v.] whom he succeeded as chief of a semi-nomad Turkish clan which had its winter camp at Sogud [q.v.] in the valley of the Kāra Su. The date of Ertogrul's death is uncertain; later sources vary between 1264 and 1282. At this time Kardaş Hīṣār and Eski Shehir [q.v.] situated considerably to the south of Sogud were perhaps already in the possession of this clan. They formed the frontier district bordering with the lands of the Germiyan-
Oghlu. 'Othman in the first phase of his career extended this cradle of Ottoman power to the north by taking the fortresses of Inegol, Khar-
menджik, Bileдjик, Vär Hisar and Kopru Hisar, which had hitherto been in the hands of the Byzantine feudal lords. This country consists of
mountains and valleys lying to the west of the course of the Sakarya [q. v.] and ends in the north in the plain of Yeşi Shehir; the capture of
the last place seems to have been of great military importance as it became a base of operations for future conquests (cf. the map Das Stammgebiet
der Osmanen, attached to the article Anatolische Forschungen, by F. Taeschner, in Z.D.M.G., N. S., viii. 492). On Von Hammer, C.O.N., ii. 495, the
inscription by Pachymeres (ed. Bonn 1835, ii. 415) of the fortresses taken by the Turks, corresponds pretty well with the conquests of 'Othman.
It is perhaps to this first stage of conquests that belongs the first recital of the Ḳutbta at Karada Hışar in the name of 'Othman by Tursun Fakhtā.
The chronicles put this event in 689 (1290). During this time the newly conquered territory seems to have received an increased of population from the
side of the Gemlyān (Ashık Pascha Zade, ed. Giese, p. 20). The second phase in 'Othman's career is that in which from his base at Yeşi Shehir he continued his conquests in the westerly
direction towards Brusa and in a northern direction towards Iznik. The Turks were not strong enough to take these towns but they ravaged the country round.
According to the chronicles, there was a battle between 'Othman's Turks and a confederation of lords (takbešir) of Brusa, Iznik and several other places at Köyün Hışar, near Iznik, in which the Turks were victorious; this battle has been identified
since Von Hammer's time with the battle of Baphaeon, in which, according to Pachymeres (ii. 337), the heretarch Mouzalon was defeated in 1301
as a result of the impetuous onslaught of the Turkish cavalry. This victory enabled Lefke and Ağa Hışar on the Sakarya to be taken and in the
west Tricoccia between Iznik and Brusa (Pachymeres, ii. 637). In connection with this last victory (in 1308) Pachymeres mentions a personal feud between
'Othman and the Byzantine princess Maria, sister of the emperor Andronicus, who lived in Nicaea. She had been Lefke's wife and Pacho, the
Hisān, Ölkaitu Khudābanda [q. v.] and had threatened 'Othman with the latter's intervention. In this
second period the Turks extended their conquests as far as Ulubad (Leopardon) to the west of Brusa. The third phase is that in which 'Othman
no longer took part personally in the military expeditions although, according to tradition, he was still alive. It was Orkhan [q. v.] and his
companions in arms who continued the conquests. The first enterprise of Orkhan was the expulsion of a horde of Tatars who had invaded the district
of Eski Shehir (perhaps sent by the Mongol allies of Byzantium). In the latest stage, 'Othman devoted himself to the closer encirclement of Iznik and
Brusa. This last town finally fell in 726 (1326), according to the chronicles, shortly before the death of 'Othman who is said to have received
the good news just before he died in Sügd. These sources are not agreed as to whether 'Othman was buried at Sügd or Brusa. This last town has
however for a very long time claimed to have a turbe of 'Othman.
From the very beginning of his reign 'Othman was surrounded by a group of devoted followers, consisting in part of his brothers and their sons
and in part of allies like Shaikh Edebali — whose daughter Mâ'ḵšat âdun (in the two versions of Uruđ Beg her name is Râbi'a) became the wife of
'Othman and the mother of his sons Orkhan and Aâdâ al-Dîn — and the Byzantine lord of Khrimendjik, Köse Mîkhâl [q. v.] who later became a Muslim. The chronicles record how 'Othman
divided among his friends the civil and military administration of the places he conquered. As to 'Othman's foreign policy, it seems that his relations
with the Germiyan Oghlu were not very friendly; it was from their territory that Eski Shehir was exposed to the ravages of the Turks. The chronicle of 'Ashık Pascha Zade tells us that he had
other independent Turkish allies like Samâmâ Çâüşh with whom he made raids across the Sakarya.

The chronology of the career of 'Othman is uncertain. It is a pure fiction to say his reign began in 700 (1300); this is connected with the
popular belief that at the end of each century a new conqueror makes his appearance (cf. 'Ali, Kuchi al-Aхbār, v. 3). Neither does the statements
made by several chroniclers that at his death 'Othman had reigned nineteen years (byzâlîk etti) agree with other records. Perhaps however it gives
a hint that his death took place long before the traditional date. The importance of the career of 'Othman has attracted research into the true
nature of the expansion of the little Turkish clan and the power of its first chief. It has been suggested (Gibbons) that it was the conversion
of 'Othman to Islam which gave the first impetus to expansion, but that is little probable as most of the available facts suggest a milieu already
Muslim; 'Othman did just what a number of other Turkish chiefs were doing in Asia Minor about the same time. 'Othman's name, which looks strange
among the Turkish names of the members of his family (the name of his grandfather Sulaiman Shâh excepted), has also been the subject of
study. While the chroniclers all write 'Othman (like the few coins of Orkhan, cf. T. O. E. M., viii. 48 and an inscription of Orkhan at Brusa; cf. T. O. E. M., v. 318 sqq.), Pachymeres has the
give 'Othmândjik (Ahn Fadl Allah al-Umar, however, has Taman) and the Italian historian Donado da Lezze (Historia Turcica, Boccares: 1910, p. 4) says that Ottoman was the son of Zich. Now
some traditions make the founder of the dynasty be born in the town of 'Othmândjik to the south of Sinope (Ewijâ Celebi, ii. 179) which may be a
hint of the origin of the name. Moreover, the text of the chronicle of Uruđ Beg (p. 6), taken in combination with other texts, shows that Ertogrul
had three sons with Turkish names which might even make one suppose that 'Othman was not a son of Ertogrul (cf. J. H. Kramers, Wer war
belonged to one of the corporations of ghâzin or akhî's as did several members of his entourage like Edebali and his nephew Akhi Hasan ('Ashık Pascha Zade, p. 28), corporations which at
this period represented a Muslim element more civilised

**ÖTHMÂN II,** sixteenth sultan of the Ottoman empire, was born on the 19th Dhu- mada II 1012 (Nov. 15, 1603; cf. *Sidjil-i ʿothmâni*, i. 56), the son of Sultan Ahmad I. After the death of his father in Nov. 1617, the brother of the latter had been proclaimed sultan as Mustafa I [q. v.] but Öthmân, taking advantage of the weak character of his uncle and supported by the mufti Esâd Efendi and the Khâlîg Agha Muṣṭafâ, seized the throne on Feb. 26, 1618 by a coup d'état. The youth of the new sultan at first assured the promoters of the coup d'état of considerable influence. To them was due the replacement of Khalîl Paşa as grand vizier by Oküz Mehmed Paşa [q. v.] in Jan. 1619, Khalîl had just concluded a treaty of peace with Şâh ʿAbbâs I of Persia, after a campaign which had been indecisive. The relations with the other powers, Austria and Venice, with which the capitulations were renewed, were also peaceful. But after, in Jan. 1620, Mehmed Paşa had been replaced by the very influential favourite Güzeldje ʿAli Paşa [q. v.] who removed from the court all possible rivals, the chances of war increased. This time it was a war with Poland which broke out through the intrigues of the wooid of Moldavia. In the battle of Yassy on Sept. 20, 1620, the Polish army was annihilated by the ser-asker İskender Paşa. The grand vizier, who held office mainly by satisfying the avarice of the young sultan, never lost an occasion to irritate and provoke the enmity of Austria and Venice. He died on March 9, 1621 and under his successor Hüsam Paşa of Oktîr, Öthmân took part in person in the campaign of 1621 against Poland. This campaign ended in a check for the Turks and the Tartars, who, with great losses, had in vain tried to storm the fortified Polish camp on the Dniester near Choczin. A preliminary peace was signed under the same conditions as before under Sulaimân I and the sultan appointed a new grand vizier Dilâwîr-Zade Hüsam Paşa. Since the time when Öthmân, still considerably under the influence of the Khâlîg Agha Sulaimân and his Khodja Molla ʿOmer, had begun to act independently, he had not been able to gain the sympathy of the army on account of his brutal treatment of the Janissaries, nor of the people chiefly as a result of his avarice, nor of the *ulâma*. The latter were particularly horrified at the sultan's wish to take four legitimate wives from the free classes of his entourage; he actually married the daughter of the Mufti Esâd. His unpopularity increased still further when he wished to put himself at the head of an army to fight Fakhr al-Din, the Emir of the Druses, and to go on and make the pilgrimage to Mecca. Preparations had already been made for this expedition when on May 15, 1622 a mutiny broke out among the Janissaries and Sipahis who plundered the house of Molla ʿOmer. Next day the rebels secured the cooperation of the chief *ülâma* and demanded the heads of the Khâlîg Agha, the Khodja, the grand vizier, and three other high officials. Öthmân at first refused but after the rebels had forced the third wall of the palace he had to sacrifice the grand vizier and the Khâlîg Agha. But in the meanwhile his uncle Muṣṭafâ had been brought out from his seclusion in the harem to be proclaimed sultan. Öthmân tried during the night to secure his throne through the influence of the Agha of the Janissaries, but the latter was killed on the following morning and he became the prisoner of the Janissaries who took him to their barracks. The rebels had no intentions against his life but in the meanwhile the direction of affairs had passed to Dâwid Paşa, the favourite and son-in-law of Mah-Feiker, the mother of Sultan Muṣṭafâ. Dâwid Paşa being appointed grand vizier had ʿOthmân taken to the castle of Yedi Kule where he was put to death in the evening of May 20, 1622. He was buried in the *türbe* of his father Ahmad I. — Öthmân is praised for his skill as a horseman and for his intelligence. He was also a poet with the *mâghâš* of Fârisî. He was the first of three sultans to lose his life in a rising; the others being İbrahim and Selim III.

*Bibliography:* The Turkish sources are the works of Naîmî, Pečevî, Hasan Bay Zade, the *Rudat al-ābrâr* of ʿAṣrî Čehbi Zade, and the *Relatione* of Fedh'lehe. The *Othman Khan* of Tücht is specially devoted to the deposition of ʿOthmân (transl. by A. Galland; cf. *G. O. W.*, p. 157), while his whole reign is described in a *Shâhnâmeh* by Nâdir (G. O. W., p. 169). Among contemporary western accounts: the *Relazioni* quoted by von Hammer, in the note on p. 806 of *G. O. R.*, ii. and that of Sir Thomas Roe. Cf. also the general histories by von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

**ÖTHMÂN III,** twenty-fifth sultan of the Ottoman Empire and son of Muṣṭafâ II, succeeded his brother Maḥmûd I on Dec. 14, 1754. He was born on Jan. 2, 1699 (Sidjil-i ʿothmâni, i. 56) and had therefore reached an advanced age when he was called to the throne. No events of political importance took place in his reign. The period of peace which had begun with the peace of Belgrade in 1739 continued; at home only a series of seditious outbreaks in the frontier provinces indicated the weakness of the Empire. In the absence of any outstanding personalty the sultan was able to please, but his activities were practically confined to changing his grand vizier frequently (six times). His favourite Şihâb-ʾâr ʿAli Paşa, grand vizier from Aug. 24 to Oct. 22, 1755, had his career terminated by execution. The appointment on Dec. 13, 1756 of Râgib Paşa [q. v.] was an important one, as for five years this great statesman showed himself an excellent administrator of the empire under Muṣṭafâ III. ʿOthmân III's other activities were the suppression of cafés, of the liberty of women to show themselves in public and the regulation of the dress of his non-Muslim subjects. His name is associated with the great mosque of Nūr-i ʿOthmânî, which had been begun by Maḥmûd I and was solemnly opened in Dec. 1755. The reign of this sultan is remembered
for the great fires in the capital in 1755 and 1756. He died on Oct. 30, 1757 and was buried, like Mahmud I, in the tomb of the Yeüs İjâmî.

Bibliography: The Tārikh of Waṣîf is the principal source. The reign is described in the great histories of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

Othmân III — ʻothmân b. ʻAffân

J. H. Kramers, the third caliph (23-35 = 644-655). He belonged to the great Meccan family of the Banû ʻUmâya and to the branch descended from Abu Ḍa'īṣ, whose grand-son he was (cf. the genealogy in Wustenfeld, Genal. Tabellen, U. 23). This makes his prompt acceptance of the teaching of Muhammad quite noteworthy; he became a convert, if not at the very beginning of the Prophet's mission, at least at a very early date, several years before the Hijra. ʻOthmân was a rich merchant and an accomplished man of the world; tradition, which likes to represent him as a model of beauty and elegance and deals to a degree which borders on exaggeration with his toilet, may be correct, simply because it is unusual. Whatever was the exact motive that induced him to embrace a cause of which no one could then have possibly foreseen the success is a question that can never be answered with certainty. One set of historical traditions connects his conversion with his marriage to Muhammad's daughter Ruqayya but other sources, probably with more justice, put this marriage after his conversion.

The conversion of ʻOthmân, the first Muslim of high social rank, must have made a sensation and contributed to the success of the new religion, but his personal efforts on behalf of Islam were never remarkable. His indolent character, which was however accompanied by a very living faith and great good nature, is another feature ascribed by tradition to ʻOthmân and it is unlikely that we have here an invention intended to excuse the inaction of this caliph against his lying officials; just because lack of energy and initiative is evident in ʻOthmân from the very beginning of his career, this defect must have been there in the first instance. ʻOthmân is believed to have taken part in the two migrations to Abyssinia and then joined the mukābîrîn in Medina; but he did not take part in the battle of Badr (it is alleged that he had to attend to a sick wife; the Prophet however regarded him as present and allotted him his share of the booty).

After the death of Ruqayya the Prophet's alliance with ʻOthmân was renewed by his marriage with another daughter, Umûm Kullûh; the doubts raised by Lammens (Fâmi'm et les filles de Mahomet, Rome 1912, p. 3-5) regarding the actuality of this marriage do not seem to be justified; there is no reason to think that Muhammad did not lay great stress on this alliance with the only member of the Meccan aristocracy of whom the Muslim community could so far boast.

During the lifetime of the Prophet and those of the caliphs Abû Bakr and ʻOmar, the part played by ʻOthmân was very humble; how did it happen then that the council (qâta) appointed by ʻOmar on his deathbed chose him as successor to the second caliph? The sources dealing with the history of this laborious conclave have been minutely analysed by Caetani; but it is only too evident that the mysteries of these secret deliberations are never destined to be revealed to historical criticism. What it seems possible to affirm is that, as often happened in the papal conclaves, the most outstanding candidates ruled one another out; for example ʻAli whose election would have meant the negation of ʻOmar's policy; or al-Zubair and ʻAbd, also it seems opponents of ʻOmar and whose ambition and covetousness was feared. If among the three who remained, Sa'd b. Abû Wâqîq, ʻAbd al-Rahmân b. ʻAwf and ʻOthmân, it was the latter who was chosen, it may be thought that even more than his relationship to the Prophet it was his being a member of the Umayyad clan that proved the decisive argument in his favour. The Umayyads had already regained in the lifetime of the Prophet, and especially during the caliphate of ʻOmar, a part of the position they held during the ʻAbdîhîlîya. There is no need to think as some one has done that Abû Sufyân, the head of the family, was the deus ex machina of policy during the first twenty years of the caliphate, and it would be naïve to represent the Umayyads as having formed a kind of secret committee dealing with the Islamic state as it pleased.

In reality it was not so much to their noble birth as to a real talent for affairs possessed by several of their members that the Umayyads owed their influence. But this was counterbalanced in the time of ʻOmar by the part played by other elements and especially by the oldest Companions. The strong personality of the second caliph had been able to maintain equilibrium among a number of heterogeneous elements, often in opposition to them.

It was otherwise with ʻOthmân. In reality, as Wellhausen pointed out and Caetani has expanded at length, ʻOthmân only followed and developed the policy of ʻOmar. The difficulties he encountered were only the results of the policy of his predecessor. But it was just here that the difference in their talents became apparent.

The tragedy which put a bloody end to the reign of ʻOthmân and opened up the period of civil wars has caused the greatest embarrassment to the Arab historians, forced to record the series of grievances which the adversaries of ʻOthmân raised against his rule and faced with the alternative of either accepting the caliph's sin as having been committed against the laws of Islam that ʻOthmân, among whom were some of the most venerable patriarchs of the faith, had either lied or been deceived. It is owing to this painful dilemma (out of which orthodox tradition extricated itself by means of the theory of the "excusable error" and other subtle distinctions) that there has been preserved for us the long list of these grievances (which are given in great detail for example in Muḥibb al-Dîn al-Tabari, al-Riyâd al-maṭrîra fi Manâhib al-ʻAṣharâ, Cairo 1327, ii. 137-152). The first and perhaps the gravest charge against him is that he appointed members of his family to the governorships in the provinces; if Syria had already been long in the hands of the Umayyad Mu'awiyâ b. Abû Sufyân, ʻOthmân replaced Abû Mâsa al-ʻAshâri and Sa'd b. Abû Wâqîq at Basra and Kufa respectively by his two relatives ʻAbd Allâh b. ʻAmir b. Kuraiz and al-Walîd b. ʻUkba, his half-brother; when the latter was dismissed, having been involved in a scandal, he was replaced by another Umayyad, Sa'd b. al-Ăsîb, to whom is attributed the celebrated saying: "The Sawâb of Kufa is the garden of the Kuraish". Egypt, the first conqueror of which, ʻAmir b. al-Ăsîb, seemed to deserve the right to hold the governorship for
life fell to 'Abd Allāh b. Sa‘d b. Abī Sarḥ, who was not an Umayyad, but whose Muslim past was, to say the least, suspicious. Finally the caliph's intimate adviser to whom tradition likes to ascribe a beneficent influence, was Marwān b. al-Ḥakam b. Ḥabīb. Abī l-'Āṣī, first cousin of the caliph, who had recalled his father from the exile to which the Prophet had condemned him. It cannot be denied that these measures of 'Othmān were not entirely free from nepotism; but we must recognise in them a deeper motive: the intention of establishing unity of government and administration where it was being threatened by the excess of independence which the governors enjoyed. It was practically the same end that 'Omar had in view but the latter had succeeded by his energy and prestige in imposing his authority even on governors who belonged to other tribes and clans. 'Othmān thought he could obtain the same results by using officials connected with him by ties of blood; he was not successful; the parts were reversed and it was the caliph who was under the influence of his relatives (perhaps however to a less extent than the official historians say); besides, popular discontent ascribed solely to this cause the troubles that arose, which were probably quite independent of the personality of the officials. Indeed (and it is one of Caenans's great merits that he has called attention to this) the 'Abbasid system instituted by 'Omar demanded that the plunder taken in war should increase steadily in perpetuity, the regular receipts from the taxation of the Abi al-Qasimyya not sufficient for the new recruits who hastened to the provinces from the depths of Arabia. From this came the stimulus to the expeditions in which the caliphate of 'Omar never ceased to push forward the frontiers of the Arab empire: such were the conquest of the last provinces of the Sāhānīan empire (the dynasty of which became extinct with the murder of the last king Yazdāgird III), the occupation of Armenia, a series of expeditions along the north coast of Africa, into Nubia, into Asīr Minor, and by sea into the eastern basin of the Mediterranean. If we sum up the conquests made or begun by the 'Abbasids, the caliphate of Othmān we shall see that if there do not exist the swift expansion of those that took place under 'Omar, they are nevertheless impressive as they mark on one side the conclusion of the initial stage of the Arab empire and on the other the preliminary to the second period of expansion, that of the 'Umayyads.

Nevertheless the booty produced by these expeditions was perhaps not so great as had been hoped; besides, 'Othmān — this is another of the grievances against him — instead of assigning it entirely to the soldiers, reserved a share for his governors and for the members of his family, by developing the system of fiels (taba‘ī), which 'Omar had already made great use of. In this again, we should recognise not a simple scheme for enriching his relations but perhaps rather a conscientious attempt to form domains for the state in contrast to the communist system of dividing all the booty among the combatants. The 'Imāmī empire was tending from an innate necessity to give itself a regular administration, for which the Byzantine and Persian afforded models. What 'Omar had already begun, what the 'Umayyads to some extent accomplished and the 'Abbasids realised, the transformation of the incoherent and anarchistic grouping of the tribes into an absolute monarchy of oriental type, was also 'Othmān's programme. He may be reproached with not having chosen the means best fitted to realise it and described as not being fit for a task of this magnitude; but his plan was a reasonable one and only meant following up 'Omar's ideal. Besides, the economic crisis, the inevitable consequence of the sudden enriching of the Arab masses, very soon forced the state to make economies and to cut down the military pensions; this not unnaturally increased the number of malcontents.

One of the steps which contributed very greatly to stirring up against 'Othmān the religious element, formed of the old Companions of humble or even servile origin (such as 'Am'mār b. Yasir, Abū Dharr, 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd etc.), whose influence upon the masses was very strong, was the official edition of the Kur'ān (cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qorāns, ii. 47—119). What was found most odious in this process was the destruction of the provincial copies. 'Othmān was no doubt urged to this step by considerations of a religious and liturgical nature, but nevertheless the dominant motive may have been a political one. The Qur'ān, which were the receptacles of and of course also the expositors of the sacred text, exercised for this reason a tremendous influence on the masses, which made them to some degree independent of the central power, the latter having no way of checking whether the Qur'ānic passages used by the Qur'ān were authentic or not. In depriving them of this weapon and making itself the monopolist of divine revelation, the government was endeavouring to realise unity and to establish its absolute power over the state: but it is only very natural that the opposition to this tendency should have accused the caliph of having mutilated and destroyed the divine word.

'Othmān therefore made himself enemies in very different quarters: the turbulent elements of the anjar [see Mišr] faced with economic difficulties and disposed to accuse the caliph of confiscating for his own benefit the property of the Muslims; growing piety to which the assertion of the authority of the state seemed a breach of the principle of equality laid down by the Prophet; lastly the former governors who had been dismissed and the great Companions who, removed from power, were striving for it with all their might: such were Taḥṭa, al-Zubair and 'Alī. It may be asked if 'Othmān, while following the line of conduct imposed upon him, as we have seen, by the necessities of state and the example of his predecessor, could have avoided the fate which overtook him and which so profoundly disturbed the unity of Islam. Although the answer to this kind of question cannot be a definite one in the field of history, it may be supposed that a more intelligent mind and a more energetic temperament than that of the third caliph (or to be more definite a real political genius such as Mu‘awiya) would undoubtedly have revealed if he had then been at the head of the government, might perhaps have overcome these difficulties. Perhaps also his adviser Marwān, who was thirty years later to face a situation not less difficult, lacked as yet experience and prudence. In any case, 'Othmān, incapable in himself, was also badly advised and the Umayyads, whom he had overwhelmed with riches and honours, thought more of themselves than of their relative in the hour of danger.
The course of development of events can only be briefly indicated here. Tradition divides quite artificially the caliphate of 'Othman into two periods of equal length: six years (23–29) of good government and six (30–35) of illegality and confusion. The change is represented symbolically by the loss of the seal of the Prophet which 'Othman, according to the story, dropped into the well of 'Aris in the year 30. It is in any case a fact that it was just at this period that the first movements of rebellion began in the 'Iraq, the region which was suffering most from the economic crisis and the one where the turbulent elements were the most numerous. The episode of Abi Dharr, one of the precursors of asceticism in Islam, exiled to Syria with several of his companions, and later sent to Rabatha to die there in destitution, although embellished by legend is characteristic as showing the attitude of the growing piety to the secular transformation of the caliphate. Much more serious troubles broke out in Kufa in 32–33, led by the kurrari', who combined a religious character with a dynasty character, and involved a number of doubtful elements. In spite of severe measures taken against them, the caliph's elements succeeded in procuring the deposition of Sa'id b. al-'Aṣ who was replaced by the former governor of Başra, Abi Mā'ṣ al-Ash'ari, himself a pretender and opponent of 'Othman; Kufa was henceforth no longer under the central government. Similarly in Egypt, Iön Abi Sarhī had to yield to the violence of a group led by the young Muḥammad b. Abi Ḥudhaifa who although an adopted son of 'Othman took the side of his opponents. It seems that the wily 'Amr b. al-'Aṣ who had retired to Palestine after his dismissal was secretly encouraging the revolutionary movement in Egypt. The storm which had been brewing for some time burst at the end of the year 35 when bodies of rebels advanced on Medina from the provinces. The first to arrive were the Egyptians; dramatic interviews took place between them and the caliph; the grievances against 'Othman were expounded with great bitterness of language. But the rebels were disarmed by the humble and conciliatory attitude of the caliph who gave in to all their demands, promised to annul his previous measures and to change his governors; the Egyptians left satisfied. But suddenly, on the way back at the halting-place of al-'Arṣih, a messenger of 'Othman's was seized and a letter found upon him from 'Othman to Ibn Abi Sarhī confiscated which contained an order to put to death or mutilate the leaders of the movement on their return. The latter turned back furious and retraced their steps to Medina, determined on vengeance. 'Othman denied that the letter was genuine, and even insinuated that it had been forged by his enemies in order to ruin him. Although official tradition shows a tendency to attribute this forgery to Marwān, there is also the trace of other versions and even of one (preserved by al-Baladhuri alone), which says that 'Othman suspected 'Ali; this, by the way, is what Caetani had suspected without knowing of this text (Annali, viii., p. 159). Whatever we may think of this suspicious episode (we know well that the manufacture of false documents intended to bring ruin upon an adversary who cannot be defeated otherwise has been regularly practised in ancient as well as modern times), it is certain that, while it was the immediate cause of the tragic end of 'Othman, events had already begun to move. A regular siege of 'Othman's house was set up; the conduct of the old Companions who remained in veiled opposition was of the most hypocritical character; without having the courage to share in the deposition of the caliph by violence, and without the desire to help him against the rebels, they, 'Ali in particular, maintained an attitude of malevolent neutrality. 'Aṣīha, the widow of the Prophet, who had conducted a violent campaign against 'Othman, preferred to slip away at the last moment on the pretext of a pilgrimage to Mecca. Reduced to the last extremity, 'Othman mustered all his dignity and refused to abdicate. After a siege, the length of which is given differently in the different sources, a number of men penetrated into the house in the last days of 35 (June 656) led by Muḥammad b. Abi Bakr (the son of the first caliph and brother of 'Aṣīha) who raised his hand against 'Othman. We do not know if it was he or another (tradition gives several names and it is evident that the exact details were obscure at this first round between the caliph an the opressor). His blood flowed, it is said, upon the copy of the Kurān which he was reading when attacked; his wife, the Kaibīt Na'īla bint al-Furāfīsa, was wounded. The house was pillaged. During the night the body was burned with the greatest secrecy by his wife and some friends. The troops sent by Muḥtawīya from Syria (too late, says tradition, accusing him of duplicity) received the news of the murder when half way there and quickly returned home.

We know how the new caliph was elected in the midst of tumult and terror (cf. Caetani, Annali, ix. 321–342); it shows, the author of this article thinks, that there was no previous arrangement among the principal Companions, each of whom probably thought he could deal with events as they arose. The election of 'Abī was without doubt due, even more than to the prestige given him by his close relationship and alliance with the Prophet, to the support of the Anṣūr who in the confusion in the Umayyad party had resumed control over their own town. But the new government from the first was destined to be challenged either by the unsuccessful rivals or by Muḥtawīya, the only one of the Umayyad governors who had remained master of his province. Political unity, and soon also the religious unity, of Islam was now at an end and the period of schisms and civil wars had begun. The caliphate of 'Othman and its bloody end mark a turning point in Muslim history and give to the third caliph an importance which his true personality, a somewhat mediocre one at best, would never have merited.

Bibliography: The sources and earlier works are collected and summed up in Caetani, Annales dell' Islam, vii. and viii., Milan 1914–1918 (cf. also by the same author Chronographia Islamica, p. 279–388). The only historical text of importance still unpublished, the Anwa al-Aṣṣāf of al-Baladhuri, is in course of publication by the University of Jerusalem. The part relating to 'Othman, edited by D. S. F. Goltzein (who has lent us his corrects and complements on many points the material already available but does not supply much that is new. We may also expect shortly the publication of the long biography of 'Othman in the Tavarih
'OTHMÂN b. 'Affân — 'OTHMÂN Abû Bakr Dîguna


(Levi Della Vida)

'Othmân b. Mâzûn b. Ĥâbi b. A'bî-l-'Aṣînâ of the Kurâish clan of Dîjumâh, one of the earliest companions of Mûhammad, the thirteenth man to adopt Iṣlâm. He took part in the hijâra to Abyssinia, returned, like some other refugees, on the false news of a reconciliation between Mûhammad and his pagan enemies and became for some time the client of al-Walîd b. al-Mughıra. Soon he renounced this privilege, because he preferred to bear his share in the insults offered to his co-religionists in Mecca. On a quarrel between 'Othmân and the poet Lâbid see Ibn Hîshâm, p. 343–344.

'Othmân took part in the hijâra to Middina where he found lodging with Umm al-Ĥāla. When Mûhammad formed pairs of "brothers" between the Mûhâdhîn and Anṣâr, 'Othmân was associated with Abu Ḥârîrî b. al-Ţalîyînân. He took part in the battle of Badr and died in the following year, 3 a.H., according to another account in the year 4. He was the first Muslim buried in Bâkîf al-Ĥuṣayn. The affection in which Mûhammad held him was seen in the grief he showed at the sight of his corpse. Nevertheless Mûhammad is said to have reproved his widow Khwâlîn bint Ḥâkîm al-Sulamîyâ for using language, more natural than theological, and saying her dead husband was one of the inhabitants of Paradise.

In Tradition 'Othmân is the most characteristic representative of the ascetic tendencies which were not entirely foreign to primitive Iṣlâm. He abstained from wine before this beverage was prohibited. He neglected his wife who did not fail to complain to 'Aîsha whereupon Mûhammad tried to divert him from a too rigorous asceticism by suggesting that he should follow his example. The tradition is also very well known according to which he asked Mûhammad to permit him to castrate himself, a request which the Prophet did not at all consider with favour.


(O. J. Wensinck)

'Othmân Dan Fodio. [See pul.]

'Othmân Abû Bakr Dîguna (Dîguna), govern- nor and general of the Mahdîyya in the Eastern Sudân from 1883 onwards, born in Sawâkîn about 1830 (cf. Shûkâr, iii, 200; Dietrich, p. 50), was according to some a descendant of Khûbatu dijîr Bâkî who had come in 1517 under Sulţân Selîm to Sawâkîn and intermarried with the Hadendoûa. The resulting family of the Dîgunî (Dîguna) settled in Erkowit (Arkowât) west of Sawâkîn. Shûkâr mentions several relations of 'Othmân: two brothers, Muhammad Mûsa and the slave dealer 'Alî, a half-brother Ahmad Dîguna, two nephews, Madani b. 'Alî and Muhammad Fâi, emir of Kassâla. 'Othmân gave them appointments in the army and in the administration. Ahmad Dîguna and Madani both fell in fighting in the Eastern Sudan.

Down to the outbreak of the Mahdîyya rising, 'Othmân was a trader, dealing especially in slaves between the Hijâz and the Sudan. The prohibition of the slave-trade by the Egyptian government in 1877 affected not only his livelihood and his liberty— he and his brother 'Alî suffered a period of imprisonment in Djûdâ— but also his religious conviction that the slave-trade was a permitted one. Even then his religious fanaticism displayed itself in joining the ecstasy of begging order of the Mahdîyya. On the hearing of the coming of the Mahdî Muhammad Ahmad [q.v.], "he migrated to him" (hadîyâra), met him shortly after the fall of el-Ouend (al-Ubâyîd) in 1883 and took the oath of obedience to him (bâti'â). Henceforward he was blindly devoted to the Mahdîyya and retained his allegiance to it until his imprisonment.

It is evidence of the Mahdî's keen judgment that he at once recognised 'Othmân's extraordinary abilities and in a proclamation to the tribes of the eastern Sudan on May 8, 1883 (in Shûkâr, iii, 201 sqq.) appointed him governor-general (ʿamal ʿanma, over the till then peaceful tribes of the Beidjâ, between the Atbara and the Red Sea (with the towns of Sawâkîn, Tôkâr and Kassâla). These tribes who did not speak Arabic and had never been ruled by an Arab, readily gave obedience to the Mahdi with the only knowledge they had of him being that he was well known to them through years of friendly commerce but also knew their language and ways.

'Othmân's activity from 1883 to 1900 falls into two periods. In the first (1883—1891) as leader of the Mahdîyya rising in the eastern Sudan he carried out the important task of protecting the eastern frontier of the Mahdîyya against the Anglo-Egyptian government, which made it possible for the Mahdî to concentrate his forces on the Nile. In the second period (till 1900) after the loss of the eastern Sudan, he was still general of the Mahdîyya along with others in the service of the Khalîfa ʿAbdulâhî against the English in Khartoum.

I. The events of the first period which he opened from Erkowit with the encounter at Sinkât on Aug. 5, 1883 were at first concerned with Sawâkîn. The details of this fighting are given by Shûkâr, i, 200 sqq., 323 sqq., 400 sqq., 538 sqq., 601 sqq. The main object was not so much the taking of Sawâkîn and other towns as the command of the roads between Sawâkîn and Berber, the shortest and most convenient route to the Nile. 'Othmân is entitled to the merit of having for seven years successfully closed this road to the government. In contrast to this, the results of the actual fighting were of little significance on either side. 'Othmân defeated the Egyptians under Mûhûd Pîshâ at el-Ţeb (Nov. 5, 1883), destroyed an Egyptian expedition at al-Tamânib (Dec. 1883), undertook the siege of Sawâkîn, Sinkât and Tôkâr, defeated Bakr Pîshâ in a second battle at el-Ţeb (Feb. 4, 1884), on Feb. 8 forced Sinkât to surrender and on Feb. 24 Tôkâr, but on Feb. 29, 1884 suffered a severe defeat at el-Ţeb and again on March 13 and 27 at Tamâl at the hands of General Graham, which checked him for a time but did not cause him to withdraw. It was not till March 1885 that he began new operations from Tamâl, Tell Hashim and Tôkâr, with little success.
because the tribes which composed his army threatened to disperse, fearing English intervention. Nevertheless, he succeeded again and again in inspiring the undisciplined masses with enthusiasm, not least by the fact that he transferred the centre of his activities to Kassala and Abyssinia. The years 1884—1885 mark the zenith of his career. He incited the people of Kassala by Mahdist pamphlets; after the death of the Mahdi on June 22, 1885 and the fall of Kassala he was sent there by the Khalifa 'Abdullâhi, as the only higher official of the Mahdi (not related to the Khalifa) who had remained in his position, and from there waged war on the Amârâ and the Abyssinians. He compensated himself for the failure of his Abyssinian campaign by a savage treatment of the people of Kassala. As he was continually threatening Sawâkin and even went so far as to draw trenches round the town and begin a regular siege from Handûb, Kitchener, who was then in command at Sawâkin, forced him after a series of defeats to retire to Tôkâr. 'Othmân's position now began to decline. The tribes became alienated by his strictness and severity and by the continual warfare. The exhaustion of the Mahdists was so great that the Khalifa allowed 'Othmân to resume trading between Sawâkin and the Mahdiya via Handûb, but this was stopped on the opening of the final struggle between the Mahdists and the Anglo-Egyptian government, and the result was famine among the Mahdists. The oppression of Kassala by Muhammad Fâlî, sent there as emir by his uncle 'Othmân, induced the Khalifa to summon 'Othmân to Omdûrman [q. v.]. He returned with full approval of his conduct and with new military powers but was completely defeated by Holled Smith Pagâ who finally took Tôkâr in Feb. 1891; the tribes scattered, 'Othmân fled abandoned by everyone to the mountains between Kassala and Berber. The country between the Atbara and the Red Sea was lost to the Mahdists; Berber and Kassala were open to the English and Italians. 'Othmân was banished by the Khalifa to Alârâna on the Atbara, where in addition to buying himself with agriculture he endeavoured to raise a new army which was to hold the Atbara line.

II. When at the beginning of the decisive campaign against the Mahdiya, Kitchener conquered Berber in 1897, 'Othmân came to the front again. He led an army over the Nile at Ghendi and joined his fellow-general Mahmûd. They were both defeated and Mahmûd was taken prisoner. In the battle that followed at Omdûrman (Sept. 2, 1898) he attempted in vain to check the flight of the dervishes with a strong force between the Sughab hills and the Nile. After the defeat he accompanied the Khalifa on his flight until the latter's death at Gadîd (Nov. 24, 1899), refused to surrender, escaped across the White Nile and Atbara into the Werriba mountains and endeavoured with the help of the Shaikh of the Djumlat to cross the Red Sea into the Hijâz. Through the treachery of the Shaikh he fell into the hands of the authorities of Sawâkin on Jan. 18, 1900, and was sent to prison in Damietta where Shukair saw and spoke with him in 1905 (see Bibl.). To the kindness of the Royal Egyptian Embassies in Berlin I owe the following data of 'Othmân's later life: 'Othmân's imprisonment took place on Jan. 12, 1900; he was brought to Rosetta, from there to Tiura near Cairo, finally, out of climatic reasons, to Wâdi Halfa. After some years his lot was relieved; he was allowed to retain his property in Berber, but did not take any interest therein. In 1924, at a great age, he made the pilgrimage to Mecca; after his return to Wâdi Halfa he settled outside the town, where he died in 1926; he was buried there.

'Othmân Digna was the model of a primitive unbroken nature. He was the type of the fanatical Mahdist, noteworthy as the only non-Arab to hold high office in the Mahdiya. He was an imposing figure as described by Shukair, iii. 200 (German by Dietrich, p. 49). Not only did he know the languages of the tribes placed under him but he also spoke and wrote Arabic fluently (a specimen of his concise style is given by Shukair, iii. 206 sqq.). Courage veering on foolhardiness and cleverness which seized upon the slightest advantage, strictness to the verge of cruelty, and a stubbornness in following up his goal, from which even the severest defeats could not turn him, were combined in him with an ecstatic piety — Shukair described his ecstatic fits in prison (iii. 609 sqq.) and also his mode of living. From time to time on the coming of the Mahdi he went without sandals and shoes and used riding-beasts only for longer journeys. He was therefore, along with Wad Nadjâm and Âbû 'Amûdâ, the most important Mahdist general and the most dreaded enemy of the government.

Bibliography: Na'âmî Bey Shukâr, Tahriû' al-Sâdûn, iii., Cairo 1903; E. L. Dietrich, Der Mahdi Mohammed Ahmed von Sudan nach arabischen Quellen, Berlin 1925, p. 49 sqq. (with further literature). — Cf. also the article Muḥammad Ahmad.
Turkish sources are contradictory: Hâdîddî Khalîfa says that the town of Othmanîdik took its name from the fact that in the 10th century a leader named Othman conquered it. Evliya Celebi (1647-1648) says (ii. 180 sqq.) that many see in Othmanîdik the birth-place of the emir Othman. This opinion had become the current one about the middle of the xvith century, as may be seen from a passage in Les Voyages et Observations of François le Gouz (Paris 1653, p. 63). The place does not appear in the clearer light of history till 1392 when it was taken by Bâyazid from the lord of Kastamuni, Bâyazid Kuturum, and definitely incorporated in the Ottoman empire. The fact is mentioned that there was evidently a considerable Bektashi settlement here at an early date and the tomb of the famous Bektashi saint Koyun Baba [q. v.] in Othmanîdik has always been much visited. The inhabitants according to Hâdîddî Khalîfa belonged almost entirely to the order of the Bektashis. Cf. on this point in 1546 Le Voyage de Monseigneur d'Ararat, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1887, p. 66 (where Cochinia Baba should be read Koyun-Baba). — Makarjus of Antioch mentions a place called Othmanîdik near Malîfâh. He visited the site where there was said to have been formerly a large town of this name also called Osman Dada (= Othman Dede). (Trattel, ii. 453 sqq.).


(TRANZ BUVINER)

'Othmanî Zâde Ahmed Tûn, a notable Ottoman poet, scholar and historian of the end of the xvith and first third of the xvith century. The son of the râz-nâmîdî (mâlîye teskeretçî) of the pious foundations, Othmanî Efendi, he took up a theological career. The year of his birth is not recorded. From 1689 (1099) he held the post of miadîris in various medreseâs in Constantinople. At intervals he also worked in other places. For example in 1107 (1695) he went to Damascus with Kemânehs Mehmed Pasha when the latter was appointed governor there. In 1124 (1712) he was appointed miadîris at the Salâmîyâ, a post he had aimed at from the very beginning. He then went as chief judge (Ḫâleb molla) to Aleppo in 1126 (1716) and lastly as Miyr mollaî (chief justice of Cairo) to Cairo, where he died at the end of his year of office on the 2nd Ramadan 1136 (May 25, 1724). According to Brusali Mehmed Tûbîr, there is existence a biography of Othmanî-zâde composed by Ibn al-Emin Mahmûd Kemal Bey.

Othmanî-zâde was regarded by his contemporaries as the most important poet of his period. He was particularly celebrated for his chronograms (târîkā'î and kifâ). A chronogram on the birth of prince Bayhaqîm (1133 = 1720-1721) made such an impression on Sultan Ahmad III (1115-1143 = 1703-1730) that he gave Othmanî-zâde the title "king of poets" (mâlîye [sulûm al-îlâmî]) and granted him a special khâtîf. Othmanî-zâde left behind him a divân of the usual type (muraqkeb divânî) which consists of 12 kașfîs, 32 chronograms and 77 ghazels. Along with these are isolated poems, e.g. a satire (khâvî) on Tâbîk Efendi composed in 1124 (1712). He also wrote in verse a commentary on the 40 hadîðîs entitled Sharh-iHadîth-i 'Abî 'Abdisîn, which is still known as Şâhid-iâbîd, it was written in 1128 (1715).

It is however to his prose works that he owes his fame with posterity, especially his historical works, some of which are still popular and valuable at the present day. The most important is his biographical collection Hadîkat al-Wusurâ, a most estimable and still important collection of lives of the first 92 viziers of the Ottoman empire, from 'Alâ' al-Dîn 'Ali Pasha to Râmi Mehmed Pasha who was dismissed in 1115 (1703). The work was composed six years before his death. It was printed at Constantinople in 1271 (1854). Othmanî-zâde's idea was later taken up by others. His biographical collection was continued by: Dilâwer Aghâ-zâde 'Omar Efendi ('Omar Wâhid), a friend of Râkib Pasha's who wrote a Sharh-i Hadîkat al-Wusurâ, also called Kimdh-i Manâbi-i Wusurâ-i 'Zïbân or Gulî Zîbân, which covers the period from the grand vizier Köwanos Ahmad Pasha to Sa'id Mehmed Pasha; also by Ahmad Dâvud Bey, who compiled a continuation entitled Wird al-Muwarra which covers the period 1172-1213 (1758-1802), from Râkib Pasha to Yusuf Zîyâ Pasha, the conqueror of Egypt; finally by 'Abd al-Fettâh Sheikh-i Baghdâdî entitled Bûk-i zebî, covering the period 1217-1271 (1802-1854), from Zîyâ al-Dîn Yusuf Pasha to 'Alemdar Muşafî Pasha.

All three continuations are printed as an appendix to the Hadîkat of Othmanî-zâde, while the later continuation by Rifât Efendi: Wird al-Ḥasîrî appeared in a lithograph separately while the continuation by Mehmed Sa'id Shehri-zâde entitled: Shâhid-i Hadîth-i al-Wusurâ or Gulî Zîbân or Ḫâwîsî-i Muîläh, which deals with 31 grand viziers from Nîhândji Ahmad or Sîlîhîdî Mehmed Pasha to Sa'id Mehmed Pasha, is still only available in MSS.

The two sketches of Turkish history by Othmanî-zâde also attained great popularity. The longer: lûmîsî Manâbi (or Târîkā'î) Salatîn-i Âlî 'Othman deals with the first 24 Ottoman sultans, from the founder of the dynasty to Ahmad III. The shorter version: Fikrist-i Şâhidîn or Fikrist-i Şâhidîn-i Âlî 'Othman or Mütcetürür-Târîkâ-i Salatîn or Târîkh al-Mulûk or Hadîkat al-Mulûk covers the period from 'Othman to Muşafî I. The number of varying titles shows the popularity of the work. The book, sometimes quoted as Fadîli-i Âlî 'Othman, dedicated to İbrahim Ibrahim Pasha, seems to be only a variant title of one of these books.

In the year of his death (1136 = 1724) Othmanî-zâde wrote a history of Fâdíl Ahmad Pasha entitled: Ta'rîh-i Fâdíl Ahmad Pasha, which like most of his works is only accessible in MSS. The Munâzara-i Dewletîn (struggle between the two kingdoms) in the form of questions and answers is also dedicated to İbrahim Pasha (MS. in Vienna).
and is an interesting contribution to the very highly developed mułağara literature.

As further independent works may be mentioned: İdżas Naṣiğ-i-Ḫulanza and Taḫfat al-Na-mūn. Here we may mention his anthology Ḏanî al-Laṣṭîf (a collection of anecdotes, jests etc.). His stylistic collection Munṣif-i-a Tābīf Efendi was intended for practical purposes; it is a collection of letters in three fasl and a concluding chapter.

His extracts from and editions and translations of other works are very numerous. The greater part of his work is collected in his Kuflîār with an introduction by Aḥmad Ḥanif-zade. Some titles cited by von Hammer and Fransa Mehmed Tāhir which apparently go back to Ḥanif-zade, the compiler of the Kašīf al-Ṣu-nă of Ḥadjīlī Khaliṣa, are probably not correct and refer to double or subsidiary titles. — Translations by him are: Maḥārîj al-Anwâr and Masḥârî Şerîf, the latter entitled: Tawâwîl al-Mujâli on hadîth. — Extracts from or versions of other works are: Akhâbâr Muḥînî (or Muḥâṣṣar-i Akhâbâr-i Muṣhîn or Kuflât al-Ḳawâlî) from the Ethics of Ḥunain b. ʿAlī Kāshâfī, who is known as Wâqî al-Qarî (d. 910 = 1504). The actual work which was written in Persian for Mīrza Muḥînî b. Ḥusain al-Baḳâra was translated by Pîr Mehmed known as Ḥaramî, with the title Anš al-ʿArifîn in 974 (1565); Akhâbâr-i-ʿAṣîr, an extract from the work of ʿAlî b. ʿAmr Allâh, known as Ibn Ḥīnâ (Kīnâl-zâde) which was written for the Emīr al-ʿUmmâr of Ǧām, ʿAlī Ḷâṣṭa, and therefore called after him; the Manâbîx-i Ismâ̄-i dâlam, i.e. of ʿAbû Ḥanîfa. We also have from his pen a synopsis of the Humâyûn-nâm-e. The Anwâr-i Suḥâlî, the Persian version of Ibn Mûkâfâ's Arabic version from the original Indian (Pahlawi) of BîĎpî was the work of Ḥusain Wâqî Kâshâfī, court-preacher to Ḥusain Bâkâra of Herât. This Anwâr-i Suḥâlî was translated into Ottoman Turkish by ʿAbd al-Wâṣîl Allî Mollâ ʿAlî Čelebi b. Șâhî, known as Ṭalî Waṣî or Șâhî-zâde al-Râmî with the title Humâyûn-nâm-e and dedicated to Șûlân Sûlaimân. Ĭthâm-zâde abbreviated the Humâyûn-nâm-e to about a third of its length. This version was printed in Constantinople in 1256 under the title Tâmâr al-Aśmâ. In the Kuflîār this extract is entitled Zâbîd al-Nâṣîh.I. The version of the Naṣīḥ (Naṣīḥî) al-Muṭâb of Re's Efendi Sarf ʿAbd Allâh entitled Taḥkîs al-Hikam is also described as a synopsis of the Humâyûn-nâm-e. A synopsis of the Madjâlis al-Śâbâr of ʿAlî is also attributed to Əthâm-zâde.

Bibliography: Sâlim, Tırchere, Constantinople 1314, p. 178—181; Fatîn, Tırchere, Constantinople 1321, p. 32; ʿAbîn ʿAlî afâlî, Kašīf al-Zu-nâ, ed. Flugel, esp. however Aḥmad Ḥanif-zâde, Nova Opera (Aṭārā-i new) ed. in vol. vi; do., Kašīf al-Zu-nâ, Constantinople 1321, i. 428; Thrâyèa, Südîlî-ī ʿothâmînî, i. 242; Muʿallîn Nâdî, Əstâmî, Constantinople 1308, p. 92; Șâmî, Königstal al-Aṭīm, iii. 1261; Brussal Mehmed Tâhir, ʿothâmînî Maḥîlîfîrî, ii. 116—117; Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 238; do., G. O. D., iv. 120—131; Babinger, G. O. W., p. 254 sqq. a.o.; the MS. Catalogues by Flugel (Vienna); Persch (Berlin); Aumer (Munich); Rieu (Br. Museum); Upsala, No. 202.

OTRÂR, a town on the right bank of the Str Daryâ (Salîbûn), a little south of its tributary the Aris. The name is found as a geographical term for the first time in Yâqût (i. 310) as ʿUtrâr but Ṭabarî (iii. 815—816) already knows of a prince called ʿUtrâr-bandā as a rebel vassal of the Caliph al-Maʿmûn. The place that Maḍîq calls Tarâr Zârâk (9 G. A., iii. 263, 274) in the district of ʿIsâbîdân must be quite a different place. ʿUtrâr may perhaps be the same as the capital of the district of Fârâb [q. v.], a town which replaced the older one of Kâdâr (mentioned by ʾĪsâḥîrî and Ibn Ḥâkîm) and called Fârâb by Maḍîq (Bârbî on p. 273). The town of ʿUtrâr acquired a melancholy fame through the part it played at the time of Ǧîzîg Ǧîhân's invasion. It was then a frontier town of the empire of the Khwârizmshâh Muḥâmmâd, who had captured it in 1210 from the Ǧârâ Ǧîhân. The town was at that time under the command of Ṭâfî al-Dîn Ǧilî Ǧîhân Ǧâh who was giving trouble to his new ruler. In 1218, there came to ʿUtrâr a great caravan of 450 people (Djuwâinî), all Muslims, sent by the conquering Mongol to open up commercial and peaceful relations with the Muḥâmmâdân empire. Detailed at first by the commandant ʿInâkîlî, either because he thought they were spies or simply because he coveted their wealth, they were later all massacred and the commandant seized their merchandise. One source (Nâsawî) throws upon the Ǧîlî Ǧâh a part of the responsibility for this deed; in any case when an ambassador came from Ǧîzîg Ǧîhân to complain of the outrage and demand the surrender of ʿInâkîlî, he refused to hand him over and put the envoy to death. This made war inevitable. In 1219, Ǧîzîg Ǧîhân appeared with a Mongol army on the Str Daryâ and laid siege to ʿUtrâr. The town was taken after several months siege and ʿInâkîlî was captured and sent to Kârâkûrûm to be executed.

It was from ʿUtrâr that the Mongol armies set out which conquered the empire of the Khwârizmshâhs. ʿUtrâr still existed at the beginning of the xth century for Timîr Lang died there in 1405 (ʿAllî Yâdî, Žafar-nâmâ, ii. 646). The site of ʿUtrâr is now only indicated by ruins.


UDOHI (AWADAH), a district now forming part of the United Provinces of modern India, has an area of 24,154 square miles and a population of 12,794,979, of which 11,870,266 are to be found in the rural districts (Census of India, 1931).

From very early times Oudh and the neighbouring countries of the great alluvial plain of northern India have been the peculiar home of Hindu civilization. The ancient Hindu kingdom of Kosala corresponded very nearly to the present province of Oudh. Its capital, Ayodhya, the modern Adhodh on the river Gogra, is supposed to have been the residence of Daçaṭân, the father of Râma whose
exploits are recorded in the *Rāmāyana*. Here too arose a number of religious reactions against the sacerdotalism and the social exclusiveness of Brahmanism.

The apart from plundering raids, such as Maḥmūd of Ghazni’s attack upon Mānaśc and the doubtful exploits of Sālār Masudi Ghāzī recorded in the *Mīrāb Masūdī of ‘Alī al-Raḥmān Chishtī*, it was not until the last decade of the twelfth century, in the days of Kūth al-Dīn Abū Bakr [see Abū Bakr], that the Muslim invaders established themselves in Oudh and annexed it to the Dīlī Sultanate. It definitely formed a province of Muhammad b. Taghūlūk’s extensive empire, but, towards the close of the fourteenth century, it was absorbed by the *Shārkī* kingdom of Ḍjāwānpūr [q. v.]. Under the Lōdīs [q. v.] it was once more part of the Sultanate.

In the days of Akbar [q. v.] it formed a ṣāḥa of his empire, extending from the Ganges on the south-west to the Gandāk on the north-east, and from the river Sai in the south to the Tarai of Nepal in the north. According to *Abū ‘l-Fadl*, it was divided into five sākārā and thirty-eight parganas (*Ḍīn-e Akhārī*, in *Bibliotheca Indica*, ii. 170—177 [tr. Jarratt], 1891). Local traditions in Oudh, however, conflict with the Muslim accounts and declare that the Rāḍāpūr chiefs maintained their authority practically intact throughout the Mughal period (W. C. Benett, *The Chief Clans of the Reyn Boreilly District*, 1893). The weakness of the central government under Awrangzīb’s successors gave the nawāb of Oudh an opportunity of asserting their independence, although nominally they still acknowledged the authority of the Mughal emperor.

Sa’dāt Khān Barhān al-Mulk, the real founder of the Oudh dynasty, was descended from a respectable Saiyid family of Nīghāpūr (Munāṣib al-Ludāb of Khāṭī Khān, ii. 902). During his nawābship (1722—1739) he both maintained internal order and extended his dominions so as to embrace Benares, Ghāzīpur, Ḍjāwānpūr and Cunār. His successor, Sa’dār Dīnjg (1739—1754), was appointed nawār of the empire in the year 1748. It is said that he invited the Marāḥās to assist him against the Rohlīs, the engagements entered into at that time forming the basis of later Marāḥā claims on Rohilkhand. His son and successor, the nawāb-wazir Shudjā’s al-Dāwla (1754—1775), came into conflict with the rising power of the English East India Company and was totally defeated at Baksar in 1764. This left Oudh at the disposal of the Company. By the treaty of Allāhābād (1765) Oudh was restored to Shudjā’s al-Dāwla with the exception of Kora and Allāhābād, which were given to the emperor for the upkeep of his dignity. British relations with this buffer state between Bengal and the Marāḥās were placed on a firmer footing by the treaty of Benares (1773) which fixed the subsidy for British troops at 210,000 rupees a month. At the same time Kora and Allāhābād were sold to the ruler of Oudh for fifty lakhs of rupees, because the emperor had deserted the Company and surrendered these districts to the Marāḥās.

The accession of the incapable Āṣaf al-Dāwla (1775—1797) enabled the hostile majority on Warren Hastings’s council to raise the subsidy to 260,000 rupees per mensem and to force the new nawāb to cede Benares, Ḍjāwānpūr and Ghāzīpur in full sovereignty to the Company. At Cunār, in 1781, Hastings attempted to reform the wazir’s administration and to afford him relief by reducing the number of English troops in Oudh. His share in the resumption of the *ḥādās* and in the sequestration of the trances of the ḍāghts of Oudh formed one of the charges against him on impeachment.

In 1801 Lord Wellesley forced Sa’dāt ‘Alī Khān (1798—1814) to cede the whole of Rohilkhand and part of the Rābhās, the revenues of which were devoted to the payment of the subsidiary force. Sa’dāt ‘Alī Khān was succeeded by his eldest son, Ghāzī al-Dīn Haidar, who was the first ruler of Oudh to assume the title of king. The remaining kings of Oudh were Nāṣir al-Dīn Haidar (1827—1837), Muḥammad ‘Alī Shāh (1837—1842), Amjad ‘Alī Shāh (1842—1847) and Wadjiḏ ‘Alī Shāh (1847—1856).

It was a provision of the treaty of 1801 that the ruler of Oudh should introduce into his country a system of administration conducive to the prosperity of his subjects and calculated to secure their lives and property. In spite of repeated warnings nothing was done and misgovernment continued unchecked. On these grounds Oudh was annexed by Lord Dalhousie in 1856. Wadjiḏ ‘Alī Shāh received a pension and was allowed to reside at Calcutta where he died in 1887, his title expiring with him.

On annexation Oudh was controlled by a Chief Commissioner, until, in 1877, both Agra and Oudh were placed under the same administrator, who was known as the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces and Chief Commissioner of Oudh. The title of Chief Commissioner was dropped on the formation of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in 1902. It was not, however, until 1921 that this administration was raised to the status of a Governor’s province.

The first land revenue settlement after annexation was carried out with a lack of consideration for the great talukdārī families of the province, who were ousted from the greater part of their estates. This was reversed after the Mutiny when Canning reverted to a talukdārī settlement and confirmed the rights of the talukdārs by sanads.

To-day in Oudh Muḥammadans are to be found chiefly where they held sway in the past, their preference for urban life explaining their presence in the chief towns. Although the population is predominantly Hindu it is interesting to note that in the last decade Muslims have increased nearly twice as rapidly as Hindus. This is largely the result of social customs which permit Muslim widows to remarry and do not favour early marriages. Conversion has not affected these parts of Muslims was countered by the *shudhī* and *sanghathān* movements on the part of Hindus.


**OUDJDA** ((Wâjda)), a town in Eastern Morocco, eight miles from the Algerian frontier in the southern part of the vast plain of Angad. It was founded in 384 (994) by Zirî b. 'Âtiya chief of the great Zenâtì tribe of the Maghrib. (q. v.) We shall give a resume of the events that led up to its foundation. In the course of the fighting between the Şanhâdja and the Zenâtâ, the latter had been driven towards the extreme Maghrib. Supporters of the Umayyads of Cordova, they had loyally defended their imperial policy in Barbary, especially in the time of the great minister Ibn Abî 'Amir al-Mansûr. Zirî b. 'Âyyâ al-Maghârâwî, who had proved himself a particularly valuable ally, was allowed to occupy with his tribe the environs of Fâs. He seized the opportunity to expel from the city the Banî Ifran, and he then fortified the town which had already established themselves there. Not however having full confidence in the Umayyad minister, of whose policy he disapproved, and not feeling secure in the vicinity of or in the town of Fâs, and wishing to be in touch with the central Maghrib which was the real country of his tribe, he founded the town of Oudjda and garrisoned it with his troops; he brought his possessions there and put one of his relatives in it as governor. The foresight of the founder was justified; in 424 (1033) the Banî Ifran having reoccupied Fâs the emir Hâmmâmâ, one of the successors of Zirî, took refuge in Oudjda.

According to al-Bakrî, about the middle of the xiith century (after 1048), a new quarter surrounded by a wall was added to the original nucleus by a chief of the Oufrâghüm (q.). The great mosque was outside of the two towns.

During the period of Umayyad expansion Yûsuf b. Tâshfîn occupied Oudjda in 472 (1079). In the middle of the xiith century it became an Almohad town. In the reign of the Almohad al-Nâsîr, when the Banû Ghâniyâ, hoping to restore the power of the Almoravids, came from the south of Tunisia and extended their ravages into the region of Tlemcen, the fortifications of Oudjda were repaired and strengthened (Kîrîh, p. 203; transl. p. 194).

It was however mainly after the installation of the 'Abd al-Wâdids in Tlemcen [q. v.] that the town of Oudjda “the bulwark of the frontier which separates the central from the extreme Maghrib” (Ibn Khaldûn) was summoned to play an important strategic part. Belonging to the kingdom of Tlemcen, it was the first place encircled by the Marinids of Fâs when they invaded the lands of their hereditary enemies and the first victim of their attacks. In 670 (1271) the Marinid Abî Yûsuf having defeated Yaghmurâsân, the king of Tlemcen, near Oudjda, laid the town in ruins. In 695 (1296) the Marinid Abî Ya'qûb having fortified his own frontier town of Taûrit seized Oudjda and destroyed its defences. In the following year he seems to have wished to make Oudjda a base for his future expeditions. He rebuilt it; he created a palace there, a citadel and a great town (possibly the one which still exists) and began the siege of Tlemcen which lasted eight years. In 714 (1314) the Marinid Abî Sa'id delivered a fierce attack on Oudjda which resisted and, presumably leaving troops in front of it to immobilise the garrison, he went on towards Tlemcen. In 735 (1335) Abu 'I-Hasan besieged Oudjda; it was taken and the fortifications dismantled. In 772 (1371), Tlemcen being occupied by the Marinids and Oudjda being also in their hands, the Arab tribes of the region took the side of the dispossessed 'Abd al-Wâdids and laid siege to the town.

The tribes of the region, Arab as well as Berber, were also closely involved in the fighting in the xviith down to the xixth century between the Turks of Algeria and the Moroccan sultâns. In the town itself there were clans which supported each side. Authority passed from one side to the other, but it was only a relative authority, enjoyed precariously and intermittently; of the peace reigning in the Maghrib and the sultan's orders were fully carried out, Oudjda formed part of his empire; if on the other hand the country was troubled and the power of the sovereign weakened, Oudjda went with the province of Tlemcen and belonged to the Turks' (Voinot). One of the few periods during which the authority of the sherif was firmly established in this remote province was the reign of Mûsîy Ismâ'îl (1082—1139 = 1672—1727), who brought to Oudjda Arabs from the south of Marraksh, formed them into a dîjîh [q. v.], strengthened the defences of the town, built several kâbâlas around it and organised the tribes of the plain. After his death the country lapsed into insecurity and anarchy. The Turks reappeared. Finally in 1795, a Sherifian force again took possession of Oudjda which henceforth remained under Moroccan rule. An 'ânâm (governor) represented the sultan in it.

In 1844 after the battle of Isly, the town was temporarily occupied by the French as a punishment for the help given to 'Abd al-Kâdir by the sultân. The French troops reappeared there in 1859 and finally occupied it in 1907.

Oudjda, a town of old Morocco, where local government was non-existent had become a haunt of smugglers and fugitives from Algerian justice; it has been cleansed of all suspicious elements.

The town, surrounded by its wall which however only dates from 1866, is surrounded by modern suburbs and beautiful gardens. The population is now about 30,000 of whom half are Europeans.

**Bibliography:** al-Bakrî, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale, ed. de Sigea, Algiers 1911, p. 77—78; transl. in J.A., 1859, ii. 160; Ibn Khaldûn, Histoire des Berbères, ed. de Sigea, ii. 44; transl., iii. 243 and passim; Ibn Abî...
PADISAH, the name for Muslim rulers, especially emperors. The Persian term падишах, i.e. (according to M. Bittner in E. Oberhumer, Die Turken und das Osmanische Reich. Leipzig 1917, p. 105) "lord who is a royalty" in which the root pad is connected with Sanskrit padis, lord, husband, fem. patni. Greek πάδισα is derived. Lat. patris, G. Curcius, Griech. Etymol., p. 377, was originally a title reserved exclusively for the sovereign, which in course of time and as a result of the long intercourse of the Ottomans with the states of the west also came to be approved for certain western rulers. In the correspondence of the Porte with the western powers, the grand vizier Kuyudpasi Pascha (d. Aug. 5, 1612) probably for the first time applied the title padisah to the Austrian emperor Rudolf II. At the conference of Yenbua (1737) Russia demanded the title for its Czars (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., viii. 488) and claimed it again at the negotiations at Bucharest (1773; cf. ibid., viii, 412). When padisah came to be applied to the sultan, the patishah ab-i ulqm, does not seem to be exactly known. In any case it is found in conjunction with all kinds of rhyming words as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century in Ottoman documents. Padisah therefore may have come to be used towards the end of the nineteenth century, presumably instead of bluqeh (from bluqakan, bluqkan, from bluq, bluqeh, bluq), an obsolete word, as well as bluqan (cf. id., xi, 70) already found in dervish Sufism, and was regularly used in the end of the sulqanate (cf. the cry of padisahmi lis or bi rach with which the sultan was until quite lately greeted by his troops and subjects).

Bibliography: St. Kekule, Uber Titel, Aeuter, Rangstufen und Ausrufen in der offiziellen osmanischen Sprache. Halle a.d. S. 1892, p. 3 and P. Horn, Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie, Strassburg 1893, p. 61, No. 266 (where however another derivation is given, from Old Persian pad, protector, and śāh, ruler; cf. thereon Horn, in G. I. Ph., i, 74).

PADRI (padri, padrī); bā-i fārsī or bā-i 'āṣām: the bā with three points subscript, invented for Persian as supplement to the soft Arabic bā' and to represent the hard label. It is sometimes interchangeable with bā' (e.g. asp and asp, dabir and dafir) and more frequently, with ū (e.g. saṭīl and saṭī, Ṣāfī and Fāsī). The regular use of the letter in manuscripts is comparatively modern, but it is found in good examples of the nineteenth–twentieth century while at the same time it is often omitted in manuscripts of much later date (G. I. Pā, i, iv., p. 74).

(FRANZ BABINGER)

PADRI. "Padries" or "Pedaries", also "Pedaries" is the name given in Dutch literature to the people who wished to carry through by force a reformation of Islam in the early decades of the sixteenth century in Minangkabau (Central Sumatra). In explanation of this expression it may be said that, according to one opinion, the word is connected with Padri, a harbour on the north coast of Sumatra; while, according to another, it corresponds to the word padri (Port. padre) used in several Indonesian languages meaning "Christian clergyman", whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. The first derivation cannot be supported, but the second is probably correct. It may be that Malays, when asked by Dutchmen after the troubles, accommodated themselves to the linguistic level of the interrogators by designating the insurgents as padri as they laid special stress on the religious life. Such a case would not be unique in dealings of Dutchmen with natives. The Dutchmen then adopted the word and retained it; it also occurs sometimes as padari in native sources. The usual native name however for the people called padri by us was urang putih-"white men", a common term among Indonesian peoples for those who take their religious duties with particular seriousness and are distinguished by their white robes (van Ronkel, in Indische Gids, 1915, ii. 1193). In the official reports and Dutch colonial literature of the time, those who did not join the Padaris are called "Malays", a misleading designation as the Padris were also Malays. Padris and non-Padris were of the same stock. A better name for those who held by the old customs is the "Adat party"; they formed the party who on every occasion tried to base their action on the traditional usage. The Minangkabauans or Minangkabau Malays inhabited the central Sumatran highlands between about ½° N. lat. and ½° S. lat. From this mountainous country they have extended eastwards over the highlands which form the transition to the eastern Sumatran lowlands. To the west they reached the coast of the Indian ocean. Here there are several harbours which gave a connection with the outer world. It is generally supposed that the country was converted to Islam from Atjeh. The Atjehnese held several points on the coast when the Dutch and English Trading Companies established themselves here.

Islam was firmly established in the country when the activity of the Padris began. There was a burning zeal for the faith, in certain circles at
least. In 1785, a spiritual leader came down from the mountains with some thousands of followers and disciples in order to circumscribe the Christian population of the port of Padang, then the principle possession of the Dutch, and force them to adopt Islam (T. B. G. K. W., v. 55). The Minangkabaus managed to combine a strongly Muhammadan outlook with the retention on a large scale of their old popular institutions. Matriarchy still prevailed among them. The administration of a village is conducted by the leading heads of the various families, the various *uku*, i.e., union of families of different descent in common council. The form of government is republican. Every matter of any importance is considered by all the prominent families, their chiefs and other leading men (*muqadda*, Ar. *nuwafasha*). It is a wearisome process, not calculated for speedy decisions. A society organized on these lines is naturally at a disadvantage against vigorous and powerful attacks.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century three Minangkabau pilgrims came home. They had seen Wahhabi rule in Mecca (after 1806). Filled with the puritan zeal of the Wahhabis, they set out to purify the religion of their own land. They were able to win over to their views a prominent theologian of the central district of Agam named *Tuanku nan Renjih* (*tuanku* is a title for a theocratic prince). He at once set to work. He first of all insisted on the exact observance of the law, particularly in ceremonial. Popular customs which in his opinion were contrary to the *shari'a* were attacked, such as cock-fighting, which was associated with betting and was the most popular pastime of the people, dice, drinking of palm-wine, opium-smoking, betel-chewing, filing the teeth, wearing long nails, smoking tobacco. All these were forbidden. The prohibition of interest was insisted upon. The men were to cut their hair, let the beard grow and wear white clothes in the Arab style. The women were to wear veils. Finally the Padris dealt a blow to the matriarchial institutions by taking their women into their houses with them (de Stuers, i. 185, footnote 3). The prohibition of tobacco seems to be directly taken from Wahhabi practice, while the other prohibitions and commands all find a place in the *Shi'i* school. It is also evident from *Tuanku nan Renjih*'s attitude that he did not intend to institute Wahhabism. In the same district of Agam lived a highly respected and very influential teacher: *Tuanku Kótá tuá*, he was *guru* *tarçat* (Ar. *warás*), a master of mysticism; to what order he belonged is not known. Mysticism of a popular kind is much cultivated in Minangkabau; *Tuanku nan Renjih* turned to him, not to quarel with him but to seek his cooperation. The *Tuanku Kótá tuá* agreed that a strict observance of the law should be aimed at; but when *Tuanku nan Renjih* insisted that if any one did not perform the *gúlát* correctly he was a *mustād* and was liable to the penalty of death as *kadd*, *Tuanku Kótá tuá* met him with the milder doctrine that the *mustād* should not be put to death, unless every effort to bring him to the true faith had failed, a case which however did not exist and was not to be expected. *Tuanku nan Renjih* now went his own way. After the Minangkabau custom, he summoned an assembly which was to approve his views. He met with enthusiastic approval from the theologians but with opposition from the chiefs; for the latter recognised at once that the Padri demands attacked their positions and would overthrow the whole social system. *Tuanku nan Renjih* went vigorously forward. With his own hand he stabbed his mother's sister whom he caught smoking; the body was thrown into the forest and not allowed to be buried. The effect was considerable; his followers applauded the deed, his silent or open enemies shrank back; he who had done such an unprecedented thing as not to heed the bonds of blood must be acting under a higher inspiration: it was not cruelty but self-sacrifice; the reformation went on with fanatical zeal. Whoever omitted a *gúlát* had to pay a fine; for a second offence the punishment was death. Opponents were overcome by force, their villages burned, themselves killed or made slaves or at least made to pay an indemnity. Soon the greater part of Agam and of the district of *Tuanku Kótá tuá* were in his power. Several villages which had already yielded to pressure and adopted the stricter teaching of *Tuanku Kótá tuá* were also plundered and burned. In the end the doings of his followers were too much for the leader and he retired after about eight years. It was only at a later date when the Dutch troops entered the country that he again placed himself at the head of the movement. He died in 1832.

The procedure adopted by *Tuanku nan Renjih* was as follows: after a village had been taken, he appointed on his own authority an *imin* and a *kali* (Ar. *khafi*); the former was head of the mosque and had control of all religious matters; the sphere of activity of the *kali* is not quite clear. In any case, this proceeding was revolutionary; by constitutional law the offices were hereditary with certain limitations; important decisions could only be made by *muqadda* (see above).

Another teacher, *Tuanku Pasaman*, also called *Tuanku Lintau*, was active in the south east in the district of Lintau. Less well known than *Tuanku nan Renjih* he in no way yielded to him in fanatical ardour. Lintau was soon in his power. He then entered the adjoining territory of *Tanañ Data(r).* Here in the old capital lived in faded glory of their former greatness the descendants of the royal house of Minangkabau. Well led, their power might have resulted in a restoration of their former age. *Tuanku Lintau* had them all murdered, except one who escaped across the frontier. Burning and murdering, he brought the whole land under his rule.

A third centre of Padri activity was *Alahanpandjang* in the north. The movement began here at the same time as in Agam and Lintau. Very soon there came to the front here a man who is best known by his later name of *Tuanku Imam*, first as an adviser and then as the leading figure. We possess exceptionally a native source for the life and deeds of this important figure. Quite recently a Malay work, a kind of biography written by one of his sons, has been discovered and published (see Ronkel, *Indische Gids*, 1915). The Padris of Alahanpandjang began by building a fortress which they called Bondol. Here the strict doctrine was observed and it was the central position of the Padris power from which they sent out expeditions in all directions. Invited by sympathisers they would go to a village, subject it, appoint a *kali* and an *imin*, as *Tuanku nan Renjih* did, and return to Bondol with rich booty. The bio-
graphy relates that campaigns were undertaken at intervals of about a year. This was the period of Tuanku Imam's rise to be Imam, for in many matters he was Imam, Imam in religion, Imam in all matters requiring intelligence and reflection so that all quarrels and disputes were finally brought to him". Four men were sent to Mecca to guarantee the purity of the doctrine. After a long time they returned, even more strict. There was not yet regular spiritual intercourse with Mecca. Pilgrims were very few in number.

As soon as the Padris had overcome or driven away the supporters of the Adat, the latter tried to resist the English who had occupied Padang in 1795 to the extent that they could not. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrender


PALAHENG — PALMYRA

p. 78 (with reference to the Bektashi of Kruga in Albania); John Potter Brown, The Debates or Oriental Spiritualism, ed. H. A. Rose, London 1927, p. 214. (Franz Baringer)

PALANPUR, a Muslim state in India now included in the Western India States Agency. The territory incorporated in this agency includes the area formerly known as Kathiawar together with the Cutch and Palanpur agencies. Its creation in October 1924, marked the end of the political control of the Government of Bombay and the beginning of direct relations with the Government of India. The old Palanpur Agency with its headquarters at the town of Palanpur was a group of states in Gujara[t [q.v.] lying between 23° 25' and 24° 41' N. and 71° 16' and 71° 46' E. It was bounded on the north by the Rajput states of Udaipur and Sirohi; on the east by the Mahi Kāṇṭha Agency; on the south by the state of Baroda and Kathiawar; and on the west by the Rann of Cutch.

The state of Palanpur was conquered towards the end of the sixteenth century by Lohānī Pathāns, subsequently known as Dīhlōris. A short account of its history under the Mughal emperors will be found in the Gazetteer of Bombay, v. 318—324, and in the Mir'tā-i Aḥmadî (Ēthē, No. 3599, fol. 741). British relations with this state date back to the year 1609, when, through British influence, arrangements were made for the payment of tribute to the Gaekwar of Baroda (Aitchison, vi. lxxix). This engagement was further strengthened by an agreement signed on November 28, 1817 (cp. cit., ed.). In 1848, the military and commercial agent from the Gaekwar was abolished and the finances of the state remained under British supervision until 1874 when the ruler of Palanpur was entrusted with the management of his own finances.

Palanpur is still ruled by Lohānī Pathāns. It has a population of 264,179, of whom 245,000 speak Gudjārāti. The distribution of population according to religion is as follows: Hindus, 222,714; Muhammadans, 28,690 and Jains, 12,542.


PALMYRA, Tadmur, now Tadmur, the ancient Tadmor, called Palmyra by the Greeks (probably a corruption of the older name by a popular etymology; cf. Hommel, in Z.D.M.G., xlv. 547; M. Hartmann, in Z. D. P. V., xxiii. 128 sqq.) lies northeast of Damascus in the great desert in an oasis watered by two springs. The water is sulphurous but drinkable after it has settled. The climate is unfavourable, having great differences of temperature between day and night and being unbearably hot in summer and sometimes having snow in winter. What it lacked in climatic conditions was compensated for by its situation which made Tadmur an important junction on the caravan routes connecting east and west, notably that from the Euphrates to Damascus. The natural supposition that the place was already of importance and settled in very early times has been confirmed by several inscriptions of Tiglat-Pileser I of the eighth century B.C. because the "town of Tadmor in the land of Amuru", which the Assyrian kings mentions, can hardly be anywhere else (R. Meissner, et al., O. L. Z., 1923, p. 157; Dhorme, in R. B., 1924, p. 106). Otherwise the city is not mentioned till shortly before the beginning of the Christian era and in the Old Testament only in a peculiar ġquil ģro qvo. While in I Kings ix. 18 in the accepted text it is said that Solomon built Tamar (in southern Palestine) among other towns, the Chronicler (ii. 8, 4) followed by the variants and by Josephus, Archeology, viii. 6., gives Tadmor instead. From this it appears that the latter in his time must have been of some fame and size and also that the later widely known legend according to which Solomon built the wonderful city, was already in existence. This story was known at a later date to the Arabs among whom it was related, in keeping with the fantastic elaboration of the legend of Solomon, that the ġjin helped the king to build it (cf. Nuzair, v. 22; cf. Syme, Ancient History, p. 514 and several of the Arab geographers mentioned below; according to Ibn al-Ṭahrir, ed. Tornberg, i. 166 the queen Bilkits visited Solomon in Tadmur and is buried there).

Its incorporation in the Roman empire was of the greatest importance for Palmyra. Its already busy trade increased enormously and great wealth poured into the town, surrounded by the dreary desert (on the roads connecting Palmyra with the other world see Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie ancienne et médiévale, 1927, p. 248—270). From this period dates the brief but accurate account of Palmyra by Pliny (Hist. nat., v. 25). The merchants were able cleverly to use the enmity between Rome and Parthia for their own advantage, and the conditions, when the emperor Hadrian, by the clever stroke of policy of leaving Assyria and Mesopotamia to the Parthians, inaugurated a long period of peace, contributed still more to the prosperity of the town. The customs tariff of the year 136 written in Aramaic and Greek gives a vivid picture of the business life of the Palmyrene republic in this period, while the splendid ruins of the temple of the sun and of several other fine buildings show how highly developed was the artistic sense of its citizens under Greek influence. In the third century, further prospects opened up which induced the Palmyrenes for a brief period to dream of a new power in the east with their city as its centre. At the beginning of the third century arose the new Persian dynasty of the Sāsānians which revived the ancient bitter feud with the Romans so that the Palmyrenes again had an opportunity to use their diplomatic ability. The Palmyrene king Odenathus (Udhain) I at first wanted to join the Persians under Shāpur (241—272) but, when his offer was rejected, he joined the Roman general Ballista in Asia Minor and inflicted a heavy defeat on the retiring Persians. Under Gallienus he became the actual ruler of the whole of the east and was given the title Augustus by the emperor. When in 266—267 he was murdered, his dignity passed to his son Valaballatus, but the real power was in the hands of his widow Zenobia (Zainab), a highly gifted lady who extended her kingdom, notably by the conquest of Egypt. This was done with the approval of the emperor Aurelian, but Palmyra soon rebelled against the Romans and in 270 a battle was fought in which Zenobia was
defeated. Palmyra then surrendered. When it rebelled again, Aurelian had the city with its fine buildings destroyed. Zenobia fled, was captured and brought to Rome. This queen, distinguished alike for her beauty and intellect, made a great impression on her contemporaries and her memory survived among the Arabs under the name of al-Zabda although only in fabulous tales in which little of history remains. She is said to have enticed the Arab king Daghima (q.v. and the article tiik) to her and then killed him by opening his arteries. Her nephew 'Amr b. 'Adi wished to evade his obligation as avenger of blood but was forced by the cunning Kayr to do so and when the latter by stratagem got the cunning queen in his power, she took poison which she always carried in a ring she wore, in order not to be put to death by him.

With the fall of Zenobia, Palmyra lost its importance. The walls however were rebuilt although not on the former scale but the trade, the source of the town’s livelihood, began to dry up. In this period Christianity began to spread in the town; bishops are mentioned and Justinian among others built a church there. Palmyra remained under Roman rule for about 35 centuries until the Arab conquest put an end to it. When Khalid b. al-Walid approached the town on his celebrated campaign, the inhabitants thought of defending the town against him but abandoned the idea and capitulated voluntarily in order to secure the status of dhimmi (q.v.); they seem however to have rebelled again for it was only when Yazid sent Dihya against it, after the taking of Damascus, that it was finally subjected.

Palmyra never regained its former prosperity under Muslim rule. It was inhabited mainly by Khalifs and was one of the towns which rebelled against Marwan II who set out with an army against it. An agreement was come to however, but according to Ibn al-Fakhrī (298 = 902), Marwan had a part of the walls destroyed. According to the legend, he abandoned the idea of destroying the town completely when he came upon the corpse of a richly dressed woman on whose forehead was a plate of gold with an inscription warning him against doing so.

Several Arab geographers mention Tadmor but very briefly. Some of them speak of the wonderful buildings and ruins, and as a rule they repeat the old legend that the town was built by Solomon with the help of the djinn. Yāküf makes the intelligent observation that people are everywhere inclined to attribute great buildings to this king. The terrific earthquake of 1157 affected Palmyra. Benjamin of Tudela (1173) makes the rather remarkable statement that no fewer than 2,000 Jews were able to bear arms lived in the town. Duništi mentions along with incomparable ruins the djinn of the roof of which was formed of 15 stories. The strong citadel of Kal'at al-Man’s north of the town is ascribed by the inhabitants to the famous Druse king Fakhr al-Din (q.v.) but this is doubtful. Palmyra disappeared in the period of great decline in the east; its inhabitants finally lived in a wretched village built on the court of the temple of the sun, quite forgotten by the west. Not till 1678 was the once so famous city again discovered by members of the English factory at Aleppo and in 1751 it was more closely explored by Robert Wood and described in a handsome volume. When traffic began to revive again, Palmyra resumed its importance as a station on the caravan routes and in quite recent times new life has been given it by the motor, the new means of transit across the desert; these give a rapid and comfortable connection between Palmyra and the cities of east and west.


PAMPELUNA. Sp Pamplona, Ar. BANBALUNA, a town in the north of Spain, capital of the province of NAVARRE, has at the present day about 30,000 inhabitants. It was conquered by the Arabs in 121 (738) during the rule of the wali 'Ojbā b. al-Hadidjādī. But the occupation of the town and its territory was of very short duration. It soon became the capital of the province of Navarre when García Íñigo tried to found a small independent state; later at the beginning of the tenth century, it was the capital of the first king of Navarre, Sancho Abacar. Several expeditions were sent against Pampluna by the Hmāyid emirs of Cordova, in 228 (843), 246 (860), and in 260 (874). 'Abd al-Rahman III succeeded in taking it for a time in 312 (924) in the course of his campaign against Navarre and destroyed it. Of her attempts against Pampluna were made by the Muslims in 322 (934) and during the rule of the two 'Amrīd Ḥabūs al-Mansūr [q.v.], and al-Muẓaffar [q.v.]


(P. LEVI-PROVENCAL)

PANDJĀB, the land of the five rivers, is a province of modern India which, together with the North-West Frontier Province and Kashmir [q.v.], occupies the extreme north-western corner of the Indian Empire, and, with the exception of
the recently-constituted Delhi province, comprises all of British India north of Sind and Radjputâna and west of the river Dîjamân. Geographically therefore it includes more than its name implies, for, in addition to the country watered by the Dîheluna, Cînâb, Kâwî, Beas, and Sâteledj, it embraces the table-land of Sîrnând between the Sateledj and Dîjamân, the Cînâb-Sâsâr Dôâb between the Sateledj and the Indus, and the district of Dâr Khân.

Administratively the province is divided into two parts, British territory and the Pândjâb States. British territory, which has an area of 99,265 square miles and a population of 23,580,526, is divided into 29 districts, each administered by a deputy commissioner. These districts are grouped into the five divisions of Ambala, Lîjhlundur, Lahore, Râwâlpindi, and Multân, each under a commissioner. The Pândjâb States have an area of 37,699 square miles and a population of 4,910,005. The conduct of political relations with Dâdjânâ, Pâtawdi, Kâlsîa, and the 27 Sînula Hill States is in the hands of the Pândjâb Government.

The history of this area has been profoundly influenced by the fact that the mountain passes of the north-west frontier afford access to the Pândjâb plains. For this reason it is ethnologically and more nearly allied to Central Asia than to India. The recent excavations at Harappa in the Montgomery district are evidence of a culture which probably flourished in the Indus valley about 3000 B.C., and which bears a general resemblance to that of Elân and Mesopotamia (Sir John Marshall, Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization, 3 vols., 1931). But the first movement of which we have any evidence is that of the Aryan-speaking peoples who established themselves on the Pândjâb plains in prehistoric times. Centuries later successive waves of invaders swept like devastating torrents through the mountain passes of the north-west. Persian, Greek, and Afghan, the forces of Alexander and the armies of Mahââd of Ghâznâ, the hosts of Timûr, Bîbûr, and Nûr Sâdûr, and the troops of Ahmad Shah Durrât (cf. these articles), all advanced by these routes to lay waste the fertile plains of the Pândjâb. All these migrations and invasions added to the heterogeneity of the existing population in the land of the five rivers. The history of invasions from Central Asia proves that the Pândjâb and the frontier zone from the banks of the Indus to the Afghan slopes of the Sulaimân range have never presented any real barrier to an enterprise of the existing population of the Indus and the lower Pândjâb, but the real threat to Hindustân came from the direction of modern Afghanûstân. The Ghaznavid invaders found the powerful Hindûghâshiyâ dynasty of the Khâbhâr ruling between Lâmâghân and the Cînâb. The power of this Hindu state was completely shattered by Mahââd of Ghâznâ who annexed the Pândjâb, which became a frontier province of his extensive empire and the sole refuge of his descendants when driven out of Ghâznâ by the Shânshâbâni sultâns of Ghôr (see Gôrîn). Multân and the surrounding country had remained in Muslim hands since the days of the Arab conquest, but the fact that its rulers were heretical Karmaângs (q.v.) was one reason for Mahââd's attack in 1006 A.D. Muhammad Ghôrî annexed the Pândjâb in 1186 A.D. and on his death in 1206 A.D. it definitely became a province of the Sulâtânate of Dîhil under the rule of Kûfû al-Dîn Aiblâm. With the exception of occasional rebellions and raids from Central Asia it remained under the Sultâns of Dîhil until the defeat of Ibrâhîm Lodi (q.v.) by Babur at Panîpât (q.v.) in 1526 A.D. paved the way for the foundation of the Mughal empire. Under Akbar (q.v.) the modern province of the Pândjâb was included in the sîbâs of Lâhôr, Multân, and Dîhil, a detailed description of which will be found in the Ain-i Akbârî (transl. Jarrett, ii. 278–341).

The persecuting policy of Akbar's immediate successors led to the growth of Sikh political power in the Pândjâb and transformed a band of religious devotees, founded by Guru Nanak in the second half of the fifteenth century, into a military commonwealth or Khâlîsa animated with undying hatred toward Muslims (cf. the art. SIKH). The weakness of the central government and the unprotected condition of the frontier provinces under the later Mughal's exposed Hindustân to the invasions of Nûr Sâdûr (q.v.) and Ahmad Shah Durrât (q.v.). On the bloodstained field of Panîpât, in 1761, the Marâhâs, who were aspiring to universal sovereignty, sustained a crushing defeat at the hands of the Afghân invader. In the following year, at Bârnâlîa near Ludhâna, Ahmad Shah dismally defeated the Sikhs who had taken advantage of his absence in Kâbul to possess themselves of the country around Lahore. The Sikhs, however, soon extended their sway to the south of the Sateledj and ravaged the country to the very gates of Dîhil, but their further advance was checked by the Marâhâs who had rapidly recovered from their defeat at Panîpât. It was the defeat of the Marâhâs by Lord Lâke, in 1803, which facilitated the rise of Ranjit Singh and enabled him to found a powerful Sikh kingdom in the Pândjâb. His attempts to extend his authority over his co-religionists, the cis-Sulâtânate Sikhs, brought him into contact with the British, and, by the treaty of 1809, he pledged himself to regard the Sateledj as the north-west frontier of the British dominions in India (Aitchison, viii., No. llii.). After the death of Ranjit Singh, in 1839, his kingdom rapidly fell to pieces under his successors. Revolution succeeded revolution, and during the minority of Dalip Singh the Khâlîsa soldiery became virtually rulers of the country. Unprovoked aggression on British territory produced two Sikh wars which ended with the annexation of the Pândjâb in 1849.

At first the newly-conquered territories were placed under a Board of Administration. This was abolished in 1853, its powers and functions being vested in a Chief Commissioner. In 1859, after the transfer of the Dîhil territory from the North-Western (now the United) Provinces, the Pândjâb and its dependencies were formed into a Lieutenant-Governorship.

The annexation of the Pândjâb by advancing the British administrative boundary across the Indus
brought the Government of India into closer contact
with the Pathan tribes of the north-west frontier
and the Amir of Afghanistān [q. v.]. Because this
frontier was too long and too mountainous to admit
of its being defended by the military alone, much
depended upon the political management of the
tribes. At first there was no special agency for
dealing with the tribal tracts, and relations with
the tribesmen were conducted by the deputy-
commissioners of the six districts of Hazara,
Beshāwar, Kohat, Bannu, Derā Is-lā'il Khān, and
Derā Ghīza Khān. In 1875, the three northern
districts formed the commissionership of the
Pendjdeh, the three southern ones that of the Derādż. The
system of political agencies was not adopted until
1878, when a special officer was appointed for the
Khyber during the Second Afghan War. Kurram
became an agency in 1892, while the three remaining
offices of the Malakand, Tochi, and Wāna were
created between 1895 and 1896. The Malakand
was placed under the direct control of the Government
of India from the outset, but all other agencies
remaining under the Pendjāb Government. This
was the arrangement until the creation of the
North-West Frontier Province in 1901.

The Pendjāb attained its present dimensions in
1911 when Dihāl became a separate province. It
was not however until 1921 that it was raised to
the status of a governor's province. To-day it
contains 13,930,000 Muhammadans, 8,600,000
Hindus, and 4,072,000 Sikhs. Unfortunately the spirit of communal antipathy has been fanned in the province by the activities of the Anglogan, zābātī Islām, and tablīgh movements organized by Muslims for the purpose of combating the proselytizing activities of the Hindu community known as the ḥudūdī movement. In 1926 Swānī Shārdhānand, a leader of the ḥudūdī movement, was murdered in Dihāl by a Muslim. Communal relations were further embittered by the murder in Lahore of a Hindu bookseller who had published a libellous attack on the Prophet of Islam in his book entitled the Raṅgīla Raṣūl. Far more serious than this communal strife were the political disturbances culminating in the Dīa-
līsānī, Bāgah Incident of 1919 (Sir M. O'Dwyer,
India B. C. to Know It, 1883—1925).

At least 90 per cent. of the total population
live in villages and 60 per cent. is supported
by agriculture, for the Pendjāb is a country of peasant
proprietors. But the bulk of the cultivators are
born in debt, live in debt, and die in debt. Almost
the whole of this money has been advanced by
Hindus and Sikhs who are not debared by religion
from the taking of interest, but, unfortunately, well
over half of this debt has been incurred by Mu-
hammadans. No community can hope to thrive
under so great a handicap and some organization
to combat this evil is essential to the prosperity
of the Muhammadan community.
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in Prosperity and Debt, 1925; C. C. Davies,
The Problem of the North-West Frontier, 1932;
C. Gough and A. D. Innes, The Sikh and the
Sikh War, 1897; L. H. Griffin, The Rajas of
the Punjab, 1873; do., Ranjit Singh, 1892;
Indian Statutory Commission, vol. x., 1930;
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Religion, 6 vols., 1909; Ghulām Muḥyī l-Dīn,
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1875; H. A. Rose, A Glossary of the Tribes and
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PANDJĐIH, (PENJĐIH) a village in the Turko-
noman republic of the U. S. S. R., situated
to the east of the Kugah river near its junction
with the Murghāb at Pulī Kīghtī. The fact that
the inhabitants of this area, the Sarık Turkomans,
were divided into five sections, the Sukāts, Harzāqis,
Khūrāsānis, Batārā, and the Ḍāhī Shāh, has
been put forward as a possible explanation of the origin
of the name Pendjāb, but it carries no weight as the Sariks
were only fourteenth century immigrants whereas the
name was in use in the fifteenth century.

This obscure oasis owes a somewhat melancholy
importance to the "Pendjāb Incident" of 1885,
when an Afghan force suffered heavy losses in
an engagement with Russian troops. History proves
that an ill-defined boundary is a potential cause
of war. It was a knowledge of this and the Russian
occupation of Murw, in 1884, that gave the neces-
sary impetus to negotiations which ended in the
appointment of an Anglo-Russian Boundary Com-
mission for the delimitation and demarcation
of the northern boundary of Afghanistān. Trouble
immediately arose in this quarter for while the
Russians contended that the inhabitants of Pendjāb
were independent the British held the view
that they were subjects of the Amir of Afghanistān.
According to the British, the district of Pendjāb,
which comprised the country between the Kugah
and Murghāb rivers from the Band-i Nadir to Ak
Tepē, together with the rest of Badghis, formed
part of the Herāt province of Afghanistān. During
the first quarter of the nineteenth century Pendjāb
had been occupied by Djamšidis and Hazaras.
Towards the end of this period some Turkomans
of the Ersari tribe, whose settlements were scattered
along the banks of the Oxus between the Cargi
and Balkh, moved to Pendjāb and obtained per-
mision to settle there. Salor Turkomans had also
settled in this area. About 1857 the Ersaris migrated
from the oasis of Pendjāb and soon afterwards the
Sarık Turkomans, forced southwards by their more
powerful neighbours, the Tekkehs, occupied Valistan
and Pendjāb and compelled the Salor families to
migrate elsewhere. Although, therefore, Pendjāb
had from time to time been occupied by various
tribes, they had all, whether Djamšidis, Hazaras,
Ersaris, Salors or Sariks, acknowledged they were
on Afghan soil and paid tribute to the nābīb or
deputy of the Afghan governor of Herāt. The
Sarık Turkomans had even supplied the Amir
with troops. The British therefore contended that
the district of Badghis, of which Pendjāb formed
part, had long been under Afghan rule (Foreign
Office MSS. 65, 1205).

The Russians on the other hand contended that
the people of this oasis had always enjoyed independence. Lessar, a Russian engineer, who visited Pendjdeh in March 1884, discovered no trace of Afghan authority, but a Russian doctor, named Regel, who visited it in June of the same year reported the presence of an Afghan detachment.

In their opinion therefore Pendjdeh had only recently been occupied by Afghan troops. The fact that the Afghans had not permanently garrisoned this area was no proof of its independence. On the contrary, it was only natural that, after the Russian occupation of Merw and Pul-i-Khatun, 'Abd-Al-Rahmân Khan should have taken steps to indicate his sovereign rights over this area. When, therefore, an Afghan garrison occupied Pendjdeh, the Russian Government immediately protested and disputed the Amir's claim to the territory. While negotiations were taking place between London and St. Petersburg events moved swiftly on the frontiers of Afghanistan. On March 29, 1885, General Komarov sent an ultimatum demanding the withdrawal of the Afghan garrison. The Afghans resolutely refused to withdraw whereupon the Russians attacked them driving them across the Pul-i-Kishti with the loss of some 900 men. It must be admitted that the posting of Afghan troops in Pendjdeh, and the Russian advance to Yulatan on the Marghab and to Pul-i-Khatun, the Mulbccul, were regrettable actions almost certain to precipitate war. The whole incident should have been avoided, but the confusing reports of Lumsden, the British Commissioner, to the Foreign Office, and the delay of Zelenoi, the Russian Commissioner, in arriving at Sarakhs complicated matters still more.

At the time this incident seemed likely to embroil Russia and Britain in war, but, fortunately, the good sense of the Amir, who was at this critical moment on a visit to the Viceroy, and the diplomatic skill of Lord Dufferin prevented this, for even the pacific Mr. Gladstone had proposed to Parliament that £1,000,000 should be expended on preparations for war.

It was finally agreed that Pendjdeh should be handed over to Russia in exchange for Dhu'l-Fikhr, and by the year 1886 the northern boundary of Afghanistan had been demarcated from Dhu'l-Fikhr to the meridian of Duki in forty miles of the Oxus. After a dispute as to the exact point at which the boundary line should meet the Oxus, the process of demarcation was completed in 1888. This recognition of a definite frontier between Russia and Afghanistan led to a decided improvement in the Central Asian question.


(C. COLLIN DAVIES)

PANGULU (Jav.), pangulu (Sund.), pangolô (Madur.), literally 'headman, director' used in the east Indian Archipelago as the name for secular and religious chief administrators, in the islands of Java and Madura the name of a mosque official, namely the chief in his area. The official representatives of religion are organised there on the same scheme as the native administrative officials. Alongside of the regent, the highest administrative official, is the pangulu of the regency, alongside of the head of the district is the pangulu of the district, called the pangulu naib or briefly naib, and so on. The officials of the mosque are graded in a hierarchy; the pangulu at the capital of the regency is at the head of all the personnel of the mosques of the regency. The village official in charge of the divine services is of a different origin. He is a member of the village authority for attending to the religious requirements of the village he does that, alongside the staff of the mosque. This man is exceptionally called pangul in Bantén (Western Java); elsewhere he is known by other names.

The pangulu is the director of the mosque and the chief of its personnel; according to a fat law, he is appointed, like the rest of the staff of the mosque, by the regent, usually being chosen from the staff of his own or another mosque. This procedure does not always guarantee that the man appointed is specially qualified (see below).

Theological training is quite free from special prescriptions. The student of theology, whether he intends to take up an official position or remain a private student, studies at schools (all private institutions of which there are many in the land). Each studies as he pleases, for shorter or longer period, just as he likes; an effort is made to attend lectures at several schools.

The duties of the pangulu are varied, but not uniform throughout the whole regency. The office of director of the mosque has already been mentioned; in larger villages, especially at the capital of the regency, the staff is large: there the pangulu does not himself take part in the work. The pangulu has charge of marriages which are concluded in his presence: talâk and rughû are pronounced by him and marriages are registered by him. The pangulu of a regency only performs this office in the case of very prominent families: in this case it is the custom to conclude the marriage in the house of the family. The pangulu also performs the ceremony when the wâli of the bride appoints him wâskil, a regular custom, observed by the majority without the reason being quite clear to them; to the popular mind the pangulu is the person who binds in marriage. It is therefore a very old custom to have the marriage performed in the mosque by the pangulu: this unwritten custom has now been given the force of law by a colonial enactment (since 1895, the law in question is of 1929). This law also regulates the fees to be paid at marriages, proclamations of talâk and rughû, taking the old customs as the guiding principle. These fees form the most important part of the income of the pangulu and his staff; the latter also receive their share; if properly qualified they frequently act as deputy for the pangulu at marriages. Women who have no wâli are married by the pangulu as wâli hâkim. The number of pangulus with this qualification is always less than the number of officials appointed to perform marriages. In some districts the regent appoints himself wâli hâkim but in practice he leaves the exercise of his rights to the pangulu.

The djakat (Ar. sukâr) is of course not collected in Java and Madura by the authorities; it is, if it is levied at all, a free-will offering and in many places insignificant. Only in Western Java was the collection at one time organised and in the
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hands of the mosque officials. The revenue went
to them. To this day the *djabat* is still a con-
siderable source of revenue for the pangulu,
especially in western Java.

The pangulu — this is true only of the pangulu
of the regency — is also the *kadi*; but his
jurisdiction is limited to family law and the
*wokap* (Ar. *wa'ák*) estates. The office of *kadi*
is his main sphere of activity. These judicial functions of
the pangulu have a very long history. The
colonial authorities thought from the official position of
the mosque officials that they were priests;
they further thought that they had to deal with a
*collegium* because the pangulu sits with some of
his subordinates to assist him when in legal
session. This misunderstanding was perpetuated
fifty years ago in colonial legislation. The pangulu
was made president of a bench of judges; his
assessors were appointed by the authorities and
chosen from the subordinates of the pangulu and
private individuals learned in law. In this way a
pangulu of lower rank may be a member of a
"priestly college". It is now intended to restore
the old state of affairs. The "college" is to be
abolished and the pangulu's court i.e. one in which the pangulu,
sitting with assistants, will be sole judge, will take its place. The law is
prepared but has not yet been put into operation
(1934). The "priestly college" holds its meetings in
a room in the mosque. Most of the cases are
brought by women. In Western and Central Java
it is the regular custom for the husband imme-
diately after the wedding to be forced to pro-
nounce the *tātılı* in a way which, from the
legal point of view, is not quite free from ob-
jection. If he does not fulfil the obligations which
he takes upon himself in the *tātılı* formulae and
if the wife is not satisfied she brings the matter
before the "college" and the latter pronounces that
a *tātılı* has taken place. These are the most
common cases. In Eastern Java and Madura a
facilitated *fašh* takes the place of the *tātılı*. We
also find cases in the rest of Java where the
"priestly college" decides questions of *fašh*. Women
who are refused *nafaqha* also apply to the "college".
If there are difficulties after a divorce about the
division of property acquired during marriage, or
if the heirs to a property are dissatisfied with the
decisions of an ordinary pangulu, the matter is
referred to the "college" for decision. The method
of procedure is as follows. The "college" gives
its verdict as to how the property should be
divided according to the *shar'a*. If the parties
prepare to carry this out but all are not ready to
do so, the scheme can only be legally enforced
when the secular court has given authority. This is
always done if the verdict of the "priestly college"
is formally in order; no test is made of its material
correctness. Fees have to be paid whenever ap-
lication is made to the "college"; a considerable
revenue is gained from the division of estates as
in such cases the "college" gets a percentage of the
objects in dispute (6% to 10%) — hence the name
*mesr*.

The "college" is consulted also in other matters
of Muslim family law but these are of less importance.

Finally there are *wokap* foundations the founders
of which intended the revenues for mosques, schools
of religion, or cemeteries. It is the task of the
"priestly college" to decide according to the *shar'a*
such disputes as arise and in general to supervize
the administration.

The pangulus in the native states are appointed
by the princes; their sphere of activity is the same.
Whenever a new pangulu is appointed he is given
his appointment as *kadi* by an edict "in confirmation
of my oral command", as the phrase is, in order
to comply with the demands of the *shar'a*.
In this edict the phraseology suggests that the ruler
hands over his jurisdiction to the pangulu.

The Netherlands Indies colonial law requires the
presence of the pangulu when Muslims appear
in the government courts as accused in civil or
criminal cases. A number of such assessors are
attached to each court according to its requirements.
They are appointed by the government and chosen
from the personnel of the mosques. It is arranged
that the director of the mosque is at the same
time an assessor. The right of appointing pangulus
has thus gone out of the hands of the regents
into those of the colonial administration. As the
pangulu is usually chosen from the lower staff,
the government has been able to secure influence over
the appointment of these minor officials so far as
they are capable of being pangulus. The object is
to choose as competent men as possible, so that
the prestige of the pangulu has increased in the
Muslim community. This is less true of their
position as assessors at the courts; the colonial law
intended that the court should be advised regarding
the *adat* (traditional) law. The choice of the pangulu
was therefore a mistake, as the latter goes by the
*Rh* books.

The word pangulu as the name of a mosque
official is not unknown outside the islands of Java
and Madura. In some places there are pangulus
whose work resembles that of the pangulus of
Java, e.g. in the centre of the former sultanate of
Palemhang (Sumatra). The colonial authorities have
retained the name; they have also given the name
to the court assessors appointed by them in districts
where the name was not previously in use.

Bibliography: J. C. Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschrie
nissen, iv./l. 279 sqq., 89 sqq.; iv./ii. 366 sqq.; C. van Vollenhoven, Het Ad
rrecht van Nederlandsch-Indië, ii, 160 sqq.

(R. A. Kern)

PANIPAT, a town and tahsil in the Kar
nāl district of the Pāndštāb [q. v.]. On
tree occasions has the fate of Hindūstān been
declared on the plain of Panipat: in 1526, when
Bābur [q. v.], the Barās Turk, defeated Ibrāhīm
Lōḍî in 1556, when Akbars [q. v.] crushed the
forces of Hīmī; and lastly, in 1761, when the
Marāthās where defeated by Ālīā Mahī Shāh
Durtānī [q. v.]. The geographical factor combined with
internal decay and a weak system of frontier defence
has been chiefly responsible for this. From the
strategic background of Afghanistan the path for
invaders lay along the lines of least resistance,
the Khyber, Kurram, Tochi, and Gomal passes,
on to the Pāndštāb plains, for the Indus has never
proved an obstacle to an enterprising general.
Checked on the south by the deserts of Rādjputāna,
invading troops were forced to enter the Ganges
and Djamna valleys through the narrow bottle
neck between the north-eastern extremity of the
desert and the foot of the Himalāyās.

Bābur's success over Ibrāhīm Lōḍî, in 1526, has
long been regarded as resulting from the extensive
employment of artillery. The source of this error
is to be found in an inaccurate translation of the
word *araba*. It is true that 700 *'arabs* were used
by Bābur, but it is incorrect to regard these as gun-carriages, for the word simply means "carriages". There is no textual or circumstantial evidence for supposing that Bābur had guns in such numbers as to demand 700 gun-carriages for their transport. Indeed, from Bābur's "Autobiography" it may be inferred that he possessed two guns only and Bābur himself makes his victory a bowman's success.

The importance of the first battle of Pānīpat is that it decided the fate of the Lodī dynasty. Far more formidable was the resistance offered by the Radjputs at Kāhānī in the following year.

The second battle of Pānīpat, in 1556, when Akbar defeated Hemānī, is of outstanding importance in the history of India, for there was no Moghul empire before Akbar, only the attempt to create one.

After his victory over the Marāthās, in 1761, Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī made no attempt to consolidate his position in Hindustān but returned to Afghanistan. The Marāthās were only temporarily crushed, for they rapidly recovered from this defeat and, by 1771, were once more a menace to the peace of India. The importance of this battle is that it facilitated the growth of British power.

**Biography:** A. S. Beveridge, Bābūr-nāma, ii, 1921; H. Beveridge, Akbār-nāma, ii. 58 sqq.; "All Muhammad Khān, Mir ārā-Mahmūd (Bādī, No. 3598, fol. 593 sqq.); Igān-nāma-i Bīnd, 1766 (see also Aishtī Researches, vol. iii., and Elliot and Dowson, viii. 396-402; Selections from the Prākāsa's Daftars, Letters and Dispatches relating to the Battle of Panipat, 1761-1763, 1930. (C. Collin Davies)

**Pāra,** a Turkish coin, originally a silver piece of 4 akēs, first issued early in the sixteenth century; it soon replaced the akē as the monetary unit. The weight, originally 16 grams (1.10 grammes), sank to one quarter of this weight by the beginning of the sixteenth century and the silver content also depreciated considerably. The multiples of the silver pāra were 5 (beṭīlik) pāras; 10 (āmil) 15 (ouzādīgh) 20 (ṣīγīmīparālick); 30 (zōlīsa) and 40 (ūrān) or piastre Higher denominations were 50 (beṭīlik) and 100 (jūlik) pāras were occasionally issued.

In the new Medjidieh currency of 1260 (1844) the pāra became a small copper coin with multiples 5 (beṭīpālick), 10 (ouzādīgh), 20 (ṣīγīmīparālick) and 40 (ūrān). In the later years of the Turkish empire, the larger copper pieces were replaced by nickel. The pāra under the republic is a money of account, the 100 pāra or 2½ piastre piece of aluminium bronze being the smallest denomination issued.

When Serbia became independent it retained the name para for its smallest coin as did Montenegro also. The name survives in Yugo-Slavia, where the nickel 50 para piece is the smallest coin issued. During the Russian occupation of Maladvia and Wallachia in 1771-1774 copper coins were issued with the value in para and coppers.

**Biography:** Lane-Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. viii., London 1881; Belin, in J. A., ser. 6, iii., p. 447-451. (J. Bliss)

**Pārgāna,** the Indian name for an aggregate of villages. The first reference to the chaulkān in the chronicles of the Sultānate of Delhi appears to be in the Tūrīkī Fīūs Shāhī of Shamsi, Surjī 'Allī (Bibliotheca Indica, 1891, p. 99), for it is not used by Ḥasan al-Ḍīfī in his Tażī al-Maḍīrī or by Mīrāḥī al-Dīn in his Tūrīkī Fīūs Shāhī. Although it first came into prominence in the sixteenth century partially superseding the term ḥāsh, it is, in all probability, based on still more ancient divisions in existence before the Muslim conquest. The exact date of its creation is therefore uncertain.

An account of the internal working of a pārgāna occurs in the chronicles of the reign of Shīr Shāh who learned the details of revenue administration in the management of his father's two pārgānas at Sāsarām in Bihar. When he became ruler of Hindustān he organized his kingdom into administrative units or parganas which were divided into collections of villages termed parganas. Each pargana was in charge of a fīōdār or military police officer who supported the amīn or civil officer. The amīn had for his civil subordinates a fīōdār or treasurer and two kīrkhāns or clerks, one for Hindi and the other for Persian correspondence. It does not seem correct to hold the view that in this respect he was an administrative innovator, for the provincial officials and institutions which he has been credited with creating were already in existence before he ascended the throne. This remained the administrative system until Akbar organized the Moghul empire into sābās (provinces) which were divided into sārās or districts. The smallest fiscal unit under Akbar was the pargana or mahāli. Thus, for example, the sābā of Oudh was divided into five sārās and thirty-eight parganas (Āmīn-ī Akbarī, in Bibliotheca Indica, i. 170-177 (Jr. Jarrett, 1894).

Under the Moghul emperors the chief pargana officials were the kānūnī, the amīn, and the shikārī, who were responsible for the pargana accounts, the rates of assessment, the survey of lands, and the protection of the rights of the cultivators. Similarly in each village a patwārī or village accountant was appointed whose functions in the village resembled those of the kānūnī in the pargana. It must not be imagined that the pargana was a stable and uniform unit. Not only did it vary in area in different parts of the country, but often a new land settlement was followed by a fresh division and redistribution of these fiscal units. The co-extensiveness of a pargana with the possessions of a clan or family has given rise to the suggestion that it was not only a revenue-paying area, but that it was founded on the distribution of property at the time of its creation.

The Twenty-four Parganas: a district of Bengal lying between 21° 31' and 22° 57' N. and 88° 21' and 89° 6' E. It derives its name from the number of parganas comprised in the zamindāris ceded to the English East India Company in 1757 by Mir Jāfar, the Nawāb Nāṣīr of Bengal. This was confirmed by the Moghul emperor in 1759 when he granted the Company a perpetual heritable jurisdiction over this area. In the same year Lord Clive, as a reward for services rendered by him to Mir Jāfar, was presented with the revenues of this district. This grant which amounted to £3000 per annum, made the Clive both the servant and the landlord of the Company. The sum continued to be paid to him until his death in 1774, when, by a deed sanctioned by the emperor, the whole proprietary right in the land and revenues reverted to the Company.

**Biography:** given in the article. (C. Collin Davies)
Pāṛṣīs. Under this name (Pahl. pārsik, Mod. Pers. pārși literally "inhabitant of Pārś") are known the Zoroastrian Iranians, who, after the Arab conquest, refusing to adopt Islam, fled and after various vicissitudes finally settled in India in Gujjūrāt, where they now form an ethnical and religious group of 100,000 persons (101,775 according to the census of 1921). At the present day the name Pāṛṣī is beginning to be used also for the Zoroastrians remaining in Iran instead of yekb, the somewhat contemptuous significance of which [cf. Mādīš] is no longer in keeping with the spirit of tolerance which is increasing every day in Iran.

What we know of the wanderings of the Pāṛṣīs before their arrival in their present abode in India is based principally on two narratives: Kišābi Sandžān, written in verse by a Zoroastrian priest named Bahman Kā Bobad of Nawsāri in the year of Yazdagird 969 (1600 A.D.) and Kišābi Zartoštīn (Kisah-i Qaṣīdā-i Bahrām-i Nawsārī, a work written at the end of the xvith century by the Dastur Shapourji Manockjī Sandžān (1735-1805).

According to these sources, the first group was composed of Zoroastrians who about a century after the Arab conquest went from Khurāsān, where they had sought refuge, to the south, reaching the island of Hormuz at the mouth of the Persian Gulf (751 A.D.). After a short sojourn there they crossed to Diū on the Gulf of Cambay to the south of the coast of Kāthīwār (766) and remained there 19 years. Continuing their journey southwards they landed at Sandžān (785) and installed the sacred fire there. According to the tradition of the Pāṛṣī priests, before obtaining permission to settle there they drew up for the lord of Diū, Ujjālāi Rānā, in a series of 16 shlokas the principal articles of their faith. In these shlokas, of which several versions exist in Sanskrit and Gujjūrā, several points of contact between Hinduism and Zoroastrianism are cleverly brought out. At Sandžān they were twice joined by other bodies of refugees and these formed a community which prospered rapidly and spread to Cambay, Bankāt, Bankānār and Anklewar. After the year 1000 Pāṛṣīs are also found in upper India, but it is probable that these were isolated bodies who came directly from Iran.

In 1490 A.D. the Pāṛṣīs who had made common cause with the Hindus were forced by the troops of sūlṭān Mahmūd Bigara to abandon Sandžān and take refuge with their sacred fire among the mountains of Barbhūt. When the Muslim pressure ceased, the Zoroastrian community resumed its development. According to the data given in Kišābi Sandžān, the sacred fire was installed at Nawsāri in 1491 after the sack of Sandžān, and after a brief period at Barbūt and Bansdāh it was brought back in 1516.

The sacred fire was installed at Sūrat in 1733 as a result of the raids of the Sindārīs but the settlement of the Pāṛṣīs in the town dates from the second half of the xvith century. We do not know the exact date when the Pāṛṣīs went to Bombay, which is now the principal centre of the Pāṛṣī community in India.

The Pāṛṣīs were able to settle in India without meeting any opposition mainly owing to the excellence of the moral principles of the Mazdaean religion observed in the threefold rule of kāṃata, kāśṭā, kāwarhāta — "good thoughts," "good words," "good works" — which is found in the Avesta. Although they have always abstained from any proselytising activities, they had the good fortune to attract the great emperor Akbar to the Mazdaean religion. Trustworthy and active, assisted by the fact that the social character of their religion does not prevent adaptation to the forms of western life, they are at the present day a flourishing and well organised community much appreciated for the high standard of piety of their lives.

The old religious inheritance of Zoroastrianism has been preserved by the Pāṛṣīs with remarkable piety. In the xvith century on the initiative of the dastur Cāṅgā Asāh of Nawsāri a mission was sent to Persia to obtain from the Zoroastrians who had remained there information regarding certain details of their religion. As a result the study of the manuscripts of the Avesta and of the exegetic literature was intensified and at the present day Pāṛṣī scholars are engaged in preparing a laudable activity in the publication of the old texts.

The sacerdotal class still occupies a predominant place in the community; its hierarchy (dastār, māsōdā, kārdā) is a hereditary one.

The interests of the community are managed by a committee (fātagi) composed of 6 dastārs and 2 māsōdā but with incorporation in the public life of British India the functions of such a committee are gradually diminishing.

The mass of the faithful (behadān) conform — with a few concessions to the demands of modern life — fully to the ritual prescription of Zoroastrianism. Birth must take place on the floor of the house to show detachment from the things of the world. At the age of 7 there is the investiture with the kūśšī, the sacred cord formed of 72 threads which winds three times round life. The funeral rites consist of exposure of the corpse on the tower of silence which is frequented by vultures (šāvag). In the ceremony of marriage, which tends more and more to monogamy with the marriage of full rights (Pahl. zamh-i faštikānāthā) to the exclusion of secondary marriages, Hindu customs have prevailed.

The prohibitions regarding contamination of the sacred elements of fire, water, earth are still scrupulously observed and the greatest care taken in purification after contact with impure objects, especially corpses. The Zoroastrian principles of morality are faithfully observed in all activities of life; hatred of falsehood, honesty in all dealings, assistance of the poor are the regular rules of piety.

The Zoroastrian community in India is keenly interested in the lot of their co-religionists in Iran and it was through the intervention of the Pāṛṣī "Persian Zoroastrian Amelioration Fund" that the dzīsys paid by the Zoroastrians of Yazd and Kirmān was abolished in 1882 by the Persian government. As a result of the decline of religious intolerance in Persia, there has been increasing intercourse with the Zoroastrian communities still existing in Iran and the Pāṛṣī community has frequently sent appeals to the Muslims of Persia to ask them to return to the ancient religion.

While as regards doctrine perfect harmony still exists in the community, as regards ritual controversies have not been wanting and are not lacking within it. In 1656 the question of precedence was raised between the priests of Nawsāri and those
of Sandžān. Another question which has been a subject of controversy even since the xviiith century, is the question whether the use of the pādān — i.e. a kind of veil placed in front of the mouth to prevent the sacred fire from being contaminated by the breath — should also be put on the dying, thus nullifying the laws of purity.

Much more serious however is another controversy, that regarding the calendar; it goes back to the xviith century and divides the community into two sects: the Shahenštihās and the Kadimis. According to the Avestic calendar adopted by the Parsis, to make up for the loss of a quarter of a day each year, a month is added every 120 years but this system was not observed during the period of persecution following the Muslim conquest. In 1745 a group of the faithful felt the need for a reform of the calendar; but this group, which took the name of Kadimis, was opposed by those who wished to adhere to the Hindu system of calculating the months and who took the name of Shahenštihās. The result is that the calendar adopted by the latter is a month behind that adopted by the Kadimis. The Parsis follow the era of Yazdigird which dates from the accession of the last Šāhīdad (June 16, 632).


PARVANA. [See Mu’in al-Dīn Sulaiman.]

PASAN TREN. Javènese "santri-place", a monastic school for students of theology (santri) on the islands of Java and Madura, Madur, sanjantren, Sund. usually pondok, i.e. the lodgings of the students of the school ("to go to the pondok" = to attend a pasantren). — Elementary education i.e. reciting the Kūrā, and the elements of a knowledge of ceremonial law is given in the East Indian Archipelago wherever there are Muslimmadans by teachers, who confine themselves to these subjects, in their own houses. In the larger villages and towns of Java and Madura there are also teachers who collect pupils around them in a mosque, in their own house or in a special building. If their reputation increases it often happens that students come from a distance and live in the place for a time to enjoy their instruction.

The pasantrens however are institutions for advanced theological training. They consist of several buildings and when they are not built out in the country, form at least a separate quarter of the village. Javanese princes have from time to time issued edicts making villages "free" i.e. the taxes and services which they have to yield are given in perpetuity to the teacher of the pasantrens founded there. Pious individuals have also endowed wakfs in favour of pasantrens. The others are private institutions which owe their origin to the initiative of a learned man who establishes himself as a teacher. Their foundation and prosperity or decline is therefore bound up with the personality of the teacher and that in which his learning is held; even pasantrens which are regularly endowed are influenced by this factor.

The pasantren consists in the first place of the houses of the teacher and his assistants, then of lecture-rooms, a chapel, rarely a Friday Mosque, the lodgings of the students (pondok), rice-barns, all of which occupy a considerable space. The pondok alone possess a peculiar form of architecture not found in other buildings. A pondok is a quadrangular building built of the usual materials. The interior is divided by two walls into three long compartments of about equal breadth, the central one of which forms a corridor running from an end of the living to the other. The two outer ones form the living rooms; each of them is divided into cells of equal size by partitions. The door of the pondok is in the centre of one of the shorter outer walls; it opens into the corridor. Only blank walls are seen on right and left as one enters; then it is noticed that very little doors are let into these walls, made of the same material as they are; these admit to the cells. The little doors are at regular intervals in the two walls, two always being opposite one another. The cells are lit from the outside by little windows in the wall; they are so low that the occupant can only sit or lie on the floor; for the students study in a recumbent position. Several students live in one cell; in very popular pasantrens, the pondok may have two stories. The number of students may amount to several hundreds. It may also be quite small. There are hundreds of pasantren in existence. In each pondok discipline is maintained by one of the older students or by a junior teacher. In spite of this, cleanliness leaves much to be desired. The head of the pondok is at the same time tutor and assists the students under him in every way. We also find women sharing in the instruction given in a pasantren but it is very rare for them to live in this institution.

The pasantrens have a life of their own. Great activity prevails even before dawn. After the salat al-suhb which the teacher himself conducts and which is followed by a dhikr, the lectures begin. The teacher takes the beginners one after the other and after their lesson they return to the pondok; here they go over what they have learned by themselves or with a more advanced student or with the head of the pondok until noon. The students
then have their midday meal, the santri of each pondok forming one mess; this is practically speaking their only meal. All then go to chapel to the salat al-zuhur. They are summoned to three further salat in the course of the day. The intervals between them are devoted to lectures and study. The more advanced students are taken together by the teacher; he reads the Arabic text, translates it and adds any necessary notes of explanation. After the salat al-fikr the day's work is over and the students retire for the night. Some santri may still be engaged on little tasks which may bring them in something, soon these also stop and quiet reigns over all.—Friday brings a variation in this monotonous round; all go to the nearest Friday mosque to attend the salat ashura'a. Harvest is also a busy time for the santri; they work in the rice-fields or beg for zakat. Many santri go home in the month of the fast.

Fikr is the primary subject of study in the pasantrens; the Arabic works used are those in use in other Shi'i lands. There are also a large number of javanese works; those based on Arab sources or theological works taken from Arabic are called kitab. Javanese works written by the students of the pasantrens; in the Sudanese speaking districts (western Java) Javanese works are more and more replaced by Sudanese. At the same time dogmatics are also studied. Here no particular maqdis is followed, nor are the works used written only by Shi'i. Orthodox mysticism is less studied. There is, it is true, a popular form of mysticism tinged with pantheism; but this is less and less taught in the pasantrens. The santri calls the main fikr book used by him in the pasantrens kitab pethik without further qualification (he hardly knows its title) and work on dogmatics kitab usul. Small books for elementary instruction on the duties of religion and dogmatics are also called kitab usul.

The method of instruction is one peculiar to the pasantren. As soon as he has finished the elementary text-books, the student is introduced to more important Arabic texts. He reads them, sentence by sentence, under the supervision of the teacher who himself has perhaps never studied Arabic properly and has only his memory to rely upon for the vocalisation. The sentence is translated into Javanese and paraphrased by the teacher. Finally the student is so far advanced that he can translate easy texts from Arabic into Javanese (a list of the texts most used [at the time] is given in T.H.G.K.W., xxxi. [1886], p. 518 sqq.). This takes a long time; the joy however at seeing his knowledge steadily increasing and the pleasant feeling of being able to read texts in the original spurs the student on. Under Meccan and Ijāgra-maw interpretation, however, this method is being gradually driven out by another which begins with Arabic grammar. It certainly seems the more logical; one disadvantage, however, is that the study of Arabic offers so many difficulties to the Indonesian that many lose heart before they succeed in reading texts.

Study at the pasantrens is quite free. Diplomas are neither sought nor given. The student comes and goes as he pleases. The majority when they enter the pasantren have already had an elementary education at home. The desire to increase their knowledge of the faith, the wish among rich and prominent families to see one of their sons devoting himself to the study of religion and among others the hope of gaining a livelihood, bring young men into the pasantren. The santri endeavour to attend the lectures of a number of teachers, each on his special subject. They therefore go from one school to another; some indeed travel about all their lives studying. Others when they think they have acquired sufficient learning settle somewhere, but not in their own districts, as teachers or become assistant teachers in a pasantren or they may prefer to remain "independent scholars". There are no offices for which study in a pasantren is a requisite preliminary; in general the theologians are averse from anything official or belonging to the state but the higher mosque officials have usually studied for a time in a pasantren.

It is considered very reprehensible to give instruction in sacred learning for an agreed fee. Nevertheless, most of the teachers are well to do. Pious gifts are liberally given to them on account of the blessing they bring. The teacher is a most welcome guest at religious feasts, of which there are many in Javanese life. All appeal at all times to his learning or for his intercession; gifts accompany these appeals. New arrivals among the students, if they can afford it, make their offering: sons of the better situated parents bring back presents when they go home, and poor students work in the teacher's fields.

The majority of the students are poor and indeed live by begging. On certain days they go round the district; their begging is not considered a nuisance; they are assisted readily for they are acquiring sacred learning; to give to them brings a blessing. Work on the land, the copying of Kur'ans etc. also bring them in the little they require for their frugal life. The colonial government only troubles about the pasantren in so far as it exercises a general supervision over them; the foundations of new ones are reported to the authorities and the principal has to keep a register of the names of the students and of the titles of the books used.

The spread of schools on the European model has dealt a blow to the pasantrens in recent years. Only the pasantrens could give religious instruction as the public schools instituted by the colonial authorities gave none. On the other hand, only the latter prepared for everyday life. This has resulted in the growth of private schools intended to do both. These are called madrasas and are intended to be schools for all. Attached to the madrasas are schools for higher education; in these religious instruction plays a very prominent part. In these schools, which owe their origin to circles influenced by modern ideas, the method of instruction is taken from European models; but their outlook is not by any means broader than that of the old pasantrens. The name madrasa points to Egypt or perhaps Arabia; the organization, apart from the religious instruction, is modelled exactly on the government schools.

In the country of the Minangkabau Malays (Central Sumatra) there are theological seminaries which correspond on the whole with the pasantrens; they are called surau, a name also given to elementary schools, chapels, houses for men, and also to the separate buildings of the institution called surau. The students' houses are not divided into cells; the occupants have a common lecture- and sleeping-room.

Ateh also has seminaries comparable with the
PASANTREN — PASHA

Javanese. The method of instruction however, which in Java may be called the new one, is the only one here; Malay takes the place of Javanese here; a knowledge of this language is therefore indispensable for students in Atjeh. The lodgings of the students (ranggang) have the same plan as the pondok of Java; just as the pasantrens are also called pondok, so the name ranggang in Atjeh is also applied to the whole institution.


PASE, the name of a district on the north coast of Atjeh (Sumatra) which according to the prevalent native view stretches from the Djambó-Ajé-river in the east to the other side of the Pasé river in the west. The whole area is divided up into a number of little states each with a musbalang or chief.

Pasé at one time was a kingdom known throughout eastern Asia. The north coast of Atjeh was in the middle ages on the trade route by sea from Hindustan to China. Islam followed this route and firmly established itself from India on this coast, the first point in the east Indian archipelago which it reached. In the xiiith century we know there were already Muslim rulers here. One of these was Malik al-Sallí (d. 1297), according to native tradition founder of the state and the man to make the country Muslim; his tomb made of stone imported from Cambay (India) has been discovered along with several other gravestones on the left bank of the Pasé river, not far from the sea. The capital of the kingdom is said to have been here. A second capital rather more to the west was Sumatra; it was the royal residence when Ibn Baṭūṭa in the middle of the xivith century twice visited the land, on his way to China and on the return journey. The present name of the island of Sumatra, by which it is known in the west, comes from Sumatra — in Ibn Baṭūṭa: Sumatra. Pasé was then a flourishing country on the coast; the ruler was king of the port, who himself sent out trading-ships; a ship belonging to him was seen by Ibn Baṭūṭa in the harbour of Ch’unchou (Fukien) in South China. Life at the court was modelled on that of the Muḥammadan courts of India. The ruler at this time was an ardent Muslim, who took a great interest in learning. He waged a victorious djīkdī on the natives in the hinterland. Leaden coins struck in the country and Chinese crude gold were the means of exchange. The chief food was rice.

Shortly after Ibn Baṭūṭa left the country the king had to recognize the suzerainty of the Javanese Hindu empire of Majapait (before 1365). A tomb of a queen or princess found near Līh Kukun has an Arabic inscription, dated 791 (1389) at the top of the stone and at the bottom an inscription in much weathered old Javanese script. It has not yet been read. The Chinese envoy Cheng Ho remarked in 1416 that the land was involved in continual war with Nago (Fidie). He mentions rice, silkworms and pepper as its products. The last-named attracted the Portuguese there. From 1521 they had a fortified settlement in Pasé but in 1524 they were driven out by the sūlān of the rising kingdom of Atjeh (i.e. Great Atjeh). Henceforth Pasé was a dependency of Atjeh. The tombs of the rulers of the former kingdom were still an object of pilgrimage to the most famous sūlān of Atjeh, Iskandar Ḥānī, as late as 1048 (1638—1639); at the present day even the memory of the old kingdom is extinct. The mouth of the Pasé river is silted up and the place where the capital stood is no longer recognisable.

Pasé exercised through the years a considerable influence in the Malay Archipelago through its Muslim scholars and missionaries. Javanese and Malay tradition have preserved their memory.


PASHA (T., from the Pers. pāshīqār, probably influenced by Turkish başqār), the highest official title of honour ("uquyin or laḳāb") in use in Turkey until quite recently and still surviving in certain Muslim countries originally parts of the Turkish empire (Egypt, Iraq, Syria). It was always accompanied by the proper name like the titles of nobility in Europe but with this difference from the latter, that it was placed after the name (like the less important titles of bey and efendi). In addition, being neither hereditary nor giving any rank to wives, nor attached to territorial possessions, it was military rather than feudal in character. It was however not reserved solely for soldiers but was also given to certain high civil (not religious) officials.

The title of pasha first appears in the xith century. It is difficult to define its original use exactly. The word had in any case early assumed and lost the vague meaning of "seigneur" (donintus) (cf. Divān-i türk-i Sultān Fevled, p. 14; text of the year 712 = 1313, where Allāh himself is invoked in the phrase Ey Pasha!). At this same period the title of pasha like that of sultan was sometimes given to women (cf. Ismā‘īl Ḥākī, Kitāb-i, 1927, index; s.v. Kādem pasha, Sejuk pasha), a practice which remains, and then exceptionally, in the xivith century in the case of the mother of the Kheðive (cf. WELIDE SULTAN).

Under the Seldjūks of Anatolia the title of pasha (in as much as it was an abbreviation of pāshīqār and always by analogy with that of sultan) was given occasionally to certain men of religion who must also have at the same time been soldiers and whose history is not yet well known. To judge from the genealogy which Aşık-pasha-zade claims for himself, the title of pasha was already in use in the first half of the xivith century. Mālkhūs al-Dīn Māsā Babā, alias Şamsik Mālkhūs or Mālkhūs Pasha had, according to 'Alī Efendī, seized the power before the Karamanoğlu and in the same region, after the defeat of the Seldjūk Sultan Ghiyath al-
In the provinces they were, and became, more numerous, and two classes of pashas were distinguished: 1. the pashás of 3 horse-tails (kızıl) or væzir (a rank which became more and more one of honour and extending to the provinces gradually absorbed that of beylerbeyi); 2. the pashás of 2 horse-tails or mir-müran (rank at first the Persian synonym for the Turkish beylerbeyi and the Arabic amir al-unwar but gradually became a lower rank). Besides, the old sandalbeyis having in principle a right to only one horse-tail were promoted mir-müran and thus became pashás in their turn.

After the Tānzımāt the title of pasha was given to the four first (out of 9) grades of the civil (1. væzir, 2. bâlû, 3. ilâ, 4. şâhiye şinflı evedevi) or military (1. meğkhr, 2. birîndî fêrîb, 3. fêrîb, 4. livâ) hierarchy and to the notables (3. râmîlî beylerbeyi, 4. mir-müran, with in practice unjustified extension to the fallen mir-il-unwar, in this case to the purely honorary rank of the sixth grade).

The table of ranks having been abolished after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish Republic retained the title of pasha for soldiers only. It has just been abolished by the Grand National Assembly of Ankara (Nov. 26, 1934). Instead of pasha one now uses general and in place of müşkûr, mareşal.

In western usage the word was at first pronounced bağha (the pronunciation pasha does not appear till the xviii century): Ital. bascia, Low Latin bassa, Fr. bâcha or baxsa, to say nothing of variant spellings. In Greek on the contrary, the form pasha is the oldest (xvii century) but probably under western influence we also find başha (xviii century); cf. Ducange, Glossarium medice et infimæ Graecitatis, s. v. pasha.

The pronunciation as bașha by Europeans is due either to the influence of Arabic in Egypt or to a confusion with the old Turkish title of başha (cf. the end of the article).

Etymology of the word pasha: we shall examine the various etymologies that have been proposed.

1. Pers. pāy - shāh “foot of the sovereign”. This explanation, which was based on the fact that in ancient Persia there were officials called “eyes of the king”, is found already in Trévoux’s Dictionary (s. v. baxsa) and was revived by G. v. Hammer.

2. Turk. baş “head, chief” already suggested by Antoine Geoffroy (Brieve description de la Cour du Grand Turc, 1542) and by Leunclavius (Lowenh., Pandectes historiae turcicae, suppl. to his Annàles (1588). Cf. also Trevoux’s Dict. and Barbier de Meynard, Suppl. — It is to be rejected. — Cf. the following word.

3. Turk. bask-ağa taken (for the purposes of proof) in the meaning of “elder brother”. This is the etymology accepted in Turkey until lately (Mehmed Thureya, Sîkîl-i Ilhâmi, iv. 738; Shams al-Dîn Sâmî, Kâmi-i türkî, s. v. pasha) and based on the fact that Sulaimân Paşa and ‘Ali al-Dîn Paşa were the elder brothers of Orkhan and ‘Olmân respectively. Ali Efendi in his Künk ul-Akhbâr written in 1593—1599 (v. 49, 29) and ‘Olmân-zade Ahmed Tâhib (d. 1724) called attention to this use of the word pasha among the Turkomans (Hadâker al-Wussâr, Istanbul 1271, p. 4, 16); Heidborn (Manuel de Droit Public et Administratif Ottoman, Vienna 1908, p. 186, note a) also says that pasha

Din Kaikhusraw II which took place in 1243 (cf. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, i. 177).

At the end of the same century the title of pasha seems to have been added to the names of certain members (restricted in number) of the petty Turkish and Turkoman dynasties which shared Asia Minor; these are sometimes rulers, sometimes members of their families. It was the same in the principalities of Tékke, Aidin, Deñizîl and Kızl-Ahmadî [cf. the article TURKS, iv. p. 961] and probably also in other little kingdoms of Anatolia (cf. for Sâfuqk, ‘Ali Pasha, according to Shihâb al-Dîn b. al-Umar, al-Ta’rîf etc. quoted by Kâkshandî, viii. 16, 14).

In the family of ‘Olmân, two individuals are credited with the title of pasha: ‘Ali al-Dîn, son of ‘Olmân, and Sulaimân, son of Orkhan.

The case of ‘Ali al-Dîn is very obscure. Two different individuals of this name have even been distinguished: the one being ‘Ali al-Dîn Bey, son of ‘Olmân, the other ‘Ali al-Dîn Pasha, væzir of ‘Olmân, and the two may have been one and the same (cf. Hauser, Historiadel, ‘Alîzadeh al-Dîn Bey, in T. T. E. J., years xiv. and xv., 4 articles). It may be added that the same individual or one of the two in question may also have been a beylerbeyi (cf. Oruç’s chronicle, ed. Babinger, p. 15, 18). Whatever be this case with the insoluble problem, it seems certain that the title of pasha was early given to statesmen (cf. a Sînàm Paşa under Orkhan: article TURKS, iv., p. 962).

The title of pasha in any case very soon became the prerogative of two classes of dignitaries: 1. the beylerbeyis of the provinces and 2. the væzirs of the capital. It was later extended to officials with similar functions.

In the second half of the xvi century (in 1539 or 1632?) Lâlî Shâhîn who, according to the Ottoman historians, was the first (?) beylerbeyi of the ‘Olmânîâs, was given the title of pasha at the same time as he received this office. The same title was then given to the beylerbeyi of Anatolia (thus keeping up the idea of the two beylerbeyis, one of the right and one of the left wing) and later as new posts were created in the growing empire, extended to the other beylerbeyis or væzirs “governor-general”.

It was the same with the væzirs, of whom the first (?) according to the Ottoman historians, was Djiandarî Khalîl surnamed Khârî al-Dîn Pasha in 1770 = 1368—1369). The number of the væzîrs [cf. væzir] who were called Chûbhe vazelerî down to the time of Ahmad III was raised to three and then to nine and the title of væzir, also given to high officials like the kapûnân pasha, the nişâhî, the defterdar, became more and more one of honour, carrying with it the title of pasha; but since at the beginning and for a considerable time in the capital itself there was only one væzir, the title of pasha in particular excellence and without any addition, came to be applied to the prime minister (later the væzir or tavr d’ám), whence the expression pasha kapûl which was later replaced by that of kâbi ‘alî, “Sublime Porte, the door of the first minister”.

The increase in the number of pashas was not at first very rapid. M. d’Aramon mentions only 4 or 5 pashas or væzir-pashas and at the time he wrote (in 1547), there were only three (Ayaz, Gavdîlî Kâsim and İbrahim, all three of Christian origin). It is true that here he is referring only to the capital.
means “elder brother” among the Greeks of Karachania, but there seems to be nothing to confirm these isolated statements. Some Turkish lexicographers like Ahmad Wefik (under 十) and Said have admitted this etymology but by two stages: pasha comes from the Turkish title başka which is for başbakan. The title of başka to be discussed below does really seem to come from baş-ka-z, but contrary to what I at first thought, has nothing to do with pasha.

4. Pers, स "sovereign". — Etymology, the only admissible one (with however the possibility of the influence mentioned under 5), proposed by the Turkish-Russian dictionary of Boudagov (1869) and later revived by the Russian Encyclopedia of Brockhaus and Efron. It had been previously proposed by D’Hebelot (under pasha, à propos of the spelling with final k). This explanation is based on the use of the words nhất and pādīshah, as the titles most often placed after the names when applied to individuals of high rank in the religious world (derives). Cf. Giese, in Türkkyät Muḥammad, i, 1925, p. 164. It seems that one can even explain by pādīshah the obscure phrase used by Orkhan to “Ali” al-Din Paşa in ʾĀshīq-paşa-zade (ed. Giese, p. 34—35) before the latter asks leave to retire (cf. above). Orkhan says “you will be pasha for me” Now a few lines earlier he had asked him to be a fāvārī pādīshah, i.e. a shepherd for his people. On the other hand, it may be noted that the title of pasha is often used not only as an alternative for pādīshah but also for shah. Here are a few examples:

Shadār al-Din Sulaimān, of the dynasty of Kizil Ahmedi, is called Sulaimān Pādīshah in Ibn Battūta (ed. Defreyn and Sagniuetti, ii, 343) and Sulaimān Pasha in Shihāb al-Din b. al-ʿOmari al-Taṣīf bi l-Muṣṭali al-darāsī, Cairo 1312, p. 4: written baška, following the Arabic script) and in Munaḍājam Bašī (in. 39). The son and successor of this ruler, Ibrāhīm, is called Shāh in Ibn al-ʿOmār and Pasha in Munaḍājam Basī. — In the Dastur-nāme-i Emwet (ed. Mukrīm Khālid, p. 83—84) Sulaimān Pasha, son of Orkhan, is called Shāh Sulaimān (with poetical inversion). — ʿAli b. ʿīcīk (Čecika), the Ikhānīan governor of Baghdad (d. 1336), is called ʿAli Pāša by Ibn al-ʿOmār. According to Naṣrī-zade (Gliesher- Khālīfāt, Constantine 1143), he is also found in some MSS. as ʿAli Shāh. He is also called Ḥalim Pāša (Čecika, Histoire de Bagdad, p. 10). In the oriental dialect, the title of pādīshah is given to petty local rajas were there it has the form, not of pādīshah but of pātka (Kırgız) and pātka (Ozbek).

5. Turk. baška (variants bashkaq, bashkak) “governor, chief of police” (Dictionary of Pavet de Courteille and under baṃmā in that of Boudagov). This word of the Khwarizmian language” according to Vullers came into use in Persia (Ikhānīd). Among the Mongols it meant the commissioners and high commissioners sent by them to the conquered provinces (of the west only?); notably in Russia. The accepted etymology is from the verb baṃmā, “to press, crowd, oppress, impress”, whence the meaning “oppress, extortioner” for baškaq, an official, it is noted (cf. the Russian and Polish encyclopaedias), whose main duty was to collect taxes and tribute. However extraordinary such an explanation of an official title may appear it seems to be confirmed by the parallelism with the Mongol equivalent of baškaq which is daruğa or daruğa [q.v.] and which may be compared with daružkin, a Mongol verb, synonymous with baṃmā in the sense of “to impress”. These may however be popular etymologies.

Schefer in his edition of the Voyage de M. d’Aramoun (p. 238, note 3) says “The etymology of the word pasha given by Geoffroy (from the Turkish bask) is wrong. Pasha is a softened form of the word bašqaq or pachqaq which means a military governor”.

Carpini renders the Mongol baškaq by bashmati (variants in the MS. : bascati, basstæ; cf. The texts and versions of John de Pl. Carpini... London, Hakluyt Soc., 1903, p. 67 and 261 notes). In the edition of 1598 (Hakluyt) there is a marginal note “Basha, vox Tartarica qua utuntur Tureci”. This also implies a confusion between the words baškaq and pasha.

It is not impossible that there was actually some confusion among the Turks themselves between pādīshah (pasha) and the title baškaq, the synonym of the Mongol daruğa. We had thought of this even before we saw the notes of Schefer and Hakluyt. It may be noted that the title of pasha (which is not found in Persian sources, as Muḥammad Ḥazvimī kindly informs us) was applied either to Anatolians, subject in fact or in memory to the Mongols, or to officials of the Mongol Ḥaḏān (like the governor of Baghdad mentioned above; cf. also Hit-śa ʿAff Paša alluded to in the Bism-ʿū Reem of Aziz b. Ardāšir Astābād [ed. Korpali, p. 249, 8]). The confusion could be explained the more easily as one finds (certainly not true) the form bashkaq (Djuwairī, Türkischer-Jazagut-Gründen of 1260, ed. Muḥammad Ḥazvīnī, ii, 113, note 9; in this passage there is a reference to a Khwarizmian official of 699, i.e. before the Mongol conquest).

It may be suggested that but for the influence of this confusion with the title baškaq that of pasha would never have attained such importance.

The Turkish title of baškaq. — This title which is not to be confused with the preceding, nor with the Arabic or old eastern pronunciation of it, was also put after the proper name but was applied only to soldiers and the lower grades of officers (especially janissaries) and, it seems, also to notables in the provinces (Meninski, Thesaurus, i, col. 662 and 294, l. 18; Onomasticon, col. 427; d’Herbelot, s. v. pasha; Vigier, Éléments de la langue turque, 1799, p. 218, 309, 327; Žemtke, p. 164, col. 2 (probably following Meninski); De La Mottraye, Voyages, 1727, i, 150 note a; cf. Ewliyā Čelebi, v. 107, 4; 211, 8; Na’mā, v. 71 11; İsmal Hājči, Kitābaler (کتاب‌البر), p. 41 and 8)]. De La Boulaye-Le-Gouz (Voyages, 1657, p. 59 and 552) also distinguishes the title from bacha and translates it by “monseigneur”. Meninski, loc. cit., also notes the pronunciation bašhi (باشی) which is not to be taken as the word bašha followed by the possessive suffix of the 3rd pers. -i; Meninski knew Turkish too well to make such a mistake. As to the pronunciation bašha (given by Chloros, s. v. pasha) it comes from the spelling باشا (cf. e.g. Ahmad Wefik Paša, Zaraki Tašhi, act i, se. 2, ironically applied to a woman) but Meninski pronounces basha, even with this spelling.

As the lexicographers have sometimes confused
basha and pasha, some have thought that basha also meant "elder brother" (Mehemet Salahi). Kaminu-i orteemi, ii. 291 sqq. followed by Chiloros.) I think we have two separate problems and that basha is really for basha-agha but with the meaning of "aoga (E. usage). The janissaries or yatachii were called basha-agha (according to Roehrig). On the other meanings of basha-agha and in general for more details on some of the points dealt with here see Deny, Soumaine des Archives Turques du Caire.

Note on the accentuation. — In the word pasha the tonic accent is on the last syllable (pasha). In the word basha it is on the first (bashe) as is shown by the weakening of the final vowel in the pronunciation bashi, already mentioned.

(J. Deny)

PASHALIK (r.), means 1. the office or title of a pasha [q. v.]; 2. the territory under the authority of a pasha (in the provinces).

After some of the governors called sandojak-beyi (or mir-beyi) had been raised to the dignity of pasha, their territories (sandojak or irad; q. v.) also received the name of pashalik.

Early in the sixth century of 152 sandojaks 79 were pashaliks. Of these 25 were pasha sandojaks, i.e. sandojaks in which were the capitals of an eyalet, the residence of the governor-general or wall of a province. For further details, cf. Mouradse d'Othmann, Tableau general de l'Empire Othoman, vii. 307.

(J. Deny)

PASHTO. [See ARZHIYNISTAN, i. 149 sq.]

Pasir. The Sultanate of Pasir in S. E. Borneo comprises the valley of the Pasir or Kendilo river, which, rising in the north on the borders of Kutei runs in a southeasterly direction along the eastern borders of the Beratos ranges and turning east finally reaches the straits of Malacca through a marshy district. The country, about 1,252 sq. km. in area, is still covered by primitive forest. It is so far as the scanty population, which is found mainly in Pasir, the residence of the sultan, and in Tanah Grogot, that of the official administration, has not cleared the trees to make ricelands. Although some gold, petroleum and coal are found in Pasir, Europeans have not exploited them, still less do they practice agriculture. A European administrative official was first stationed in 1901 at Tanah Grogot at the mouth of the Kendilo river. Pasir is therefore a good example of the Borneo coast state which as regards Islam has developed independently of European influence. The population of the sultanate is estimated roughly at 17,000. It consists of Dayaks who live by growing rice, of immigrant Bandjareses and Baginese from Celebes, who control the trade; they are found chiefly in the flat country at the river mouth. On the coast the Badjos, a people of fishermen, live in their villages built on piles in the sea. Of the 9,000 Dayaks, about 4,000 have adopted Islam, while 5,000 in the highlands are pagans. The 5,000 Baginese have a predominating influence in view of their large numbers and their prosperity; the 1,200 Bandjareses are of less importance. There are very few Europeans and about 50 Chinese and Arabs in Pasir.

Half of the population are therefore foreigners, but like the Dayaks they belong to the Malay race and mix with one another.

Pasir is despoticallyl ruled by the sultan and the members of his family; the people have no voice in the government. Alongside of the sultan and his presumed successor there is a council of five notables which the sultan consults on important occasions; this is also the highest court of the country. These notables and a number of other members of the sultan's family have estates as fiefs. Since 1844 each sultan on his accession has concluded a treaty with the Netherlands Indian authority. In 1908 they declared themselves vassals of the Netherlands Indian government. In 1900 the right to collect duties on imports and exports and taxes, as well as the monopoly of opium and salt, was ceded to the government in return for compensation. This amounts to 16,800 gulden yearly of which 11,200 go to the sultan and 5,600 to the notables.

The sultan still collects the following taxes: a poll-tax from adult males; 1/10 of the yields of the rice-fields and forest products, 2 cocoanuts from each fruit-bearing tree; also military service. He also has an income from the administration of justice in the capital.

From the very legendary history of the country it may be gathered that this despotic government which is foreign to the Dayaks was introduced from eastern Java. Under the ruling caste are the chiefs of lower rank, priests and landowners and freemen as a middle class. At the beginning of this century there were still slaves and debtorslaves as the lowest class in Pasir; although slavery had long been abolished in other states of the Indies under Dutch influence. As is usual among other Dayak tribes, slaves go about like free men, take part in all festivities and games, may own property and are not even distinguished by dress. If their debt is paid to their master by one person, they go over to the latter. Slaves are not sold.

As the social condition of the Muslim Buginese, Bandjareses and Badjos have already been described elsewhere, the following remarks are confined to the pagan Dayaks and their Muslim relatives, the Pasiarese.

According to tradition, an Arab (Tuan Said) brought Islam to Pasir. His marriage with the daughter of the reigning chief did much to further the progress of Islam in the country.

As to the Pasirese, their social life was only superficially affected by Islam. In their daily life a pagan conception of the worship of the deity and of the world of spirits still prevails. The old belief in the important influence of spirits on the fate of man and reliance upon their signs are evidence of this. The fact also is significant that throughout Pasir there is only one misikis and a few smaller places of worship. The number of Muslim priests and hadjis is also small nor is the enthusiasm to make the pilgrimage to Mecca great. On important occasions appeal is made for assistance to the spirits; this is particularly the case with illness among the Pasirese, who hold the pagan bhinan feasts, which are also celebrated in South Borneo. Amid a great din of gongs and drums which can be heard a long way off, the pagan priest (batian) becomes possessed by the spirit which then communicates to him the remedy for the illness. Even in the capital Pasir, exclusively inhabited by Mujaannamans, the advice of the batian is sought; only during the month of Ramadhan, the sultan forbids this.

How attached the upper classes of Pasir still
are to animistic views is evident from the legend still current according to which Sultan Adam in the middle of the last century used to isolate himself for several days in the year on the mountains of the spirits, Gunung Melikat; he had concluded, it is said, a marriage there with a female djinn from which a son named Tendang was born. This son, who has the gift of making himself invisible, is said to live on the island of Madura where he married a princess of the djinn. He appears from time to time in Pasir, when he is invited by a great sacrificial feast (formerly also human sacrifice). These feasts are still celebrated occasionally, especially in order to free the land from misfortune and sickness. In the village of Pasun a house has been built for Tendang with a roof in three parts, which is built on a large pole and thus resembles a dove-cote.

The revenues of the priests consist of what they collect at the end of the month of fasting in cæteris pribus, everyone giving what he can and the chief exercise no pressure. A priest also receives a small fee at a marriage or divorce.

The calendar now in general use in the sulphate is the Muhammadan. As elsewhere among the Dayaks the tilling of the fields begins when a particular constellation becomes visible in the heavens.

The family life of the Pasisrese has developed to some extent according to Muslim ritual. Among the followers of Islam, marriage is performed through the intermediary of a priest, with the father or another man as wali, but only after an agreement has been come to about the very considerable dowry. This is paid to the parents of the bride; she herself only receives a small part of it. According to Dayak custom young people are allowed to meet very freely before marriage. A marriage feast is marked by a very considerable consumption of palm-wine. The man remains at least a year in the home of his parents-in-law before he can take a home of his own. Divorce is very frequent because attention is seldom paid to the wishes of the woman in the negotiations between the parents. Man and woman retain their property after marriage; after a divorce this goes back to the family. Property acquired during marriage is divided into two equal portions between husband and wife. After the death of one or the other the survivor inherits all. Only a few families follow the Muslim law. The followers of Islam are buried with Muhammadan rites.

Bibliography: A. H. F. J. Nusslein, 
Beschrijving van het huldschap Pasir, in B. T. L. V., 1895.
(A. W. Nieuwenhuis)

PASWARÓWITZ. [See POFZERKHAN.]

PASWAN-OGHLU (written پیسران وغل; cf. Kêmmâs al-Astâm, ii. 1467) or Paswan-Oghlu (پرکممشان وغل) in Aid al-Rahman Sharaf, Türkîh, ii. 280) or, according to the new orthography, Paswanâtlu (Hümit ve Muhsin, Türkîye Tarîhi, p. 423) but on his own seal “Paswan-wadé Othmân” (in Orêskow, see Bîhl), the rebel Pasha of Vidin (1759—1807). His family originated in Tuzla in Bosnia, but his grandfather Paswan Agha, for his services in the Austrian wars, was, granted two villages near Vidin in Bulgaria about 1739. Othman’s father ‘Omar Agha Paswan-Oghlu not only inherited these villages but as bakrâk etc. was also a rich and prominent man (dyân); on account of his defiant attitude, however, he was put to death by the local governor.

Othmân himself only escaped death by escaping into Albania, but after taking part in the war of 1787—1789 as a volunteer, he returned to his native town. Very soon he was in the field again and fought with distinction, returning to Vidin in 1791. From there he organised with his men raiding expeditions into Wallachia and Serbia. When the sultan wanted to punish him for this he cast off his allegiance in 1793, took to the mountains and at the end of 1794 captured Vidin with his robber band and became the real ruler in the pashalik there. Vidin, which he fortified again, thus became a meeting-place for robbers and discontented janissaries who were driven out of Serbia in 1792, and he himself became the popular leader of all those who opposed the reforms of Selim III.

In 1795 Paswan-Oghlu even attacked the governor of Belgrade, Hâdhîji Mustaфа Pasha, a supporter of the reformers, who had been given the task of divorcing himself and returning in order to marry another woman. His troops were defeated by the Porte but without success. In consequence negotiations were begun at the end of 1795 but Paswan-Oghlu remained practically independent in the whole of Upper Bulgaria.

But since the Porte did not also formally recognise him, Paswan-Oghlu drove the official governor out of Vidin and in 1797 attacked the adjoining pashaliks; in the east his forces occupied or threatened a number of places in Bulgaria (but they were defeated at Varna) and in the south they attacked Nish [q. v.] without success; in the west they advanced up to Belgrade, occupied the town but were driven back from its fortress by the resistance of the Turks and Serbs whom Hâdhîji Mustaфа had armed. As a result of this attack and because of Paswan-Oghlu’s negotiations with France and Russia the Porte in 1797 sent an army of 100,000 men against him under Admiral Kâvuk Husaín Pasha. He besieged Vidin in vain until October and had to withdraw with heavy losses. This defeat and Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt induced Turkey to come to terms, nominally at least, with Paswan-Oghlu and give him the rank of Pasha of three tails (1799).

Nevertheless he declared himself against the reforms, against the central government and even against Selim III; he also sent several expeditions to plunder Wallachia (1800 and 1801) and incited the janissaries who had in the meanwhile returned to Belgrade to occupy the fortress (in the summer of 1801) and to murder Hâdhîji Mustaфа Pasha (at the end of the year).

At this time he repeatedly asked the Czar to number him among his faithful subjects and also offered his services to France. The Porte, which shortly before had forgiven Paswan-Oghlu everything, from 1803 declared war on him again, but the Serbian rising of 1804 diverted their attention. Paswan-Oghlu himself had to fight in the western part of his territory against Pintzo’s rising (1805). The appearance of the Russians on the left bank of the Danube (1806) induced him to offer his services to the Porte but the latter instead gave the supreme command to the commander of Rusçuk. This embittered him so much that he resolved to defend only his own territory against the allied Russians and Serbs but he died soon afterwards on Jan. 27, 1807.

PASIR — PASWAN-OGHLU
That Paswan-Oghlu was able to hold out so long was due to the state of the Ottoman empire at the time, to his personal ability and foresight (he never abandoned Vidin!) but for the most part to luck. Within his area he collected customs and taxes, ruled strictly and despotically, although not entirely without mildness and justice. Although his health was rather poor as a result of too great mental strain, ambition led him to aim at independence as evidence of which we have the coins struck by him and known as Pasvanbota.


(FEHEM BAJRATAREVIĆ)

PATANI, an administrative district of Siam in the extreme south of the kingdom on the east coast of the peninsula of Malacca; it is bounded on the south by the Malay states of Kélan and Kédah, both under British protection. The whole district is made up of seven Malay petty states, each with its own native chief who is assisted by a Siamese official. Malay forms of government are allowed to remain. In the capital of the same name resides the Siamese High Commissioner of the district. His advice has to be obeyed by the rulers of the states.

The native inhabitants are Muslims. Friday and other mosques are distinguished. The latter are called surau and have their own staffs. All the states have law-courts: the sharia is followed in matters of family law, Siamese law in other cases.

Patani is a very mountainous country. There is only a strip of plain on the coast. The area is about 13,000 sq. km. and the number of inhabitants about 350,000; the great majority are Malays, the remainder being Siamese and Chinese. There are few roads. The railway which connects the Siamese Southern railway with the English lines in Malacca cuts through the country a short distance from the coast. Agriculture is of little importance; only in the environs of Patani and in Nawng-Chik rice is cultivated. A large number of the people live by fishing; the fish caught are salted with salt obtained locally. Tin-mining is increasing. The exports include dried fish, salt, cattle, elephants and tin. Intercourse with Bangkok and Singapore is maintained by small steamers. The revenues amount to £45,000, of which one third is allotted to the Malay rulers as private income for themselves and their families, one third goes to administration, and a third set aside for special purposes, is also as a rule used for administrative purposes.

Fra Odorigo of Pordenone in 1323 mentions a place called Paten in this region, which he identifies with Thalamosyn. It is doubtful whether the reference is to Patani. The first certain occurrence of the name is in the xvith century when the Portuguese begin to come here to trade. Patani has for centuries belonged to Siam. Advancing southwards the Thai reached Ligor about 1284 (on the coast, a little N. W. of Patani; Sukhotei inscription); in 1350 the whole of the peninsula of Malacca was under Siamese rule; the conquest of Patani took place between those dates. The Nigarakrāgama in 1365 mentions Džere, the modern Djiring, one of the seven states of the district with its capital on the sea, a little east of the town of Patani, as conquered by the Javanese kingdom of Madjapait. Soon after the conquest of the town of Malacca in 1511, the Portuguese began to trade in Patani. Many Portuguese settled here. About 1600 the Dutch and English appeared; Patani at this time was a prosperous centre of trade, a station between Malacca and China and a depot for the exchange of goods from China on the one side, and the most important harbours of the East Indian Archipelago on the other.

When this latter activity began to decline about 1620, the place lost its importance and the Europeans abandoned their settlements.

It is not definitely known when Patani became converted to Islam. About 1600 it was a Muhammadan country; the queen ruling at this time had succeeded her husband fifteen years before; in all probability the country was already Muhammadan at an earlier date when Mendez Pinto (1534, 1540) visited it. According to native tradition, the conqueror of the land, Chaw Sri Bangsa, a son of the Siamese king, converted the country to Islam, after adopting it himself and taking the name and title of Suljân Ahmad Şah. He is said to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Malacca; this suggests that Malacca was the power that caused the conversion. Malacca, as is well known, was during the xvith century the predominant power in the Malay Peninsula.


(R. A. KERS)
PAITHAN. [See AFGHANISTAN, i. 149 sqq.]
Paula, the name given in the Moghul Emperor Akbar's monetary system to the 1/4 dam (1/4 paisa).

(P. Allax)

PNENEG, a people of Turkish stock of the middle ages. Their name occurs in numerous variants (Bağdâk, Pañém, Pathâkân, Patânâkân, Pathânâkân, Patânakâ, Patânacae, Pecinigi, Pin-cenakî, Pecenâcî etc.); also Bysseni, Besi, in Hungarian Bezeny etc.). There is no longer any doubt that they were a branch of the Turkish race. Rashid al-Dîn (xiiith century; see Ethnography) and Maḥmûd Kâshghari (1073) number them among the Ghuzz (p. v. 27); the latter (Dvîgin Lugât al-Turk, i. 27; cf. K. C. A., i. 36) puts them in the northern group of Turkish peoples, to which the Köka, Oghuz, etc. belong and describes them "as next to the Romneys" i.e. the most westerly Turkish tribe.

In all probability the Penegeks separated very early from their brethren in the original home of the Turks in Turkestan. Their earlier home is said to have been the Emba-Ural-Volga regions, which according to Bakker and Gârdzî was 50 days' journey in length and breadth. There they remained probably for a considerable time, their neighbours being the Khazars in the S.W. and the Oghuz in the S.E., and they traded with Persia and Khwâshim.

But by 860 the Oghuz began to move westwards and to drive the Penegeks from the Ural region.

Towards the end of the xith century the Oghuz (Uzen, Oçjûs) came to terms with the Khazars and drove the main body of the Khazars from their old home, so that in 922 Ibn Fâdîl found only a small remnant of the Penegeks there; according to De administrando imperio (p. 166), the latter remained there of their own accord.

The fugitive Penegeks came up against the Magyars, drove them into Hungary and occupied their lands, at first the territory between the Don and the Dniesper and later as far as the Danube. Constantine Porphyrogênetos (c. 950) says this took place "fifty years ago"; but the chronicler Regino (d. 915) dates it exactly in 889. The power of the Penegeks in the end extended from South Russia over Besarabia and Moldavia up to the Eastern Carpathians.

Warlike and powerful as they were the Penegeks were a constant danger to their neighbours. Here however we can only briefly mention their relations with Hungary, Russia and Byzantium. In the course of the xith and xith centuries they frequently attacked Hungary from the Eastern Carpathians or settled peacefully in various Hungarian districts (cf. the map of their settlements in Németh, Die Inschriften des Schatzes von Nagy-Szent-Miklós, 1. Beilage). In the xith century the Penegek settlements in Hungary still enjoyed certain special political privileges. They finally became merged in the Komans.

With the Russians, the Penegeks were early on friendly terms (according to the De adm. imp., p. 69, they sold them cattle, horses and sheep); sometimes they were their allies against Byzantium and Bulgaria (in the time of Igor, c. 911), but more frequently they were attacking the Russians. In the year 968 they besieged Kiev, in 971 they killed the Grand Duke Svatoslav on his way back from Bulgaria and the Russians had to build a number of fortifications against them. Their last attack (1034) was completely repulsed. A little later (1065) they were being hard pressed by the advancing Uzen and moved more and more towards the Danube and later also back to the Balkan peninsula.

The Byzantine imperial historian in De adm. imp. (p. 68) recommends the maintenance of peaceful relations with the Penegeks and there was actually an alliance with them but by 970 we find them fighting with the Russians against Byzantium. Henceforth the Penegeks were continually at war with the Byzantines until the emperor Alexius I in 1091 routed them completely at the mouth of the Maritsa and in 1122 John II inflicted another heavy defeat upon them. Of the remnants of the Penegeks some were taken into the military service of the Byzantines and some settled in the Balkan, especially in Bulgaria.

The Gagauz (q. v.) are sometimes regarded as what was left of them but their present language gives very little evidence of this (cf. vol. iv., p. 992). Nevertheless a number of Balkan place-names still recall the fact that the Penegeks were once there.

With the nomadic nature of the Penegeks it is obvious that the tribal organisation was an important factor. According to C. Porphyrogênetos the Penegeks were divided into eight tribes (four beyond and four on this side of the Dniesper) with as many great chiefs and into 40 clans with petty chiefs. The names of the tribes according to Németh were mainly derived from the names of horses and from titles of the supreme chief e.g. Zêrouxâtaîn = îmbi Kûl-bey, i.e. "the tribes of Kûl-bey, with grey horses". The three tribes who were prominent for bravery and distinction are called Kangar (Kârî-du) by Porphyrogênetos. Of the names of chiefs that of the tribe of Julia (Julia), namely Kûkât (q. v.), is probably the most remarkable. In the time of Kedrenos (i. 581–582) there were thirteen Penegek tribes "each of which had inherited its name from its ancestor and chief".

We know very little about the religion of the Penegeks. According to Bakri, they were formerly fire-worshippers (Magians) but according to other sources there were already a considerable number of Muslims among them by the beginning of the tenth century.

As to the Penegek language, Anna Comnena (xith century) already asserts its identity with that of the Komans [see kirîsî]. Until recently its scanty remains consisted almost entirely of the names of the Penegek tribes, chiefs and fortresses listed by C. Porphyrogênetos. But when in 1931 Németh succeeded in deciphering the inscriptions of the treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklós, it became evident to him that the gold and silver vessels contained in it belonged to the Penegek chief Bota-al Calam (d. 900–920) and that we had here further specimens of the Penegek language; from these he concluded that the language of the Penegeks was closely connected with that of the Komans in Hungary and that of the Codex Chuenicus. The characters of these inscriptions may be called Penegek runes, which belong to the family of the Kok-turk script and are closely connected with the Hungarian runes.

In conclusion, from the fact that there are two baptismal fonts in the treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklós it may be assumed that several Penegek chiefs were converted to Christianity. Very
little more is known of the Pécegens; cf. however the index to K. Dieterich (s. Bibl.).

**Bibliography:** The earliest Arabic (Ibn Rusta and Bakri) and Persian (Gardizi) records of the Pécegens are based on Djanhäuser (tenth century) and on a source of the first half of the 15th century so that they only refer to the earlier home of the Pécegens; Mr. Huseyin Namik, a detailed account however includes the period after they were driven from the Volga region. Both groups of sources have been used by J. Marquart and W. Barthold. — Also: Constantin Porphyrigenetos, ed. Bonn, vol. ii. (1849) see index historicus (the whole of ch. 37 deals with the Pécegens); P. Golubovskiy, Pécegen, torki i polovtsi do nazhestviyata tatar, Kiev 1884; Sh. Santi Bey, Kâmiûl al-Ālam, ii. 1905; K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur 2, 1897, p. 1105; G. Lethz, Slawische Historien, vol. xxvii. Sister. Petersburg 1890. \( \star \) Logos, ed. E. Orleans, s. indes; Rózsa Nagy Lexikona, vol. iii., Budapest 1911, s. v. Besenyök; K. Dieterich, Byzantinische Quellen über Landver- und Weltverkünde, 1912, part ii., esp. p. 51–58, 147 and 186; N. ʻAsım and M. ʻArif, ʻOktàmni Túrkih, vol. i., Constantinople 1335. p. 75 sq.; E. Oberhumer, Die Türken und die Osmanische Reich, Leipzig and Berlin 1917, s. index; Z. Gombocz, Über den Volksnamen besenyo, in Türkî, Budapest 1918, p. 209–215; W. Bang, Über den Volksnamen besenyo, op. cit., p. 436–437; G. Fehér, Die Petschenegen und die ungarischen Handwurzen, in K. C. A., i. 125–140 (assumes among other things that the royal family of the Abas is descended from Cseba or from the Pécegen tribe Török); Gy. Czeczó, Ungarisch-byzantinische Münzzeichen (F), in K. C. A., i. 209–219 (rejects Fehér’s hypotheses, approves Németh’s linguistic deductions and analyses once more the Pécegen chapter in Porphyrigenetos); W. Barthold, Oor Aya Türk Túrkhine hadžända Derser, Istanbul 1927, p. 23 and 92 sq.; J. Németh, Zur Kenntnis der Petschenegen, in K. C. A., i. 219–225; do., Die petschenegischen Stammesnamen, in Ungarische Jahrbücher, vol. x., 1930, p. 27–34; do., Die Inschriften der Schätze von Nagy- Szánt-Miklós, Budapest-Leipzig 1930, especially p. 36 and 45–59; Huseyin Namik, Pécekteltér (Turkish), Istanbul 1933.

(Fejém Bajraktarevic)

**PECÉWI, Ibrahim, Ottoman historian.** Ibrahim was born in 982 (1574) in Funkichene (Hungary, Ung. Török, Turk. Pécevit), i.e. Pécevit, whence his epithet Pécevi (cf. Pécevi, Török, i. 286 and ii. 433; also j. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 5, note). His ancestors were holders of fiefs in Bosnia and Hungary. Pécevi has not recorded his father’s name (cf. Török, i. 87); he was in any case already domiciled in Funkichene. His mother was a member of the celebrated family of Sokolović (Sokoli). Of Pécevi’s early years, we know that at the age of 14 he was taken as an orphan into the house of his uncle Ferhâd Pasha, governor of Ofen, and later went to another relative Lâlâ Mehemet Pasha (cf. his Török, i. 323); he spent 15 years in the latter’s entourage. In 1402 (1593) he joined the army, took part in the Hungarian campaigns of Sinan Pasha, was an eye-witness of the siege of Gran (cf. Török, i. 136, 180), of the Erlau campaign and the siege of Peterwardein. The next few years he spent mainly on the staff of Lâlâ Mehemet Pasha who had been grand vizier since 1513 (1604). He gives a detailed account in his history of the various offices which he held. After the death of his patron Lâlâ Mehemet Pasha (1524 = 1615) he was sent by his successor to Anatolia where he had to prepare a description of several sanjâjs. He was next desterr for a short period in Tokât, went in the same capacity to Rumelia and finally was given the office of Anatolia as “alms”. He spent the rest of this life in his native district. He became muteperrîf of Stuhlweissenburg, then desterr for Temesvár. In 1541 (1631) he retired from office and went to Ofen. He spent his last years here and in his native town engaged in writing his history. The date of his death is not exactly known. He must have however died about 1600 (1650).

Ibrahim Pécevi, who from his youth upwards displayed a marked turn for history, is the author of a work which is one of the best Ottoman sources for the years 926–1049 = 1520–1639. While for earlier events he relies upon the accounts of his Turkish predecessors, and as N. IV. Istvânyi and K. Heitai have shown, also Hungarian sources, for the later period he writes from his own observation or information. His work, which is written in lucid and simple language, survives in numerous manuscripts (to those detailed by Babinger, G. O. W., p. 194 may now be added two others in Upsala, University Library, cf. Zetterstén, Katalog, p. 531 and a manuscript in Rhodes in the possession of Hâfiz Ahmed, No. 446), but so far we have no critical edition. Several preliminary drafts seem to exist which vary considerably in the periods covered and were presumably later expanded. The Stempl printed edition of the Târîkh-i Pécevit in two parts (1540–540 pp. and 7 + 487 pp., printed 1828; cf. J. D., 1868, i. 471 and 484 and F. v. Kraelitz, in Lit., viii. 259) covers the period from the accession of Sulaimân the Magnificent to the death of Murâd IV in 1049.

**Bibliography:** F. v. Kraelitz, in Lit., viii. (1918), 252 sq. and the sources given in Babinger, G. O. W., p. 195.

(Franz Babinger)

**PECCHINA, Arab. BADJÎNĂ, formerly an important town in the south-east of Spain, to the north of Almeria [q. v.] (originally Mari-yet Badjînâ), from which it is about six miles distant. Towards the middle of the ninth century it was the centre of a kind of maritime republic founded by Andalusian sailors, who had also a colony on the Algerian coast at Tenes [q. v.]. It consisted of several quarters separated by gardens; becoming the capital of a šâura of the same name, Pechina was later supplanted by its neighbour Almera, to which its inhabitants soon migrated.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)
PEHLEWÂN, MUHAMMAD b. ILDEGZI, SHAMS AL-DIN, ATABEG OF ÂDÂBÂBÎDÂN. His father Ildegzî [q. v.] had in course of time risen to be the real ruler in the Saldjûk empire; the widow of Sultan Tughîrî [q. v.] was Pehlewân’s mother and Arslân b. Tughîrî [q. v.] his step-brother. In the fighting between Ildegzî and the lord of Mâzâgha, Ibn Âk Sunkur al-Almâshî, Pehlewân played a prominent part [cf. the article Mâzâgha]. From his father he inherited in 565 (1172–1173) Arslân, Âdâbâbîdân, Dâhimâshî, Isâfâshân and al-Kaj with their dependent territories and a few years later he also took Tabriz, which he gave to his brother Kûzî Arslân [q. v.]. Like Ildegzî, Pehlewân also became the real ruler. Sultân Arslân b. Tughîrî was completely under his control as was also his young son Tughîrî [q. v.], whom Pehlewân put on the Saldjûk throne, after Arslân had been disposed of by poison. Pehlewân died in Dhu ’l-Hijja 581 (Feb.–March 1186) or the beginning of 582 (1186) and his brother Kûzî succeeded him.

Ibn al-Athîr (xli. 246) pays a high tribute to Pehlewân’s statesmanlike qualities and during his tenure of office peace and prosperity prevailed in many of the territorial possessions of his dominion. After his death his son, bloodshed and unrest broke out. In Isâfâshân the Shâfî and Hamâfis fought one another and at al-Kaj the Sunnis and Shî’is until order was gradually restored.


PENDIJIH. [See PANDIJH.]
PERA. [See CONSTANTINOPLE.]
PERAK. [See MALAY PENINSULA.]
PERSEPOLIS. [See IJâSHâR.]

PERSIA.

I. Historical and Ethnographical Survey. (J. H. KRAMERS)

II. Language and Dialects. (H. W. BAILEY)

III. Modern Persian Literature. (E. BEKTHEIS)

I. Historical and Ethnographical Survey

Name. The name Persia is of Western origin and probably only in the Middle Ages began to be used for the countries occupying the Iranian plateau (in Plautus Persia is found once instead of Persis). It is derived from the Greek-Roman appellation "Persae" for the Persians, an appellation that goes back to the name of the region of Persis in the south-west, named in its turn after a tribe that is probably identical with the Parsua, known by the Assyrian inscriptions as having occupied formerly a part of Media (oldest mention 844 B.C.). The name Pars, (New Persian: Pârs) in Media and Persia is from media times is applied to the same region of Persis only, but Pârsi was already at an early time used for one of the types of language spoken in the Iranian provinces (cf. Fihrist, ed. Flügel, p. 13), which language since the 16th century became the written literary language that we call Persian. Equally the appellation al-Fûrûs, found in early Arabic literary sources, denoted the whole of the people of Persia, but was restricted in use to the Persians of pre-Islamic times or to those who had kept to their ancient traditional and religious views. This meaning is often synonymous with the Arabic expression al-Shârâb.

The form Iran is of Pehlevi origin and goes back to an earlier form Ariana, originally an adjective (airvana in the younger Avesta) meaning "Aryan". It was the name of the core of the state of the Sasanids, who styled themselves "kings of Eran and Arsân", and it occurs in the early Arabic historical and geographical sources in the form Irân-shâh, meaning the country of Iran (cf. i. a. Yâkût, i. 417 sqq.). In Muhammadan times the name became popular again by the revival of the ancient traditions in the Sâhân-mâna, but the use of the word Iran for the modern kingdom of Persia is probably not older than the sixteenth century, when the Persians began to call themselves Iranîyân (about 1800 there existed already a newspaper called Iran). Nor does the use of the words "Iranian" and "Iranistic" in scientific publications appear to be older than the second part of the sixteenth century (Spiegel's Iranische Alltumskunde was published since 1871, and Darmesteter's Études Iraniciennes in 1883).

Geographical Survey. Throughout the Middle Ages Persia was neither a geographical nor a political unity. In treating the Persia of Muhammadan times we therefore must choose an arbitrary delineation of the country, namely the territory comprising present Persia, Afghanistan and Baluchistân and in addition the region of Marw as far south as the present Persian frontier. The territory thus circumscribed may represent the actual Achemenid and later the Sasanid empires, excluding the territories of al-Irâk, Mesopotamia and Armenia, which during both periods belonged to those empires; Babylonia was called even in Sasanid times Dîlî Irânshâr (B. G. A., vi. 5).

The greater part of Persia thus circumscribed consists of a plateau, very mountainous in parts, with the coastal regions of the Caspian and the Persian Gulf. With the exception of these coastal regions the waters of Persia have no outlet to the sea. The consequence is that there are hardly any great streams, the only rivers deserving that name being the Hîlmand, which falls, like many smaller streams, into the depression of the Sistân lake, and the Herî-Rûd, which ends in the northern steppe. The many small streams allow only of a limited cultivation in the mountain valleys and on the fringes between the mountains and the deserts. This circumstance gives even to the inhabited mountainous stretches of the plateau a character of a series of oases, which are larger or smaller as the irrigation systems, mainly effected by the subterranean aqueducts called kâkerîs) is more or less developed. The territory between the oasis towns and villages is steppe, which, in central Persia, become real desert, the soil of which is more or less saltish. The steppes, as also the higher mountain regions, support nomad life only, as they are only habitable during certain periods of the year, to which cause is added the very considerable variation of temperature in many regions. Nomads or semi-nomads have therefore
always lived together on the Iranian plateau with the settled population; the proportion has considerably varied on account of the frequent invasions of nomad peoples. Persia consists of a number of regions of very different character, which accounts for the lack of political unity during long periods of history. Each of these regions has formed occasionally an important political and cultural centre and the Islamic geographers in describing Persia give for each of them its own description. Their division is mainly traditional and at the same time geographical, but disregards the very variable and ephemeral political frontiers.

The regions may be divided into a western and an eastern group, separated by the great central Iranian desert, which extends from the Caspian Sea south-eastwards practically as far as the Indian Ocean in Mukrān. This desert, called by the geographers Mafsat al-Khurāsān, Mafsat Faris, Mafsat Kirman or Mafsat Sīstān, depending on the parts particularly taken into consideration, varies in breadth and character. Its level is on the whole considerably lower than the eastern and western parts of the Iranian plateau. The northern part is a large salt desert, where vegetation is hardly possible. Further to the south, to the east of Fāris, begins the region called on modern maps Dagh-i Lūt; here, and further to the south-east there are not a few oases, which form important resting points on the many caravan ways that have linked up since olden times Fāris and Kirman with Khurāsān and Sīstān. In the southern regions of Tūrān and Mukrān, with which it is linked the large desert to the south of the Hindu River, the desert steppe character is prevalent. This series of deserts, though not forming an impassable barrier between east and west, has often coincided with political frontiers; only in the north in the region of Kūmis, east of al-Kayā (later Teheran) and along the Caspian coast, a more continuous cultivated stretch links up Media with Khurāsān.

The central part of the western regions is Media, called al-Djībāl in Muhammadan times and later Irbāt-i Aḥāmat, consisting of a plateau all covered by mountain ranges running mainly from N. to S. E. and bordered on its south-western side by the Zagros mountains; the most important towns are here Hamāqān and Isfahān. To the north-west Aḥdarbajdān forms a continuation of al-Djībāl, from which it is separated by the desertlike region of Ardalān. Aḥdarbajdān is still more mountainous, being a transition to the Armenian and Caucasian mountain systems; it is also richer in water-courses; the river Araxes (al-Rass) may be considered its northern boundary. Its chief geographical feature is the big salt lake of Urmia. In early Muhammadan times Ardabīl was here the most important place, succeeded in modern times by Tabāz. The small coastal border to the east of Aḥdarbajdān belongs to the South Caspian regions, known in Islamic geography as al-Djīl, al-Daillam, and further Aḥbaristān, Bīlān and Mzandra. This region consists of a narrow coastal stretch, widening somewhat towards the east and contrasting with the rest of Persia by its moist climate and rich vegetation; to the south it slopes rapidly upwards to the high range of the Elburz that forms the northern border of the central plateau; alongside the southern slope of this range stretches a narrow cultivated and inhabited area, in which al-Raiy was the most important town and through which ran the main route to Khurāsān, passing, after al-Raiy, Sammān, al-Dāmghān and Bīstān. At the south-eastern corner of the Caspian the route passed south of the mountain region of Djarjdān, which region, owing to the fact that its waters — the rivers Djarjdān and Atrek — flow towards the Caspian, does not belong geographically to Khurāsān.

In the south of al-Djībāl the Luristān mountains are a transition to the low country of Khūrizān, the ancient Elam and the modern 'Arabistān. It is very similar to al-Irāk, from which it is separated by desert stretches. The rivers of Aḥwāz, now the Kūrān, fed by its tributary the Kerkhā, in the early Middle Ages flowed directly into the Persian Gulf, and later into the Shāh al-Arab. To the east of Khūrizān and south-east of al-Djībāl begin the mountain ranges of Fāris with their many mountain lakes and their fertile valleys, which find their continuation in the similarly shaped mountain region of Kirman, where, however, the desert areas are more numerous. The chief town of Fāris is the medieval and modern Khurāsān, which has replaced the ancient towns of Djar and Iṣfahān, while the medieval towns of Kirman, al-Strādān and Dirūf, have disappeared, the present town of Kirman being comparatively young. The coastal region of Fāris and Kirman is barren; here were the very important ports of Tawaddū, Sīnt, Sīrāf and Hurmuz, now replaced by Būshīr and Bandar 'Abbās. The geographers distinguish Fāris and Kirman a southern hot zone (jāwār, garmst) and a northern colder zone (sarād, sarvest), a distinction important to nomads and pertaining to the climate and the vegetation; hot regions are found, however, also in the north-eastern parts of Kirman, where the land descends to the level of the central desert. The oasis of Yazd and environs is generally counted a part of Fāris. The country east of Kirman as far as the Indus, occupied by several mountain ranges, is poor in cultivated areas and has not much importance as a passage to the Indus region. It consists of the coast region of Mukrān and the parallel inner zone of Tūrān, forming together the present Balācīstān.

The north-eastern part of the Iranian plateau consists of three main regions, of which Sīstān with al-Rukhhādād (Arachosia) is formed by the basin of the Hindu; these waters flow into the Sīstān lakes, which have considerably changed their form in the course of history. The principal medieval towns were Zarandj and Bīst; the mountain ranges become higher towards the north of this region and run mostly north and south; the eastern border is the water-shed of the Indus valley. To the north of Sīstān stretches the large region of Khurāsān. Its main features are a series of mountain ranges running east and west, bordered in the east by the Hindū Kush; between these mountains flow a number of rivers, mainly from the south-eastern ranges to the north-west or the north, where they lose themselves in the desert, bordering the south bank of the Djarjdān (Amū Daryā) and continuing in a western direction towards the Caspian. The largest river is the Hei Kūnd, on which is situated Herāt; then the Murghāb with Marw al-Rudh and Marv, and the river of Balkh. The westernmost section of Khurāsān with Isfarāy, Naftūr and Tūs (Meshhed) receives its waters from the western mountains that form a
not quite complete watershed between Khurasan and Djurджan. Though certainly presenting a geographical unity, the large extent of Khurasan allows the division into smaller regions, such as Bādghīs, al-Djurджadjan, Tukhiristan and others. The present frontier between Persia and Afgānīstān cuts from north to south right through Khurasan and Sistān. Finally the basin of the Indus and its tributaries forms a region of its own, although the part with Kābul to the south of the Hindū Kūsh and Ghāzna (Zābulistān) was often counted by the Islamic geographers to Khurasan. The more southern part of the Indus valley is separated from the Hindu system by the Sulaimān range and the deserts of Waziristān and is, owing to climate, poor in cultivated areas.

All over the Iranian plateau a system of secular caravan roads links up the many cultivated centres. The chief connexions with the surrounding countries were the passage of the Araxes towards the eastern Caucasus (al-Rām), the pass west of Urmia to Armenia, the passeways of Shahriruz and Halwān to Mesopotamia and al-Iraq, and the road from al-Baṣra to Ahwāz. The sea-ports on the Persian Gulf maintained regular intercourse with the coast towns of Arabia, India and even Eastern Africa. Towards Transoxana (Mā warḵ al-Nahr) the chief passage went by Tirmiḏ on the Oxus, while the roads from Kābul and Ghāzna to Mulkān were the chief connections between the Iranian plateau and the Islamic parts of India. The Caspian ports maintained a small traffic with the Volga mouth.

Historical Survey. The relations between Arabia and Persia date from long before Islamic times. Arabs settled in southern Persia from the time of Ṣhadīr I, and the Šāšānids were masters of southern Arabia up to the time of Muḥammad. Then began, under the caliph ʿUmar, the Arab conquest of Persia, which inaugurated the Islamic period in the history of that country. The political and psychological prelude to this conquest was the taking of the capital of the Šāšānid empire, al-Maḏārīn, in 637, after the battle of al-Kādisiya. Although the exact dates of the different conquests and battles are not known, the early historical sources allow a reliable survey of the phases of the amazingly rapid progress of the Arabic invaders all over the Iranian plateau. For, with the exception of Mārkān and Kābul, all regions had been reached, as far as Bālḵ, before the death of the caliph ʿOṯmān (656). We may distinguish different chief expeditions that were directed primarily from Madīna, and secondarily from Kūf and Baṣra by the governors of those two garrison towns. The first expedition, however, the conquest of the greater part of al-Djurдж and south-eastern Ardharbijdān, was the immediate consequence of the capture of al-Maḏārī in the army of Saʿd b. Abi Waqāq. It was followed, probably in 638, by the battle of Djalulā and the conquest of Halwān, Karmāsīn (Kirmānshāh) and, after reinforcement had been sent from Kūf, by the famous battle of Nihāwān. These events caused the flight of king Yezeḏegard by the way of Isfahān, ʿIsaḵr, Kirmān, Sīḏuṣṭān, to Marw, where he was killed by the Marzubān Māḥūya (651). Immediately after Nihāwān came the capitulation of Ardaḵīl (about 644), together with raids into Djerfān. The further conquest of Ardharbijdān, however, started from Māsūl, taken in 641 by ʿOtbā b. Farkaḏ, who, in the course of his expedition, took Shahriruz, Urmīya and several other places in Ardharbijdān. Nīhāwand remained the base from which, under the direction of the first governors of Kūf, were conquered al-Raḵwī and the towns of Kūmis (after 641), and about the same time Hamadhān, Kaẕwīn and Zandjān. In the following years several expeditions were necessary in this region against the Dailamīs and other mountainers. From Kūf started also the first invasion of Khūzistān under the governor al-Mughīra b. Shuʿbā, but the real conquest of this region began in 638 under the famous governor of Baṣra Aḥb Ṭūrūḥān al-Aḥnaf b. ʿAṣ’ī. The subjugation of this very near neighbour did not take much time, the most serious resistance being met at Tustar (Ṭustar). Khūzistān remained Abū Mūsā’s base, from which he conquered the remaining towns of al-Durḏālī, namely al-Sirwān, al-ʿAṣimāra, Kūm and Kaḏān, and finally, in 644, by means of his brother Harb b. Abū Mūsā, was brought under his sway. The latter was also the first to move in the direction of Khurasan by forcing the towns called al-Tabaristān to capitulate. About the same time took place the first invasion of Fāris, not, however, from Khūzistān, but from the opposite Arabian province of al-Baḥrānī, whose governor ʿOṯmān b. Abī ʿAṣ’ā had an encounter with the marzubān on the island of Abarkawān and subsequently took Tawwādji, from where he began raids on the other towns of Fāris. His brother al-Ḥakām defeated the marzubān of Fāris near Rāshār on the coast, in 640, in a great battle, which, according to al-Balḵhūrī, was equal in importance to that of al-Kādisiya. Then Abū Mūsā was ordered to join forces with ʿOṯmān b. al-ʿAṣ. Together they conquered between 644 and 647 a number of towns: Arrāḏān, Ṣahrāb, Ṣīrāz, Dārābjudāl, Fasṭ; Abī Mūsā penetrated far into Kirmān, Shīrāz became the principal Arab garrison. It was from here that, in the caliphate of ʿOṯmān, started the great campaigns of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr, after his appointment as governor of Baṣra. In 649 he took the not yet conquered towns of Iṣṭakhr and Djerfān, and in 650 he set out for the conquest of Khūzistān; the reason of this is said to have been an invitation by the marzubān of Tūs, addressed equally to his colleague of Kūf, Saʿd b. al-ʿAṣ. But while Saʿd did not go beyond Ṭabaristān and Durdān, where the malk was made tributary, ʿAbd Allāh became the real conqueror of Khūzistān. He had already dispatched his lieutenant Mūdjīšī b. Maʿṣūd towards Kirmān, in pursuit of Yezeḏegard; this first expedition having failed, Mūdjīšī was sent a second time to Kirmān in 650, where he conquered the principal towns: al-Sirwān, Bamm and Djerfān. Battles were fought near Hūrmuz and at the Sīfān mountains. A similar minor expedition was sent by ʿAbd Allāh to Sistān, under al-Raḵwān b. Ziyād, who crossed the desert from Ṭabaristān and conquered with considerable difficulty Zandjān, the capital of Sistān, where he remained several years. His successor having been expelled from Zandjān, ʿAbd Allāh dispatched ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Sāmūra, who reconquered the country and penetrated as far as Dīwar, Bust and Zābul. In 650 ʿAbd Allāh had in the meantime proceeded to al-Tabaristan, already conquered, and sent from there al-ʿAṣnāf b. Kāis to the conquest of Khūzistān. He himself reached Nīshābūr, which surrendered after a siege. From there several
towns were subdued by him and by his lieutenants, and with the marzubān of Tūs a treaty was concluded. Mawar capitaulated without a fight. A secondary expedition to Herat under Aww b. Tha'labā resulted in the capitulation of the ruler of that town, while finally eastern Khurasān was raided by al-Āṣīf b. Kāiš, who fought a decisive battle near Marw al-Rūdhāb and conquered the region of al-Djīzaḏjān and the town of Balkh, continuing from here this advance as far as Khwārizm. When ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr returned, he left Kāiš b. al-Ḥaithām as the first governor of Khurāsān.

This was the military situation at ‘Othmān’s death. The conquests were by no means secure, least of all in Sistan and Khurasān. The placing of garrisons in Nihāwān, al-Ahwāz and Sirās, enabled the Arabs to complete their conquests against the civil wars were over. The people and the authorities with whom the Arabs had to deal in Persia were very different. After the royal army had been destroyed at al-Kalābīstān and Nihāwān, it was chiefly the marzubān who opposed the Arab invaders with their local troops and concluded on their own account treaties (mutālaḵa), which guaranteed freedom of religion and the possession of private property against payment of kharāj. Where a town or a region had been taken by force, the Arabs became proprietors of the soil, as in the Median regions Māḥ al-Kūfah and Māḥ al-Baṣra. Wholesale acceptance of Islām, as is reported of Kāzawā, was rare; the Zoroastrians continued the practice of their religion, notably in Fāris and Aḥbarīḏgān, but from Fāris many of them took refuge in Sistān and Mūrkan, and about 700 took place the first emigration of Zoroastrians to Kathiāwar in India. In the town of Dārābḏījīd it was the local herbānī who treated with the Arabs. On the other hand, many Persians were taken as captives to Ḥirā and Ḥarabīyā, where they became wasūfī, while also entire groups, such as many knights (āḏizwīr) of Zevedegard’s army, and different elements of the population of southern Persia (the Zūţ, Saybdīḏa and others) joined forces with the Arabs. The mountainers, however, in Fāris and al-Dījībāl, and especially those of Dījīlān and Dālaţī, long remained unconquered, living under petty local dynasties. In Khūsān the Arabs had had to deal with remnants of the Ḥēphāltās (Ḥēphāltīs), still further east with polytheists (muṣhrākīn), probably Buddhists and, in Khurāsān, often with Turkish auxiliaries. On the other hand, the conquests introduced a contingent of Arab Muslims in the Persian towns, where they generally began by establishing a mosque; they increased by colonisation in Umayyad times and among them were many bearers of the traditions (kadīth) about the Prophet and other religious matters and in this way was prepared the gradual Islamisation of the population, favoured at the same time by economic conditions.

The civil war, in which not a few Persians took part in Ḥirā, crippled for some time the Arab progress; the emissaries of ʿAṭī’s governors in Kūfah and Baṣra had great difficulty in maintaining themselves, and the whole of Khurasān rebelled, in spite of the reported vassalage of Mawar. Now that caliph Balkh was even for some time under Chinese control. It was only under the energetic governors of Ḥirā under the Umayyads, Ziyād and al-Hādhījīdī, that the conquest was taken up with renewed vigour. Under Muʿawāya ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr had been again appointed governor of Baṣra (662) and he sent again ʿAbd al-Ḥaṣān b. Samura to Sistān, and then the Arabs reached Kābul, although he and his successors experienced greater difficulties in their dealings with the Kābul-Shāh and the different rulers of Zābulīstān who are called zambīl (according to Marquart, Erānsahr, p. 245). These difficulties continued throughout the Umayyad period and became less only when Sistān was joined administratively to Khurāsān, and the Arab domination grew stronger in the latter region. Ibn ʿAmīr was also the first to begin the reconquest of Khurāsān by his lieutenant al-Kāiš b. Ḥaithām (capture of Herat and Balkh); he was continued by Ziyād b. al-Ḥaṣān (from 666), under whom Marw was made a strong Arab garrison, and shortly afterwards 50,000 Arab colonists were established with their families in Khurāsān. Al-Hādhījīdī operated in Khurāsān through his able generals al-Muhallab b. Abī Sufrā, Yāzīd b. al-Muhallab, and finally Kuṭāibī b. Mūsīm. One of the greatest difficulties was, in his time as many times afterwards, the clearing of the main road to Khurāsān by al-Raʾīs, Kūnīs and Ṭabarīstān, where many battles were fought with the mountainers. The transfer of a considerable Arab contingent to Khurāsān under Ziyād had been a consequence of tribal wars that had started during Muʿawāya’s reign. The new comers soon began to infect the Arab solders of the garrisons, while at the same time the political and religious parties born from the civil war began to gain adherents in Persia, first among the Arabs and soon among their Persian clients. Prominent were the Khūrqās, who, under their leader Kāṭārī b. al-Fuḍāwā (killed ca. 697), founded a refuge in Kirmān and made from there raids to the north and the west. And towards the end of the Umayyad period, Isfahān with parts of Fāris and Khūrāsān were temporarily in the power of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muʿawāya (744–746). The main object of the Umayyad administration was the collection of the ḏiyā and the kharāj and, until the time of al-Hādhījīdī, the books were kept by native scribes in Persian, after the custom of the Sāsānids. Under al-Hādhījīdī the language and the script of the administration were changed to Arabic in Ḥirā, and we must assume that gradually Arabic came into administrative use in the Persian provinces; nevertheless the first Arab governors, and among them Kāṭārī, had coins struck with Pehlevi and Arabic legends. A considerable advance in the Islamisation of Persia was due to the financial policy of ʿUmār b. ʿAbd al-Azīz and Ḥishām; after ʿUmār’s edicts had induced many Persians to adopt Islam in order to get rid of the ḏiyā, the taxing of Muslims and non-Muslims alike by Ḥishām brought about an assimilation of the different elements of the population, from which there emerged at this time a reliable class of Islamic-Persian functionaries. Only the mountain people under their local chiefs remained unruly. But notably the remote province of Khurāsān, though revolts were not rare, and notwithstanding the continuous tribal feuds of the Arabs, remained under firm government control, owing to the presence of the strong garrison at Marw, where the governor resided, and in a not less degree to the successes of the Muslims in Transoxiana under Kūtāibā.

This makes comprehensible why the anti-Umayyad propaganda, directed by the Abū Ḥāṣāsīd in Syria, chose Khurāsān as the field of operation for their
emissaries. Making use of the animosity between the Arab tribes and of the general dissatisfaction with the existing rule, this propaganda resulted finally in the revolt of Abî Muslim in 747 and his victorious entrance into Marw and soon afterwards into Naṣīrābād. So it was to the Arab legions in Persia and their Persian helpers that the 'Abbâsîds owed their final victory in 750. This, of course, brought about a completely new orientation of Persia within the empire of the new dynasty, the more so as the 'Abbâsîds transferred their residence to 'Iṣâk, where the centre of the last national Persian dynasty was formerly situated. Persian attitude to life and Persian tradition became dominant in the new centre of Arab political power and soon of Islamic civilization in the newly founded Bagdad (762). A symptom of this Persian cultural influence is the translation into Arabic of products of Pehlevi literature by authors like Ibn al-Muqaffâ. Further, powerful families of Persian origin, gained as the Barmakids, and afterwards the Banû Nawbakht, such influence as viziers on the affairs of state. This was also the time when the racial sentiment of the Persians began to assert itself in the Shia 'Ithâya movement and when the manifestations of the Persian simîds aroused the anxiety of religious circles. The caliphs themselves showed more interest in their Persian provinces than the Umayyads had ever done; they were moreover compelled to do so, as events had shown what a powerful commander might be able to undertake against the central authority. In the south-western provinces — al-Djâdîl, Khûstân and Fâris — revolts of this kind were not so to be feared, but farther away and in the mountains authority could only be maintained by repeated expeditions. So when the governor of Khûsrâûn showed signs of disloyalty, the caliph al-Manûsîr sent his son al-Mahdî with the general Khâzûzman to restore order and afterwards to subjugate a local dynasty in Tabaristan. Then al-Mahdî took up his residence in al-Raiy until his accession. Hijrân al-Râshîd undertook himself at the end of his life an expedition against Khûrsân and Transoxiana, during which he died at Tîb (809). His son al-Ma'mûn, who had accompanied him, remained in Khûsrâûn, even after he had become caliph (813), until 817. During this time happened the episode of the inâm 'Alî al-Râfiq [q.v.]. In the same early 'Abbâsid period the attitude of the Persian population towards Islam had changed in so far as notably the revolt of Abî Muslim had induced many Persians of the better class (the akîbâns) to become Muslims, but at the same time the lower classes were able to outstrip the religious fanaticism, in which Islamic and pre-Islamic views were untimbered. In Khûsrâûn a number of "false prophets" made their appearance: Shânshâh the Maqâlî (754—755), 'Omadîs (766—768), Ya'ûsîf al-Barmî, al-Muqâmannâ (777—789). To the same kind of religious movements belonged the prolonged rebellion of the Khurramites under Bâbak (816—838) in Adharbâjdân. The caliphs were justifiably in repressing these movements with great severity, because they were generally accompanied by aspirations towards political independence. The revolt of the 'Abbâsîs b. 'Abd Allah in Fâsil in 793 showed likewise that it was already possible to operate in Persia with I-manic devices, and for this reason the caliph Harûn had to proceed with much circumspection in its repression.

Under al-Ma'mûn the political loosening of Khûsrâûn and neighbouring provinces from the 'Abbâsîd caliphate, not by the action of the ancient Persian nobles or princes, nor by the popular movements already described, nor by Khûrâbidite or 'Abbâsîd propaganda, but by the action of Persian-Muhammadan governors not of ancient noble lineage, but nevertheless animated by national feelings, preparing in this way the Persian-Muhammadan political and cultural renaissance. TIâhir b. al-Husûn, general of al-Ma'mûn, was appointed in 820 governor of Khûsrâûn. His descendants, the Tâhirîs, were nominally governors of the caliphs, but the latter had to leave to them an almost independent authority over Khûsrâûn with the regions to the east as far as the Indus and to the west as far as al-Raiy. Those regions never came back under the caliphs' full authority, for the Tâhirîs lost their power and their territory in 873 in the struggle against the Sa'dîrs, a dynasty of still less noble descent, who in 867 had begun to make themselves masters of Sîstân under Ya'ûsîf b. al-Hâlî and his two brothers. Their territory comprised for some time Khûsrâûn with the regions of Kâbul and al-Raghîbîkhdj — where the 'Abbâsîd power had never been well established — and even Kîrmân and Fâris, but the position of the Sa'dîrs as leading power in Persia soon came to an end, when they were beaten in 879 in Kûsrâûn in their endeavour to attack the caliph in Bagdad. The cultural and religious position of the Sa'dîrs is not well known, but their exploits remained famous in Persia long after their extinction. During the same period the caliphs had to suffer the establishment of other more or less independent dynasties, such as the Dulafrîs in al-Karâfî in the southern part of Media (842—897), and the Rudainî family in Adharbâjdân. Far more important is the rise of the Zâma'îd dynasty in Khûsrâûn and Transoxiana. This dynasty originated in Khûsrâûn; they had been at first faithful servants of the Tâhirîs and occupied already a powerful position in Transoxiana when the troubles in Khûsrâûn, after the fall of the Tâhirî power, enabled them to establish their power in Khûsrâûn in 892, under the nominal suzerainty of Bagdad. Under Ya'ûsîf b. Ahmad (913—943) they governed also in Sîstân, Kîrmân, Luvagjînîn, al-Raiy and Tabaristan. The immense cultural importance of this dynasty for Persia lies in the fact that a revived national but Islamized Persian spirit found an opportunity to develop itself in Khûsrâûn, as is revealed to us by the beginnings of the New Persian Islamic literature [cf. infra. ill.]. This development certainly goes back at least as far as the time of al-Ma'mûn. The Zâma'îds re-sided in Transoxiana and had Khûsrâûn governed by governors, so that it was not the native mass of their brilliant court alone which formed the Persian branch of the Islamic culture; this was due rather to the general prosperity which began to reign and which brought into existence a class of wealthy landowners who were able to patronize literary and scientific activity, for Arabic literature also began to flourish in Khûsrâûn (al-Palîkî and others). It is further noteworthy that the Persian renaissance did not take place in the traditional centres of Persian, Fâris and Adharbâjdân, where about this time the ancient conditions had not much changed, but rather in a (culturally speaking) new country, where new forms could more easily come into existence.

In western Iran the manifestation of the Pe-
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The 18th century witnessed the rise of the Turks in Persia. Turkish troops had already formed large contingents in the armies of the governors and princes who disputed with each other parts of Iranian soil, not excluding the mountain-eaters who needed horsemen alongside their local foot-soldiers. It is true that already in Sāmānīs times sections of Turkish tribes had been established south of Dījān in Ṭukhārjān, but the main role of the Turks in Persia had always been that of soldiers and military commanders in the service of local governors and princes. In the Sāmānī state seven Turks had risen to high military and administrative functions, and, as the military power of the Sāmānīs began to weaken, these Turkish commanders aspired to political leadership, relying on their Turkish troops and using their natural capacity for military organisation. In this way the Turkish vassal of the Sāmānīs, Subuktānī, founded his independence in the newly conquered region of Ghaznā and Kābul, where until then local Hindu rulers had been able to maintain themselves; his power soon became a menace to the Sāmānīs themselves, who, in Transoxiana, were continually losing ground to the Turkish ilkhanīs. Subuktānī had been Samanid governor in Khurāsān, and it was after his death (997) that his son Mahmūd of Ghaznā (997-1030) took the opportunity of establishing an independent power in Khurāsān, choosing Balkh for his capital at the outset. He extended his sway in Persia over Sīstān and as far as eastern Media, while his conquests in India and Transoxiana gave a strong backing to the consolidation of his power in Iran. Mahmūd had asked the caliph for a diploma of investiture and was noted as a champion of Sunnism. Under his reign the new cultural Persian-Islamic tradition of the Sāmānīs was continued; his court was a centre of Persian court poets and whatever his personal relations with Firdawīs may have been, they show at any rate that his states offered congenial soil for the renaissance of Persian cultural traditions. The name of al-Birūnī is sufficient to show also that the noblest and highest form of Islamic scholarship could flourish under his reign. And his immense popularity in later Persian Sufi poetry has made this Turkish ruler a cultural hero. The final islamisation of the Kābul country was the work of the Ghaznavids. In western Iran in the meantime, the later Būyids were able to maintain themselves with less brilliance; apart from the Ghaznavids they were seriously weakened in Fāris by the Shābānī Kursis in the first half of the 13th century. Yet conditions did not hinder the prosperity of Persian literature and science (Avicenna).

The rise of the Ghaznavids was only the prelude to the Turkish invasion under the house of Seljuq, by which the Seljuq rule became established in Persia and beyond. This time the Turks, mostly called Ghuzz, had begun, since 1029, to migrate into eastern and northern Persia, in spite of the opposing measures of the Sāmānīs and the Ghaznavids. Within seventeen years from his first appearance in Khurāsān (1058), their leader Taghri Bek had overrun the whole north of Persia, and made his entrance into Baghad (1055).
At the same time the power of the remaining Ziyārids and of the different Būyids dynasties was entirely crushed; the Iranian possessions of the Ghaznavid power were considerably reduced, and thus nearly the whole of Persia was united again under the Turkic dynasty of the Seljukids, whose members divided amongst them the different provinces: Khorasan, Sistan with Herat, Kirmān, Fāris, and Adharbājjan. Tughrī Bek fixed his residence at Rayy, he and his successors being called the Great Seljuks, in contrast to the minor Seljuq dynasties. The last Great Seljuk, Sandjar (1117–1157), though an able ruler, was real master only in Khorāsan and had already to face new factors in Persia, which, after his death, brought about a political disintegration that could only be arrested by the Mongol conquest.

The Turkish invasion, which brought nomadic Turks into nearly all parts of Persia, where they found conditions suited to their mode of life, and which in many regards may be compared with the Arab invasion, did not make of Persia a Turkish country, as was the case with Transoxiana, although the period was the last position only of Adharbājjan. The young Persian cultural revival had gathered enough vital force to assimilate the ruling Turkish elements, and this to such a degree that, until the xiii. century, the Seljukids continued to spread Persian culture in Asia Minor. The nomadic Ghuzz did not find the opportunity, as elsewhere, to assert themselves otherwise than as a very turbulent element, which in the xiii. century became threatening even to the Seljukids themselves. The influence of their certainly not very orthodox Islamic religious views on the religious history of Persia has certainly not a little contributed to the spreading of Shi'ite ideas. The Seljukids themselves continued the tradition of the Samanids and Ghaznavids by becoming champions of Sunnism. The minister Nizām al-Mulk is an outstanding figure among the many personalities of Persian descent who were the pillars of the political, religious and literary currents of the time. Under his patronage worked al-Ghazzāl, the scene of whose later activity was Nishāpūr in Khorāsan. Persia had acquired at this time an importance as a seat of Islamic culture equal to that of Iraq and other parts of the Islamic world. The theological colleges founded by Nizām al-Mulk (Baghdad and Nishāpūr) were the crowning work of the Sunni Islamic civilisation, but involved at the same time a consolidation by which religious and cultural ideals were fixed and anchored for the centuries to come. The early Seljuk period shows also a continuation of the best of Muhammadan scientific activity in Persia, for which we have to quote only Umarî Khâsîyân.

Western Persia, however, asserted her non-Sunnite tradition by the Ismā'îlī propaganda which resulted in the capture of the stronghold of Alamut near Kazwin by Ḥasan-i Sabbāh in 1091. The sources of this propaganda were in the East (Nāṣir-i Khurasaw) and the West (Egypt) alike, but its real political effects were concentrated, as far as Persia is concerned, in al-Djibal, Fāris and Khorāsān and, in a lesser degree, in the east in Kūbatān, where about the same time a number of fortresses were acquired by the Ismā'îlīites. Ḥasan-i Sabbāh and his successors became a political power in western Iran, especially in al-Djibal, against which the Seljuqids were more and more powerless, and which was crushed only by the Mongol invasion.

The Seljuqids had established in their dominions a system of hereditary military fiefs (kāhā) with the object of being able to dispose of an army commanded by reliable chiefs. The consequence of this system was the loosening of the central power which was supplanted in course of time by a number of independent military governors, who are known in history as atabeks. On Persian soil the chief Atabek dynasties were those of Adharbājjan (since 1146), of Luristan (since 1148), of Vazd (since 1170), and the Atabek dynasty of the Salghairids in Fāris (since 1373), who annexed also Kirmān after the extinction of the ruling Seljuqids of Kirmān. In the southern parts of Fāris and Kirmān the Shābânkara continued their irregular authority. In Khorāsan the Seljuqids were eclipsed after Sandjar's death by the Khwārizmshāhs, and simultaneously these rose into prominence the Ghūrid dynasty, originating in the mountains of al-Ghor and al-Dīwar. It was the Ghūrids who, by taking Ghazna in 1144, put an end to the Ghaznavid rule in Persia, and made Khurasan, the country of Būz, and to the north, Bâṃyān and eastern Khorāsan. Later on they too lost the greater part of their possessions to the Khwārizmshāhs. Sometimes the Ghūrids were allied with the wandering Ghuzz, and sometimes they fought the latter; on the whole the devastations wrought by the Ghūrids and their temporary allies mark the beginning of the cultural decline in north-eastern Iran.

This decline was hastened by the Mongol invasions. After the Khwārizmshāh Muhammad had come into conflict with Cingiz Khān (1218), the Mongols first took possession of his lands in Transoxiana, of which their appearance in Khorāsan was the political and military consequence. In the campaign of 1220–1221 the Mongol general Lējje and Subutai conquered Khorāsan and the northern part of western Persia as far as Adharbājjan, driving the Khwārizmshāh Muhammad to the island of Abiskān in the Caspian, where he died, and forcing his son Djalāl al-Dīn to cross the Indus. The great towns of Khorāsan were devastated in a way that made it impossible for them to recover their ancient splendour; the population must have been considerably reduced by the wholesale massacres, and the works of art and literature were destroyed. The conquered cities were immediately placed under Mongol administration; where the population revolted, as in Hamadān, there followed a pitiless massacre. The conquered territories were annexed to the part of the Mongol empire given to Chaghatāi. Southern Persia was spared for the moment; in Kirmān the Mongol emissary Burāk Hādji founded in 1224 an almost independent state. Soon afterwards Djalāl al-Dīn reappeared from India to make his turbulent way to Adharbājjan and Armenia without being able to drive out the Mongols. Then, in 1256, came the second invasion of Mongol armies under Hūlagū, brother of the reigning Khān Mangu. This expedition had been carefully prepared and was directed against the Ismā'īlī heretics in Persia and against the caliphate in Baghdad, which was exterminated in 1258. Whatever the real political and religious motives for the expedition of Hūlagū, the friend of the Christians, may have been, its results were of immense consequence for eastern Islam in general.
Persia was entirely subdued and came to form the greater part of the dominions of the non-Islamic Mongol dynasty of the Ilkhan, who resided most of the time in Adharbājīan (after 1306 in Sīfānīya). By the end of the fourteenth century the smaller existing dynasties, such as the Salgharid abebeck of Fāris and the Khūlgh Khāns of Kūmān were also extinguished.

By the terrible devastations in Khūrāsān these regions ceased to be a hearth of national Persian Islamic culture and this role now was taken over by the west. At the same time these political events had loosened the ties with the western Islamic centres which at the time were wholly absorbed by the action against the Crusaders. Moreover by the extermination of the Ismāʿīlī power and the uncertain attitude of the Ilkhan towards Islam and its different aspects, Persian Islam passed in this period through a profound crisis, and many conflicting currents were at work. In this period lived in Ardabil the Shāikh Safi al-Dīn (1252—1334), the ancestor of the Safawī dynasty. Still the Persian national character maintained itself and assimilated the many new foreign elements, mostly Turkish, so far as these were capable of advance to a higher cultural level. Great Persian poets (Ṣaʿdi) flourished, and the Ilkhanīs showed an interest in the achievements of Islamic science (Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭāṣkī; and literature (Raṣūl al-Dīn). During the Ilkhan period (1255—1337) Persia was considered by the European Christian powers as their ally against Egypt, now the chief champion of Islam in the west. But although the political opposition between the Ilkhan empire and western Islam became a living reality, any attempt to organize and propagate Christianity in Persia by the institution of bishoprics was fruitless. Persia was opened, however, to closer contact with the European world than ever had been the case in Islamic times, not so much by the series of well-known travellers who passed through Persia on their way to the centre of the Mongolian Empire, as through the establishing of commercial settlements by the Italian republics in Adharbājīan, for the overland commerce from their establishments on the Black Sea (Trebizond) through Armenia and Persia to Central Asia.

After the death of Abū Saʿīd (1335) the dynasty of the Ilkhanīs came to an end in the quarrels between the Djalāʿīr and Cūbān families. Abū Saʿīd had already had great difficulty in maintaining the unity of his state, especially in his struggle against the influential amir Cūbān. Further the latter Ilkhanīs had already had to suffer the existence of semi-independent dynasties, such as the Kūrt dynasty at Herāt, the only large town in Khūrāsān that had escaped Mongol devastation. Other powerful commanders, who had served the Ilkhanīs, found during the troubles after Abū Saʿīd’s death opportunity to aspire to political independence; the most successful were the Meshafarīdīs of Fāris and Kīrmān, a dynasty of Arab extraction, who from about 1340 until their destruction by Timūr in 1392 held sway in southern Persia and for sometime as far as Persian Ibrāhīm (al-Dībālī) and Adharbājīan. Further Adharbājīan was now in the power of the Khān of the Golden Horde and now in that of the Djalāʿīr dynasty of Baghdad. Eastern Persia was mainly divided between the Kūrt dynasty of Herāt already mentioned and the Serbēdīr clan who had their centre in Schenzewar.

In these chaotic times, when the authority of political power was waning, the more popular and, in a way, democratic elements in Persia, gained more opportunity of asserting themselves, as may be seen from the rather independent way in which the citizens of different towns treated the quarrelling rulers. This self-assertion of democratic elements is also to be observed in Asia Minor, but on the culturally more fertilized soil of western Iran, it bore the fruit of a brilliant literary development in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which at first sight may seem astonishing in such unfavourable political surroundings. This development was accompanied by an intensification of the religious currents that were at work among the population, where it was strongly influenced by the lower forms of Suʿūṣī as propagated by derwishes. In the case of the Serbēdīr in Khūrāsān the derwish activity had even political consequences and here also is a striking parallel with conditions in Asia Minor. Higher Suʿūṣī was confined to the upper classes and expressed itself in literature, by which we are able to follow the different trends of thought. From the poems of Ḥāfiz we learn that the Shīʿa creed of the taqī al-din ʿAlī al-Ridā in Meḥdī had become an object of national veneration.

At the end of the fourteenth century followed a fearful political reaction in the conquest of Persia by Timūr Lang, another foreign intervention which for the last time held up the development of a national state in Persia. Timūr, after conquering for himself an empire in Central Asia, founded on his descent from Čingiz Khān a claim to the domination of Persia. In 1370 he had already conquered Balkh; in 1380 he subdued Khūrāsān, Sīstān and Māzandarān, and in 1383—1384 he completed the conquest by taking Adharbājīan, Persian Ibrāhīm, and finally Fāris by exterminating the dynasty of the Meshafarīdīs (1392). The Serbēdīr had already been swept away and in 1389 disappeared the Kūrt dynasty at Herāt. The most bloody event during this conquest was the sack of Iṣfahān in 1387. Timūr never resided for long in Persia, but confined its government to some of his trusted men, notably Shāhrukh, who became king in Khūrāsān and Sīstān as early as 1397. In Adharbājīan reigned Mīrānshāh, not altogether to the satisfaction of his father. After Timūr’s death (1405) the political unity of the empire was on the whole preserved under Shāhrukh (d. 1447), who sought to repair much of the devastation wrought by his father’s campaigns. Shāhrukh still recognized nominally as his suzerain the emperor of China. After his death different descendants of Timūr, the Temurids, disputed with each other parts of Persia, while after 1450 the dynasties of the Kūram Koyunlu emerged from the west to dominate large parts of Persia. The best known Timurid in Persia was Sultan Husain Bājrā, who ruled from his capital Herāt over Khūrāsān, Sīstān and Hūsain Bājrā from 1468 to 1506.

Timūr’s reign in Persia meant also a Sunni reaction, but in western and middle Persia this reaction was not lasting. Among the many heterodox religious manifestations of this time is the appearance of the Huṭuṭī sect, one of whose adherents tried to murder Shāhrukh in Herāt in 1426. This religious movement was suppressed by the government, but it had, like similar currents,
strong connections towards the west, through Adharbājān into Asia Minor, where at this time the Sunni power of the Ottomans was re-establishing and strengthening itself to oppose the heterodox influence emanating from Persia. Mean-while Persian cultural life continued to manifest itself in the important literature produced in western Persia, while also in the Caucasian countries and Maḩammadan India Persian cultural and literary influence was reaching its climax. This was not the case in Khurāsān: here, in the intellectual centre of Herāt, developed at this time the eastern Turkīsch Caghatay literature, promoted by ʿAlī Shīr Nāwī at Bāburin Baḵtār’s court at Herāt. Although the Persian-Islamic tradition continued its influence in these regions, eastern Persia begins to be culturally separated from the west under influence of the Turkish and local elements; a development similar to that witnessed at the same time in Asia Minor and the regions of Arabic tongue in Mesopotamia and Irāq.

The events that preceded the rise of the Safawī dynasty have Adharbājān as their chief scene of action. It was in Adharbājān that ʿAlī Shīr Nāwī, the son of Khūnaīn Bābur, had begun his career by taking Tabrīz in 1406, and that his successors had the centre of their empire, which, under Djiāhadvāštīr (1435—1467), extended over nearly all western Persia and in the east as far as Herāt. And it was through Adharbājān that ʿUzzān Ḥasan of the Aḵ Koyunlu penetrated Persia, after his victory over Djiāhadvāštīr in 1467. Then he defeated the last Timūrid Aḥmād Ṣafī and became master of western Persia, inaugurating in the meantime the series of wars with the Ottoman Turks, that were to last for three centuries. The successors of ʿUzzān Ḥasan had already come into conflict with the Safawī leaders, Shīh Ḥādīr and Ṣafī ʿAlī, who about this time had acquired enormous influence in Adharbājān and Asia Minor. The Safawī movement began indeed in a much more democratic way than the preceding dynasties. Its chief adherents belonged to seven tribal groups of Turkish origin, amongst whom Shīʿite convictions had been spread by means of Sūfī propaganda methods. This ever-increasing flock acquired at this time the celebrated nickname of Kīlī-Baḵsh. Thus their political rising under Shīh ʿĪsā ʿAlī was again a reaction against the official orthodoxy of the ruling classes, a reaction in which it was not difficult to enlist the Persian town population of western Iran, since olden times ready to accept non-official and unorthodox religious views, by which at the same time they showed their dislike for foreign rule. These different elements gave a Persian “national” character to the Safawī dynasty; although their leaders were Turks from turcized Adharbājān. Shīh ʿĪsā ʿAlī, emerging from his hiding place in Fīzādīn, gained his first success in the Caucasus against the king of Shirvān, and this made him strong enough to turn his arms against the last ruler of the Aḵ Koyunlu, whom he defeated in the battle of ShāHR (1501). By 1530 he was master of western Persia and in addition of Armenia, Mesopotamia and Irāq (Baghdād taken in 1508) with the holy tombs of the imāms in Nādījāf and Karkhābād. He then turned to eastern Persia, where a new invasion from Transoxania was threatening, after the death of Sultan Husain Baḵtār at Herāt (1506), by the rise of the Uzbek power under Shāhi Khān. The latter had already invaded Khurāsān, and had not been defeated and killed in the battle of Marw (1510) by Shīh Ṣaydī, Persia might have experienced a fourth wave of conquest from Central Asia. Then followed in 1514 the famous battle of Cāldirān; the defeat suffered here by Shīh Ṣaydī from the army of Sūrūr I showed where the political frontiers of the Safawīs were henceforward to lie; the wave of sympathy that had spread west from Adharbājān far into Asia Minor was ruthlessly suppressed by the Ottoman Sultans and Cāldirān showed that any political extension of Persia in this direction was impossible.

Thus the important events of ʿĪsā ʿAlī’s career determined the field of action of the Safawī dynasty, which was to last until 1736. Religious and cultural traditions and geographical necessity gave this dynasty the character of a “national” dynasty, and the long period of its existence, together with the religious isolation of their empire, contributed not a little to the coming into existence of a real Persian “nation”, that overcame the troublesome period of the xviiith century and asserted itself ever more vigorously during the xixth. The nature of the country, however, was not favourable to a rapid development in this direction. The many nomadic elements of Irānīan, Turkish and Arab origin kept much longer to their own traditions, and the disconnectedness of the various inhabited centres could not but weaken the authority of the government. Throughout Safawī rule, the kings had to reconcile with the existence of half independent governors and tribal formations, from which came the powerful nobles and courtiers. In the time of Abū Shīrāz, some Georgian nobles, relatives of the king, were in a dominant position, but on the whole it was the Kīlī-Baḵsh clans who formed at times a dangerous power in the state, while nevertheless the kings were dependent on these elements for the defence of the country. It was only during the reign of ʿAbbās I that something of a royal militia (the Shīhek-sewārī) was formed, while on the other hand the army was reinforced by European artillery. Therefore the civil and military administration of the country never acquired even such a regularity and a cohesion as is witnessed in the Ottoman Empire; the Safawīs had to suffer for instance the permanent establishment of the Portuguese in Hormuz (1507—1622) and afterwards of the English, but this did not yet conflict with the state conceptions of that time. Governmental authority could only be maintained in the interior by the utmost severity, as was practised notably by ʿAbbās I. For the same reason the frontiers of the Safawī empire in east and west were never very stable, although gradually a demarcation takes place. The eastern part of Khurāsān and the regions to the south of it, long since culturally disconnected from western Persia, never returned to the Safawīs. Balkh and Marw were under the almost unbroken domination of the Uzbek (ʿAbbās I only temporarily occupied Balkh in 1598), while Kābul and Kandahār belonged from the beginning to the empire of the Great-Mughals of India, Kandahār being only temporarily held by the Safawīs. Only Herāt was for most of the time under their control and far into the xixth century Persia had not abandoned her claim to this town. All this makes clear why eastern Iran, after the extinction of the Uzbek and the Mughal power did not return to Shīʿite Persia, but came to form at last an independent state
under the Afghan rulers. Only western Khurāsān, with the shrine of Meshhed, and Sistān remained an integral part of Sa'āfawid and consequently of modern Persia. In the west the Ottoman Turks and the Persians disputed with each other in a continual series of campaigns, interrupted by temporary peace, the large band of territory stretching from the Persian Gulf to Georgia. In the xvth century the Turks won and occupied Adharbājdān, Mesopotamia and 'Irāq. Under Abbas I most of the lost territory was recovered, but the recapture of Baghdād by Murād IV in 1638 made an end of Persian domination in the Tigris valley, while Adharbājdān and parts of Armenia and Georgia remained to Persia. In 1668 took place the first conflict with Russia through a descent of Cossacks upon Māzanlārān.

Since the beginning of Ismā'īl's career the Shi'i creed had been forcibly imposed on the settled population and a regular persecution of all Sunnite theologians had begun. This persecution was accompanied by a repression of all Şûh manifestations, whereby the new state religion took at last the aspect of a fanatical and intolerant church, whose ministers, the Shi'i divines, repressed all utterances of free thought. Browne ascribes to this development the sudden poorness of literary production in Sa'afawid Persia. In these circumstances Persia became much isolated from the surrounding Islamic countries, but on the other hand the enemies of the Ottoman power in Europe looked upon Persia as a valuable ally in their common efforts to crush that power. To this was due the forming of friendly diplomatic connections with European powers, such as Venice and Spain, who, in addition, sought to profit by commercial relations. These relations, together with the political necessity of securing their colonial establishments in India and beyond, led other European states also to take up friendly relations with the Sa'afawid court, namely the English, the Dutch and the French, after the Portuguese had been driven from the Persian Gulf. The European envoys, amongst whom the Sherley brothers are most notable during 'Abbas I's reign, were well received, and established the first real contact between Persia and European civilisation. These relations also provoked the sending of some memorable Persian embassies to Europe. The political reasons that had brought the European sea powers to the Persian Gulf prevented Persia, however, from ever becoming a maritime power; even the venture of 'Abbas I to make of the newly founded Bender 'Abbas a great maritime commercial town remained unrealized.

Most of the Sa'afawid kings had very long reigns, for which the uncommon practice of killing possible pretenders amongst the royal family was probably responsible. The most brilliant reign was that of 'Abbas I (1587–1629), who transferred his residence from Karāwin to Isfahān, which, by his buildings, became a splendid royal city. His successors profited by his work. After the middle of the xvth century Persia was passing through a peaceful period, owing mainly to the weakening of its neighbours. Conditions at this time are well known by a series of European travel accounts. The same peaceful conditions had allowed, however, the establishment at Kandahār in 1709 of a Sunni rebellious movement, which was opposed in vain by the Sa'afawid king Husain and was the beginning of the Afghan state. In 1722 the Afghan army of Mir Mahmūd conquered Isfahān, after which the Afghans were masters in Persia for about eight years. At last the Sa'afawid successors of Husain were able to liberate the country through the help of their general Nādir Kuli of the Afshar tribe who, in 1736, made himself king of Persia as Nādir Shāh. At that time he had already restored to Persia the cities in Adharbājdān and Georgia that had been taken by the Turks and likewise Rašt and Bākū, occupied by Russia. After his coronation he set out on his invasion of India and the Afghan country, but his reign had brought so little stability that, after his murder in 1747, there followed a period of general lawlessness in Persia. The Afghans regained strength, but allowed Nādir's blinded grandson Shāhshūkh to reign over Khurāsān. The fall of Nādir Shāh to establish a lasting dynasty was also due to his endeavours to abolish the Shi'i religious practices, but in this he met a determined opposition from the people and their spiritual leaders. After Nādir's assassination there was hardly any question of restoring a Sa'afawid to the throne. The real power devolved on Karim Khan Zand, who resided mostly in Shīrāz and who succeeded in uniting Persia during a benevolent reign; in his time the troubles on the 'Irākian frontier led even to the conquest of Baṣra. His death in 1779 occasioned a dispute for the throne among his descendants. Agha Muhammad Khan of the Kājār tribe round Astārābād profited from these troubles by bringing with much cunning and much cruelty the entire empire under his control. He was finally enthroned in Tehran in 1796 and was assassinated in 1797. With him began the Kājār dynasty, which reigned until 1925.

At the beginning of Afghan rule Russia had occupied Derbend and Rašt, while Turkey had invaded the country as far as Hamadān; the Afghan ruler Aṣḥāf, however, and after him Nādir Shāh succeeded in recovering the occupied territories. A second Turkish attack in 1740 was equally thrown back by Nādir. During the second half of the century Russia and Turkey were too much occupied with each other to pay attention to Persia. The political development in the north-east had eliminated direct danger from the Uzbek states, but now the lawless Turcomans north of Khurāsān had become by their raids the terror of the Persian population; Agha Muhammad Khan had inflicted serious blows upon them. With the coming of the Kājārs, however, the international situation grew much more difficult, owing to Persia's becoming involved in world-wide political struggles. Until 1814 the alliance of Persia was an object of dispute between England, whose position in India made Persian friendship a vital question, and the France of Napoléon, who schemed an invasion of India with the aid of the Russian army. In 1814 the French threat disappeared and England concluded a treaty with Persia. But the struggle with Russia for the possession of Georgia, which had begun already in 1812, soon led to military disasters and finally to the loss of all territory to the north of the Araxes by the peace treaty of Turkmānchāri (1828). From this time on begins the rivalry between Russia and England, the latter country's policy being to prevent Persia, now politically under strong Russian influence, from gaining strength. Great Britain opposed for this reason any extension of Persian territory in
Afghanistán; it prevented the capture of Herât—a cherished Persian ideal—in 1838, and, when Herât was really taken in 1856, went even so far as to declare war on Persia and to land troops in the Persian Gulf; at the peace treaty of 1857 in Paris, Persia had to abandon her claims. In the meantime Russia’s position grew ever stronger; a Russian naval base was founded in the bay of Astrakán, and by the Russian conquest of Khiva and Bukhârâ, completed by the subjugation of the Tekke Turkomans in 1858, and the acquisition of the Mârvar oasis, the Russian Empire had attained an enormous military and political ascendency over Persia, to which was added the Russian influence in northern Afghanistán and Turkish Armenia. Persia was not able to assert entirely its political freedom, but it gained for the first time well-defined frontiers; difficulties with Turkey in Trâk (massacre of Persians at Kerbelâ) had led to the fixing of the Turkish-Persian frontier in 1843 (followed by a rectification in 1913), while the eastern frontiers with Afghanistán and Balûtân were defined by the Anglo-Persian Afghan boundary commission in 1872; these measures had been mainly necessitated by the establishing of a telegraph line through Persia to India. During the long reign of Nasîr al-Dîn Shâh (1844–1890) international conditions remained stable, to which the on the whole untroubled domestic situation also contributed, but when, under his successor, conditions became less secure, owing to inner political and financial troubles, the intervention of the two great Powers became more threatening. It took the shape of the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1907, which practically divided Persia into a northern and a southern sphere of influence.

During the sixteenth century indeed the Kadjar dynasty had been able to rule Persia in the traditional way, succeeding in checking the action of the troublesome tribes and their chiefs by profiting from their eternal discord. The influence of the higher Shi'ite religious leaders, over whose nomination the government had no authority whatever, and who resided for the greater part in the religious centres of Kerbelâ and Nadjaf, was supreme among the population, although some divergent theological trends had developed, such as the Shaikh's, since the beginning of the sixteenth century. This more spiritualized sect finally paved the way for the appearance of the Báb in 1844; the Bábí movement for some years took the aspect of a religious-political rebellion, which the government had to suppress with bloody measures. Since then Bábism and afterwards the movement of the Bahâ'ís to which it gave rise, disappeared from the surface, but remained all the time a living factor in the national-religious life of the Persians. This contributed not a little to the awakening of a more independent political attitude among the more educated classes of the population, who generally found the higher divines a hindrance in their increasing criticism of government actions. The pan-Islamic propaganda of Djamâl al-Dîn al-Afghânî also furnished elements to the awakening public opinion. Thus the bad inner conditions that had developed under Muzzafar al-Dîn Shâh and the consequences of the foreign loans contracted by that ruler brought about a popular action that led to the granting of a constitution and the opening of the first National Assembly (Majdilis) in October 1906. The succeeding Shâh's reactionary policy ended with his dethronement in 1909, but the troubles connected with the accompanying revolutionary movement gave opportunity to the Russians to occupy Tabrîz and Ìâzvin, while at the same time the Persian government was obliged to use foreigners in different branches of its administration (gendarmerie, finances, customs). During the world war Persia was officially neutral, but the German scheme of attacking Great Britain in India gave rise to an at first successful German propaganda in Southern Persia in 1915. On the other hand Russian troops were landed at Enzeli and these opposed the Turkish advance into Persia, which had begun in 1916 by the taking of Kirmanshâh. In this same year began the British counter-action in Southern Persia by the formation of the South Persian Rifles. When by the Russian revolution the action of the Russian troops was crippled, British troops landed in the Gulf and succeeded in checking the Turkish advance in the western frontier region and inpressing, together with Russian troops, the local opposition of the Jangalis in Gilân. Finally in 1918 the British had great difficulty in opposing a similar national rising in Shirâz, headed by the Kadîکî tribe.

Persia was evacuated after the war and became from the outset a member of the League of Nations. A treaty with Great Britain in 1921 re-established British influence, but the coup d'état of that same year suddenly changed Persia's internal and external policy. Saiyid Diyi' al-Dîn and Rúh Kháñ assuming forcibly the leadership of the government, Rúh Kháñ became minister of war and proved to be the strong man needed. His chief achievement during the following years was the subjugation and disarmament of the turbulent tribes, and the forming of a reliable army of 40,000 men. In 1923 he became Prime Minister, Ahmad Shâh Kadîjâr left the country and was deposed in October 1925 by the Majdilis, whereby the Kadjar dynasty was brought to an end. At the end of the same year the scruples of many sections of the population against a new dynasty were dispelled and the dictator became king of Persia under the name Pahlâvi; he was crowned on April 25, 1926.

Persia's internal situation has been much improved by the action of the present king, while the exploitation of the oil wells in 'Arabistân has secured the government a profit that has not a little contributed to its financial liberty of action. The finances have been moreover controlled by an American adviser since 1923 and since 1928 by a German adviser. As to the currents of spiritual culture, the intellectual classes are abandoning the traditional religious views and this secular movement is favoured by the government; in connection therewith the influence of the divines is declining. On the other hand, the interest awakened towards the end of the sixteenth century for pre-Islamic Persia has given a new direction to national sentiment, expressing itself amongst others in literary occupation with ancient Iranian subjects and a great interest in excavations, the results of which are no longer allowed to leave the country.

The present ethnographical structure of Persia is quite different from what it was before the Arab conquest, owing to the repeated invasion of foreign elements during the thirteen centuries of its Islamic history. The combined existence of a sedentary and a nomadic or semi-nomadic population, however, is a feature proper to the geographical conditions of the country and has continued up to the present
The general tendency of the nomadic elements to become settled, which can be observed all the time, was repeatedly counteracted by fresh invasions of nomads, chiefly from the north-east. At present the proportion of the nomads to the settled population is estimated to be 20%. The development of urban settlement is a feature proper to Islamic times; it began with the expansion of the population outside the walls into the 
*rabaqs* (cf. al-Baladhuri, p. 324). From that time on the Persian name for a town became *zahr*, which word had designated originally an entire region or country. The Arabs often placed their garrisons in less important places, which subsequently overshadowed the ancient centres. In the course of history many towns were devastated, but the generally rebuilt or near the spot of the ancient ruins. Since the later Middle Ages great Islamic towns like al-Raiy and the towns of Kirmān have disappeared, to be replaced by formerly less significant places; among the latter are Teherān, Tabriz and Mašhad, at present the largest towns of Persia. The townspeople, composed of craftsmen and merchants, have been in history the passive and suffering element, together with the rural population of the villages clustered together in the oases. This settled population was generally regarded with scorn by the tribesmen, who were the aristocrats, and from whom until modern times were recruited the ruling classes and the high officials. From the tribes have also been recruited the best soldiers in the armies.

At present the largest towns in Persia are Teherān (210,000 inh.), Tabriz (200,000), Isfahān (90,000) and Mašhad (70,000). The towns population has been constituted in the course of centuries from the very different invading ethnic elements. They now constitute the most stable element in Persia and speak, with local dialectic variations, the New-Persian language, which runs more or less parallel with the written New Persian. Only in Adhārbaījān Adhārī Turkish is the language of the townsfolk and the peasants.

The rural population of the villages around the towns have kept many particular local features of their own and amongst them many remnants of other Iranian dialectal groups have been preserved, a fact which is already noted in ancient Islamic historical and geographical sources. In north-eastern Persia the different dialectal groups of these peasants are called Tāt, while in southern and eastern Persia they are often designated as Tādžīk.

Among the rural population, however, and in a less degree amongst the townsfolk, there are many elements that are conscious of their allegiance to tribal formations, mostly so in regions where the population of the neighbourhood still possesses the tribal organisation. These settled members of the tribes are often called *zahr-nishīn, dīn-nishīn* and *zāhrā-nishīn*.

As to the tribes themselves, called *tīyār* in Persia, they nearly always occupy a definite territory nowadays, on which many members of the tribe have become entirely settled, while the others are no more than semi-nomads who, in summer, go with their cattle to the higher mountain regions. Nomadism is not extinct; however, and anywhere in the Persian steppes the black tents of nomads may be seen occasionally.

The origin of the tribes is an extremely complicated problem. In almost every region they have resulted from a mixture of pre-Iranian, Iranīan, Arabic and Turkish-Mongolic elements. In northern Persia the Turkish element is no doubt the dominating, as judged by the language; here the redoubtable mountaineers of the Dailam and the Dīj, who so long withstood Islamization and had still in the Middle Ages a language of their own, have mostly been turcized, in so far as they have not been assimilated by the Iranian settled population. In the mountain region stretching from Adhārbaījān to Fāris and Kirmān, the Iranian element is largely prevalent, again so far as we can judge from the languages spoken there. The local traditions circulating among those tribes, and about those tribes among the neighbouring populations, have often preserved the memory of extensive migrations that betray a partial Turkish or Arab origin. Some groups are even known as Turkish, although they speak Iranian dialects. Other tribes are still conscious of their Arab origin, although they no doubt have already been Iranianized for centuries; only a few tribes in Kūhistan and Khurāsān have preserved the Arabic language. But those local traditions, which never go back more than two hundred years at most, often do not square with what we may regard as established facts from historical sources. It is true, however, that even in recent historical times more or less important migrations of Iranian tribes have taken place. The movement of the Balūcīs from the North-West to Kirmān and afterwards to modern Balūcīstān had already begun in the early Middle Ages. In addition, reasons of military policy induced several rulers of the xviith and xith centuries to transplant some Kurdish tribes to the North-East; best known is the settlement of Kurdish tribes by Nādir Shāh on the Khurāsān frontiers around Kūcān and in Māzandarān, where they have still preserved their own features and their language. The only possible description of the tribes in Persia has therefore to be based on their geographical distribution.

With the mediaeval Arab geographers all the tribes in al-Dījābīl and Fāris are included under the designation of Akrād, i.e. Kurds, but this general term has hardly any ethnographical value. At the present day the name of Kūrd is generally restricted to the tribes inhabiting the environs of Kirmānshāh and further to the north in western Adhārbaījān. South of Kirmānshāh begin the Lur tribes, to the west of whom, in the mountains between Persien, Ḥārān and Arābīstān live the Bāshṭiyārīs. The northern mountains of Fāris are occupied by the Kūhgelu and the Māmāsīn tribes. South of these, round Shīrāz, live the Kashkāy, who still speak a Turkish dialect. In Ārābīstān, where in the Middle Ages the local khāri language was not yet extinct, the Arah element of the settled population is strong; the Arab tribes here belong to the Ka'b division and consist for the greater part of Arabs transferred here from Šāhī under 'Abbās I. The tribes on the Gulf fringe, in Persian Bāltīstān, and in Sīstān are Bālūcīs who, since their immigration, have absorbed such inconsiderable local elements as the Kuft, known from medieval sources. Further to the north there are Arabs in Kūhīstān, notably around Kāin. There is further a not unimportant part of the population, who claim descent from the Prophet, and consequently an Arabic origin; these sayids abound especially in Māzandarān, where there were 'Allī dynasties at an early period. In Persian Khurāsān there are also Arabs,
a few Afghan elements and the already mentioned Kurds on the frontier. Finally there live all along the northern frontier of Khuzestan Turkish tribes, some of whom have been there since the later Middle Ages, such as the Afshars and the Kajbars (found Arambar), while the more recent element is composed of Turcomans.

Other ethnic elements are the Armenians in Persian Armenia in Ardabîrdjan, and the large Armenian colony in the suburb Qafla of Isfahan transplanted there by 'Abbâs I. The Nestorian Christians east of the Urmia Lake have nearly disappeared as a result of the war. In 'Arabistan there are still remnants of Mandaeans, and finally there are reported to be about 40,000 Jews in Persia, who for the greater part are probably descendants of the Jews who lived already in Persia in the beginning of the Islamic period and among whom notably the Jewish colony of al-Yahidiya at Isfahan was well-known.

The great mass of the inhabitants of Persia, including in the first place the townspeople and the settled population, but also many members of the tribes of ancient Turkish origin, belong to the 'Imami Shī'a (the Safavids, 'Abbâsids; 'Abbâs I.), and follow the nawâkhîb called 'Ijâ'ârî. Their number is estimated at little less than 7 million. About a million of them are the so-called Akhbarîyûn, living in Hamadân and al-Ahwâz and environs, who recognize only the authority of the traditions of the Prophet and the Imams. Other Shī'ite sects are the Shâkiyâ (about 250,000) and the Nuktiwyâ (about 100,000 in Gilân, of Zaidite origin). The Babis and the far more numerous Bahâ is are represented in all towns and reach together about the number of 700,000. The extreme Shī'ite called 'Ali 'Ihârî or Ahî 'Hâkî are found among the Kurds round Kirmânshâh, among the Lurs, and partly in Mâzandarân and Ïar, and in the number of 500,000. Half that number is given for the adherents of the Ismâ'îlî Hurūfî sect, spread all over Persia. There are also some Yazdîs on Persian soil near Mâzâ, Nûnî (Shâkiyê) Muhammedans are found only among the Kurds and the Arabs, the Turcomans and the Afghans, these latter being (l. a. jânsîtes (about 85,000). Finally there are still remnants of the Zoroastrian creed at Yazd, Kirmân, 'Tehrân, Shûrî and Kâshân.

The entire population of Persia is given as 12,000,000. This last figure is given on the authority of the last edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica; the other figures given are derived from the Annuaire du Monde Musulman, 3rd edition 1929.

Bibliography: In view of the general character of the above article it is sufficient to refer for all detailed bibliographical information to the historical, geographical and ethnographical articles dealing with Persia, and to the general bibliographical works on Persia: M. Schwab, Bibliographie de la Perse, Paris 1875; and A. T. Wilson, A Bibliography of Persia, Oxford 1930. (J. H. KRAMERS)

II. LANGUAGE AND DIACRITICS.

Introduction. The Persian language is one member, now the most widely extended member, of a group of languages which are spoken over a region stretching from the River Euphrates to the East of the Hindu Kush, with branches in the Caucasus and in the Masandam Peninsula, 'Oman. It is convenient to group these languages, which in turn form one group within the Indo-European languages, under the name 'Iranian, a designation from Iran, the modern national name of the Persians, as it was also earlier, in Sassanian (arzân, irân), and Achaemenid times (arâb-), and which is used also by the Ossetes (in, ira, iron). Formerly these Iranian dialects were more widely extended, to the north of the Caspian Sea, from Chorasmania (Khâvârîm) to the west of the Black Sea (see M. Vasmer, Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnsitze der Slaven, I., Die Iranier in Südrußland, 1923), and also to Sogdian colonies in Northern Mongolia (see O. Hansen, Zur segelsichen Inschrift auf dem dreisprachigen Denkmal von Karasagun, in J. S. F. O., xxiv., 1930).

Earliest sources. 1. Sakâ. Three divisions of the Sakâ are referred to in the Achaemenid inscriptions: Sakâ hâmuwargâ, Sakâ tivrâvââ, Sakâ iva/([p]irâ)vâra(vâ) (on the tomb inscriptions published in J. R. A. S., 1932, p. 374: Sakâ para(dy)â). They are the Sakâ of Herodotos, and the Sace of the Latin writers. At a later period they are attested in Sakastân (mod. Sistan), and in the Saka kings of India. Names of Sakas are preserved in Greek, and in the Middle Saka dialect is now largely known.

2. Chorasmania and Sogdiana. Both these countries are named in the Avesta (xorârîm, sogda-) and the Old Persian inscriptions ([k]horârân-mî, sogâ), but the dialects are known only in later times.

3. Media. The Medes (Madaî, Mâdam) appear first 355 b.c. in the inscriptions of Shulmanu-sharidu III. (see F. Hommel, Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orient, 1926, p. 194). Names and some words are known in Greek (Herodotos quotes σαγξα 'bitch'), and there are loanwords in Old Persian (vispa/nām, cf. the da-na-ik of the Elamite version).


5. The Avesta. To avoid too definite implications, it is usual to employ the designation 'language of the Avesta' (Pahl. 'pêk, Syr. 'bîg, Pzand avawstra, avâstâ, Arab. abâstâ, abâst, isâstâ, basist) for the language preserved in the oldest Zoroastrian texts. The considerable extent of these texts makes them the most important witness to the Old Iranian stage of the dialects, although they have been preserved in a late orthography). In spite however of continued discussion (see F. Tedesco, in M. O., xxv. 255 sqq.; H. Reichelt, Iranisch, p. 29, in Geschichte der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft, ii., 1927; G. Morgenstierne, 1.) For convenience the transcription of the G. J. Ph. is here followed, but a revised orthography, more conform to that of the Old Persian texts and the Greek and Akkadian transcriptions, would represent the Old Iranian form more satisfactorily (as e.g. aâyâ for aîyâh).
Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, 1926, p. 28 sqq.; J. Markwart, Das erste Kapitel der Gāthā Ustavāti, 1930, it has proved impossible to point definitely to the provenance of this dialect (or possibly two dialects). The legendary matter of the Avesta points to Chosrau as the earliest home of the Iranians (E. Benveniste, L’Éravévé et l’origine légendaire des Iraniens, in B. S. O. S., 1934, VII. 265 sqq.), while the Zoroastrian traditions became closely associated with the region of the Hātamīn (Hilmand) river (E. Herzfeld, Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, I.–II., 1929–1930; A. Christensen, Les Kayanides, 1932, p. 5).

The linguistic development within the Avesta with the all the other known dialects suffices to isolate Avestan. This may be briefly indicated. In Avestan sp. (afrav. ‘horse’) corresponds to Old Persian s (ara. ‘horse’), Saka š (afrav. ‘horse’), and Wakhši (yay ‘horse’). Old Persian, Saka, and Wakhši are therefore separated from Avestan from an early period. All other dialects have sp, but other tests suffice to exclude them. Avestan hr (r) < r, b < δ, m < k without ṣ, s < s, sm < s, exclude Sogdian (mowrt ‘dead’, ṣgr. ‘door’, ṣvān–antelope), Yagnobi (ārt ‘four’, ḍīrān ‘door’) Mundji (tūrān ‘door’) Yāzgūlāmi (derv. ‘door’), North-Western dialect forms (Turfan texts atūrī ‘righteous’, Pahlavi, New Persian gara ‘deer’, New Persian āšım ‘fuel’, Armenian loanword mazed ‘worshipping Mazda’). Here again Pashō, Ishkāsmi, Parāēi and Ormuri agree with Avestan for ḍ and the evidence of ṛ is indecisive (Pashō may ‘dead’, Ishkāsmi mādak ‘man’, Parāēi may ‘died’, Ormuri mādak ‘died’). Probably however Pashō is excluded by ṛ > s (tavita ‘hot’, Avestan ṛtē), and by ṛ (Pashō wrīl ‘rice’). Ishkāsmi by ṛ > r (tēr ‘seven’, Avestan ṛhāpta) and by ṛ > s (pārud ‘yesterday’, ṛūd ‘cushion’); Ormuri by ṛ > ṛ (rīm ‘rice’); Parāēi does not permit, in the absence of examples of ṛ and s, and in the development ṛ > r (rīr ‘seven’), any decision. The negative conclusion is so far of interest that connection with the North-Western dialects is excluded.

6. It is possible that other dialects developed in the cities of Carmania (Strabo, xv. 2, 14 speaks of τον διαλέκτον τον Κερμιανότα, Arachosia, Aria and Margiana, but nothing survives.

Relationship with Indo-Aryan and Kāfīri dialects. The Old Iranian dialects stand in close connection with the Indo-Aryan languages of India, which are known in their oldest form (apart from the words of uncertain position within Indo-Iranian history preserved in the Mutani and Hitite documents, see N. D. Mironov, Aryan Vestiges in the Near East of the Second Millennium B. C., in Acta Orient., 1933; J. Friedrich, Realtaikon der Assyriologen, 1929, i. 144 sqq.; A. Christensen, Die Frühin., 1933, p. 209 sqq.) in the Vedas, and with the modern Kāfīri dialects of Kāfīristān. The vocabulary of Indo-Aryan and Old Indo-Iranian is largely identical (āp. ‘water’, vyāk. ‘speak’, martijke-‘man’, kard. ‘do’, ā ‘up to’, puri ‘around’, irwan ‘thou’, ka ‘who’), so also is the morphology of verb and noun. Differences do however exist in vocabulary (Iranian yār ‘year’, gām-b. ‘speak’, gād. ‘pray for’, sanj. ‘to snow’), and in morphology (Iranian ša 2 sing. pret. middle, as Greek -i). In the phonology there are two groups which have diverged in the oldest texts. To Sanskrit š ch j h (taya. ‘hundred’, cha. ‘to appear’, jān. ‘to know’, deh. ‘to form’) correspond Avestan š z (satu. ‘sand’, zan. ‘do’), and Old Persian š d (sha. ‘year’, šand. ‘to appear’, daw. ‘know’, dida ‘fortress’); Sanskrit g gh, d ḍh, b bk, to Avestan, Old Persian g d b; Sanskrit kha h ph to Avestan, Old Persian x j f; Sanskrit ed edh, yd ydh, yd ydh to Avestan ud, uḍ, uṣ; Sanskrit ti dth to Avestan rd.

The Kāfīri dialects of Kāt, Askūn, Prasun, Wāgil, are known only in a modern form from the sixteenth century, and adequately only this century (see Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, 1926, p. 39 sqq.; do., Report on a Linguistic Mission to North-Western India, 1932, p. 46 sqq.; do., The Language of the Askūn Kafers, in N. T. S., II. 1932–1933). The evidence of the Kāfīri dialects is important for the Indo-Iranian period, in particular for the history of the sounds represented by the Kāfīri ts, ḍ, dz; the corresponding to the Avestan s, ḍ, dz; Old Persian š d, Sanskrit ś ḍ j ḍh. Thus Kāt has dat. ‘ten’, tawu ‘autumn’, ṛṣ, wahu ‘I’.

Periods of the Iranian dialects. The extant documents, of widely different character, and in many scripts, are sufficient to allow the distinction of three periods: Old, Middle and New Iranian. In the west of the Persian empire, the change to the Middle Iranian stage (marked by the acquisition of a large part of the old inflexion) is clearly defined already in the later Achemenian inscriptions.

Old Iranian. The Old Iranian stage of development is known in the Old Persian inscriptions, the Avestan texts and the names of Medians and Sakas. The two dialects Old Persian and Avestan, in spite of the restricted number of texts, and hence little known vocabulary, agree closely, but are clearly distinct. In phonology Old Iranian has t p k unchanged before and between vowels (tēk. ‘to run’, tap. ‘to be hot’, pē. ‘to fly’). In morphology, Old Persian has š d, Sanskrit ś ḍ j ḍh. Thus Kāt has dat. ‘ten’, tawu ‘autumn’, ṛṣ, wahu ‘I’.

Old Iranian is a stage characterized by the development of vocalism and morphology, with great facility of composition and derivation. Nominal bases terminate in consonants, or in vowels and diphthongs: a ā āu āu a i i u u u un. Alternation of vowels (apophony, Ablaut) rests upon the older system attested also in the other Indo-European languages. The inflexion can be seen in Avestan with base –a (wholly falling forms of one noun the following are quoted: ahūra. ā. ‘lord’, aspa. ‘horse’, aha. ‘bad’, zāsta‘hand’, ās. ‘party’, mara. ‘man’): singular, nom. ahūra, acc. ahūrā, gen. ahūrā, dat. ahūrā, abl. ahūrā, gen. ahūrā, loc. ahūrā, aspa. ‘horse’, voc. aspa, dat. aspa, abl. aspa, gen. aspa, loc. aspa. The verbal system is elaborately developed, but the extant texts do not provide all the forms. There are three voices: active, middle and passive; six moods: indicative, conjunctive, injunctive, optative, imperative, infinitive, with tenses present, preterite (imperfect and aorist), perfect, pluperfect, future,
with personal terminations in singular, dual and plural, and in addition participles present, aorist, future, and perfect. These cannot all be illustrated here. The following Avestan forms may be quoted: 

**baraiti** 'he bears', *vazaiti* 'he worships', conj. pres. *barat* 'he will bear', opt. pres. *hyat* 'he shall be', opt. perf. *japany* 'I would have come', imperative *bara* 'bear', *baratu* 'let him bear'; *id* 'go', *korxiti* 'make'. The infinitive has no single form, but is expressed by oblique cases of verbal nouns of action: *avatasti* 'fall down'; *vilfizdiri* 'to choose', *apagjarziti* 'remove'. There is an aorist passive (*vudti* 'was spoken', *jaimi* 'was struck'), confined to the 3rd sing. The personal terminations differ in pres., pret., perf. and imperative. In the present are found: *barati*, *bariti*, *baraiti*. dual 3 *barati* plur. *baritahati*; *zayad*; *zaraniti*; in the imperfect: *baram*, *fard* 'thou canest', *baraj*, dual 1 *fardu* 'we two live', 3 *fazati* 'they two came', plur. *baruma*, *jatati*, *baram*. The present base was formed either with or without suffix, or by reduplication: asti 'he is', *dadati* 'he gives', *barati* 'he becomes', *korxanti* 'they remove', *nearanti* 'I bless', *korxasti* 'makes', *irxanti* 'leaves', *hinlanti* 'pours out', *jiaxanti* 'I pray for', *tapxanti* 'heats'. The aorist was formed direct to the base (adit 'he created') or with the suffix -i (dardit 'he held'), the perfect was either reduplicated (*tavata* 'has spoken') or not (*vaditi 'has known') with special terminations, the pluperfect was expressed by the use of preterite endings to the perfect base (*tavata* 'had said'). The active present and future participle was formed by the -ant suffix, and the passive pretetite participle usually by the suffix -ta. Of these present bases and of these and other participles examples are preserved in New Persian. The comparison of adjectives could be expressed in two ways (suffixes *yad-, yad-*, *tara-, tama*): *vahu* 'good', *vahyeh*, *vahita*; *ako- 'bad', *akatare*, *haztama* 'best'. Three morphemes (see Hubatsch, fem., m. f.) are expressed in nouns and adjectives. Of the many suffixes may be named the noun of agent in -tar-, noun of action in -di-, abstract noun in -tah-. Compounds are of many forms: *asparita* 'horses and men', *vireyam* 'slewing men', *abyasit* 'lord of a country', *penxunbardi* 'possessing many brothers', *munxam* 'up to the knee', *daryarzatara* 'holding a chariot'. Of this whole elaborate Old Iranian system but small part has survived to the present day.

The Sogdian verbal system has present (durative past present expressed by adding *šōn*, *šon*, and future by adding *kmn*, *kmn*) imperfect (*nōyō* 'thou hearest'), preterite (*parō* = 'they bore'), durative preterite with *šōn* (varṇat asthewa—*they went*), conj. present (*vamān* 'I will do'), perfect (*gōh* = 'you have given'), *gāṭim* 'I have come', optative (*gāpar* I. sing.), imperative (*ḥōr*, *śawm*), infinitive (*nīn̄ak* 'to pull', *xswart* 'to eat'), participles active present -*dān*, -*āk*, -*ād*, passive preterite -*t* (*ḥārt* 'given'), adjectival form -tak (*aṃswtak* 'prepared'). The augment a is prominent, see H. Reicheht, *Beiträge zur sogdisch-iranischen Grammatik*, 1931. In Saka there is present (*dītē* 'he sees'), pres. injunctive (*kaḥtā* 'he will know'), pres. conj. (*kāmāt* 'he will be'), optative (*yanyī* 'he would do'), imperf. (*tō* 'go'), the preterite is expressed by inflected participle (*vijī*, fem. *vita* 'was'), plural *vita*, fem. *vīta* 'were'), compound tenses (*tātī vijī* 'he was seated'), participles (*mūhāndu* 'resembling'), *śāna* 'lying down', *jāta* 'slain', *kvāna* 'to be spoken'). The noun is fully inflected in Saka in three genders, and in Sogdian traces of nominal inflection are preserved (see P. Tedesco, in *Z.f.I.,* iv. 94 sqq.; E. Benveniste, *Gram.,* 1956, pp. 77). Since the Indian Brāhmī script is used in writing Saka, verbs as well as consonants are fully known.

Chorasmian is still little investigated. Apart from words quoted in Arabic writers, particularly the calendrical terms to be found in al-Birrānī (*Chronology*, ed. Sachau, p. 47, 173, 192), material has been collected by Ahmet Zeki Valhali (*Hdı̇n̄°msic Sätze in einem arabischen Faks-Feile, in Islamica*, iii., 1923). Here *mānix* is 'milk', cf. Sogdian *aixix* 'milk'; *aixix* 'deep', cf. Avestan *jafrā* 'deep'; *kān* 'nose', cf. Sogdian *nīx* 'nose'.

An exhaustive study is still awaited.

Middle Osotic is known in names (see W. Miller, *Osettisch: Etyudy*, iii. 39 sqq.; M. Vamoser, loc. cit.) such as *Buropot*, *Buropot*, *Burakhat*, and in loanwords in Hungarian (circa 800 A.D.) such as *gont* 'care', *kusdak*, *gazdag* 'rich', *kara* 'sword', *tēsē* 'drink' (see H. Skold, *Die ossetischen Lehnwörter im Ungarischen*, 1925). They suffice to indicate the phonology of this period.

In the West two Middle Iranian dialects are known, which can be assigned to North and South respectively. The southern dialect is closely related to literary New Persian. Phonology and vocabulary distinguish these two dialects sharply (see P. Tedesco, *Dialektologie der nordostiranischen Turfanfragmente, in M.O.,* xv. 1923; W. Lenz, in *Z.f.I.,* iv. 251 sqq.): in the North *aman* 'woman', *dūn* 'ten', *kē* 'three', *tēfār* 'four', *bīrī* 'second', *bīrā* 'new', *kūn* 'make' coincide with the South: *cēn*, *dasm* *svār*, *sahr*, *dūl*, *bīl*, *kun.* Other dialect influence can be detected, as e.g. in the change *wē* -to *gē* (cf. New Persian *ganak* 'sin'). Nominal inflection is absent from the Manichean texts. It is possible that the frequent final *y* of the Sāsānian inscriptions represents the remains of the old oblique case in *y*. The *dān* ending (in Old Persian *dānān* is gen. plur.) appears as nom. plur. *ardvān* 'the righteous'). The verbal system of the southern dialect agrees largely with that of early Persian of the Muslim texts (see Henning, *Das Verb der Mittelpersischen der Turfan texte, in Z.f.I.,* ix., 1933). The Old Iranian present bases

are represented by *hī*- 'leave', *sīy*- 'live', *parvaw*-

*ghy*, *sān*- 'strike', *brāz*- 'shine', *vind*- 'find',

*dān*- 'know', *kun*- 'make', *īn*- 'gather', *sāy*- 'bring forth'. The trans. preterite is expressed by the participle in *t* in passive sense: *nīn*āmāh kēn 'and you have clothed me', but the form *kīn bānd* 'they have done' (as in New Persian *kānd*') is found. A passive is expressed by *yakh*- *istāyāh* is 'raised'. Beside the present indicative with the endings -*dān*, -*ēt* (*ēt*), -*ēm* (and -*om*), -*ēd* (and -*and*), a full present conj. is attested with the endings -*dān*, -*āy*, -*ād*, -*ām*, -*ād*.

An optative 3rd sing. in -ēt occurs. The infinitive is in -ēn, the present participles in -*dān*, and (adjectival) -anāy. The vocabulary has many words lost to New Persian lexicography.

New Irānian. The third period may be dated from the introduction of a new orthography by the writers in Arabic. In the early Arabic books many Irānian words and names, Persian, Sogdian and Chorasmian, are recorded, stripped of the old historical spelling.

The Arabic alphabet was long insufficient to represent the Irānian sounds, while certain signs were superfluous (cf. گ گ گ). Hence some symbols had double employment: چ چ چ چ چ چ. In final position, the guttural (which was written, e.g. in Pahlavi *kīk* 'house', Turfan texts *yag* 'house', and has moreover survived in some New Irānian dialects, Kumzāri hūmāy 'fuel', as in Turfan texts *yng* 'fuel', Balōkī W. hāmāg, E. hāmāy 'raw') was indicated by *y* or *b* (*sāzn* *sāzn* *sāzn* *sāzn* and medially by *y* or *b* (*bīqgān* *bīqgān* *bīqgān* *bīqgān*). To indicate vowels a new system was adopted in accord with Arabic usage. The older Aramaic system did not distinguish the quantities of *t* and (only partially of *d*), nor the qualities of *y* *a:* *Alif,* *y,* *s* served to express *d* *t* *t* *t.* But in the Arabic script *alif,* *r* *s* served medi ally for *ā* (sometimes *w*), *l* *b* (the Arabic diphthongs *ai,* *au*).

New Persian, which is closely connected to the colloquial language, deviating widely from the literary norm, of the western cities, and the Tādžiki of the eastern Irānian region, Afghānistān, the Pāmirs, Turkistān (see the references in W. Lentz, *Pamir-Dialekte,* 1. 29 sqq.), is in strict accord with the language of the Old Persian inscriptions (Old Persian *musa* 'son', *dīn* 'know', New Persian *pūz,* *dūn*), and the southern dialect of the Sāsānian inscriptions and the Manichean texts, but from its earliest monuments after the introduction of ʿĪslām it appears as a dialect largely mixed with forms of other dialects. The mixture had been brought about already in Sāsānian times. As successors of the Parthians whose dialect was of northern type the Sāsānians took over part of the official vocabulary (e.g. *sahr* 'country', *tāh-pāhr* 'king's son') as proper name). Forms of both dialects occur in the Zoroastrian books and among the loanwords in Armenian. A few words entered from the eastern dialects (*fajfār* "divine son" as title of the Chinese emperor). Hence New Persian has two forms side by side: *bāz,* *bīj,* *bīz* 'tribute', *dūn,* *fardān* 'wise', *zamī,* *zamīn,* *dāmīk* 'earth'. In the vocabulary of New Persian, the Irānian verbs have been greatly reduced in number. Verbs which are found still
in use in other dialects have disappeared or survive only with preverbs or in nominal derivatives. Such is the case with an- 'breathe', ruu- 'speak' (in jian 'say', warn, morat- 'scream', darb- 'scream', darb- 'scream', sew (in darz 'stream', darz 'tailor', dil 'enclosure'), nor- 'send', nun- 'lead', yad- 'lead', dow- 'bind', build), vind- 'find', barz- 'boil', saidh- 'throw', shoot, gund- 'dress', daz- 'thorn', mon- 'put on', bar 'weep', ar- 'grind', gow- 'come upon', fond- 'tied', saidh 'make wet', suz- 'pull out', kaf- 'fall' (cf. kukan 'old', Turfan Texts kofawon, ti- 'see', snag- 'snow', nan- 'perish' in gunah 'sin'), tirp- 'steal', har- 'go', tard- 'split' (in istaidan 'split', yaz- 'Old Persian tur- 'take away' (in zyan 'loss'), say 'to wind'. Nominal forms have also been lost: Farsi dialect of Badingen pah 'small cattle', Ossetic sel 'bridge', Balouch zer 'house', Kiz 'milk', Pashto 'known'.

These and these are not represented in New Persian. Arabic has continued encroaching upon the vocabulary. The Iranian character of New Persian is however still easily recognised in its morphology (plur. of nouns -an, -an; pronouns man, tu, t, m, thu, kih, teh, an, in; verbal forms, pres. tense kunam, kunad, kunum, kunand, pret. kard, the verb substantive am, i, ast, and.).

New Iranian dialects have been preserved by their isolation, although except Ossetic and Kumzai by reason of their position, they are everywhere yielding to the prestige of New Persian. Recent research has brought knowledge of most of the existing Iranian dialects. Isolated places may, as perhaps in the Khoti Table region, still conceal unknown dialects, elsewhere and especially in the Farsm iran has been largely increased. These dialects have so widely diverged from Old Iranian that the whole complex development cannot be indicated here. It must suffice to point out in the various groups certain developments in phonology and morphology.

Phonology. The developments of Old Iranian u, he, die, z, s, d, j, v, b, may be here selected to illustrate the divergence.

1. Ossetic (in two dialects, Digoron and Iron, in Ossetia in the Caucasus): (Digoron) nad 'storm', nadvag 'self', dazh 'door', zarin 'heart', zoun 'dog', du 'three hundred', radnng 'window', decatkar 'open-eyed', mad 'dead', arat 'three', fort 'son'.

2. Vaghohi (in the Vaghohi valley between the Zanafsh and Hajj ranges): set 'willow', suh 'wind', up 'self', shi 'door', bizam 'to know', pas 'to cook', zarim 'I live', arat 'flour', trai 'three', pula 'son'.

3. Shughun (in the Pamirs): war 'willow', oxar 'to eat', davd (Davrgam daw, Oroshoi 'daw'), wadzin 'to know', sam ' I', pah 'to cook', ed 'knife', pala 'son'.

4. Ishkohni (in the Pamirs, closely with Sangleh): sem 'to see', sar 'to eat', war 'door', pran 'to know', sbah (Sangleh bahr) 'brother', sonj 'woman', kef 'knife', raf 'three'.

5. Wakh (in Wakh, in the Pamirs): winun 'I see', bu 'mother-in-law', far 'door', vil 'two', sas ' I', san 'brother', selvan 'I cook', sitzn 'I milk', dare 'now', mor 'dead', vil 'flour', trai 'three', pot 'son'.

6. Mandj (in Mandjan, in the Pamirs, related to Vudgh): siv un 'I see', wa 'willow', crd shan 'I eat', xob 'mother-in-law', inow 'door', siv 'to know', siv 'to sow', as ifren 'I strike', kuy 'knife', fir 'three', far 'son'. A development peculiar to Mandji (and Vudgha) is that of s to s': mon likam 'I saw'. Initially and mediially replaces d: bpat 'daughter', kld 'when'.

7. Pashti (in several dialects, with a more isolated dialect Wanzo): siva 'willow', wins 'the sees', siva 'sweet', sivat 'mother-in-law', dar 'door', siv 'I', zar 'heart', plar 'father', rizw 'day', zon 'life', sava 'knife', mom 'dead', daz 'three', siv 'fire'.

8. Ormuri (in two dialects, of Logar and Kaniyagah, Afghanistai): yor 'to rain', raw 'self', bar 'door', koi 'other', as 'I', sii 'heart', gai 'I', sii 'father', ron 'day', siv 'to strike', koli 'knife', maf 'tied'.


10. Balochi (in several dialects: the following forms are from the western dialect): gur 'wind', gosan 'to choose', saqag 'to eat', swat 'self', sazu 'son-in-law', sarh 'heart', brai 'brother', ron 'day', palag 'to cook', jinag 'to strike', mora 'dead', son 'three', siv 'fire'.


12. Yazdi (from material written down in Yazd, at the dictation of a Zardush in 1932): me vizin 'I see', vod 'willow', me wax 'I eat', be 'other', beil 'again', me sone 'I know', sode 'white', ron 'day', me vishin 'I speak', sefen 'needle', jenin 'women', e hewstring, membari 'I bore'.

13. Nain (closely connected with Anarak and Yazdi): mbi sain 'I see', xarag 'to eat', xar 'other', mbi sain 'I know', vod 'wind', saz 'hundred', mi sani 'I say', mi sazi 'I burn', bu 'borne', siv 'dirt' he had, par 'son'.

14. Natanzi (closely with the dialects of Yaran and Farizand): vod 'willow', xayon 'I see', xayon 'I eat', bar 'door', bu 'other', zonon 'I know', vod 'wind', xayon 'I say', siv 'woman', b heard 'I bore', kez 'knife', par 'son'.

15. Suri (from material collected in Isfahun and Soh in 1932): airun 'the sees', buqen 'he has eaten', ebi 'other', sam 'he knows', ebit 'white', avan 'he says', ege 'they cook', je 'woman', b ode 'strike', ait 'flour', klawed 'he had done'.

16. Khumsari: bes 'zain 'I see him', utsun 'I eat', bar 'door', am zain 'I know', dig 'saw', bir 'brother', idoven 'I say', izacio 'I burn', etsim 'theay struck', wick 'man', bimbari 'I brought'.

17. Gazi (near Isfahun): shini 'the sees', xirin 'he eats', falla, ebi 'other', zaine 'he knows', wo 'white', hersa 'arrived', rie 'he pours', siwe 'he burns', peine 'he cooks', saudu 'alive', re 'gum', bizen 'he knocked', dyrde 'he had', par 'son'.

19. Simnāt (in North Persia, east of Tīhrān): via 'willow', ṣan 'wind', a musurun 'I eat', bar 'door', ma swam 'I know', rūz 'day', a dumārūn 'I pour', jānī 'woman', sānīa 'wife', kārd 'knife', na bābardān 'I bore', šīr 'son', hārīne 'three'.

20. Sangsār (related to the dialect of Lāgzīrd): ẓi 'willow', bāxānār 'I eat' (Aor.), ẓīnī 'knee', saī 'hundred', rūz 'day', bēdūz 'I say' (Aor.), ẓīn 'woman', bēstān 'to strike', āft 'fire', āft 'three', šīr 'beer', šīr 'son'.

21. Talisht (on the west of the Caspian Sea): va 'snow', han 'sleep', hanī 'to sing', ba 'door', az 'I, zone 'to know', darsan 'needle', ka 'house', si)pī 'white', rūz 'day', zi 'live', ẓīn 'woman', pard 'bridge', kārd 'to do'.

22. Gilaki (closely connected with Māzandarānī and the dialect of Gozarakh): ẓarv 'snow', šārīn 'I eat', sānī 'son-in-law', barar 'brother', sufan 'I burn', pāq 'cooking', zan 'to strike', bān 'I bore'.

23. Gūrīnī of Kandilā (dialects of Kandilā, Pāwa, Aurāmān, Rījavē, Barājālān, Talahadehk are recorded): ṣevarom 'rain', ẓvrv 'snow', ẓvrv 'sun', wārm 'sleep', ẓi 'heart', sānī 'son-in-law', mardī 'he pours out', rūzin 'window', ẓi 'bowstring', sān 'woman', ẓār 'kārd that made'.

24. Kurdi (in several dialects: the following is from the Mukri): baʃr 'snow', ẓo'art 'eaten', dark 'door', dašnzīn 'I know', si)pī 'white', rūz 'day', dašnzī 'it is burnt', ẓīn 'woman', kīr 'done', hānī 'I sent', šīr 'three'.

25. Zātā (dialects of Siwerek, Bījāq, Čabakhūr, Kīghī, Kor, Čenmūn and Pālu are recorded): ẓa'ur 'snow', ṣvrv 'wind', var 'to eat', bar 'door', saan 'to know', ẓārīn 'fire', rūz 'to flow', rūz 'day', pan 'to cook', ṣāf, ṣāf 'to say', jān 'to strike'.


27. Tātī (on the Apsheroun Peninsula): ẓarv 'snow', ṣvrv 'widow', āzwar 'sister', dar 'door', dzmbar 'son-in-law', dnmstān 'I know', zmstān 'winter', zūkn 'tongue', bīzan 'to be', diran 'to see', ṭos 'brother', ṭos 'autumn', mīžirm 'I lift', ṭus 'day', sun 'woman', ẓīsān 'to live', xōrdān 'to eat'.

28. Fārsī (dialects of Somghīn, Paflpn, Māsām, Būrīngīn and Ḫamārāde-Zamān Ishūl): mīnūnī 'I see', šīr kīrān 'to send', mīnrān 'I slept', nimīzānī 'I do not know', zārīn 'knee', ẓārīy 'given', mīmpāz 'I cook', za 'struck', šūr 'bored'.

29. Lūt, Bakhūrtā: ẓarv 'snow', hānī 'tent', ṭurow 'sleep', xōrdan, xōrdān 'to eat', dmv 'son-in-law', zat 'tongue', izpēd 'white', di 'smoke', ḍed, ḍed 'willow', bēz 'to sift', rūz 'day', zādān 'to strike', zinā 'woman', ord 'four'.


The following general tendencies may be especially noticed: t.μ. is replaced by a guttural in Baloch, Khūri, Ormūrī, Parātī and partly also in New Persian; 2. the correspondence of Ossetic h- (Iron dialect g-), r- d, Yaghūnī γ̣, τ̣, δ̄, Shughrī and Yazgulāmī γ̣, τ̣, δ̄, Mundjī γ̣, τ̣, δ̄, Pāshū ɣ̣, w̄, l, marks a distinction within the eastern group: 3. ɛ- tends to be modified in the eastern dialects: Ossetic ba, qan 'ear', Ormūrī goy, Parātī gī, Mundjī yāy, Pāshū goy, Waqats poy, Shughrī qoy, Iskāshīmī gar, Sarīk gol, Sarghīn jī, Bartangī and Oroshorī gay, Yazgulāmī γ̣ỵān, contrasting with New Persian gāy (gū).
Verb. The divergence from the Old Iranian system, already marked in Middle Iranian, has developed further in New Iranian. New verbal systems have been evolved. In spite of independent growth, however, a general resemblance is found, for example, between New Persian and Ossetic. In New Persian means are to hand to express active and passive, indicative, conjunctive, optative, imperative, infinitive, present (punctual and durative), imperfect, pretetrite, perfect (punctual and durative), pluperfect, future and conditional.

Infinitives. The infinitives show independent derivation from Old Iranian verbal nouns. Old Persian -tana'ya reappears in New Persian -tan, Swandi berd 'bear', Vonishin burtan, Songisari bebartan, Avestan badan 'be', Modern Kurdish kit 'draw', Gilaki giftan 'say', Tâst diwan 'see', and other western dialects, beside a second infinitive (representing the Old Iranian verbal noun -iti, which serves in the dative in Avestan -iti as infinitive): New Persian gafiat 'speak', Avestan ke- 'make', Modern Kurdish knis 'kill', Avestan w3 'say', Zoroastrian behter 'bear'. Other verbal nouns are found: Ossetian sar 'task', Avestan kordman 'mountain' (with related dialects), Yasdr beth 'pour out', dedan 'give', Gurs (Austrā) bali 'come', kardali 'make', Zāza kordi 'make', Balādī jam 'kill', Yaghadī karok 'do', Wakhī xanak 'speak', Ormuri ×ant 'laugh', Parāzī kuy 'make', Sanglī sun 'go', Ishkāshim xaruk 'eat', Yaghadī irectional 'bear', Mundji zoh 'know', Kirghiz 'reap', Yaghadī karok 'make', Pashī xaf (here -i represents the Old Iranian -a). Present tense. In Old and Middle Iranian pres. indic. and pres. conj. are clearly separated. Both modes of thought are expressed in New Persian. Conj. pres. inflection, distinct from indic. pres., is preserved in Yaghadī (kantī 'he does', conj. kowt) and Ossetic (kən 'does', conj. kana). Other dialects have one form of present inflexion, which therefore serves to express both present and aorist (with meanings of fut. and conj. pres.). In certain dialects, as in early New Persian kwan 'I do', Mundji xarom 'I eat', Yaghadī xey 'I put', Oroshori kintim 'I do', Shaghad xarom 'we eat', 1 plur., Sanglī xarom 1 plur., this form appears alone in both senses. But greater precision was attained by use of prefixes, suffixes, and periphrastic forms marking off the present. So in Khūrī di- (diferon 'I eat'), Turki dixi (dixim 'I fall'), Kumandī shab- (xabam 'I fall'), Abdū tā- (tāram 'I bring'), Mahāštī dē (dēm 'I come'), Nānī i (i: mi 'I bring', inia 'he runs'), Luri Baghtūštī (baghtūstan 'I do'), Yaranī a- (afram 'I be'), Farāzandī a- (abaran 'I bear'), Zoroastrian a-' (zarin 'I bear'), Sūrī a- (šarin 'he grinds'), Gurskian Kandīdā mā (mādāl 'I make'), New Persian hamī, mi (mikunam 'I do'), Yazi ne- (ne wēšat 'I cook'), Gaz-e (orē 'he grinds'), Žāza of Siwerek -an- (žāmāzān 'I weep'), Lārgārdī -m- (m均使其 'I say', Žon xordan 'they say'), Sangisari -n- (n: wond 'I say'), Ormūri bū, b- (baman 'I take', bu k 'he makes'). Periphrastic forms are used in Parāzī: 2nem xarān, 2nem xarām (I eat). Gilaki has amandaron 'I am coming' (infinite amon 'to come' with davan), beside the durative preterite amonde bū 'I was coming', and Balōcī kāyā 'I am doing', Zāza kordi 'I am doing'. Nātanzī born 'I bear' and Gilaki būrīn have no prefix. The aorist (in meaning fut. and
Along with the perfect and pluperfect, the perfect and pluperfect were also used in Semitic and Germanic languages. In Semitic languages, the perfect and pluperfect are formed by adding the participle to the verb root. For example, in Arabic, the perfect past tense is formed by adding the particle "ال=" to the root, as in "أَتَمْهَدَ" (أَتَمْهَدَكَ). In Germanic languages, the perfect past tense is formed by adding the participle to the verb root, as in "I have eaten" (in English).

(H. W. Bailey)

III. Persian Literature.

Definition. By Persian literature we understand all works written in modern Persian, in contrast to middle Persian (Pahlavi), or in other words the whole of Persian literature from the Arab conquest to the present day. It should be observed however that this literature can be regarded as a unity only up to a certain point. The vicissitudes of western Asiatic history brought it about that Persian became the literary language of a number of peoples whose vernaculars had no connection with Persian. Persian became the language of the upper classes of these peoples, just as French became in the xviiiith century for various peoples in Europe. The result is that Persian literature in the wide sense includes not only the literature of Persia, but also the literature of Central Asia, and to some extent of Turkey, India and Afghanistan. Although down to the xivth—xvith century these literatures were very slightly differentiated, in modern times the differences between them have become so strongly marked that their literatures can no longer be considered as a single whole. This circumstance makes a comprehensive survey of all the literature which may be called Persian an impossible task and forces the student to set more precise limits, which must also apply to this article. Here therefore by Persian literature we mean only the literature of Persia, and such writers as belong to Central Asia, India or Afghanistan will be more or less disregarded.

The beginnings. It has so far not been possible to trace the initial stages of Persian literature exactly. There is, it is true, no lack of authorities relating to these first steps but they are so obviously unreliable that they are hardly worth consideration. It is of course natural that these early stages could only have been recorded by chance, as from the point of view of later ages they appeared of very little value.

Nevertheless the fragments that have survived make it possible to put forward certain hypotheses which are probably not too far from the actual truth. The early centuries after the Arab conquest saw a gradual decay of Pahlavi literature. At first sight it might appear that literary activity in Persia ceased completely. But this was not the case. If we turn to the Arabic literature of this period we find that a large number of Persian poets and scholars were writing in Arabic. The valuable anthology of al-Tha‘alihi (d. 1038), Yatmat al-Dahr (pr. 1885), contains most interesting information which shows that already in the xith century Arabic had become the literary language of the upper classes in Khorasan and Transoxania.

But at the same time there were signs of activity in the opposite direction. The political situation of Persia, whose rulers were trying to cast off the Arab yoke, and the gradual exhaustion of the caliphate demanded not only political opposition to the Arabs but also the ending of the domination of the Arabic language in the field of literature. But the 150 years of the supremacy of Arabic did not pass without leaving a trace. Pahlavi had become a dead language; there was therefore only Persian to oppose to Arabic as a literary language. On the other hand, there prevailed, especially in poetry, Arabic forms (kaṣīda, ghīṣal) and the Arabic quantitative metre (‘arūd), which so firmly established rhyme, probably foreign to Pahlavi, that a return to the poetical technique of the Sasanian period was impossible. Arabic poetry had however to submit to certain changes, such as the introduction of the very long syllable into prosody, which was not possible in Arabic at all and probably arose in the process of inserting Persian words into Arabic lines. How and when the first lines of verse entirely in Persian arose it will hardly be possible to ascertain with certainty. Persian sources profess to consider the fragments that survive of a kaṣīda by ‘Abbās Mawāzi said to have been composed in Marv (Sog) in honour of
Ma'mūn, son of Ḥarūn al-Raṣīd, is the oldest poet in Persian. Unfortunately it is still somewhat difficult to express a definite opinion on the genuineness of these lines. The anthologies (tālikhārūn) and dictionaries (notably Asadi's valuable Lughat-i Fars) contain isolated lines from poets like Abū Ḥafs Ṣughdī, Ḥānjala bāḏghīš, Maḥmūd Warrāḵ Harawī, Firūz Māshrikī, Abū Saʿīd Gurgānī, Abū Saʿīd Ṣughdāl, and others. These fragments however are but miserable remnants, which give evidence of the existence of poetry but do not enable us to obtain a clear idea of Persian verse in its earliest period.

The tenth—eleventh century. As early as the tenth century we find these early efforts attaining a very high degree of artistic perfection. The courts of the various princes around whom the poets gathered formed centres of literary activity. But as the poets were usually directly dependent on their patrons, and had to some extent to adapt themselves to their taste, it is quite natural that almost every dynasty in Persia was surrounded by a group of poets who present a certain unity, especially from the point of view of style, so that the classification of Persian poets by dynasties, as has been usual in Persia from early times, has a certain amount of justification in literary history. In order to give some lucidity to our account of the rather complicated process of the literary evolution of Persian poetry, we shall retain this classification, at the same time subdividing our account according to the various kinds of poetry so that the links may not be broken. In the first section the following kinds of poetry are mainly concerned: a. lyrical court poetry, b. epic, c. mystic. Prose hardly comes into consideration at all in this section, as the older Persian literature scarcely ever uses prose for belles-lettres. Prose is for old Persia the language of scholarship only. But it is to be noted that for the pre-Mongol period the language of scholarship is predominantly Arabic so that even in this field a higher degree of development of Persian prose is only slowly attained. a. The Court Lyric. While as early as the time of the Tāhirids and Saffārids we can recognize the first approaches to the formation of a characteristic court style, we do not see it in its full perfection till the time of the Sāmānids (875—999), whose capital was Buhārā. Although here also the devastation wrought by time has left us only a few remains, it is still absolutely clear that at this time a flourishing literary activity in Buhārā was in full swing. Round the Sāmānīd court gathered a large number of distinguished poets, who on the one hand were engaged in singing the praises of the rulers in sonorous κασίδαs and on the other in bitter outcries with one another for pre-eminence, a struggle carried on with poetical weapons also, i.e. satires (kājfa, kīḍā). Of all these poets the greatest was the celebrated Rūdkāki [q.v.] of Samarkand. His κασίδα Mādār-i māi is an unsurpassed masterpiece. Rūdkāki seems to be the first creator of the type of the Persian poet which all others endeavoured to copy: poet, aristocrat, liberal, frivorous, amorous, wine-loving, chivalrous, devoted only to the joys of life, never touching its gloomier sides. In the field of didactic poetry also he won great fame by a version (which has unfortunately not come down to us) of the Kātīla wa-Dīmān. But he introduced another theme into Persian poetry, the lament for lost youth, which he expressed in moving language. His younger contemporary Kīsāʾi [q.v.] (b. 953) of Marw dealt with the same theme. It may be assumed that these laments were not simply exercises in style but had a genuine foundation in the circumstances of the Persian poet. His duty was to adorn the court of his prince, to share his pleasures and to amuse him; a soured old greybeard was not suited for this and was no doubt, little appreciated in spite of former services. No less characteristic are the laments of the famous Shāhid of Balkh who is said to have been the first to collect a complete Dīwān. He laments principally the injustice in the distribution of the world’s goods, which clearly points to his lack of success at court. The language of all these poets is clear and lucid; they are still very moderate in the use of poetic artifices and observe the limitations of poetry. Of second class (or perhaps by chance less known) names of this circle of poets the following may be mentioned: Maʿrūfī Balkhī (c. 954—961), Abū Ḥafs Ṣughdāl, Abū Saʿīd Ṣughdāl, Mahir al-Rawānī, Ḍiyāʾbār Bakhrā'ī, Abū al-Aḥsādī, Buhkhrā'ī, Rawānī, Maʿnawī, Abū ʿl-Fath Būstī (known also from his poems in Arabic) and Ammār al-Marwāzī.

After the fall of the Sāmānids a new literary centre arose in Ghazna at the court of the celebrated Sulṭān Maḥmūd (q.v., 998—1030) and his successors. This school received its key-note from the famous poet Unṣūrī (q.v., d. 1050) of Bakh. His κασίδαs, which celebrate the Sulṭān and his campaigns and endeavour to prove his claim to the throne of Persia by theological hair-splitting, are very fine examples of the more serious court poetry. Rūdkāki’s frivolity would have been out of place at the court of the rigidly orthodox Sulṭān. Two other poets who were mainly active at the court of his brother Muḥṣīl recall in their joi de vivre more the poetry of the Sāmānīd period. They are Mīnūqīr (q.v., d. 1050) of Damghān, who has given us in several poems fine specimens of pre-Islamic legends, and Fardkūsh of Sīstān (q.v., d. 1037—1038), whose Persian literary historians are fond of comparing with the master of the Arabic κασίδa al-Mutanabbi [q.v.]. The glowing colours of his descriptions of nature are really marvellous expressions of the imagination. As a theorist also he is known for his treatise Tarjumān al-Balūţa. No less important is Asadī (q.v., d. between 1039—1041) of Tūs, who was the first to enrich the varieties of court poetry with the muwāṣara or disputation (like the temone of Southern France). Two poets of this name are usually distinguished; the younger, author of the Garšānā-nāma, is said to be a son of the elder. But there are reasons for thinking such a distinction unnecessary and the existence of two Asadis doubtful. Under the successors of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, who were no longer able to hold together their father’s vast empire, poetry was still held in high honour. Of the poets who adorned their courts the master of the κασίδa Abū ʿl-Farādī Rūnī (d. about the beginning of the viii = xith century) and his pupil Masʿūdī Sāʿīd-i Salmān (d. 1131) were specially prominent. The latter in particular, who spent a great part of his life in prison, created a new kind of poem, the Habbīyat (prison κασίδa), in which he lamented his cruel
late. No less important is ʻUḥmān Muḥḥarī (d. about the middle of the viii—ixth century) in whose poems the learning of his time gradually penetrates into poetry. The other dynasties who shared the power with the Ghaznavids, but were hardly on the same level, also endeavoured to attract poets of talent to their courts. Mention must thus be made among the poets of the Būyids (932—1055) of Kāmāl-al-Dīn Būndūr al-Rāy, who in addition to literary Persian used the dialect of Rāyī for his poems. The celebrated Kāțrān Dżābilī (q.v., d. 1072—1073) also sang the praises of the Būyids, but he was for the most part in the service of the rulers of Adharbalδān and his poems were long thought to be the work of Rūdākī. Even beyond the Oxus among the Turkish Ilk-Khans (931—1155) Persian poetry flourished. The best poet of this school was the brilliant ʻAmḵā (d. c. 1148), who shared his fame with Ṣhīdī and Nadjībī Farḡhānī. ʻAmḵā's ḵāšās are especially distinguished by their unusually fresh and joyous nasīns, which are full of unexpected turns of speech.

As already mentioned, prose played very little part at this period in the life of the court. But we must mention at least three works of the greatest importance for the history of the development of Persian prose style, namely the universal history in Persian of the Sāmnādī vizier Aḥbū ʻAlī Balḵāmī (q.v., d. 996), the highly interesting history of the Ghaznavids by Aḥbū 'l-Fāḍī Bahākhī (q.v., d. 1077—1078) and the ʻAṣḠān-nāma (begun 1082) of prince Kāī-Kaṭār b. Iskandar b. Kābūs.

Court poetry undoubtedly reached its highest development in the time of the Sālḍūjīs (q.v.) (1037—1300). But the simplicity and the vigour and freshness of colour which so delight us in Sāmnādī poets gradually disappear; the ḵāšā becomes more arid, but attains more and more technical dexterity, which finds expression in the one hand in an accumulation of poetical artifices and on the other in the utilisation of all branches of scholastic learning to create choice and unusual images. While in the time of Sultān Mahmūd the works of the court poets were readily intelligible to any reader of some education, the later Sālḍūjī period produces poems which presuppose a well-educated reader and could be a source of pleasure only to specialists. Many works of this period are really only intelligible through commentaries, which have been preserved. Among the poets of this period the following are outstanding: Aẓrākī of Herāt (q.v.; d. c. 1113), who procured a somewhat doubtful fame as author of the Alfiya-Shafīyya, a didactic poem on the art of love. Aḥbī Šābīr, the great master of the ḵāšā, who was sent by his sovereign on a political mission to the Khwārizmshāh where he met a tragic end (between 1145—1151). The favourite of Sultān Sandžar, Aḥmīr Muʾizzī (q.v.), about whose wealth and fabulous greed the biographers have much to say. Lāmīʿī (q.v. of Džārdūn) of Abū al-Wāsī Dżabālī (q.v.; d. 1260) who has quite a peculiar style and brings many animals into his ḵāšās with great skill. The place of honour among all these masters must be given to the unrivalled Anwarī (q.v.), whose ḵāšās, among which are the famous "Tears of Khwārīznāmā" are undeniably the finest that this complicated style was able to produce (d. between 1189—1191). The rulers of Khwārīznāmā endeavoured to check Anwarī's influence with the work of Ṣaḥīd al-Dīn Waṭwāt (q.v.; d. 1182—1183). This poet, who is also entitled to credit for his work as a theorist, is distinguished by unusually caustic language but as a poet he can scarcely be compared with Anwarī, beside whom only the characteristic figure of Ḥākānī (q.v., d. 1199), who sang the praises of the Šahs of Šīr-wān, remains unfaded. The difficulty of the language of this original poet is proverbial in the east but nevertheless his recognised to this day as the greatest master of the ḵāšā. Șāzānī of Šārmarḵān (d. 1173—1174) was also an occasional panegyrist of the Sālḍūjīs but he was known chiefly for his satires and parodies which are often obscene but very witty. Women also wrote poetry; for example we have a few lines by Sultān Sandžar's friend Mahīstī, which show great talent although they unfortunately contain unusually cynical expressions. Nīzāmī ʻArūḏī (q.v.) of Šārmarḵān was a poet at the Ghurid court; he is chiefly notable for his ʻAbār Malālā, one of the most important sources for the biographies of poets. The end of this period is marked by the two last great poets of ḵāšās, Žāhir al-Dīn Fār ūbī (q.v., d. 1202), whose poems in spite of facility of technique show in comparison with Anwarī a certain decline of the court style, and Kāmāl-i ʻİsmāʿīl called Ḥaṭībī al-Malānī or "Creator of Spiritual Ideas" (d. 1237). This last poet turned in his later years from the court style and preferred the contemplative life of a Šūfī šaḥīk to success at court. His best work is already full of the spirit of Šūfī mysticism and in this field also he succeeded in creating real masterpieces.

b. Epic. The first essays in epic poetry, a genre which had been practically unknown to the Arabs and which, so to speak, represented the Irańian national element in Persian literature, were made by Persian poets even before the time of the Sāmnādīs, in the period of the first wars against the Arab emirs. In this field therefore the Persians had no foreign models but were completely dependent on pre-Islāmic tradition and to some extent on popular poetry. Unfortunately once more only fragments of the oldest works have come down to us, which do not permit us to gain anything like a clear idea of their character. In this field it was again the old master Rūdākī who created the first work of any size, namely the celebrated version of the ʻAṣḠān-nāma of which only some 50 baits have come down to us. At the same court the talented young and vivacious poet Daḵēḵī (q.v.) undertook a larger work, namely a metrical version of the official Sāsamān book of kings, the ʻAṣḠān-nāma. His premature death prevented him from carrying out this grandiose scheme. All that he left was about 1,000 baits, which seem to have given the stimulus to the greatest achievement of Persian poetry, the ʻAṣḠān-nāma of the celebrated Abū ʻl-Ḵāṣīm Fīrdawṣī (q.v.) of Țūs (born c. 934, d. between 1020—1026). This gigantic work, which according to the poet himself contains 60,000 baits and combines the whole epic tradition of Persia into one whole, became the foundation for a long series of later poems or mathnawīs, as this genre is called, from an Arabic technical term. Fīrdawṣī's second work, finished when he was well over seventy years of age, namely his Yūsuf u-Zulayḵā, is from the artistic point of view little
inferior to his masterpiece. The story of Joseph, which with later poets (Dżamī) became a song of songs of mystic love, becomes in his hands a moving lament of the boy carried off to a strange land, which may well describe the feelings of the aged and homeless poet in Baghdad. Firdawsi's first successors followed his example closely and wrote regular epics, among which the already mentioned Gargāsh-nāma of Asadī and works like the Barzūn-nāma, Sam-nāma etc. may be particularly noted. But very soon the character of the epic changes and it gradually becomes a romance of chivalry. Thus for example the Wāmiḳ wa-Adhrā is, now lost, of the already mentioned 'Uṣūrī, in spite of its many descriptions of fighting, is mainly concerned with the love-story of the hero and heroine. This transformation is still more evident in Fāhār al-Dīn Gurgānī's (see ĐURĐIĆI) celebrated Witi u-Rāmin (written about 1048), the Persian counterpart of the European Tristan story, in which the hero, regarded from the point of view of the heroes of old Persia, is almost entirely devoid of knightly qualities. The court epic attains its zenith in the quintette (Khāmeśnī) of the great Nūrī (q.v.) of Gandja (d. 1203). Some of his poems have really very little connexion with the old epics and are, like Lālit u-Mudjānīn, predominantly lyrical and romantic in tone. After Nīẓām the Persian court poets hardly ever attempted to treat of new subjects and remained within the bounds already laid down for them.

c. Mysticism. We have so far been mainly concerned with the court poetry, but the other current in Persian literature has its source in very different circles. Sūfīsm (see TAŞAVVUF), arising on Arab soil, entered Persia also and spread among the artisans and to some extent also among the merchants who populated the towns of Persia. In its quite early stages Sūfīsm became connected with the futuwwa movement (q. v.) and the mystical note became more and more emphasised. So far as we can judge, the oldest Sūfī lyrics arose out of the demand for a poetry of their own which should brighten the public meetings of the Sūfī bodies. Isolated lines, quatrains and kīf's of pronounced Sūfī colouring arose as early as the tenth century, but the first more or less extensive collections belong to the first half of the eleventh century. While the famous Bābā Ţahir 'Uṛyān (see ŢAIR; d. 1019) expresses pronounced Sūfī views only in his prose works and in his quatrains follows the model of the popular poetry (even in language, for a number of them are written in dialect). Bābā Kuḥī Shīrāzī (d. 1050) is already a mystical through and through in the full sense of the word. His Dīvan which has come down to us is, it is true, much corrupted, but the theories of the 11th century are quite apparent from his verses which are interspersed with Kur'ān verses and ḥadhīths. Until quite recently it was generally thought that the earliest Sūfī poet was the celebrated Shaikh Abū Sa'id of Māhāna. But there is no longer any doubt that he only once in his life composed a quatrain on the spur of the moment. All the other poems ascribed to him are either forgeries, or possibly were really declaimed by him during his sermons without having been composed by him. The mystical lyric attains a higher degree of perfection in Anṣārī (q. v.) also called Pir-i Anṣār or Pir of Herāt (1006-1088), whose principal work is the celebrated Munāḍjāt, ardent prayers full of feeling in rhymed prose. The soil was now sufficiently prepared and Persian mysticism began to bear its finest flowers, which have given Persian poetry world-fame. But before we pass to these great masters we must briefly mention two names which it has hitherto been the custom to mention in connection with Sūfīsm. These are the famous scholars 'Omar Khayām (q. v.; d. 1123) and the preacher of Ismā'īlism Nāṣir-i Khašāwa (q. v.). To return to orthodox Sūfīsm we must first mention Sa'nā'ī (q. v.; 1048/1049-1141), the poet of Ghazna. If his Dīvan, half secular, half mystical, reveals further development along the path laid by Anṣārī (q. v.), his didactic poems, among which we may mention the Ḥadiḳat al-Ḥaḳīḳa, represent the first attempt to enliven the theories of Sūfīsm by inserting parables of a popular character. This device, only sparingly used by Sa'nā'ī, is brilliantly exploited by his successor, the celebrated Farād al-Dīn Aṭṭār (see AṬṬĀR; 1119-1230). In his poems the inserted tales attain full development and frequently display the greatest artistic perfection in their simplicity. The climax of this ascending series is formed by the incomparable and gigantic work of the great Ḡalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (q. v.; 1207-1273) also known as Māvā-yi Rāmī. His didactic poem which bears the proud title of Mathnāwī, i.e. "the poem par excellence" (perhaps with allusion to al-Kur'ān), is the finest thing that Oriental mysticism with its unlimited riches has produced. The famous Sa'dī (q. v.; 1184-1292?) is also usually reckoned among the mystics, although really only a few of his works have a distinctly mystical tinge. Sa'dī is rather a teacher of practical wisdom; he endeavours to show his readers the way by which in his troubled period the all too heavy blows of fate could be softened.

d. Prose. We have already observed that classical Persian literature was accustomed to clothe belles-lettres with a metrical garb, and preferred Arabic for learned works. The prose literature of this period is therefore not so rich as the poetry is. Along with the already mentioned work of Fāhār we may also note the famous Abū 'Alī b. Sīrāq (Avicenna; q. v.), who in addition to his works in Arabic wrote an encyclopedia of philosophy in Persian, the Dānish-nāma-yi Āṭā'ī. The dialect of Tabaristān was used at the end of the tenth century by Marzbān b. Rustām (q. v.) for the Marzbān-nāma, a version of the Kalīla wa-Dīmina (q. v.). Unfortunately this work is now lost and known only from Sa'd Warāwinī's Persian translation (written between 1210-1215). The Siyāṣat-nāma of the Sālījk wazir Nīẓām al-Mulk (q. v.; d. 1092) is an important book, which besides containing valuable historical material well reflects the political ideas of the period. This list of the most important works shows quite clearly that there is practically no belles-lettres proper. The first work that we can put in this class is the Persian translation of the Kalīla wa-Dīmina finished in 1144 by Abū 'l-Ma'ālī Naṣr Allāh [see Naṣr Allāh]. But here again it must be pointed out that the book was not then regarded as light literature but as a kind of "mirror for princes", that is to say as a learned work. The aim of the Persian translation of the Farādāy ha'd al-Shādīla completed in 1155 by Ḥusain al-Mu'āyядī was similar, but with particular stress on the didactic element. The end of the 12th century
brings a series of romances of chivalry and versions of pre-Islamíic material, the greater part of which is known only in later versions, often only in the form of popular romances. We may mention here the romance Kitáb-i Sumák'íyá by Šadáka Shirzáí composed in 1389, the fantastic and enormous romance of Amír Ťamza, the Basháyár-náma and the romance of the Beduin hero 'fátim Táyí. To conclude this section, we may mention that in this period we already find a certain development of historical writing, a series of works on poetics, and the first attempts at anthologies (tadhkíra, among them 'Awhí's [q.v.] valuable Lúbí al-
Aláá). But as this compressed survey of Persian literature is forced to confine itself to belles-lettres such works cannot be dealt with here.

From the Mongols to the sixth century.

The early years of Mongol rule were a period of tribulation for Persia. Although later Mongol rulers took an interest in the restoration of the country, the destruction done in the early invasions was so vast that the land could only recover slowly. In the general havoc it could hardly be expected that Persian literature would continue on its earlier lines. Yet it is this period that produces the great series of eminent historians whose works form the foundation of all research by European scholars. Without going into further details we must at least briefly mention the more important names. These are Atá Malik Džwainí [see Džwainí, Wáşåf [q.v.], the great Rashíd al-Dín [q.v.] Fádí Allah and Hamd Allah Mustawfí [see Kázwiní]. Poets on the other hand became rare and few, and poetry and mysticism. Court poetry after the destruction of the brilliant court life survived mainly in outlying parts of the country which had suffered less in the general destruction. But this poetry could not for the most part rise above the level of the classical period and seeks to surpass its predecessors in dexterity of technique. Several poets who knew that they possessed a certain perfection of style left their native land and sought refuge with the rulers of India. For example Bád-rí Cáče, a fairly skilled master of the küsáá, left Central Asia to become court poet of Muhammád b. Tughlék (1325—1351); there he was followed by Káni't of Tús who however afterwards went to Asia Minor. An endeavour to give new life to the court language, which had become arid and formal, by the addition of Mongol and Turkish loan-words was made by Pár-Báhá-yí Džámí, who described the earthquake at Níshápúr in 1267—1268 in a successful küsáá. Only the mystical poets still retain traces of the eschatology which filled the works of their predecessors. Of great importance is Fákhr al-Dín 'Iráki of Hamadáñ (d. 1280) who in his Lámadát, suggested by Aósárí's Manábíát, produced a work sui generis; his 'Usáfsh-náma also contains much that is valuable.

Less known but interesting is Awhád al-Dín Kirmáííí whose Mísháh al-Arzábáí in many ways recalls the Divina Commedia. Awhádí [q.v.] of Marágha attained great renown. His Džám-i Džámí, which is now very little read, was copied 400 times in a single year. For European scholarship the Gulštán-i Ríz of Muhammád Shábístáí (d. 1320) had considerable importance. This was the first work from which a clearer idea of the teachings of Sáfísm was obtained. A further development of the mystical quastrain is found in Ahsálo al-Dín Kásháí (also called Bábá Ahsáal; d. 1307), who also can claim mention as the author of several treatises of a philosophical character. Among all these quite a special position is occupied by Nizárí Kúhístáí (d. 1320). Although an Ismá'ílî, like Náshir-i Khúsraw at an earlier date, he is distinguished from the latter by sarcastic outbursts against orthodox litterateurs, with such drastic effect that almost all authorities declared his writings heretical and hostile to religion. As a result manuscripts of his works are very scarce. Some of his longer poems (like Mustíkhr n-Ázhár) read like deliberate parodies of the aphorisms of Sádí and the court epic.

If Persian literature in the Mongol period had fallen into a kind of lethargic trance, under Timúr and his successors (1370—1405) it experienced a renaissance. The reason for this is probably that, with the decline of Mongol sovereignty, a large number of petty local dynasties arose who were all anxious to restore the ancient usages of court life and to adorn their courts with poets. This period therefore became a new flowering-time of Persian poetry and it may well be called the second classical period. Although the greater part of its poetry lacks the freshness and vigour of the pre-Mongol period, some of its poets succeeded in surpassing their predecessors. Of the masters of this period the following may be mentioned: Ibn Yámin [q.v.; d. 1368], for a time court poet to the Sarbádárs in Százáwr, a great artist in the kífá, which was very little cultivated before him and that mainly for vers d'occasion. Khwádá Kírmáíííí [see Kírmáíííí] and his disciple a Khámsí which endeavours to discard the rather pedantic learning of Níshámi and is distinguished by grace and lightness of touch. His ghazals also show an endeavours to cast off Sádí's moralising tendency and to melt into pure expressions of feeling. 'Cháidí [q.v.] Zífáííííi (d. 1371), one of the most original figures of Persian literature, whose occasionally rather bold parodies contain ruthless criticism of and contempt for the Persian aristocracy. Sálmán [q.v.] Sáwadíííí (d. 1376), celebrated for his difficult play on words, witticisms and technical skill, and lastly Lísán al-Há'ísí Khwádá Há'íísí [q.v.] Shirzáí (d. 1389), the incomparable master of the ghazal, who was able to combine the greatest freshness and depth of feeling with the elegance demanded by the taste of the age and brought the ghazal to the height of its development, never again reached by any one after him.

Two less talented parodists must be mentioned as characteristic representatives of the period: Ahsí Isfá'ál Ahtíma, the poet of cooking, and Kári Ya'ádí (second half of the sixteenth century), the tailor poet. Their works show that the grand style of the court poetry was already in decline and a new way was about to break which revealed its weaknesses and had made them humble objects the subject of its art. Among the poets we may here mention Diyá al-Dín Nákhsháíííiííiíííí [see Nákshsháíííííííí], whose book of the parrot (Fá'tí-náma, 1330), a version of the old and now lost Sindhdá-náma, had a great success and was lost by several later writers. His short prose romance Gárlís should also be mentioned.

Under Timúr's successors the striving after artificiality increases still further. The poet's object is not to be generally understood. On the contrary his aim is to write only for a few select connoi-
seurs who are able to appreciate his difficult tours de force. Outwardly this aim finds expression in the widespread use of a new form of poem, the mu’amma [q.v.], a kind of riddle on names in verse. The best poets of this period were not ashamed to devote their attention to the mu’amma and even the mystical Dżam, who had cut himself off from the world, wrote a treatise on the theory of it. The authors of this period are all more or less influenced by Şīqism, which was probably a result of the years of trial and of the great invasions, which had clearly shown even to the great ones of the earth the transitoriness of worldly fortune. The famous šaikh and much honoured saint Ni’mat Allāh Kirmānī [see Ni’mat Allāh Wali; d. 1431] who founded a darwish order which bore his name, left, in addition to some 500 short prose treatises, an extensive Dhuwān which is not without a certain beauty. The mystic Kāsim al-Anwar [see Kāsim-i Anwar; d. 1535-1534] is important; in his Dhuwān he used not only Persian but also Turkish and even the dialect of Gilān. Kātibī [q.v.] Niẓāmārī (d. 1434-1435) returned to the scheme of the Ḥafiz but almost all five of his parts are pervaded by mystical allusions and endeavour to conceal a certain adherence to stereotyped patterns by artifices of technique. ‘Arīf of Herāt (d. 1449) achieved great fame by his celebrated Ḥal-i-nāma also called Gūr u-Cawgan. Ṭṣamatu Bihārī’i (d. 1425—1426), who was able to work up an old Šī’ā lefeg in his Aḏḵam-nāma to a beautiful work of art, is also of interest. Ḥusain Wā’Tī Kāhlīfī [see Ḥākhīfī] (d. 1504—1505) occupies a prominent place; he achieved great fame by his version of the Kāhlīf wa-Dīmna called Aḥwā’i Ṣahāḥī and set the pattern which has never been surpassed for a highly artificial and unusually difficult prose style. The greatest master of this period is undoubtedly ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Mīrī [see Mīrī; d. 1492], a prolific poet who in addition to his most extensive Dhuwān and many treatises. In spite of great versatility and a certain depth of feeling (as, for example, in his celebrated Vīṣūf u-Zulākhī or Lailī u-Majdūnī) all his work shows traces of decline, which is especially apparent when his poems are compared with works of the classical period. In this period also the writing of history flourished, and out of a number of distinguished historians we may mention Ḥāfiz-i Abru [q.v.], ʿAbd al-Razzāq [q.v.] Samarḵandī (d. 1482), Mirḵwānd (q.v.; d. 1498) and Khwāndamīr (d. after 1534).

It has been the custom in Europe to close the history of Persian literature with the Timurid period. The Šafawīd period is, it is quite true, a period of great decline in Persian poetry. As these rulers did not encourage praise of the secular government, the poets of this period sought in their kashīds to celebrate the supposed ancestors of their rulers, the imāms of the Šī’ā, which gave the poet Muḥtaṣab Kāhānī (d. 1588) the opportunity to compose his famous Haftband in honour of the imāms. Many other names could be mentioned such as Ḥāfiz [q.v.]: d. 1520—1521), Bā Política [see Pisch; d. 1519], Čūdī (d. 1519 or 1523—1524), the two Aḥlis, Turshīzī (d. 1527—1528) and Shirāzī (d. 1535—1536), Hilālī (q.v. d. 1528—1529). Lisānī (d. 1533—1534), Wakhshi (see Wāshī Naḵfī; d. 1583). But it must be confessed that very little attention has so far been paid by orientalists to these poets and practically nothing has been written about most of them. It seems however that isolated works, such as the Farhad u-Shirīn of Wakhshi, deserve attention and might afford quite interesting material for the student.

A characteristic feature of the xviith and also of the xviiith century is the migration of Persian poets to India, attracted by the brilliant court of Akbar and his successors. The result was that a second centre of Persian poetry arose in India and gradually a peculiar Indian style developed, which in turn exerted a considerable influence on the literature of central Asia. The best known of these Indo-Persian poets are ʿUrfī [q.v.] Shīrāzī (d. 1590—1591), who endeavoured to replace bombastic rhetoric by impressiveness and “sweetness” (halīwāt), and his teacher Faḍī [d. 1595], a distinguished scholar, who studied the religious doctrines of India and even translated several works from Sanskrit into Persian. The xviiith century again shows a long series of names, among which we mention those of Shāh ʿAbbās (d. 1601—1602), the last great master of the atraisn, Zulāfī (q.v.; d. 1615), author of Sez Saff, those longish poems of which the most notable is Mahdid u-Atīz, Tālib-i Āmulī (d. 1626—1627), the author of an interesting romance of adventure in verse, and lastly the Ḥāfiz of the xviiith century: Şāʿib [q.v.] Ta北京时间 (d. 1677—1678) who is still much read in India and Central Asia. Şīqism, which was mercilessly persecuted by the Šafawīs, falls almost completely into the background in this period, but instead a very copious theological literature of the Šī’ā develops in Persian. As the theologians of this period wanted their works to be as widely disseminated as possible, they succeeded in creating a peculiarly light and elegant prose style, which is very favourably distinguished from the artificial periods of the Timurids and prepares the ground for modern Persian literature. Philosophical literature also was considerably enriched by the works of the great Mollā Šadīr (see Šadīr al-Dīn; d. 1640—1641) and his successors.

The Kādijārs and modern Persia. The Kādjar monarchy established at the end of the xviith century brought in its literary revival in Persia. While Fath ʿAli’s court poets still followed the old traditions and produced little of value, a distinct change becomes apparent in the second half of the xixth century, the result of a closer contact with the European powers who were vying with one another for predominance in Persia. Fath ʿAli’s court poets, like Naḵshāt (q.v.; d. 1828—1829) with his tender lyrics, ʿAbbās (d. 1822—1823) with his Šāhānšāh-nāme, an imitation of Firdawsi’s, which celebrates the wars of ʿAbbās Mirzā with the Russians, or the “Djam-i of the xixth century”, Wiṣāl, all have much that is admirable to their credit, but nevertheless they are only epigones who lack originality completely. Quite a new note is struck in the works of the three great masters of this period: Kāˈānī (d. 1853—1854), Shāhīnāt (q.v.; d. 1888) and Ṭāqā (q.v.; d. 1860). Although Kāˈānī studied both French and English and translated several books from these languages, his kashīds are still, broadly speaking, repetitions of the long obsolete court style. But in the nashīs these hombastic exercises in style there are many wonder-
fully realistic scenes which would be quite impossible in the "golden age". Șahîbânî, who suffered great injustice from the Kâdîjîs, strikes a gloomy and pessimistic note and bitterly laments the rottenness of the whole structure of the Kâdîjî monarchy. Vâjmâ, perhaps the most interesting of all three poets, whose life was an unbroken chain of sorrows, attacked the Persian notables in bitter satire and ended with even blacker pessimism and a complete denial of the possibility of a happy life. His effort to purify the Persian language of Arabic loanwords is of interest. A great influence on further development was exercised by the Dâr al-Funûn (1852), the first educational institute intended to further the study of western learning, the teachers in which were almost exclusively Europeans. The work of this institute required the translation of a series of western textbooks. This task however revealed that the admired prose of the classical period could not be used for such a purpose. The works of these first translators, who in addition to the textbooks also translated several novels, chiefly from the French, was of tremendous importance for the literary language of Persia and prepared to some extent the way for the literature of contemporary Persia. The Dâr al-Funûn was also of great significance for learning in Persia. Its first director Râd Kûlî Khân (q.v.; d. 1871), who used the ta'kallû havâyât for his poetry, was one of the greatest literary historians of Persia. Among his pupils were the famous historian Șânî al-Dawla, later known as Lihtâhûm al-Salâtîn (d. 1896), whose works are still one of the most valuable sources for the history of modern Persia. The efforts of the Dâr al-Funûn also produced a widespread desire to help in making known the achievements of European science. Remarkable in this respect is the work of Mirzâ ʿAbd al-Râhîm Nâvdîrây-zâdâ, who under the name of Tâlibof published a series of popular works which dealt with the most varied subjects. Of these works the most important are the Kîbî-eh Ahmâd and Marâlîk al-Muhsinîn. Of the greatest importance for Persian literature of the xixth century was the introduction of printing (first press in Tabriz in 1816—1817), which also made newspapers possible. But the first newspapers were intended only for court circles. It was not till 1851 that the first newspaper of any size appeared. The press made remarkable progress during the great struggle for the constitution (mashrûha) especially after the opening of the Mâdîsî.

This struggle hastened the literary revolution, which had been prepared for by the work of the writers of the xixth century. The political struggle made quite new demands upon the participants. Literature was no longer to be the special property of the aristocracy but had to speak clearly and intelligibly to the masses. Satirical poetry, which was particularly cultivated during these years (1896—1909), therefore broke away from the old tradition; instead of the old literary language which was difficult to understand it uses the language of the street and of the bazaar, instead of the dry old classical forms it sets out to imitate the street ballad (ta'âsfi). The vernacular also found its way into prose. ʿAli Akbar Dîkhbûdâ (Dâkhbûdâ), the great master of the feuilleton, wrote his biting and humorous pamphlets Ārân-fârân, which brightened the revolutionary paper Sûr-i Irâfîl. This style was also adopted by later writers and influenced two of the best satirical works of recent years, namely the incomparable collection of stories Yaki bid yakî na-bid ("Truth and Fiction") by ʿAbû Saîyîd Muḥâmâd ‘Ali Dâmâl-zâdâ (1922) and the trilogy by Muḥâmâd Masûd (M. Dîhâlî) the last part of which appeared in 1934 under the title Ashgâf-i Mashûhûrî ("the Crown of Creation").

In the war against the antiquated, the dramatic form, unknown to the classical literature, was also used. While old Persia had had only farces ("wandering players") and religious mysteries (ta'âsîvā q.v.) or aza, the comedy after the European model made its appearance in the form of Persian translations of the famous works of the Adharbaîjânî author Fâth ‘Ali Akhund-zâdâ, which were translated by Mirzâ Djâfâr Kârawadâhî. These plays obviously served as models for the original plays by the well known politician and founder of freemasonry (fârâmîk-hânîn) in Persia, Mirzâ Malikum-Khân. If the theatre was influenced on the one hand by Adharbaîjânî literature, on the other acquaintance with the Turkish drama made possible the appearance of versions of Molière's plays, among which we may mention Le médecin malgré lui, Le Mariage de Figaro and Tartuffe. The lack of a regular stage in Persia however made the further development of the drama impossible for the time being.

Only in recent years has tragedies appeared in Persia, among which the historical Dâsin-i lûmîn (1926) by Saîyîd ʿAbd al-Râhîm Khân-îlî, Akhûm yâd-dîrî Nâdîrîy (1927) by Saîd Nafissî and Farûnî (1951) by Sadîk Hûyât may be mentioned. The wave of satire in the first decades of the xixth century also produced the first satirical novel Sîyâhat-nâmâ-i ibrahîm-kây by Bâdîjî Zain al-ʿAbîdîn of Marâghâ (d. 1910). This work, planned in three parts on the model of the Divina Commedia, had a fabulous success and is still of value as a characterisation, exaggerated it is true, of the defects of old Persia.

The Present Day. In order not to destroy the continuity we have already been compelled to mention some of the most recent works. It would be very difficult to give at this time a comprehensive sketch of the last few decades. The period after the War and the great changes that have taken place in Persia naturally have also had their influence on literature. Yet it is not so easy for Persian literature, particularly poetry, to cast off the thousand-year-old traditions of the classical literature. The struggle with these traditions found expression mainly in two ways: on the one hand prose attempts to gain predominance over poetry and thus to reverse the old proportions, and on the other the new poetry endeavours both in form and matter to break through the old limitations. This second task is the more difficult as it requires unusual ability to prevent the efforts of the innovators appearing as mere schoolboys' work alongside of the perfection of the classics. For this reason the greatest of the modern poets still adhere rather tenaciously to the traditional forms, even if as regards matter they are far removed from the old models. The greatest of the modern poets, Saîyîd Muḥâmâd ʿAbîb-i Pîshâwârî (d. 1931), can hardly be distinguished as regards form from the classical poets, of whose
Müftüf Mustafa Kazimi in his *Thürani mañeh* (2nd ed. 1924). The same author has also published several shorter novels. Ahmed 'Ali-Khan Khuda'da deals with the sufferings of the peasant in his *Rusi styrh kürger* (1927). The novel *Majnûn al-Diwânaqân* (1925) of the already mentioned 'San′at-izâda is fanciful and Utopian; the same author in 1934 published another Utopian novel, *Rastum dar Kâni bist ud-dawr*, in which he endeavours to demonstrate the inadequacy of the old ideals of chivalry.

This compressed survey, which can only mention more important works, shows that modern Persian prose has developed much more vigorously than poetry. If we consider the difficulties which the Persian moderns had to overcome, there can be no doubt that the next few years must produce an ever greater literary revival and that new Persia will soon produce works of art, which will be able to take their place beside the noble creations of the classical period in the literature of the world.


(Ed. Berthels)

Pertew Pasha, the name of two Ottoman statesmen.

I. Pertew Mefned Pasha, Ottoman admiral and wezir, started his career on the staff of the imperial harem, became kapudan bâshî [q. v.], later Agha of the Janissaries and in 1657 he was advanced to the rank of wezir; in 1668 (1657) he was appointed third wezir, in 1672 (1574) second wezir and finally commander (serdar) of the imperial fleet under the kapudan pasha Mu'ezzîn-RA `Ali Pasha. He later fell into disgrace and died in Stambul where he was buried in his own türbe in the cemetery of Eyiwh.

II. Pertew Mehmeth Sau'd Pasha, Ottoman dignitary and poet. He was of Tatar descent and was born in the village of Darīdža near ʿUmmiya in his early youth he came to the capital Stambul and entered upon an official career. In Muḥarram 1240 (Sept. 1824) he became ʿaylāhi ʿefnā, i.e. State referendary and in Şahrizād 1242 (March 1827), head of the imperial chancery (rahis al-katāḅ). Two years later he lost the post of chancellor and went on a special mission to Egypt. On his return he became in 1246 (1839) assistant (khuwā) to the grand vizier. On the 23rd Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 1251 (March 12, 1836) he was appointed minister for civil affairs (muṣīkiyye ʿumāṛ) and given the title of marshal (müzājkir). In the spring of 1836 he was given the title of Pasha but was dismissed by the autumn. In the beginning of Sept. 1836 he was banished by Muḥammad II to Scutari in Albania. Pertew Pasha set out a few weeks after his banishment to the place of exile but did not reach it. He died in Adrianople three hours after a banquet which the governor there, Muṣṭafā Pasha, gave in his honour (according to Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 333: Emin Pasha). No one doubted that his sudden death was due to poison and public opinion ascribed the crime to Muḥammad himself. On his family see Sıdıllı-i șəffār, ii. 38. His son-in-law, who shared his views, was the intriguing private secretary to Muḥammad II. ʿAbd al-Rasāl Pasha, a highly educated man but lacking in character and accessible to bribery, who lost his office about the same time as Pertew Pasha and was banished to Tokat in Anatolia; cf. G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türkei, i. Leipzig 1866, p. 255 sq. Pertew Pasha’s successor was his political opponent (ṣ̄abīḥ Pasha, cf. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 357 sq. — As a statesman Pertew Pasha took up a pronounced anti-Russian attitude and was no less hostile to the Christians, whom he oppressed with long obsolete and forgotten laws. His feeling against the Christians increased with advancing years.

As a poet, Pertew Pasha composed a Dīvān, which was esteemed as a model of the poetical art of the period of Muḥammad II. There are two editions of it: Būāk 1253 (89, 91 pp.) and Stambul 1256 (89, 130 pp.). On other works by Pertew Pasha see Brüssl Mehmed Tahir, Othmanlı Mu'ellifier, i. 114 sq. — His valuable library, rich in manuscripts is now in what was formerly the Selimiye monastery in Scutari.

Bibliography: G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türkei, i. Leipzig 1866, pass., esp. p. 255 sq.; Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 334 sq. with references to Jawannin and J. van Gaver, Turanien Paris 1843, for an account of the death of Pertew Pasha in Adrianople; Mehmed Thureiya, Sıdıllı-i șəffār, ii. 38; Sāmi Bey Frāhstār, Kamāl al-'Ālam, i. 1494 sq.: Brüssl Mehmed Tahir, Othmanlı Mu'ellifier, i. 114 sq. — This Pertew Pasha is not to be confused with the statesman and poet Pertew Edhem Pasha who died on the 7th Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 1280 (Jan. 6, 1873) as governor of Kastamuni [q. v.], a number of whose poems have been published e.g. a Şəhānname and Lālah, s.l. (= Stambul) n.d., and İlah al-Afsar fi 'Abd al-Abbār, Stambul 1304. On him cf. Mehmed Tahir, op. cit., i. 114 sqg.

(Pənter B氨基酸)

PESANTREN. [See Pasantren.]

PESHĀWAR, a district, tahsil, and city in the North-West Frontier Province of British India. The district which lies between 71° 25' and 72° 47' E. and 33° 40' and 34° 31' N. has an area of 2,637 square miles and a population of 947,321 of whom 92 per cent are Muslims (1931 Census Report). It is bounded on the east by the river Indus, which separates it from the Pindari and Hazara, and on the south-east by the Jhelum Ghusha range which shuts it off from the district of Kohat. Elsewhere it is bounded by tribal territory. To the south lie the territories of the Ḥasan Khēl and Kohāt Pass Afridis; westwards, the Khāber Afridis and Mullāgūris. Farther north, across the Kābūl river, the various Mohmand clans stretch to the Swāt river. The northern boundary of the district marches with the territories of the ʿUṭmān Khēl, the Yūsufzais of Swāt and Buner, the Khudū Khēl, Gaduns and ʿUtmanzais. Mountain passes famous in frontier history connect it with the surrounding tribal tracts. In the north-east, the Mora, Shākot, and Malakand passes lead into Swāt. The historic gateway of the Khāber connects it with Afghanistan, while, to the south, the Kohāt Pass runs through a strip of tribal territory, known as the Djiwaki peninsula, into the neighbouring district of Kohāt.

References to the district occur in early Sanskrit literature and in the writings of Strabo, Arrian, and Ptolemy. It once formed part of the ancient Buddhist kingdom of Gāndhāra, for, from the Khāber Pass to the Swāt valley, the country is still studied with crumbling Buddhist stupas. Here, too, there have been unearthed some of the best specimens of Graeco-Buddhist sculpture in existence, while one of Asoka’s rock edicts is to be found near the village of Shāhbāzgarha in the Yūsufzai country. Both Faḥiḥ, in the opening years of the fifth century A.D., and Hüden Tsang, in the seventh century A.D., found the inhabitants still professing Buddhism. It is also on record that Purushapura was the capital of Kanishka’s dominions. Through centuries of almost unbroken silence we arrive at the era of Muslim conquest, when, between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, numerous Pathan tribes from Afghanistan spread over and conquered the country roughly corresponding to the modern North-West Frontier Province (T. C. Plowden, Kalil-i Afghānī, chap. i.—v., Selections from the Tarkhā-i Muraṣā). Toward the end of the fifteenth century, according to local tradition, two large branches of the Pathan tribes, the Khaḵhāi and the Ghōriya Khēl, migrated from their homes in the hilly country around Kābul to the Dīlahālād valley and the slopes of the Safīd Kōh. The most important divisions of the Khaḵhāi were the Yūsufzai, Gugiyān and Tarkālān; the Ghōriya Khēl were divided into five tribes, the Mohmand, Khaḵhāi, Dīlāzāis, Camkānis, and Zeinānis. The Yūsufzais, advancing into the modern Peshāwar district, expelled the inhabitants, known as Dilāzās, and finally conquered the country north of the Kābul river and west of Hotī Mārdān. By the opening years of the sixteenth century, the Ghōriya Khēl had also reached the Khāber area. Eventually these powerful tribes dispossessed the original inhabitants, driving some to the Swāt Kōhīstān and forcing the Dilāzās across the Indus. Later, the Ghōriya Khēl attempted to oust the Khaḵhāi.
branch but were signally defeated by the Yusufzais.

Since the modern Peshāwar district lay athwart the route of invading armies from the direction of Central Asia, much of its history resembles that of the Pandjāb. The Pačhāns of this part of the frontier proved a thorn in the side of the Muslim rulers of India, and although nominally incorporated in the Mughal empire, they were never completely subjugated, even Akbar and Awanzāb contenting themselves with keeping open the road to Kābul. With the decline of Mughal power this area became a part of the Durrant empire founded by Āhmād Shāh Abdālī. Disintegration set in under his weak successors and eventually in the early nineteenth century Peshāwar was seized by the Sikhs of the Pandjāb. Sikh rule was of the loosest type, and Peshāwar groaned under the iron heel of the Italian General Avitable. With the annexation of the Pandjāb in 1849, the Peshāwar valley came permanently under British control and remained an integral part of the Punjab until the formation of the North-West Frontier Province in 1885. (A detailed examination of British administration and of the various expeditions against the frontier tribes will be found in The Problem of the North-West Frontier by C. Collin Davies.) In recent years this area has been the scene of the activities of Ābhād al-Ghaffār Khān, the founder of the "Red Shirt" movement, which, although ostensibly based on Gandhī's creed of non-violence, has seriously disturbed the peace of the Peshāwar valley.

Peshāwar City, the capital of the North-West Frontier Province, has a population of 87,440 and is situated near the left bank of the Bārā river about 13 miles east of the Khāiber Pass. Its importance as a trading centre on the main route between India and Afghanistan has increased since the construction of the Khaiber railway in 1925. It has 16 gates which are closed every night and opened before sunrise. The richest part is the Andarshahr where the wealthier Hindus have taken up their abode. In this quarter, conspicuous on account of its high minarets of white marble, stands the mosque of Mahātā Khān who was governor during the reign of Shāh Djahān. On the north-west the city is dominated by a fort known as the Bālā Ḥiṣar. The Shāh Bāgh with its spacious and shady grounds is a favourite resort of the inhabitants in the spring. The fame of the Kīsha Kexpression or Storytellers Bazaar is known throughout the length and breadth of the frontier and beyond.

Two miles to the west of the city are the cantonments (population 34,426), the principal military station in the province. Some three miles to the west of the cantonments is the famous Islāmābād college which, although essentially a Muslim college, opens its doors to students of all castes and creeds.


PESHWA. [See Peshwa.]

PETERWARDEIN. [See Petrovaradin.]

PETROVARADIN (Hungarian Pétérvarád, Turkish Varadin), a famous fortress and town in Sirmia (Yugoslavia) on the main railway line Belgrad—Petrovaradin—Novi Sad—Subotica-Budapest, lies on the right bank of the Danube opposite Novi Sad (Neusatz), chief town and headquarters of the Danube banate, with which it is connected by two bridges and since 1929 also administratively. There are two fortresses, an upper one which rises 150 feet above the Danube on rocks of serpentine surrounded on three sides by the river (forming the most northerly spur, 400 feet high, of the Fruška Gora) and a lower one which stands at the foot of the cliffs on the north. In the upper fortress there are no private houses but only military buildings, including the celebrated arsenal with many trophies from the Turkish wars, while the other fortress has a fine market, a main and two side streets. Numerous trenches have survived within the area of the two fortresses which have room for 10,000 men. The town proper lies half on the Danube and before its union with Novi Sad it had over 5,000 inhabitants (1921). There are many vineyards in the vicinity.

There was a settlement here even in Roman times called Caesum in which definite traces of the cult of Mithra have been found. According to one legend, the settlement received its later name Petrocium from Peter the Hermit, who assembled the armies for the First Crusade here. In any case the town was known as Petrikon in the wars of the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus (1143—1180) with Hungary. After belonging for a brief period to Byzantium, Petrovaradin returned to the kings of Hungary, and Bela IV in 1237 presented the town and the royal palace to the Cistercian abbey there of the B. M. V. Belefontis de monte Varadinipetri. This abbey survived throughout the middle ages until 1521 but from 1430 it and the town of Petrovaradin passed under the control of the ban of Maća.

In Sulaimān's second campaign against Hungary, the first blow was dealt at Petrovaradin: the grand vizier and brother-in-law of the sultan, Ībrāhīm Pasha (cf. Sūfīlī, ʿotbāmānī, i. 93—94), stormed the town on the 15th and the fortress after a brave resistance on the 27th July. The Turks held Petrovaradin till 1687 when they began to withdraw gradually after the fall of Ofen. Soon afterwards the town was occupied by the Austrians (finally in 1691) and after Sürmeli ʿAlī Pasha had besieged it in vain for 23 days in 1694 (from Aug. 20) it was definitely ceded to them by the peace of Carlowitz 1699. But it is from the war of 1716—1718 that Petrovaradin is best known. The grand vizier Şahīd ʿAlī Pasha (on him cf. ʿAbd al-Rahmān Sharaf, ii. 138 and Sūfīlī ʿotbāmānī, iii. 528—529) with an army of 150,000 men encountered Prince Eugène of Savoy near the town and tried to begin
a regular siege. The Austrian general however foiled this attempt and instead fought a five hours pitched battle with his 64,000 men which ended in the defeat of the Turks (Aug. 5, 1716). This battle, in which 'Ali Paša himself fell, with the fall of Temesvár and Belgrade (1717) about a decision in the war and led to the peace of Požarevac [q.v.] which established the Turkish frontier much farther south of Petrovaradin (indeed over the Save). A little later the empress Maria Theresa built the new fortress. In the Hungarian war of independence (1848—1849) Petrovaradin was for over nine months in Hungarian hands until it surrendered to the Austrians in Sept. 6, 1849. On the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1918 the town passed to Yugoslavia.

Bibliography: (in addition to references in the article): Ewliya Čeibî, Sîyahnamese, viii. (Stanbul 1928), p. 145—147 (gives a very full account of the capture by the Turks; the other statements are rather vague as most of the figures are left unfilled); Hammer, G.O.R., ii. 50; iii. 866 und iv. 145; Zinkeisen, G.O.R., ii. 652 and v. 533—534; Sh. Şâmî, Kâmûs al-'Alâm, ii. 1498 (wrongly thinks, that Petrovaradin remained Turkish down to the reign of Ahmad III [1703—1730]); 'Abd al-Râhîm Sharâf, Türâkhi-Devletî-i OTTOMAN, ii. 143; Meyers Reisebücher: Turkei etc., Leipzig-Vienna 1898. p. 33; J. Modestin in Naradina encyclopedija, iii. (Zagreb 1928), p. 336—337 (where some further literature is given); Almanah kroatische Jugoslavije, Zagreb 1931, p. 531; Glasnik Istoriskog društva u Novom Sadu, vol. vii, Heft 1—2, Sremski Karlović 1933 (special number devoted to Novi Sad and Petrovaradin with important contributions and several old plans [from 1688] of the latter town).

FEHMISIAHRAKTAREVIÇ

PHARAO. (See FINNIAH.)

PIÎLE PASHA. Ottoman Grand Admiral, came according to St. Gerach, Tage-Buch (Frankfurt a/M. 1674, p. 448), from Tolma in Hungary and is said to have been the son of a shoemaker probably of Croat origin. Almost all contemporary records mention his Croat blood (cf. the third series of the Relazioni degli ambasciatori Veneti al Senato, ed. E. Alberi, Florence 1844—1845, and esp. iii/ii. 243: di nazione creto, vicino al confluente dell'Ungheria; p. 357: di nazione creto; iii/iii. 294: di nazione unghiera; p. 418). Following the custom of the time his father was later given the name of 'Abd al-Râhîm and described as a Muslim (cf. F. Balinger, in Litteraturdenkmale aus Ungarns Turkenzeit, Berlin and Leipzig 1927, p. 35, note 1). Piîle came in early youth as a page into the Serai in Stambul and left it as kapudan pașa [q.v.]. The year 961 (1554) saw him appointed Grand Admiral (kapudan pașa: q.v.) with the rank of a sandjak bey and four years later he was given the status of a beylerbey (J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 403). He succeeded Sinâm Pașa, brother of the grand vizier Rustu Pașa [q.v.], in the office which he had held from 959—961 (1548—1554). When after his capture of Djerba and other heroic achievements at sea he thought he might claim the rank of vezir with three horse-tails, Sultan Süleyman, thinking it too soon for this promotion and regarding it as endangering the prestige of the vezirate (cf. Hâddîdd Khalîfî, Ta'fıfat al-Kirâr, first edition, fol. 36 and J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 406), married him to his grand-daughter Djâher Sultan, a daughter of Selim II (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 392: summer of 1562). It was not till five years later that he received the three horse-tails as a vezir related by marriage (dâmûd) like Mehmed Sükollî Pașa. In the meanwhile he had carried out several of his great exploits at sea and attained the reputation of one of the greatest of Ottoman admirals. Along with Torghud Reis, at the instigation of the French ambassador d'Aramon, he had harassed the coast around Naples, besieged and taken Reggio and carried off its inhabitants into slavery. In 982 (1553) he endeavoured in vain to besiege Elba and Piombino (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 418) and finally took the fortified harbour of Oran in Algeria with 45 galleys. In the following year with 60 warships he occupied the port of Bizerta (Bish-Zerr) and a year later ravaged Majorca with 150 galleys and burned Sorrento near Naples. In 985 (1558) he lay inactive with his fleet, 90 in number, before Valona in Albania in order to watch the enemy fleets there which were preparing an enterprise against Djerba and Tripolis. July 31, 1560 saw his greatest exploit at sea, namely the capture of Djerba which had shortly before been taken by the Spaniards: this he did with 120 ships setting out from Modon. On Sept. 27, 1660, he held his triumphant entry into Stambul, to which he had sent in advance the news of his victory by a galley (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 421 sqq.). The Grand Admiral did not take the sea again till four years later when in Aug. 1564 he took the little rocky peninsula of Peñón de Vélez de la Gomera from the Spaniards and in order to prepare for the conquest of Malta, which the sultan's favourite daughter Mîhrîmâ [see RUSTEM PASHA] was conducting with all her resources. This time however fortune no longer favoured him, for the siege of Malta in June—July 1565 failed against the heroic courage of the Christian defenders who performed miracles of bravery and inflicted heavy losses on the Ottomans. During the Hungarian campaign of Süleyman in the spring of 1566 Piîle Pașha was placed in charge of the harbour and arsenal of Stambul (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 438), after previously undertaking a successful raid on Chios and the Apulian coast (ibid., iii. 506 sqq.) in which the island of Chios and its harbour passed into his hands (Easter Sunday 1566). Under Selim II, his father-in-law, he was disgraced and deprived of office of Grand Admiral because, it was alleged, he had kept the greater part of the booty of Chios for himself (according to the report of the embassy of Albrecht de Wijs of May 1568 in J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 782) and replaced by Mu'ezzin-zade 'Ali Pașa. He at once endeavoured to regain the imperial favour by new exploits at sea. In April 1570, he set sail with 75 galleys and 30 galleots, landed first of all on the island of Tine which he captured and next took part in the conquest of Cyprus. On January 20, 1578 — according to Ottoman sources on the 12th Dhu l-‘Khâdîdhi (Jan. 21, 1578) — he died in Stambul according to Stephan Gerlach (cf. Tage-Buch. Frankfurt a/M. 1674, p. 448). His vast estates passed some to the imperial treasury and some to his widow and children. His widow later married the third vezir Mehmed Paşa and his second son became Sandjak Bey of Klis (Clissa) above Split (Spalato in Dalmatia) in 1584 (cf. the Italian record quoted by J. v. Hammer, G.O.R. iv. 104, note 1: La
Sultana fo moglie di Piale era di Mohammadbessa terzo vizir, ha ottenuto dal Sign. il Sangio di Clissa per il secondo suo figlio con Piale. Piale Pasha is buried in Stambul in the Kasm Pasha quarter in the mosque founded by him (cf. Häfiz Hüsein, Hadżkât al-Djawânî, ii. 25 sqq.).

Bibliography: In addition to works quoted in the text the histories of Zinkessel and Iorga, and Râmiz Pasha-zâde Mehmêd Efendî, Sharî'î-i Kapûddînî: Deryâ, Stambul 1285; also Häfiz Hüsein, Hadżkât al-Djawânî, ii. 25 sqq. and Mehmêd Thûrâyî, Sûfîli-i ihanna, ii. 41 sq. (Franz Badinger)

PIASTRE. [See GHRUSH.] PIE. [See Pall.] PINANG or PULAU PINANG, an island on the western shore of the Malay Peninsula, lying in latitude 5° 24' N. and longitude 100° 21' E. The area is 276 km.²; it is separated from the mainland by a channel from 3 to 16 km. broad. The town of Pinang is built on the northeastern promontory, 4 km. off the shore of the mainland. The official names, Prince of Wales' island and Georgetown, never became popular and exist only in official documents. — The island was acquired in 1786 for the East India Company against a yearly payment of £1,500. The Sultan of Kêdah by an agreement with Capt. Light, who founded the colony in the same year. He hoped the place would become an emporium of the eastern seas. It was practically uninhabited at the time and was made a penal settlement shortly afterwards. It remained the penal station of India till 1857. In 1805 it became a separate Presidency. When in 1826 Singapore and Malaka were incorporated with it, Pinang continued to be the seat of government; in 1837 Singapore was made the capital. In 1867 the Straits Settlements were created a Crown Colony; since that year Pinang has been under the administrative control of a resident responsible to the Government of the Straits. He is also the representative of the Malay State of Kedah. Unofficial members of the legislative council of the colony, which holds its sittings in Singapore, are appointed with the sanction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to represent Pinang. — Pinang has an excellent harbour and is an important as a port of call; there is regular steamer-communication with the Dutch East Indies, Singapore, (British) India etc. The terminus of the Federated Malay States' railways is on the mainland opposite. Trade is adversely affected however by the proximity of Singapore, there are no port duties. — The island is now well opened up, the population has rapidly increased; it is largely Chinese and Tamil, though Malays are well represented, most of these originating from the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra; all of them are Muhammadans of the Şâhî's rite. — Wellesley Province, a strip of land opposite on the mainland, forms part of the settlement of Pinang. It was acquired in 1800 from the Sultan of Kêdah against a yearly sun paid for it and includes a district which was purchased in 1874 from the Sultan of Perak. The soil is well cultivated; there are large estates owned by Europeans and Chinese. Until recently a second strip of territory on the mainland and adjoining islands, known as the Dindings, formed part of the settlement; it was ceded by Perak and has now been restored to that state. — The population of the whole settlement, Dindings included, was 304,000 according to the census of 1921, that of the town 123,000; the number of Muhammadans is not known.


(P. A. KERN) PIR (P.), elder. In the Sûfî system he is the murîd, the "spiritual director". He claims to be in the direct line of the interpreters of the esoteric teaching of the Prophet and hence holds his authority to guide the aspirant (murîd) on the Path. But he must himself be worthy of imitation. "He should have a perfect knowledge, both theoretical and practical, of the three stages of the mystical life and be free of fleshly attributes". When a pir has proved — either by his own direct knowledge or by the spiritual power (wilâyât) inherent in him — the fitness of a murîd to associate with other Sûfî's, he lays his hand on the aspirant's head and invests him with the kîrka. The murîd need not necessarily receive his investiture from that pir who gave him instruction, who is called the pir-i şûhât. Pir also is the title given to the founders of derwîsh orders. — [See BIBLIOGRAPHY.]

PIRÎ MEHMEÐ PASHA, an Ottoman grand vizier, belonged to Amasîa and was a descendant of the famous Djalâl al-Dîn of Alâsî, and therefore traced his descent from Abû Bakr. He took up a legal career and became successively kâdi of Soňîa, Sîlîrî and Galatas, administrator of Mehmêd II's kitchen for the poor (îmaret) in Stambul and at the beginning of the reign of Bâyazîd II attained the rank of a first defterdar (boğh defterdar). In the reign of Selîm I he distinguished himself by his wise counsel in the Persian campaign (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 412, 477 sqq.), was sent in advance to Tabrîz to take possession of this town in the name of the sultan, and at the end of Sept. 1514 was appointed third vezir in place of Muşfâ Pasha who had been dismissed (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 420). He temporarily held the office of a kâmînakân of Stambul and after the end of the Egyptian campaign was appointed grand vizier in place of Yûnus Pasha, who had been executed on the retreat from Egypt in 923 (1517). In this capacity he took part in the conquest of Baghdâd in 1521. Soon after the occupation of Rhodes, Piri Pasha fell from the sultan's favour as a result of the slanders of the envious Ahmed Pasha who coveted his office, and was dismissed with a pension of 200,000 aspers on the 13th Sha'bân 929 (June 27, 1523). His successor was İbrahim Pasha [q. v.], a Greek from Parga. Piri Mehmêd lived another ten years and died in 939 or 940 (1532–1533) at Sîlîrî, where he was buried in the mosque founded by him. One of his sons, Mehmêd Beg, had predeceased him in 932 as governor of Kîlî. Piri Mehmêd Pasha created a number of charitable endowments, among them a mosque in Stambul called after him (cf. Hâfiz Hüsein, Hadzâkât al-Djawânî, ii. 308), a madresse and a public-kitchen as well as what was known as a tâb-khânî. — While his lâkûb was Piri, he used Remzî as a makhlâs for his
PIRI MEHMED PASHA — PIRI MUHYI 'L-DIN REIS

poems, which are of moderate merit (cf. J. v. Hammer, Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst, ii. 137 sqq. with the wrong year of death and also i., p. 187 under Piri without the identity of the two being recognised, also Latifi, Ta'dhib, p. 168 under Remzi).

Bibliography: Mehmeh Thauriya, Safiyya- 13th Sihman, ii. 43, more fully in ‘Othmânîa- Mehmed Tâbi, Hâdîkat ‘al-Wasir, Stambul 1271, p. 22 sqq. and the Ottoman chronicles of the xvith century. — Brüsîf Mehmed Tahir, ‘Othmânîa- Mu’allefîler, ii. 111 sqq. deals with Piri Mehem Peasha as a literary man. According to him he wrote a small collection of poems (Divanî) and an exposition of a part of the Mahomet and of the Şâkiti entitled Tuhfe- Mihr but both works are described as still in MSS.

PIRI MUHYI 'L-DIN REIS, Ottoman navigator and cartographer, was probably of Christian (Greek) origin and is described as nephew of the famous corsair Kemal Reis (on the latter see the Bonn dissertation by Hans-Albrecht von Bunsdi. Kemal Reis, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der türkischen Flotte, Bonn 1928 and especially J. H. Mordtmann, Zur Lebensgeschichte des Kemal Reis, in M.S.O.S., xxxii., part 2, Berlin 1929, p. 39 sqq. and p. 231 sqq.), who was probably a renegade. His father is said to have been a certain Hayreddin Mehemed, while he himself in the preface to his sailing-book calls himself the son of Hayreddin Hayreddin, who is perhaps only to be taken as a name chosen to rhyme with Piri (cf. Smâm b. ‘Abd al-Mannâr or Dâwâd b. ‘Abd al-Wadid and similar rhyming names of fathers of renegades usually formed with ‘Abd). As Hayreddin cannot be an ‘adam but at most a maâshûr, the pure Turkish descend of Piri is more than doubtful, if he was not called simply Hayreddin Mehemed, i.e. bore a name for which there is evidence, for a later period it is true, in the Safiyya- 13th Sihman, ii. 239.

The same source (ii. 44) says that the corsair’s full name was Piri Muhuyî ’l-Din Reis. In any case it may safely be assumed that Piri is to be taken as a translation, while the real name (‘adam) was probably Mehemed — the combination Piri Mehemed was quite customary in the xvith century — i.e. an ‘adam to which Muhuyî ’l-Din corresponded as khiibas (cf. Ist., xi. 1921, p. 20, note 3). Of the life of Piri Reis, who made many voyages under his uncle Kemal Reis (d. 16th Shawwal 916 or 16 Jan., 1511) and later distinguished himself under Khair al-Din Barbarossa (q.v.; July 4, 1546) we only know that on these raids he had acquired an unrivalled knowledge of the lands of the Ottoman world. He afterwards held the office of kapudan of Egypt and in this capacity sailed from Suez on voyages to the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea. In 1545 (1547) he occupied ‘Aden (cf. Die osmanischen Chroniken des Rastem Paasha, ed. by Ludwig Forrer [Turk. Bibl. xx., Leipzig 1923], p. 174 sqq. with full commentary). In 1559 (1551) he lost on the coast of Arabia several of his 30 ships, took the port of Masqat and carried off a number of its inhabitants as slaves. He then laid siege to Hormuz but raised the siege and returned to Basra, having accepted bribes to do so (it is said according to Pecewi, ‘Alî, Ḥâdîdî Khâli, Tuhfat al-Khârî, first edition, fol. 28 according to J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 435).

A report that an enemy fleet was approaching decided him to return hurriedly home with only a few galleys but with all the treasure he had collected. He was wrecked on the island of Bahrain, but succeeded with two ships in reaching Suez, then Cairo. Khâbîr Pascha, the governor of Basra, had in the meanwhile reported to the Porte that the expedition had been a failure, which resulted in an order for the execution of Piri Reis being sent to Cairo. He was beheaded there, in 962 (1554-1555), it is said, but probably rather in 959 or 960 and his estate sent to Stambul. After his death envos are said to have rived from Hormuz representing the plundered inhabitants to demand the return of the treasure he had carried off; they were naturally not successful. The post of kapudan of Egypt was given to another noted corsair, Murâd, the dismissed sandjakê of Kâfif (probably the same as survives in the proverb, according to H. F. v. Diez, Denkwürdigungten von Aten, part i., Berlin 1811, p. 55, as Murâd kânpîn).

Piri Reis’s is generally known as the author of a sailing-book of the Aegean and Mediterranean known as Bâhirye in which he describes all the coasts he had voyaged along with an account of the currents, shallows, landing-places, hays, straits and harbours. Piri Reis had already begun the work in the reign of Selim I (d. Sept. 1520) although he says in the preface that he did not begin it till 927 (end of 1520), in order to make the dedication to Selimân the Magnificent be more impressive. He presented the completed atlas to the latter in 930 (1523). Paul Kahle has published an edition with text and translation based on the known manuscripts, entitled Piri Reis, Bahriye, Das türkische Segelhandbuch für das Mittelländische Meer von Jahren 1521 of which so far (middle of 1935) vol. i., text, part 1 and vol. ii., part L, section 1—28 have been published, Leipzig and Berlin 1926. Separate sections had been previously published, e.g. H. F. v. Diez, op. cit.; E. Sachau, Sallston, in Centinario della Nascita di Michel Anari, ii, Palermo 1910, p. 1 sqq.; R. Herzog, Ein türkisches Werk über das Ägäische Meer aus dem Jahr 1520, in Mitteilungen des Kaiserl. Deutschen Archäolog. Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, xxvii., 1902, p. 417 sqq.; E. Oberhammer, section Zypern, in: Die inseln Zypern, Munich 1903, p. 427—434 — Other sections in Carlier de Pinon, ed. E. Blochet (with pictures) and K. Foy, in M. S.O.S., part ii., xi. 1908, p. 234 sqq. Cf. thereon F. Taebscher in Z.D.M.G., lxvii. (1923), p. 42 with other references.

The so-called “Columbus map”, found in October 1929 by Khalil Edhem Bey in the Seray Library in Stambul, according to his signature on it of the year 1513, seems also to go back to Piri Reis’s; it is in Turkish in bright colours on a parchment, 5½ by 60 cm., and represents the western part of a map of the world. It comprises the Atlantic Ocean with America and the western strip of the Old World. The other parts of the world are lost. It has been supposed that this is the same map as Piri, according to a statement in his Bahriye, presented to Sultan Selim in 1517 which would explain its preservation in the Imperial Library. On it cf. Paul Kahle, Imprinte Cuskutz in una Carta Turca del 1517, in La Culture, year x., vol. 1, part 10, Milan-Rome 1931; do., Una mappa de America hecho per il turco Piri Reis, in el año 1513, havandose in una mappa de


(FRANZ BÄRINGER)

PIŠHWĀ, THE TITTLE GIVEN TO ONE OF THE MINISTERS OF THE BAHMANT-sULTĀNS OF THE DECCAN; THE CHIEF MINISTER OF SHIWADJI; THE HEAD OF THE MARĀTHĀ CONFEDERACY. (Persian ‘leader’; Pahl. pīshîpāy; Arm. pishpahy. For older forms see Hubschmann, Armeische Grammatik, i. 230.)

Shiwadji, the founder of Marāthā political power in the Deccan, was assisted by a council of ministers known as the Ashta Pradhan, one of whom was the Pishwā or Mahāysa Pradhan. The office of Pishwā was not hereditary and the nature of Shiwadji’s autocratic rule can be gauged from the fact that his ministers were not even permitted to select their own subordinates or nāthās, all of these being appointed by Shiwadji himself. Next to Shiwadji the Pishwā was the head of both the civil and military administration, placing his seal on all official letters and documents. During the reign of Rādjâram the power of the Pishwā was eclipsed by that of the Pant Pratindhâ. It is usual to regard Bāllâjī Visvânāth (1714—20) as the first Pishwā because he was the real founder of a line of rulers who gradually supplanted the rādjas of Sâtâr as heads of the Maratha confederacy. But there were really six pishwās before this time, namely, Shâmândhâl Nikânâth Roòker, Mora Trimbak Pînglè, Nikânâth Môreshwar Pînglè, Pâramâm Trimbak Pratindhâ, Bâhiro Môreshwar Pînglè, and Balkrishnâ Visaùdev.

Bâllâjī Visvânâth Bhaṭṭâ (1714—20), the founder of the dynasty of the pishwās, was an able Cîtpâwân of Konkanasth Brahman whom Shâhâj (1778—1799) appointed as chief minister. The difficulties facing Shâhâj, the political confusion in Mahârâstra, and the weakness of the later rādjas of Sâtâr were the chief factors underlying the growth of the power of the pishwās. The imprisonment of the Pratindhâ Dâdôba (Dajâlîvanâro) at the time of Shâhâj’s death removed another obstacle to their advancement and marks the end of Deshasth Brahman political influence in the Deccan. Bâllâjī Visvânâth found the country torn by civil war: he left it peaceful and prosperous. By complicating the revenue accounts he increased Brahman control over the state finances. During his period of office the Mughal emperor, Muhammad Shâh, recognized the right of Shâhâj to levy lâwâth, a contribution of one-fourth of the land revenue throughout the Deccan, and permitted him to supplement this levy by an additional tenth of the land revenue, called nardemukhâ. His son, Bâldâji Râo I (1720—1740), adopted a policy of territorial aggrandizement. The year before his death, a treaty, principally of a commercial nature, was concluded with I.aw, the Governor of Bombay (Aitchison, vi., No. i.). The third Pishwā, Bāldâji Bâldâji Râo (1740—1761), entrusted the government to his cousin, Sâdânâv Râo, the Bâlî and the command of his armies to his brother, Râkgûhânîth Râo, better known as Raghoba. His period of office was marked by the rapid extension of Marâthâ power, his armies ravaging the country from the Carnatic to the Pandâjâd until their crushing defeat at Pânîpat [q. v.] in 1761. As a result of an agreement in 1755 an Anglo-Marâthâ expedition crushed the power of Angria, a pirate chief whose depredations were a constant menace to the shipping of the Konkan coast. At the end of this expedition a treaty (Aitchison, vi., No. iii.) was made with the Pishwā which provided for the exclusion of Dutch traders from Marâthâ territory. Dissensions broke out after the death of this pishwā which seriously impared the strength of the Marâthâs. Power now passed to the Marâthâ generals, Sindhiâ of Gwâllîor, Bhonsâl of Nâgpur, Holkar of Indore, and the Gaekwâr of Baroda.

During the rule of Mâdhu Râo (1761—1772) Sindhiâ, in 1771, once more re-established Marâthâ influence in northern India, and Sâdânâv Râo, the Mughal emperor, who had deserted the English, became a puppet under Marâthâ control. Mâdhu Râo was succeeded by his brother, Nârâyan Râo (1772—1773), who was murdered at the instigation of his uncle Raghoba. For a time the Marâthâ confederacy was divided into two hostile camps, the supporters of Raghoba, who was a pretender, and the pîshwâsh, and the Court Party under Nânâ Phadnavis, who supported the claims of Mâdhu Râo Nârâyan (1774—1795), a posthumous son of Nârâyan Râo. The action of the Bombay Government in supporting the claims of Raghoba led to war between the English Company and the Marâthâs which ended, thanks to the exertions of Warren Hastings, with the Treaty of Sâlbâi in 1782. This treaty which virtually recognized the independence of Sindhiâ secured peace between the English and the Marâthâs for twenty years. Marâthâ history now becomes a struggle between Nana Phadnavis (Bâlîdâjî Djanardhun), who attempted to bolster up the power of the pîshwâ, and Mâhâlâdji Sindhiâ, who strove to control the Pîshwâ in order to use him as a cloak to cover his aggressions.

The seventh and last pîshwâ was Bâldâji Râo II (1796—1818). During the governor-generalship of the Marquis Wellesley, after the death of Nana Phadnavis, in 1800, there followed a struggle for supremacy at Pûna between Holkar and Dâwlât Râo Sindhiâ who had succeeded Mâhâlâdji Sindhiâ in 1794. During this struggle the Pîshwâ fled to Bassein where he threw himself upon the protection of the English. In 1802, by the Treaty of Bassein (Aitchison, vi., No. xiii.) Wellesley constituted himself protector of the Pîshwâ who agreed to accept a “subsidiary” force and to permit the
English to mediate in his disputes with the other Indian princes. This naturally did not prove acceptable to the other members of the Maratha confederacy. Unfortunately Bādžī Rāo came under the influence of an unprincipled favourite, Trim-bakūjī, who was privy to the murder of the Gaekwar’s emissary who had been invited to Pūna under a guarantee from the English of his personal safety. When Elphinstone, the Resident, reported that the Pishwā was secretly conspiring to form a Maratha coalition against the English, the Pishwā was forced to come to terms and sign the Treaty of Pūna (1817), which completed the work of Bassein. But Bādžī Rāo’s promises were written in water, for when Lord Hastings proceeded to crush the Marāthās, the Pishwā rose in revolt and plundered the British Residency. Eventually his forces were defeated and the plāhsāwip was abolished. Bādžī Rāo, however, was granted a pension and allowed to reside at Bīthūr where he died in 1851. His adopted son, Nānā Sāhib, disappeared in 1858.


**PIST (P.),** a kind of food compounded of the liver of gazelles or almonds etc. A daily portion of the size of a pistachio (pistah) is taken by those derelvers and others who undertake long fasts, e.g. the illa or forty-day fast, and is sufficient to maintain life.

**Bibliography:** Vullers, _Lexicon Persico-Latinum_, s. v. pist, illa. (R. LEVY)

**PLATO.** [See _AFLĀTŪN_.]  

**PLEVEN** (Plevna, Plevna, Turkish Plewne پیلیو), an important town in Northern Bulgaria, 350 feet above sea-level, in a depression formed by the little river Tăzenica (τήταιθα), which flows not far from the town on the right into the Vid, the right bank tributary of the Danube. Surrounded by hills and at the intersection of the high roads to Vidin, Nikopol, Sofia and the passes of the Balkans, Plevna has long been a place of strategic importance; it is now also crossed by one of the main railway lines (Sofia–Plevna–Sumen–Varna). This busy town, the capital of a circle, where the chief business is in cattle and wine, and which has museums, which recall the Russo-Turkish War, is rising rapidly and in 1926 had 29,063 inhabitants.

Although in the vicinity of Pleven there are the remains of Roman settlements, the town really arose only under the Turks. We have however very little definite information about this period of the town’s history. Ewliya Celebi’s statement that Plevna was built by the Wallachian ban Ladka (لاذک) has of course to be taken with caution; on the other hand, his assertion that “in the year 720 (1830) in the time of the Ghāzī Khudāwendi, it was taken by Mīkhal-Beg”, is not free from objections on chronological grounds. According to the same writer, Plevna after the conquest was an araplık-şef of the sons of Mīkhal- Beg, and at a later date was still within the sphere of influence of the noble family of the Mīkhal- oglu [v. v.], who had several buildings erected there. According to Ewliya Celebi and other Turkish sources (cf. vol. iii., p. 493a and _Glasnik Skopjske naučne društva_, xiii. 73 and 81), Plevna is the last resting-place of Mehmed Beg, a son of Kose Mīkhal, who died in 825 (1422), as well as of the celebrated Ali Beg Mīkhal-oglu who is said to have died after 1507. According to Ewliya Celebi, Ali Beg was buried in the mosque founded by him. That Plevna was the capital of a district in the sandjak of Nikopol we know not only from Ewliya Celebi but also from Bādžī Kāfat (Rumeli und Borna, transl. by v. Hammer, _Sperneth_, xvii. 23). In the xviiith century, when Ewliya Celebi visited the town, it had 2,000 houses, a ruined fortress, a college founded by the above mentioned Ali Beg, 7 schools, 6 tekkes and 6 mosques etc. — In the best days of Turkish Plevna had, according to Sh. Sāmī (Kūmānī al-Āfīm, ii. 1522–1533), 17,000 inhabitants and 18 mosques but, as many Muslims migrated after the Russo-Turkish war, the population sank to 14,000 and most of the mosques were described in 1889 as in ruins.

But it was not till the Russo-Turkish war of 1877–1878 that Plevna became world famous. When the Russians after crossing the Danube on July 19, 1877 appeared before Plevna, they met with the unexpected resistance of Othman Paşa, who had come up from Vidin. They attacked unsuccessfully on July 20 and 30 and suffered heavily. As Plevna was not fortified, Othman Paşa now had strong and extensive earthworks thrown up around it. On Sept. 11 and 12 the Russians with the help of the Rumanians, whom they had summoned to their assistance, made a third attempt to take Plevna by storm and were again repulsed with great losses. After these and further failures (on Sept. 18 and Oct. 19, the allies decided upon and began a regular siege of the town which was conducted by Totleben, the defender of Sebastopol, in person.

In spite of all Othman Paşa was not yet shut in on his west side and received munitions and supplies from there until Oct. 10. In the middle of November he was completely surrounded and on the morning of Dec. 10 he undertook a last desperate sortie in an attempt to break through the western lines of the besieging army of 120,000 men (including the Czar). This bold effort was accompanied by success for a few hours but in the meanwhile the heroic Othman Paşa (the “Lion of Plevna”) was himself wounded, and towards midday on the same day was finally forced to surrender with some 40,000 men. The Russians
had already forced their way into Plevna, the five
months’ siege of which had cost them and the
Rumanians over 40,000 men.
The fall of Plevna opened the way for the
Russians to Adrianople and on to San Stefano,
where they dictated the peace which was there
concluded.

Bibliography: (in addition to references
in the text): Ewliyà Celebi, Sîyahätname, vi.,
Istanbul 1318, p. 164—165; F. Kanitz, Donau-
Bulgaren und der Balkan2, Leipzig 1882, ii.,
esp. p. 76 sqq.; C. Jireček, Das Fürstenthum
Bulgarien, Vienna 1891, p. 189, 286 and 545;
Meyers Reisebucher: Türkei etc.; Leipzig—Vienna
1880—1889, etc.; M. Lane-Poole, Turkey4,
London 1908, p. 361; N. Jorga, G. O. K., v.,
Gotha 1913, p. 575—577; A. Ischirkoff, Bulgarien,
Land und Leute, part ii., Leipzig 1917, p. 99
and 108.—The little book entitled Plowne
by Kemenattin Süküri (Istanbul 1932) gives only
a popular account of the siege of 1877. Quite
recently Jordan Tritonov published in Bulgarian
a history of the town down to the war of liberation
(Istoria na grada Plowen do soboljoditelnata volna,
Sofia 1933, illustrated) (cf. Bibliographie Geograpique
Internationale, 1933, p. 319).

(Efrem Bajraktarević)
Plevna. [See Plevna.]

Polei, transcribed by Arab writers as بّلٰد, is
the old name of a stronghold in the south of Spain
the site of which is the modern Aguilar de la Frontera, a little town with about
13,000 inhabitants, in the province of Cordova, 12 miles N. W. of Cabra and of Lucena. The identification of Polei with Aguilar was made by
Doyi on the strength of information supplied by
a charter of 1258. The town which played a considerable part in the rising of the famous 'Omar b. Hafṣān (q. v.) against the Umayyad emirs of Cordova is again mentioned in the xiiith century
by the geographer al-Idrisi. The ruins of a fortress
which dates from the Muhammadan period can
still be seen there.

Bibliography: al-Idrisi, Description de l'Espagne, ed. and transl. by Doyi and de Goede, text, p. 205; transl., p. 253; Ibn Hajjān, Muktabāt, MS. of the Bodleian, passim; Dozy, Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne, new ed., Leyden 1932,
i. 62 sqq.; do., Recherches, i. 307.

(E. Évy-Provençal)

Pomak, the name given to a Bulgarian
speaking Muslim in Bulgaria and Thrace.
This name which is usually given to them by their Christian fellow-countrymen, used also to be given occasionally by Bulgarians to Muslims speaking Serb in western Macedonia. There however the Serbian Muslims are usually called torbeši (sing. torbe) by their Christian fellow-citizens, sometimes also potwir, more rarely kurki etc. How far these Serbian Muslims are still called Pomsaks by some people depends mainly on the influence of the Bulgarian school and literature and would only be correctly applied when used of Muslims who had migrated actually from Bulgaria, e. g. in 1877—1878 (cf. J. H. Vasiljević, 'Jeanne Stara Srbiya, i. 187—188. 207 and 236). In the Rhodopes the Bulgarian Muslims are also called akhrjani (ch = čh) or agjarjani (Ischirkoff, ii. 15). In some
parts of Southern Serbia and Bulgaria the name šitak (pl. šitaci) is occasionally heard and it used
sometimes to be said (most recently by A. Urošević,
in Glasnik Srpskog naučnog društva, vol. v., 1929,
p. 310) that this name was only given to
Serbs converted to Islam; the truth seems to be
however that this name is limited to Turks in the
two countries (cf. H. Vasiljević, Muslimani..., p. 34 and Elezović, in Srpski književni glasnik,
xxvii., 1929, p. 610—614 and in Rečnik knjovsko-
metohiskog dijalka, ii. 449). No more correct is
the statement that apovi is the name given to
Serbian Muslims in Southern Serbia; for this seems to be a name applied to one another only by
Albanians who are closely related to one another
(brothers and cousins, according to H. Vasiljević,
Muslimani..., p. 34).

The origin and the etymology of these names
are in part more or less obscure and arbitrary.
The usual explanation that the name Pomak comes from the verb pomoti "to help" and means helper (pomagat) i. e. auxiliary troops of the Turks, was
first given by F. Kanitz (Donau-Bulgaren und
der Balkan, vol. ii., Leipzig 1882, p. 182) but
was soon afterwards (1891) declared by Jireček
(see Bibliography) to be inadequate. Another equally improbable etymology is that which explains Pomak by the Bulgarian word mok = "torment, force", and justifies this explanation by stating
that the conversion of the Bulgarians to Islam on
a considerable scale was carried out by force and
strains (Ischirkoff, ii. 15). Quite recently Iv. Lekov
(see Bibliography) has explained the name Pomak from poturnjak (lit. "one made a Turk"). Whether the word pomak which in Turkish means "club, cudgel", in Uigur "Muslim" and in South Russia "pedlar" (cf. Barthold, Oerta Asia..., p. 82—83), is in any
way connected with Pomak, or has been influenced
by the Bulgarian poturnjak or confused with it
is still to be investigated.

The history of the conversion of the "Pomaks"
or "Torbeši" is very little known in detail. In
any case the adoption of Islam did not take place
everywhere at once but was gradual and at different
periods. A beginning was made immediately after
the battle of Marica (1371) and after the fall of
Tmovo (1393); many Serbs and Bulgars at this
time, especially as Jireček thinks, the nobles and
the Bogomils among these, adopted Islam. After
these first conversions under Bayazid II consider-
able numbers of converts were made according to
native tradition in the reign of Selim I (1512—
1520); for this purpose he is said to have sent his "favourite Şinān Pasha" into the territory of the Sar-mountains. The highlands of Çepino (in the
Rhodopes) were converted according to local
histories in the beginning of the xviith century,
according to Jireček (Fürstenthum, p. 104) how-
ever, not till the middle, in the reign of Mehmed IV
(1648—1687); the grand vizier Mehmed Koprulu
is said to have taken a leading part in the work.
The conversion to Islam of the Danube territory
(Loveć etc.) is put in this period. Towards the
end of this century (xvith) further conversions
took place among the Serbs in the Debar region.
In some districts Islam only gained a footing on
a large scale in the course of the xviith century
and sometimes not till the beginning of the xixth
(e. g. in Gora, south of Prizren).

Until recently one was very often inclined to
believe that these conversions to Islam were made
under compulsion, even by force of arms, but now
the view is beginning to prevail that the authorities

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
never took any direct steps to proselytise them. Christian subjects; conversion was on the contrary voluntary and for quite different reasons except in a few exceptional cases (cf. e. g. H. Vasiljević, Muhsmans..., esp. p. 53–61).

Towards the end of the sixth century when the process of conversion had ceased for decades everywhere, the great majority of the Slav Muslims (Bulgar and Serb) were to be found in the Rhodopes and the mountains of eastern Macedonia and in groups of considerable size up and down Macedonia as far as the Albanian frontier, a wide area which stretched in the north from Plovdiv (Philippopolis) to Salonika in the south and in the east from the central course of the Arda over the Vardar and even beyond the Cni Drim, i.e. across the districts of Ohrid, Debar, Gostivar and Prizren to the west. At that time only a small part of this territory which was interspersed with Christian areas belonged to the principality of Bulgaria; the greater part was still Turkish and only after the Balkan War did it pass to Serbia or after the World War to Yugoslavia. — In addition to the main body of Muslim Bulgars in the Rhodopes mountains, there were at the same time also sporadic groups north of the Balkan range in the Danube territory, in the circles of Loveč, Plevn (Plevna) and Ochrovo (Rahov).

Since then however the frontiers of the "Pomaks" have receded considerably. During the siege of Plevna almost all the Bulgarian Muslims fled from the Danube districts to Macedonia; although they returned in 1889 they soon afterwards migrated into Turkey. After the union of eastern Rumelia and Bulgaria in 1885 the Rhodopes "Pomaks" also began to emigrate. — The frontiers of the "Torbeši" likewise were not unaffected. The Balkan War and the World War brought about certain changes which resulted in the migration of some bodies of Serbian Muslims out of Southern Serbia.

As a result of various wars and the territorial changes that followed them, the statements regarding the number of Muslim Slavs in Bulgaria, Macedonia (or Southern Serbia) and Thrace as well as about their total number differ considerably and are often unreliable. For example Jireček (1890) estimated the total at about 300,000 including 100,000 in Loveč and Plevna (see Bibl.). At the beginning of the 20th century Gavrilov (see Bibl.) estimated the total at only 400,000 and Ishirkoff at about the same (1917).

As regards the distribution of these Muslim Slavs according to countries the following statistics may be quoted. In what used to be the principality of Bulgaria Jireček estimated (1891) their number at most 28,000 souls and before the Balkan War there were between the old frontiers of Bulgaria (according to official statistics of 1910) 21,143 (0.40% of the population). In the lands acquired in the Balkan War in Southern Bulgaria there were however many more Pomaks, mainly in the regions of the rivers Arda, Mesta and Struma so that the official census of 1920 makes their number 88,399 (1.82% of the whole population). A somewhat higher figure is given by the Annuaire du Monde Musulman for 1929 (p. 305), namely 16,000 Pomaks in Bulgaria proper and 75,317 in Thrace i.e. 91,337 in all. Finally the latest published statistics (1926 census) give 102,351 Bulgarian speaking Muslims in Bulgaria, i.e. 1.87% of the population, while the number of Muslims in Bulgaria without distinguishing their languages was then 759,296 or 14.41% of the population. — Of these 102,351 Bulgarian speaking Muslims only 5,799 lived in the towns and the remaining 66,552 in the villages; the proportion of men to women was 1,000 to 1,055.

Literate Pomaks in the whole of Bulgaria in 1926 numbered only 6,659 in 1926 (of whom 5,534 were men).

The number of Pomaks (in reality of Muslim Slavs) in Macedonia was according to S. Vranković (1889; see Bibl.) 144,051 men (this figure is therefore doubled in Deux cents ansludes sur l’ethnographie de la Macédoine, publ. by the Comité national de l’Union des organisations des émigrés macédoniens en Bulgarie, Sofia 1928, and amounts to 288,092 [with an error of minus ten souls]), according to G. Weigand (Die nationalen Bestrebungen der Balkanvolker, Leipzig 1898) 100,000 men, according to V. Kancov (1900; see Bibl.) 148,800 and according to V. Sis (Musulmnen, Zurch 1918) 150,030 souls.

As regards the number of Serbian speaking Muslims in Southern Serbia, they were estimated by H. Vasiljević (Muslimani..., p. 199) whose calculations are however in some extent based on the situation before the Balkan War, at 100,000 souls; now (1935) the figure is put at 60,000 and the number of Serbo-Croat speaking Muslims in the whole of Yugoslavia at about 900,000 (exact figures cannot be given because the statistics according to religions have not been published).

For Thrace the figure of 75,337 Muslim Bulgars has already been given from the Annuaire; in Western Thrace there were according to the intercalated census (of March 1920) 11,739 (cf. La question de la Thrace, ed. by the Comité suprême des réfugiés de Thrace, Sofia 1927).

On these statistics the following observations may be made. The Bulgars (e. g. Kancov) usually include as "Pomaks" all the Macedonian Slavs of Muslim faith, i.e. including Serbs from Southern Serbia. On the other hand as an account of their religion these Muslim Slavs are sometimes carelessly counted with the Turks. Moreover some statistics are not completely free from chauvinistic and political bias. The European estimates finally are based on approximations or are quite arbitrary.

In spite of the fact that the Pomaks and Torbeši are occasionally included among the Turks and in spite of the fact that they sometimes call themselves Turks, they are nevertheless the purest stratum of the old Bulgarian or Serbian population as the case may be who have preserved their Slav type and Slav language (especially archaic words) very well, sometimes even better — as a result of their being cut off from the Christians and their isolation in outlying districts — than their Christian kinsmen, who have been constantly exposed to admixture from other ethnic elements. They have a certain feeling of aversion for the Turks whose language they do not understand. It is only in the towns that we find that in course of time some of these Slavs have adopted the Turkish language. What bound them to the Ottomans was not language but principally a common religion with its prescriptions and customs (e. g. the veil of women) which along with Turkish rule naturally imposed upon them many Arabic and Turkish
words. In spite of this there survived among them many pre-Islamic customs and reminiscences of Christianity (observation of certain Christian festivals etc.).

That the Bulgarian Muslims in particular occasionally (esp. in 1876–1878) fought with the Turks against the Christian Bulgars may be ascribed to the fact that as a result of their low cultural level they made no clear distinction between nation and religion and that their Christian fellow-countrymen treated them as Turks and not as kinsmen. These mistakes were repeated in the Balkan War when the victorious Bulgarian troops and the orthodox priests were led to so far as to convert the Pomaks in the Rhodopes and other districts to Christianity mainly by pressure and force of arms. But on the conclusion of peace they returned to Islam again. This is frankly admitted by the Bulgarian geographer Bîrkov (Ishirkhoff) and the Bulgarian writer Iv. Karavanov (in his Bulgarian periodical National Education, Küstenid 1931, according to Cemalovic [50]2).

Fifty or sixty years ago the songs and ballads of the "Pomaks" were the subject of much dispute. A Bosnian ex-cleric, Stefan Verkovic (1827—1893), an antique dealer in Sarajevo, published under the title of Veda Slovna (i.e. the "Veda of the Slavs" Belgrad 1874, vol. i) a collection of songs which were alleged to have been collected mainly among Pomaks and which celebrated "pre-Christian and pre-historic" subjects (the immigration into the country, discovery of corn, of wine, of writing and legends of gods with Indian names, of Orpheus etc.). A. Chodzko, A. Dunon (Chansons populaires bulgares infiltres, Paris 1875; cf. also Recue de litterature comparée, xiv, 1934, p. 155 sqq.) and L. Geiter (Prestične tradicije Thrášk i Bulharh, Prag 1878) also strongly supported belief in this "Veda": it was even assumed that the Pomaks were descended from the ancient Thracians, who had been influenced first by Slav culture and then by Islam.

But of ballads on such subjects neither the Muslim nor the Christian Bulgars knew anything and Jireček, who investigated the question on the spot, repeatedly described this "Slav Veda" as the fabrication of some Bulgarian teachers (Fürstenthum, p. 107). We now know that Verkovic’s chief collaborator was the Macedonian teacher Iv. Gologanov (cf. Pentcho Slawejkoff, Bulgarske Volkslieder, Leipzig 1919, p. 15).

In view of the fact that the Muslims in question consist mainly of conservative dwellers in the mountains and villages — who are very industrious, honourable, and peaceful — they are for the most part illiterate and there could be no possibility of any literary activity among them. The only people among them who can write are the köhdjas, who frequently use the Turkish language and Arabic alphabet when writing. They also frequently use the latter alphabet when writing their mother tongue. Of earlier generations of Bulgarian Muslims who distinguished themselves in the Turkish army or otherwise in the Turkish service. The modern generation who have been educated in the state schools have more national consciousness and are more progressive but are too few in number to make themselves felt in politics or otherwise.
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PONTIANAK, the name of a part of the Dutch residency "West-Andfeeling" of Borneo, also of the Sultanate in the delta of the river Kapuas and of its capital.

As a Dutch province Pontianak includes the districts of Pontianak, Kubu, Landak, Sanggau, Sekadau, Tajan and Meliana. The administration is in the hands of an assistant-resident whose headquarters are in Pontianak where the Resident of the "West-Andfeeling" also lives. The Dutch settlement is on the left bank of the Kapuas, where also is the Chinese commercial quarter. The Malay town lies opposite on the right bank. The sultanate of Pontianak with its capital of the same name is independent under the suzerainty of the Netherlands and is 4,545 sq. km. in area. In 1930 the population consisted of 100,000 Malays and Dayaks, 562 Europeans, 26,425 Chinese and 2,378 other Orientals. The term Malaya includes all native Muhammadans among them many descendents of Arabs, Javanese, Buginese, and Dayaks converted to Islam. The Dayaks
in the interior are still heathen. Roman Catholic missions are at work among the latter and the Chinese. This very mixed population is explained by the origin and development of Pontianak.

The town was founded in 1772 A.D. by the Sharif 'Abd al-Raḥmān, a son of the Sharif Ḥusayn b. Ṭāmīṣ b. ʿAbd al-Ṣamad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm, an Arab who settled in Matan in 1735 and in 1771 died in Mampawa as vizier revered for his piety. In 1742 'Abd al-Raḥmān was born, the son of a Dayak concubine, and very early distinguished himself by his spirit of enterprise. He attempted to gain the ruling power, successively in Mampawa, Palembang and Bandjar-masin, from which he had to retire with his band of pirates, although the people had been his patron, after he had taken several European and native ships. By this time he had married a princess of Mampawa and Bandjar-masin and possessed great wealth. On his return to Mampawa his father had just died. As he met with no success here, he decided to found a town of his own with a number of other fortune-seekers. An uninhabited area at the mouth of the junction of the Landak with the Kapuas, notorious as a dangerous haunt of evil spirits seemed to him suitable. After the splinters had been driven away by hours of cannon fire he was the first to spring ashore, had the forest cut down and built rude dwellings there for himself and his followers.

The favourable position of the site and the protection which trade enjoyed there soon attracted Buginese, Malay and Chinese merchants to it so that Pontianak developed rapidly and Sharif 'Abd al-Raḥmān was able by his foresight and energy to hold his own against the neighbouring kingdoms of Matan, Sukadana, Mampawa and Sanggau.

He appointed chiefs over each of the different groups of people and regulated trade by reasonable tariffs. He was able to impress representatives of the East Indian Co. in Batavia to such an extent that they gave him the kingdoms of Pontianak and Sanggau as fiefs after the company had bought off the claims of Banten to Western Borneo. As early as 1772 the Buginese prince Radja Ḥādžiḍi had given him the title of sultān. After his death in 1785 his son Kāsim succeeded him. He was the first to change the Arab ceremonial at the court for more modern ways.

According to the treaty concluded with the Dutch Indies government in 1855, the sultān receives a fixed income from them while they administer justice and police of the country. The relationship to the Dutch Indies government has now been defined in a long agreement of 1912, which also settles the administration of justice and the taxes. From the local treasury, then constituted, the sultān receives 6,800 guilden a month; he also receives 50/9 of the excise on agriculture and mines. In keeping with the nature of its origin Pontianak is predominantly Muslim in character and a relatively large number take part in the pilgrimage to Mecca. For these pilgrims who are known as Džawa Funtiana, the sultān when he performed the pilgrimage in the 30's founded several wažf houses in the holy city.

The main support of the whole population is agriculture and along with it trade in the products of the jungle. The exports are copra, pepper, gambir, sago, rubber and roten, especially to Singapore and Java. Rice, clothing and other articles required by Europeans and now more prosperous Chinese and Arabs are imported. The import and export trade is mainly in the hands of the Chinese. They live together in the Chinese quarter in the European half of Pontianak on the left bank where also the other foreign Orientals have settled.

This is therefore the centre of trade and commerce in the valley of the Kapuas.

The Chinese traders maintain with their own steamers connections with the Chinese merchants farther up the river and also over seas with Singapore, both in competition with the Royal Paketfabri Co.

In the swampy lands of Pontianak, intercourse with the outer world is almost exclusively by water. Only in recent years have motor-roads been laid over the higher ground from Pontianak to Mampawa and Sambas, to Sungel Kakap and from Manior to Landak.

It may be particularly mentioned that Pontianak is a healthy place for the town is very often inundated and it is so far from the sea that there is no malaria.


PORT SAID, a Mediterranean seaport of Egypt at the entrance of the Suez Canal on its western bank, in 31° 15' 50" N., 32° 18' 42" E., 145 miles from Cairo by rail via Zagazig and Ismā'īlīya, 26 and 145 miles from Damietta and Alexandria respectively along the coast. It was founded in 1859, as soon as the Suez Canal was decided, during the reign of Sa'īd Pasha [q.v.], Viceroy of Egypt, and was named after him. Except for the strip of sand which, varying in width between 200 and 300 yards, separates Lake Manzala from the Mediterranean, the site of the present town was under the water. This site was selected by a party of engineers under Laroche and de Lesseps, not on account of being the nearest point across the isthmus to Suez, but because the depth of the water there corresponded most favourably to the requirements of the projected canal. As soon as work was started on the Canal, five wooden houses were constructed above the water, supported on massive piles and equipped with a bakery and a water-distiller for the use of the pioneers. A year later, dredgers began to deepen the waters of the newly established harbour, and the mud thus raised was immediately utilized for more buildings which soon numbered 150 houses, 150 cottages, one hospital, one Catholic and one Orthodox Church, and one Mosque, besides the workshops, covering 30,000 square metres in all. This, however, did not suffice for the rapid growth of the population as the work on the Canal progressed towards Ismā'īlīya. To meet this emergency and in the absence of stone quarries within reasonable reach of Port Sa'id, the manufacture of artificial stones capable of resisting the action of sea-water was begun by Messrs. Bossa. Details of this process are given in 'Ali Pasha Mührak's Khīyat (x. 38—40). These stones weighed about 22 tons each and were used both for the construction of the two huge breakwaters of the outer harbour and for the creation of further building ground. In the same year, mail boats sailed up the Canal to Ismā'īlīya while others brought imports to Port Sa'id. In 1868 the breakwaters were finished, and in 1869 the Canal was completed. As a result,
the town was thronged by consuls and representatives of many nations, and the population reached 10,000.

Like most Eastern foundations of this period, Port Said was from the beginning marked by a division of 1st European and 2nd Turkish. The town has grown up in the west and south-west around the mosque, officially inaugurated on Friday 14th Shābān 1300 (1883); and the second is situated near the Canal entrance and the beach towards the north and east-north. A regular water-supply now comes from the Nile by the Ismā'īliyya Canal and the pipes leading to a large reservoir (château d'eau) capable of holding several days' supply. The rapid growth of the town may be illustrated by the increase of its population, numbering 49,884 in 1907.

The town quickly rose to eminence as an emporium of Egyptian trade — second only to Alexandria in that country, and it also became one of the most important stations for sea-borne traffic between the East and the West. Its outer harbour, covering an area of 570 acres, is two miles or breakwaters built in such a way as to protect the canal from the continuous onrush of sea-water and sand-drifts, and its docks numbering originally 32 on the western bank, all had to be extended. A large floating dock (259 ft. long, 85 ft. wide and 18 ft. deep, with a lifting capacity of 3,500 tons) was constructed; and, further, in the years 1905—1909, new docks were established on the eastern bank. To accommodate the workmen on these docks, the new town of Port Fa'ādīl, named after the present King of Egypt, has sprung up on the east side.

To safeguard the ships approaching the Canal by night, the Khedive Ismā'īl ordered four lighthouses to be erected at the expense of the Egyptian Government at Rosetta, Burullus, Burdīj al-'Izba near Damietta, and Port Sa'id. The last is 174 ft. high and its beam is distinct from those of the other three and is visible at a distance of 20 miles. It lies at the base of the western mole which, at its sea-ward extremity, carries a colossal statue of Ferdinand de Lesseps by E. Ferrmi, unveiled in 1899.

Among the notable buildings of Port Sa'id are the offices of the Suez Canal Company. The town has a very cosmopolitan population and is noted for no special industry. Small dealers live on the sale of Oriental wares and curios to tourists on their passage to the East or to the West.

Bibliography: The chief contemporary source is 'Alī Pasha Mubārak: al-Ḫīfat al-Taʿufīyya, 20 vols., Cairo (Būlāk) 1305—1306. — See also 1. publications on the Suez Canal and its history; 2. the annual Ta'ṣṣāums, Annuaire statistiques and the Trade Returns issued by the Egyptian Government and the Suez Canal Company; 3. guides to Egypt such as Baedeker's, Murray's (ed. Mary Brodrick) and Cook's (ed. Sir E. A. Wallis Budge). (A. S. ATIVA)

POZAREVAC (pronounced Pözhárevaţ; in the French orthography Pojárevaţ; Passarowitz is a corruption like the Turkish Passarofca), a rising commercial town in Yugoslavia (in the Danube banate), headquarters of the district of the same name in the fertile plain between Morava and Mlava, only 10 miles from the Danube port of Dubravica with 13,731 inhabitants (1930).

The town, the name of which is popularly connected with the Serbo-Croat word pozar ("fire") (M. Š. Miščević, Knjiga Srba, Belgrad 1876, p. 172 and 1058), is first mentioned towards the end of the 14th century. It must however have been previously in existence and have become Turkish like the surrounding country in 1459.

According to the Turkish treasury registers of Hungary of 1565 (A. Velies, Magyarországi török kincstári defterek, ii., Budapest 1890, p. 734), Pozarevac belonged to the Turkish sandjak of Semendre (Semendria. Smederevo), and in the middle of the 16th century Hādīji Khalifa describes it as the seat of a judge (bağdâcî) (cf. Spomenik, xviii., Belgrad 1892, col. 26). Towards the end of the century many Serbs migrated from Pozarevac and at the beginning of the 18th century it is sometimes mentioned as a village.

Pozarevac was however destined soon to become famous through the peace which ended the Austro-Turkish war of 1716—1718. At the end of 1714 Turkey had already, declared war on Venice on the pretext that the peace of Carlowitz was not being observed and in 1715 occupied Morea and some of the Ionian Islands. Austria, which at first intervened to negotiate as an ally of Venice, in 1716 entered the war herself and her armies led by Prince Eugene won three great victories, at Peterwardein, Temesvár and Belgrad, so that England intervened to secure peace. After long preparations (cf. von Hammer, G. O. R. 2, iv. 159—164) the congress of Pozarevac was convoked. The negotiations at which plenipotentiaries of Turkey, Austria, Venice with England and Holland as mediators took part began on June 5, 1716 and the Treaty was signed on the 21st July.

Peace was concluded on a basis of the country actually held by the opponents at the time (uti possidetis): Austria retained the eastern part of Sirmia, the banate with Temesvár, the whole of N. E. Serbia, with Belgrad, Pozarevac etc. and Little Wallachia; Venice also retained a few places she had taken on the Dalmatian and Albanian coasts, received certain commercial privileges and the island of Cerigo (Turkish Kapikonak) and had to restore to Turkey the whole of the peninsula of the Morea and the south-eastern districts of the Hercegovina. By a commercial agreement which was also concluded in Pozarevac on July 27 Austria secured certain trading and other privileges in the Ottoman Empire.

Following the traditional formalities observed after the conclusion of a treaty of peace the first Turkish plenipotentiary İbrahim Pasha went to Vienna with his retinue and Count Wirmitz, the Austrian representative in the negotiations, to Constantinople. A member of the Turkish embassy wrote in 1726 an interesting account which has been published by Fr. van Kraelitz in text and translation (Briefe über den Zustand des Gross-Botschafters İbrahim Pasha nach Wien im Jahre 1710, in S. B. Ak. Wiss., vol. 158 [1908]; in T. O. E. M., vii. [1832 — 1916], 211—227, the Turkish text of this edition was reprinted by A. Refik).

During the Austrian occupation (1718—1739) Pozarevac was the most important place in this territory. In the Serbian war of independence against Turkey it was besieged for a long period, and had finally to surrender to the Serbs (1804). In 1813, the town again fell into Turkish hands but became Serbian again in 1815.
In the years of peace that followed (1815–1915) Pozarevac developed. Prince Milos in 1825 made it his second residence and had two konaks (palaces) built there. Shortly afterwards a Prussian officer visited the town and left interesting notes on the conditions there (Otto v. Pirch, *Reise in Serbien im Spätherbst 1829*, Berlin 1830, part i., p. 119–171). In the second half of the 19th century the population increased steadily but otherwise the town offered “little of interest” (F. Kanite, *Serbien*, Leipzig 1868, p. 13).

At the beginning of the 20th century Pozarevac was one of the most important towns in Serbia. In the Great War it was occupied by the Germans in 1915 and by the Bulgarians (from Oct. 1916) but in the autumn of 1918 it was again occupied by the Serbs. Since then it has belonged to Yugoslavia.


**PRANG SABIL**

**Djihad** [q. v.] in the East Indian archipelago; *prang* (Indon.) = **war**.

The course of history has made it impossible for Muslims to fulfill their duties with respect to the *dijahd*. The representatives of the law however still teach and the masses readily believe that arms should only be allowed to rest against the *kafir* so long as any success must be despained of. In the Muslim countryside under non-Muslim rule like the Netherlands Indies the teachers however prefer to be silent. At most they say that under the prevailing conditions there is no legal inducement to conduct the *dijahd* in view of the superior forces and the comparative freedom enjoyed by believers. Or on the other hand, they expound particularly those texts which remove the more serious feuds between Muslim and *kafir* to the next world. — When political events, catastrophes, misfortunes of any kind result in disturbances, it is not at all uncommon for the Muslim population of the East Indian Archipelago to look at these things from a religious point of view. It may happen on such an occasion that the feeling of being bound to fight the unbeliever is aroused again. If the leaders utter the war-cry "prang sabil" it finds a ready answer. It is true that according to the law, the signal for the *dijahd* should be given by the imam. There is now no imam; but even in the time when the sultan of Turkey was still recognised as imam any misgivings were easily overcome if the imam remained inactive. Outside the boundaries of the territory in which

the holy war is proclaimed, the silent sympathy of the believers is with the fighters. Any forcible conversion which takes place, anywhere in the Archipelago as generally praised by Muslim chiefs and represented as a fulfillment of the more solid obligations of the *dijahd*.

This practical teaching of the *prang sabil* was of particular importance in Atjeh in the last quarter of the 19th century. Circumstances were very much in its favour. The Atjehnese were a self-satisfied people, convinced of their own superiority and also of a warlike disposition. Non-Muslims were everywhere hated or at least despised. At the same time those individuals who were in any way connected with divine worship were held in great honour. These qualities were however not in themselves sufficient to conduct a *prang sabil* with success against a disciplined attacking power. A military leader was necessary. There was indeed a sultan in Atjeh but he was a negligible factor as regards the situation in the country. The chiefs, the real rulers of the land, preferred to confine themselves to their own territory; they were not fitted for co-operation. Bands of armed men ravaged the country doing the *kafir* as much damage as possible but they could raise no claim for general co-operation and assistance as they were not waging war in the way Allah had willed. The law lays down the sources from which the costs of the *dijahd* can be met; pillage and plundering, as was the practice of these bands, could never be blessed by Allah. In addition the organisation of these bands was such that they never held together long. In these circumstances it was the *‘ulama* (also used as a singular) who took in hand the organisation of the war; among these the most prominent were the *‘ulama* of Tirto, from olden times a centre of study of sacred lore. They reproached the chiefs with their slothfulness and the people with preferring worldly advantages to heavenly rewards. Going up and down the country they preached the doctrine of the *dijahd* and there was no one who could openly oppose them; indeed they represented the divine law. In order to be able to wage war a war-chest was needed. The *‘ulama* claimed the share of the *saark* set aside for Allah’s purposes; the *‘ulama* of Tirto in particular used it to train a strong force of duly recruited soldiers. The *‘ulama* were for a long time the soul of the war. It is however clear that the authority which they had gained over the secular rulers could only last so long as they were able to inspire the people to continue fighting. When the war was over, they returned to their old still very influential position as representatives of the holy law. — Various writings which together form a regular war literature, proved an effective means of inspiring their warriors with enthusiasm. They were an accompanying feature of the *prang sabil*. *‘Ulama* wrote pamphlets and tractates in which attention was called to the duty of waging the holy war; emphasis was laid on the heavenly reward that awaited the *shahid*, and the *kafir* to be overcome were painted in the blackest colours. An elaborate poem, the *Hikayat Prang sabil*, of which there were many versions, was specially intended to be declaimed in order to increase the courage and contempt for death of those who heard it.

**Bibliography:** C. Snouck Hurgronje, *De Aziërs*, Batavia 1893–1894, i. 153 sqq.; ii.
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PUL (FULBE), a West African tribe, originally pastoral nomads, now to a large extent settled and agricultural. Fulbe, their name for themselves, is the plural of Pulo; they are called Fulani by the Hausa, Fulata by the Kanuri, and by French writers Peul. Their language is called by themselves Fulfulde.

They appear to have come in from the northeast, perhaps ultimately from Fezzân, but their lines of migration in more recent times have rather been from west to east. Migeod, in 1923, found them in what is now the British Mandated Territory of Cameroons, which they had penetrated during the lifetime of persons whom he met. Their main centres of distribution are Foutadjallon in French Guinea and Massina in Haut-Sénégal-Niger.

Ethnographically, although various theories have been advanced, they are now accepted as Hamitic by race. Meek (vol. i., p. 94) points out that they have a strong resemblance to the Proto-Egyptians. Delafosse was disposed to class them as hybrids between some mysterious Beni-Israel (not yet satisfactorily accounted for) and the tribe or tribes whom they found already in occupation; according to one account, the Tekrûr (now called the Toucouleur [q. v.]), Probenius (op. cit., p. 165) says they migrated to the S.W. from Fezzân in order to escape the oppression of the “Gara”, identified by himself and others with the Garamantes of Herodotus. He finds them spoken of in Soninke tradition under the name Bororo (still retained by the Nomad Fulbe in Adamawa at the time of Passarge’s visit in 1893) or Borojogo, as a despised subject race. He finds no originality in the legends collected from their “singing men” (mabube), but holds that, so soon as they become independent they adopted the traditions of their former overlords. In passing, it may be remarked that Probenius is clearly in error when he says (ibid.): “Schon Barthe identifiziert sie mit den Leucaethiopen”

Barth’s own words are (ii. 503): “Darum aber mochte ich sie nicht (f)ur die Leucaethioper der Alten halten”. Barth’s own view is that they are half-way between a mixed Arabo-Berber and a pure negro stock. His reference, in the same passage, to indications of a connection between their language and that of the “Kaffer Sudafríka’s” must be based on the existence of noun-classes in both, a fact which will be dealt with in a later paragraph.

Meek, after considering various hypotheses, comes to the conclusion (i. 98) that “the Fulani are probably a very ancient Libyan tribe whose original home was Egypt or Asia”. He considers the nomad Fulbe as the purest representatives of the Hamitic element in Nigeria (i. 26).

Their physical characteristics are perhaps best summed up in the following quotation from Meek (i. 26), which agrees in the main with the accounts of Mungo Park, Barth, Nachtigal, Passarge and other travellers:

“Their colour varies from a light to a reddish brown”; — Passarge says “hellrotlich gelb” — “their physique is slender and sinewy, and sometimes even effeminate; the face oval, the lips thin, the head dolichocephalic, the forehead rather receding towards the temple, the nose straight or even aquiline, and often slightly rounded at the tip. There is little or no prognathism, the hair is ringlety and often straight… On his chin a man wears a scraggy tuft of beard. The eyes are almond-shaped and overhung by long black silken lashes. The beauty of countenance and graceful carriage of Fulani women are well known. In character the Fula is distrustful and shy, shradd and artful. No African native can equal him for dissimulation and finesse”.

This estimate coincides on the whole with that of the observers previously mentioned. Passarge calls them “eine ritterliche Nation”, in the sense that they despise both manual labour and trade, regarding war, the chase and the care of cattle as the only occupations worthy of a man. They have more dignity and force of character than the negro; at the same time, “trage ich dem Fulla (sic) mehr oberlegte Hinterlist zu. Er ist der grössere Charakter, aber auch im gegebenen Moment der grössere Schurke”. Barth, also, says (ii. 503): “Die liebenswürdige Seite im Charakter der Fulbe ist ihre Einsicht und ihre Lebhaftigkeit, während sie andererseits einen ausserordentlich natürlichen Hang zur Bosheit haben und bei weitem nicht so gutmütig sind wie die eigentlichen Schwarzen”.

Passarge describes them as “fanatical in religion”, but, as the nomad Fulbe are still, at any rate to some extent, pagan (Meek, i. 200 and elsewhere), this must refer to the settled Fulbe, called by the Hausa Fulanim Gidda, who seem to have been converted to Islam, like the other tribes of Nigeria, about the eleventh century (Meek, ii. 1—11). Those settled Fulbe are “by free intermarriage and wholesale concubinage with the races whom they have conquered, fast being absorbed by the negro. Their noses are broadening, their lips are thickening, their hair is curling, their build is coarsening, and the prognathous mouth of the Negro type is beginning to appear. While they have profoundly modified the Negro type of those with whom they have settled, this modification must, in the absence of any fresh infusions of Fulani blood, tend rapidly to disappear… they do not intermarry with the nomad pagan Fulani” (Meek, i. 28).

According to Labouret, nomad Fulbe are scattered over the country in small colonies “généralement installées à côté des villages sédentaires pour en garder les troupeaux”. They supply the settled population with dairy products: Fulbe women selling milk and butter are a familiar sight to travellers.

The Fulbe reached the Upper Senegal region about 1300 A.D., when the Ghana empire was at the height of its power. About 1400, a section of the tribe, coming from Ternees in the north-west, established themselves in Masina, under chiefs of the Djallo family. This kingdom was conquered by Askia Omar, the Songhá chief, in 1494. About the same time or not much later, a Pulo Chief (arbo) named Tengella revolted against Omar, but was killed in 1512. His son, Koli, set up an independent pagan kingdom in Badian, on the Upper Gambia, and his descendants, known as the Denianke dynasty, remained in power from 1559 to 1776.

The Fulbe entered Bornu during the xvith century and, as they had done elsewhere, gradually penetrated
the country in the guise of inoffensive herdsmen, until, watching their opportunity, "by a sudden coup, they made themselves its political masters" (Meek). Towards the end of the xviiiith century, Shehu Usman dan Fodio (born 1754) initiated a religious revival which ended in the conquest of Northern Nigeria. Usman established his capital at Sokoto (built by his son Belo in 1810) and before his death in 1817 was acknowledged as Sarkin Musulmi or spiritual head of the Muslims within his empire. He was succeeded by his son Belo, the "Sultan Belo" visited by Denham, Clapperton and Oudney in 1821. He had his capital at Sokoto and later at Wurno, while his uncle Abdulahi ruled at Gando.

Meanwhile, in the west, a Pulo marabout, Seku Hamadu, had converted the Masina Fulbe to Islam about 1810. Seized Djennie and even (1826) made himself master of Timbuktu; but the dominion founded by him was short-lived, his grandson being overthrown by al-Haddj "Omar in 1862. Before this, in 1776, the Muslim Tektor, in Futa Toro, had revolted against the Fulbe Deniânke and established a "theocratic elective monarchy" (Delafosse) which lasted till the French annexation in 1881. — "Omar, at the head of another section of the Tektor, had conquered the local Fulbe and continued to give trouble to the French authorities till his death in 1864 (Delafosse).

The settled Fulbe do not differ greatly in customs from other Islamized tribes, though even these appear to retain some traces of their pagan ancestry. Animal tabus, which may or may not be connected with totemism, are observed by some Muslim families (Meek, i. 174); apparently Hausa are meant, but it would seem as if the statement were intended to include at least one "Fulani Muslim sub-tribe". Moreover, when Muhammad al-Tünsi says (Meek, i. 99): "In Sudan it is related that they descend from a chameleon", this, so far from being "a false invention for the purpose of contempt" may reflect a real totemic belief.

A system of castes, otherwise unknown in Negro and Bantu Africa is common to the Fulbe, Wolof, Malinke, Marka and Bamman, with this difference that, with the Fulbe, the "castes" originated in tribal distinctions ("werden durch bestimmte Völker gebildet"); Frobenius, p. 166), and therefore are rigid, whereas, among the Mandé, "werden die Kasten durch Sippen gebildet, die in ihrer Kastenzugehörigkeit schwanken". The castes of the Fulbe are:

- Nobles: Rimbe (plural of Dimu)
- Serfs: Rimaihe
- Traders and Herdsmen: Diawambe
- Singers and Weavers: Mabube
- Leather-workers: Sakebe (elsewhere Gargassabe)
- Wood-workers: Laobe (elsewhere Sekaebe)
- Smiths: Wailbe (plural of Bayl)

It is noteworthy that the Fulbe, unlike the other tribes mentioned, did not recognize a separate class of slaves. The serfs (called "Horige" by Frobenius) were the descendants of the Rimbe by captive women. The wood-workers' and traders' castes are peculiar to the Fulbe; the rest are common to all the other tribes.

In contrast to the Galla, Somali and other pastoral Hamitic tribes, the Fulbe do not seem to have any special customs or ritual connected with milk. They keep two distinctive breeds of cattle, one or both of which they are believed to have brought with them in their southward migration. Some particulars concerning their cattle are given by Meek (i. 115—118).

The Fulfulde language was long thought to be absolutely unique. If Barth found in "An- deutungen eines Zusammenhanges dieses Stammes mit den Kaffern Südafrikas", he must have had in mind the system of noun-classes, which, in some respects, resembles that of the Bantu speech-family, though both more complete and more logical than the latter. F. Müller placed the language in a class by itself, forming one division of the "Nuba-Fulah group", for which he could discover no other affinities. A. W. Schleicher (1891) attempted to connect it with Somali, relying chiefly on verbal coincidences, entirely disregarding the system of noun-classes, and admitting that one important grammatical feature of Fulfulde is not to be found in Somali. In so far as he classes the language as Hamite, he is partly in agreement with Meinhof who, somewhat later, came to the conclusion that it represents a pre-Hamitic stratum, from which were developed, on the one hand, the Hamitic languages as known to us to-day (Shilha, Saho, Galla, etc.), on the other, the Benue-Congo.

In addition to the class-system already mentioned (in which the plural is formed by a change, not, as in Bantu, of prefix, but of suffix), Fulfulde exhibits a remarkable cross-division into a. human and non-human; b. large objects and small objects. Here, the plurals are formed by a change of initial consonant according to certain fixed rules summed up by Meinhof as the Law of Polarity. From this latter classification, Meinhof worked out a hypothesis as to the origin of grammatical gender, which has much to commend it. This is set forth in his Sprachen der Hamiten (1912). More recently, however, he has found reason to modify his view of Bantu origins, and considers it at least possible that the class-system is not a primitive feature in Fulfulde, but might have been taken over from some Bantu or "Semi-Bantu" language (Westermann prefers the term "Klassensprachen" for the latter and would extend it to other than those enumerated in H. H. Johnston's Comparative Study). It has also emerged that Fulfulde is less of an isolated phenomenon than had at first appeared. It has points of contact with Serer and other adjacent languages, and in particular, with the little-known Biafoa of Portuguese Guinea, studied by G. A. Krause as long ago as 1895. Two important essays by A. Klingenheben in Zeitschr. f. Einigungen- sprachen, 1923—1924 and 1924—1925 are calculated to shed new light on a complicated problem. Fulfulde, like Hausa, possesses a written literature, for which the form of Arabic script, locally known as ajemi (Ar. 'adjami), has been used, probably, since the introduction of Islam. This script has peculiarities which cause it to differ markedly from that in use by the Swahili.

Some excellent facsimiles are to be found in Captain F. W. Taylor's Fulani-Hausa Readings. Bibliography: "Abd al-Rahmân al-Siddî, Tārîkh al-Sudân (transl. Houdas), Paris 1900; H. Barth, Reisen und Entdeckungen in Nord- und Central-Afrika in den Jahren 1849 bis 1855, 5 vols., Gotha 1857; Abbé P. D. Bolla, Esquisse Sinigalaise, physionomie du pays, eupeule,

PUNA, a city and district of British India in the Central Division of the Bombay Presidency. The district has an area of 5,332 square miles and a population of 1,169,798 of whom 54,997 are Muslims (Census Report, 1931). It was included in the powerful Andhra kingdom of the Dakhin which came to an end about the middle of the third century A.D. The available evidence also points to the fact that later the Western Calukyas, the Rashtrakutas, and the Deogiri Yadavas ruled over this area. With the Khalidji and Tughluq [see Muhammad Tughluq] invasions of the Dakhin it came under Muslim control. An interesting account of Puna when it formed part of the Bahmani kingdom has been recorded by the Russian traveller Athanasius Nikitin (1468-1474), who appears to have been the first foreign traveller whose impressions were preserved for us since the visit of the Chinese pilgrim, Fa-hien, in the beginning of the fifth century A.D. (R. H. Major, India in the Fifteenth Century, Hakluyt Society). Puna remained under Muslim rule until the growth of the Maratha power in the latter half of Awrangzib's reign. The district is therefore associated with the beginnings of Maratha history and closely connected with the career of Shivaji. Under the Pishwas [q. v.] it became the centre of Maratha power until the British conquest in the early nineteenth century.

Puna city, which is situated at the confluence of the Mula and Mula rivers, has a total population of 250,187, of whom 28,923 are Muslims (Census Reports, 1931). When but a village it was included in the nght of Maloji Bhonsla, the grandfather of Shivaji. Later, Shivaji finding Puna too exposed transferred his capital to Râgigad where his coronation took place. Puna was the scene of his daring attack upon Shâyista Khân. With the growth of the power of the Pishwas Puna once more became the capital and centre of the Maratha kingdom. The fortified palace of the Pishwas, known as the Shânwâri, was destroyed by fire in 1827. It was at Puna in the year 1885 that the first meeting of the Indian National Congress took place.


Pûst or Póst (P.), skin; Turkish: pöstäki; a tanned sheepskin, used as the ceremonial seat or throne of a pir or shâkh of a dervish order. The head, sides and foot had mystical significances ascribed to them. It corresponds to the Arabic bîtâf. According to Ewliya Celebi (Stambul, i. 495), the muwîd, after passing the test by the pir, is called şehîd pûst. On ceremonial occasions amongst the bâktâni order, the hall or convent was set out with twelve pîsts of white sheepskin in remembrance of the twelve imâms.


PUWASA (Skr. upavasa), in the East Indian Archipelago the name for the month of Ramadân and for fasting in this month or at other times. The Arabic names however are not unknown. Fasting is in Indonesia generally a favourite pious practice not only on the days prescribed or recommended by law but also as a means of attaining a desired end. The observation of the fast in Ramadân is here as elsewhere
PUWASA

regarded as the most important of the pillars of Islam; here also we find the popular belief prevailing that it can atone for the sins of the whole year. Not all however continue the fast to the end of the month; if any one finds it difficult he satisfies his conscience by fasting on the first and last days of the month; nevertheless such people or even those who do not fast at all are not at the same elevated sentiment which fills all and which stamps Ramadān as the Muḥammadan month like no other. Students, merchants, all whose business takes them away from home endeavour to spend this month at least in the family circle. In many districts the approach of puwasa is remarkable for the increase of slaughtering in the last days of the preceding month. The meat is preserved for use; meals in puwasa are somewhat heavier than usual in order to strengthen for the strain of fasting. The markets are also more animated towards the end of the month; this is the time to make purchases in view of the approaching end of the fast. The beginning of the month is publicly notified; e.g., the drums which form part of the equipment of the houses of prayer are beaten in a special way. The beating of the drums is repeated throughout the whole month at particular times of day, especially after sunset and shortly after midnight in order to warn the faithful that the time for eating is nearly over so that they can prepare the morning meal (Ar. ṣalār). Finally at the end of the month when the period of abstinence is over, the drums are beaten with particular vigour. The ascertainment of the end and beginning of Ramadān usually leads to friction every year. Those who are free-thinkers in religious matters use the calendar and do not hesitate to announce the end of the fast in advance; all who demand that the law should be strictly followed and these include the modernists, stick to ʿuruṣ (evidence of the senses). The tarawīḥ (Ar. tariqah) service is held in the public houses of prayer after the ʿiḥād; it is also eagerly attended by people who on other occasions do not observe the legal obligations of religion. The lack of seriousness and the unifying conduct of many participants induces the devout to avoid this tarawīḥ service and to observe it elsewhere with a small company of similarly minded people. It is worst in Atjeh; the tarawīḥ service here is simply a caricature (Smouch Hurgronje). A special importance is usually attached to the last five odd nights of the month devoted to religious exercises in connection with the ṣalāt al-kadr. They are not agreed as to which of these nights is most probably the correct one: the 21st and 27th are preferred but the practice varies in different localities. Part of the ceremonial observation of these nights consists in having illuminations in front of the dwelling-houses. In Java special emphasis is laid on the eating of meals together. Every one, if he can at all do it, gives a religious feast every evening. Later they go round their friends; open house is generally kept and time spent in rejoicing until far into the night. Besides these private entertainments there are meals of an official nature. The people of the village come to the house of the village headman to a religious feast; every one brings his share. The higher officials, especially the administrative officials, give a feast to their subordinates. The most splendid observance of these five nights however is found in the palaces of the Javanese princes. According to ancient custom, these feasts took place in great splendour after sunset; the broad forecourts of the palaces give an excellent opportunity for them. These feasts known as maṭlīman, with which many legends are associated, follow one another in a hierarchical succession. First the prince has his on the 27th, next the crown-prince, the princes of the blood, the governors and ministers; the dishes are intended for the hou’s subordinates. In recent years these maṭlīman have become restricted so that only the first of them retains its official character. The "little" feast is a day of rejoicing far surpassing the "great" feast. After the ʿftrā has been performed on the last day of Ramadān or even earlier and ablations have been taken with special care, in which the Javanese sometimes includes his cattle, a feast is prepared in the house in the evening after the breaking of the fast. The more devout make a modest meal precede this within the month of the fast to take farewell of the spirits of the deceased who wander about during Ramadān and now return to their abodes. The ceremonial ʿṣalāt on this 27th day in Atjeh but is a great ceremony in other places; there is no ʿṣalāt in the whole year which is better attended; many, who otherwise never enter a mosque never fail to be present on this occasion. In Java the regents, the highest native government officials accompanied by the whole of the staff of the regency, all in full dress go in the early morning, before sunrise from the regent's house to the mosque in order to take part in the ʿṣalāt there. After the end of the ʿṣalāt they return in the same way. The regent then receives the homage of all. The same custom prevails in the southern Celebes; except that here the native princes take the place of the regents. On this day the young people let off fire-works. After the ceremonial ʿṣalāt people set out in new clothes to visit relations and friends; congratulations are given on the successful conclusion of the fast and pardon is asked for any sins committed deliberately or involuntarily in the past year. It is a widespread custom to visit on this day the tombs of ancestors which have previously been cleaned, and there to spend some time scattering flowers and incense in pious devotion. In Java again we have the custom for the higher officials to treat their subordinates to what are called "mountains of food" (dishes of all kinds arranged in artistic forms). In the native states, at the end of the fast, one of the three public holidays is observed, the essential feature of which is the public representation of the unity of the kingdom in the person of the prince. The three feasts are on the whole on the same lines. The prince appears in oriental splendour and shows himself in the outer court of the palace before the assembled people. Large supplies of food have already been prepared in the royal kitchens and are ceremonially piled up into mountains of food of exactly defined form and preparation. These "mountains" which are so large that it takes several persons to carry one, are carried to the place of audience as soon as the prince has taken his seat and at his command taken on to the mosque. Here the food is distributed after the chief supervisor of the mosque has offered a prayer for prince and country. On account of the blessing associated with it it is lucky to get any of the food. The six days' fast in Shawwāl recommended by law is only observed
by a few very pious people; a minor festival is observed on the 8th of the month to mark its conclusion.


---

**QUETTA** (Pashtu: Kwaṭta), a taḥṣil and town in the Quetta-Pīghin district of British Balūčistān [q. v.]. The district, which contains the taḥṣil of Quetta and Pīghin and the administrative sub-division of Čaman, has an area of 4,806 square miles and a population of 147,541, of whom 107,945 are Muslims. Nearly all these Muslims are Pashtu speaking Paṭhāns, only a very small minority speaking Brahūl and Balūč. The district, which is very mountainous, is bounded on the north-west by Afghan territory, on the east by the Zhōb and Sibi districts, and on the south by the Balān Pass district and the Sarawan division of Kālāt.

The taḥṣil of Quetta, which is held on lease from the Khān of Kālāt, has an area of 543 square miles and a population of 76,649. The town of Quetta was destroyed by earthquake in 1935. In 1931 it had a population of 60,272, of whom 25,391 lived in the cantonment (Census of India, 1931, vol. iv., Balūčistān).

Until the middle of the eighteenth century, when Quetta finally came under Brahūl control, the history of Quetta-Pīghin is probably identical with that of Kandahār [for early history see the art. BALŪČISTĀN and KANDAHĀR]. Quetta was temporarily occupied by the British during the First Afghan War, 1839–1842 (see W. Hough, *A Narrative of the march and operations of the army of the Indus in the expedition into Afghanistan*, 1840). Its strategic importance was first recognized by General John Jacob who urged Lord Canning, in 1856, to garrison this important point of vantage (*Views and Opinions of General John Jacob*, ed. Pelly, p. 349). The proposal was rejected on the grounds that, surrounded by hostile tribes and cut off from its true base, the isolated position of the garrison would be extremely precarious. Ten years later, Sir Henry Green, the Political Superintendent of Upper Sind, seeking to improve the British scheme of frontier defence, proposed that Quetta should be garrisoned and connected by rail with Karāčī. Unfortunately for those who desired an advance into Bālūčistān the proposal had to face the united opposition of Lord Lawrence and his Council, all of whom were champions of non-intervention. Ten years passed. The exponents of "masterly inactivity" were no longer predominant in the Vicerey's council chamber; Khiwa [see *sīlōm*] had fallen before the Russiāns, who were drawing nearer and nearer to the gates of India; and, more dangerous still, the estrangement of Šir 'Ali had brought the Amir of Afghanistan and the Government of India to the brink of war. It was therefore decided, in 1876, to occupy Quetta. The British right to dispatch troops into Kālāt territory had been recognized by the treaty of 1854 (Aitchison, xi. 212–213). Chiefly owing to the efforts of Major (afterwards Sir Robert) Sandeman, this treaty was renewed and supplemented on December 8, 1876. by the Treaty of Jacobālūḏ (Parl. Papers, 1877, lxiv., c. 1808, p. 314–316). In return for an increased subsidy the Khān granted permission for the location of troops in, and the construction of railways and telegraph lines through, Kālāt territory. This was followed by the formation of the Bālūčistān Agency, for on February 21, 1877, Sandeman was appointed Agent to the Governor-General with his headquarters at Quetta.

The strategic importance of Quetta is now almost universally recognized. Protected on the south-west by the lofty Chiltan range and on the north-east by the Zagānč plane, it dominates all the southern approaches to the Indus valley.

RA', tenth letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of 200. For its palaeographical evolution see the article ARABIA, plate i. It belongs to the group of the liquids and is frequently interchanged with l and n. It regularly corresponds to the r of other Semitic languages. It is not guttural but lingual.


(A. J. Wensinck)

RABÄB, the generic name in Arabic for the violin, or any stringed instrument played with a bow (kaws). The origin of the name has been variously explained: a. from the Hebrew rabāb (l'ad r being interchangeable); b. from the Persian rabāb (ravwoswa), which was played with the fingers or plectrum; and c. from the Arabic rabāb (to collect, arrange, assemble together). The first derivation is scarcely feasible. The second has a raison d'être, although the mere similarity in name must not be accepted without question. In spite of the oft repeated statement that the Arabs admit that they borrowed the rabāb from the Persians, together with the word kanūn for the bow, there is not the slightest evidence for it. No Arabic author (so far as the present writer knows) makes an admission of this kind, nor have the Arabs adopted the word kanūn for the bow; their own term kaws having been considered sufficient. It is true that we read in the Maṣūfah al-'Ulam (8th century) that "the rabāb is well-known to the people of Persia and Khurasān" (237), but this author was writing in hither Persia, and we know from al-Fārābī that the rabāb was also well-known in Arabic lands. One argument against the alleged borrowing from Persia is that the rabāb with the Persians has ever been a plucked and not a bowed instrument. Still, the Arabs may have borrowed the plucked instrument and adapted it to the bow. On the other hand, the Arabic root rabāb as the parent of the word rabāb has much in its favour. As the Arabic musical accousticians point out, plucked instruments such as the 'ud (lute), jambūr (pandore), etc. gave short (muntajil) sounds, but bowed instruments such as the rabāb gave long or sustained (muntajil) sounds. It was application of the bow which "collected, arranged, or assembled" the sound notes into one sustained note, hence the term rabāb being applied to the violin (see Farmer, Stud., i. 99).

The rabāb is mentioned as early as the Arabic polygraph al-Dihāqī (d. 868) in his Maḏma‘ī al-Raṣīl. Yet we cannot be sure whether this was the bowed rabāb or the plucked rubāb. At any rate, it already had a legendary history when he wrote. According to the Kashf al-Humūm (xvth–xvith century) it is first found in the hands of a woman of the Banū Ṭayy (fol. 263). Turkish tradition ascribed its "invention" to a certain 'Abd Allah Fārābī (Ewfiyā Celebi, Siyāhat-nāme, i/ii. 226, 234). An Andalusian legend places its invention within the Iberian peninsula (Delphin and Guin, Notes sur la poésie et la musique andres, p. 59). One thing is certain even if we have iconographic evidence of the violin in the viith or ixth century (cf. infra), the earliest literary evidence of the use of the bow comes from Arabic sources, i.e. from al-Fārābī (d. 950), the Ikhwān al-Safā (8th century), Ibn Sīnā (d. 1037), and Ibn Zālīla (d. 1048), as I have fully demonstrated elsewhere (Stud., i. 101–105).

Seven different forms of viol are known to Islamic peoples, viz.: 1. The Rectangular Viol, 2. the Circular Viol, 3. the Boat Shape Viol, 4. the Pear Shape Viol, 5. the Hemispherical Viol, 6. the Pandore Viol, and 7. the Open Chest Viol.

1. The Rectangular Viol. This consists of a wooden frame, more or less rectangular, over the face (wadāf) and back (sāhīr) of which is stretched a membrane (al-bilād). The neck (al-ma’lūd) is cylindrical and is of wood, whilst the foot (riqūf) is of iron. It has either one or two strings (waṭūr), generally of horsehair, Al-Khallīl (d. 791) says that "the ancient Arabs sang their poems to its [the rabāb’s] voice [or sound]" (Farmer, Stud., i. 100). In the Kashf al-Humūm (fol. 267) we read that it was used to accompany the pre-Islamic kasīda and the elegic poem. Probably the pre-Islamic rabāb was of this rectangular form. Lane (Lexicon, p. 1005) held this latter view. Ibn Ghāfīl (d. 1435) [q.v.] describes this violin of the bedouin as rectangular (musrābāh) and with a membrane face and back and one string of horsehair (fol. 78v). Nièbuh (l. 144) says that it was still called the musrābā in the xvith century. We certainly have a rectangular instrument shown in the frescoes of Kuṣār ‘Amra (Musil, pl. xxxiv), but it was played with the fingers and not with a bow. Yet even in modern times the rabāb of the desert was to be found played in this way as well as with a bow (Chritchton, ii. 350; Burckhardt, Bedouins, p. 43; do., Travels, i. 389; Burton, Personal Narrative, iii. 76). Nièbuh (Tah., xxvi, F) delineates a rectangular viol of two strings, although he says that he saw a viol of one string in Cairo. Villoteau (722–724: 913–918) distinguishes between the two instruments. In Egypt, he says, the rabāb al-ṣāfīr (poet’s viol) had one string, whilst the rabāb al-mughannī (singer’s viol) had two strings. Lane (Med. Egypt., chaps. xviii, xxi.) also describes them. These instruments never form part of a concert orchestra, being relegated to the folk. For other delineations of the instrument see Fétis (Hist., ii. 145), Engel.
1. **The Circular Viol**. The modern instrument of this form consists of a circular wooden frame or pan, the face, and sometimes the back, being covered with a membrane. There is no foot.

2. **The Boat Shape Viol**. This form is confined to the Maghrib. It consists of a piece of wood hollowed out into the shape of a boat. The chest (zadr) is covered with thin metal or wood pierced with ornamental rosettes (marseqārā'), whilst the lower part is covered with a membrane. The head (rād) is at right angles to the body, and it is generally furnished with two strings. It seems that it has been used by the Arabs and Moors of Spain since their invasion of the peninsula. It is praised by Ibn al-Durayd (684-756) and Ibn Bakr Yahyā ibn Hudhali (see al-Shalāḥī, fol. 15), and Ibn Ḥazm (see Muhammad b. Ismāʿīl, p. 472), and doubtless they refer to either this instrument or the **Pear Shape Viol** (see infra 4) since the **Glossarium Latino-Arabicum** (9th century) equates rabāb with *ivra dīcta a varietate*. If we have no ichnographic evidence of this violin from Arabian or Moorish sources, it certainly exists among the Spaniards, since the instruments in the **Cantigas de Santa María** (13th century) show definite oriental features; see Riaño (p. 129) and Rihera (pl. xi.). Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1406) is the first to describe this violin, although not very clearly (*Pr. IV. 354*). It is not until the time of ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Fāsī (d. 1650) that we get any musical details of the instrument (*F. R. A. S.* 1931, p. 566). European travellers (Addison, Winthuys, Hōn, Shaw) mention the instrument as popular in the Maghrib, and to-day it is one of the principal instruments in ascendent rustic music. Host gives us one of the earliest delineations of the instrument from Eastern sources (Tab. xxxi. 2). For a sixteenth century description see F. Salvador-Daniel (p. 50) and for a design see Christianowitch (pl. i). Several delineations of both instruments and players may be seen in al-Hafīz (pl. 34: 39—52). Mahillon (i. 416—417), Fétis (*Hist.,* i. 146), Engel (*Cat.,* p. 143), Chouquet (p. 205), Sachs (*Reallex,* p. 317), etc. For the instrument of Northern India called the sārangī see Lavigne (p. 350) and Fétis (ii. 298).

4. **The Pear Shape Viol**. Probably, the earliest Arabic reference to this instrument is that made by Ibn Khurdābdīh (d. ca. 912) who, in an oration before Caliph al-Mutamid (d. 893), says that the Byzantines had a wooden instrument of five strings called the *lira* which was identical with the rabāb of the Persians and the *lira* of the Arabs (al-Masʿūdī, *Murājī*, viii. 91). We can probably identify the instrument in the famous Carama *Canticum* at Florence which dates from the 10th century (*L. A. T.*, 1596, p. 24). From the Siculo-Moorish woodwork of the Palatine Chapel at Palermo (13th century) we see to better advantage what the Arabic instrument was like (*B. Z.*, 1893, ii. 383). It was this form of the rabāb probably, with which al-Fārābī (d. 950) deals (see Land, *Researcher,* p. 130, 166). He gives full details of both the *acordatura* and scales. We know little about this instrument in Arabic speaking lands after the 10th—11th century, until it is described by Niebuhr (i. 143; Tab. xxv., D) in the 13th century, and even then it appears to have been favoured only by the Greek population. It had three strings. It may have been used in the Maghrib (Lane, p. 159—160), but neither Villetoeur nor Lane know of it in Egypt. In Turkey, it appears to have been adopted from the Greeks, possibly in the 13th century, and with the *ūd* and *lawāṭ* plays a prominent part in concert music today (Lavigne, p. 3015). Recently an attempt has been made to introduce this rabāb *turki* or *arabāb*, as it is now called, into Egypt (al-Hafīz, p. 661, pl. 35). Designs of the instrument may be found in Engel (*Cat.,* p. 210) and Crosby Brown (i, pl. 22), where they represent specimens in collections at South Kensington (London) and New York.

5. **The Hemispherical Viol**. This is, perhaps, the best known form of the violin in the Islamic east. The body consists of a hemispherical piece of wood, cooco-nut, or a gourd, over the aperture of which a membrane is stretched. The neck is of wood, generally cylindrical, and there is a foot of iron, although sometimes there is no foot. It is often known in Arabic as the kamāndja or more rarely as the ḥābk. The former is derived from the Persian kamān (lit. of kamān, “bow”) whilst the latter is derived from the Persian and Turkish ḥābk, ḥāhtak, ḥābk, ḥāhtak, ḥālak, etc., which may have had their origin in the Sanscrit *vahsaka*, an instrument mentioned in the pre-Christian *Nāyiga-vāstra* (cap. xxiii.). I believe that the words ḥābk and ḥānt are mentioned in the *Khvān-i ʿalāf* (Bombay ed., i. 97) and al-Shalāḥī (fol. 12) respectively, are copyist’s errors for ḥābk and ḥāhtak. The work kamāndja is first mentioned in Arabic by Ibn al-Fākīh (ca. 903) who says that it was used both by the Copts and the people of Sindh (*B. G. A.*). Of course this need not mean that the instrument mentioned was a hemispherical violin, because, being a Persian by origin, the author may have used the word kamāndja in its Persian generic sense meaning a violin. That Egypt had an early like for the kamāndja is borne out from various sources. Although in Egypt the hemispherical viol is nowadays called the rabāb *miyri* (Egyptian violin), in earlier days it was acknowledged that Egypt borrowed the instrument from Persia (*Kashf al-Humūm*, fol. 106). The kamāndja was certainly popular at the courts of the Ayyūbīd al-Kāmil (d. 1235), and the Mamlūk Baybars (d. 1277); see al-Maqrīzī, i, 136; Lane-Poole, *Hist. of Egypt*, p. 249. In the Persian *Kanz al-Tahaf* (14th century) the hemispherical violin is described and figured as the ḥālak, but in Ibn Ghāthī (d. 1355) where both the ḥālak and the kamāndja are described, the former is a larger type of the latter, having, in addition to its two ordinary strings, eight sympathetic strings (*Kanz al-Tahaf*, fol. 261); Ibn Ghāthī, fol. 78. In the 15th century the kamāndja is delineated by Russell (i. 152—153, pl. iv.), and Niebuhr (i, 144, Tab. xxvi., E). Both Villetoeur (p. 900, pl. BB) and Lane (*Mod. Egypt.*, chap. 18) give minute details.
of the construction and accoutrement. Mushāṭa also describes the Syrian kamānṣa (kamānṣa) of his day (M. F. O. B., vi. 25, 81). For the modern Persian instrument see Advielle (14 and pl.) and Lavignac (p. 3074). Turkishmanian instruments are given by Fitrat (p. 45) and Belnev (p. 54). For Malayia see Kaudern (p. 178); for India Lavignac (p. 349) and Fétis (ii. 295). For other designs see Farmer (Stud., i. 76). Fétis (Hist., ii. 136–137), Chouquet (p. 203), Sachs (Reallex., p. 207).

6. The Pandore viol. This form is practically a tambur, stīfr, or the like, which is bowed instead of being plucked by the fingers or a plectrum. The two best known examples from India are the errār and fēṣē. The former has a membrane on its face and has five strings played on with the bow together with a number of sympathetic strings. The latter is practically identical with the former but is adorned with the figure of a peacock (hence its name) at the bottom of the body of the instrument. See Lavignac (p. 351) and Mahillon (i. 131) for designs and details. With the Persians and Turkomans we see various kinds of pandores used with the bow. See Advielle (p. 14), Lavignac (p. 3074), Mironov (p. 27), Kinsky (p. 26).

7. The Open Chest Viol. This is unknown to the peoples of North Africa and the Near East, although it is popular in the Middle East. Unlike the preceding forms of the viol, the upper part of the face of the body or sound-chest is left open. The best known example of this is the sārīmā of India which has three strings. See Fétis (ii. 296). Lavignac (p. 351), Mahillon (i. 137), and Kinsky (p. 27), for both designs and details. In Turkomans a similar form is called the hāṭbā, which is very popular. It has two strings. See Bellev (p. 52), Mironov (p. 25), Fitrat (p. 43).


Kinsky, Geschichte der Musik in Bildern, Leipzig 1929; Chottin, Corpus de Musique Marcocaine, ii, Paris 1933.


(H. G. Farmer)
or mbang as far as Kuno, there was held up with his 8,000 men by some thirty Senegalese soldiers under the district commissioner Bretonnet and only overcame the resistance of this handful of heroes after eight hours fighting (July 18, 1899). On April 22, 1900, he was defeated at Kusri on the lower Chari by Commandant Lamy: Rabah and Lamy both fell in the battle. His extraordinary career had lasted 22 years and ruined a whole region of the Central Sidân.

(Maurice Delafosse)

RABAT, AR. Ribât Al-Mansûr, vulg. er-ribâṭ (Ethnic Ribai, vulg. Ribâṭ), a town in Morocco, situated on the south bank at the mouth of the Wādi Abū Raкра (Wed Bu Regreg) opposite the town of Sale [cf. Sāla]. Since the establishment of the French protectorate it has been the administrative capital of the Shaftian empire, the usual residence of the sultan of Morocco, and the headquarters of the mahkzen [q. v.] and of the French authorities. The choice of Rabat as the administrative centre of Morocco has brought this town considerable development in place of the somnolence in which it was sunk a quarter of a century ago.

The foundation of Ribâṭ al-Fath was the work of the Almohads [q. v.]. The site of the "Two Banks" (al-Idwâām) of the estuary of the Bu Regreg had previously been the scene of Roman and pre-Roman settlements: the Punic, later Roman Sale was built on the left bank of the river higher up at the site of the royal Marinid necropolis of Chella (Shâla; q. v.). The Muslim town of Sâla on the right bank had, from the beginning of the tenth century to protect it against the inroads of the Berghawâta [q. v.] heretics at the time when it was the capital of a little Ifnâd kingdom, fortified on the other side of the Bu Regreg a ribâṭ [q. v.], which was permanently occupied by devout volunteers who in this way desired to carry out their vow of ḫilâd [q. v.]: the geographer Ibn Ḥawkal is authority for its existence at this date (cf. B. G. A., i. 56). But we know very little of the part played by this ribâṭ in the course of the sanguinary wars later fought between the Berghawâta and the Almoravids. It is not even possible to point out its exact situation. It was perhaps the same fortified spot that is mentioned in the middle of the xiiith century under the name of Kašir Ḫani Tarâq by the geographer al-Fârâbî.

The final and complete submission of the Berghawâta meant that a different part was to be played by the ribâṭ on the estuary of Bu Regreg. In 545 (1150), the founder of the dynasty of the Muʿminid Almohads, ʿAbd al-Munîn, chose the fort and its vicinity as the place of mobilisation for the troops intended to carry the holy war into Spain. A permanent camp was established there and he provided for a supply of fresh water by bringing a conduit from a neighbouring source, ʿAin Ghâbûla. The permanent establishments, — mosque, royal residence — formed a little town which received the name of al-Mahdiyya. On several occasions very large bodies of men were concentrated around the ribâṭ, and it was there that ʿAbd al-Munîn died on the eve of his departure for Spain in 558 (1163).

The development of the camp went on under ʿAbd al-Munîn's successor, Abû Yaʿkûb Yusuf (558—580 = 1163—1184), but it was the following prince of the Muʿminid dynasty, Abû Yusuf Yaʿkûb al-Mansûr, who at the beginning of his reign gave the orders and opened the credits necessary for its completion. In memory of the victory gained in 1195 by the Almohads over Alfonso VIII of Castile at Alarcos [q. v.], it was given the name of Ribâṭ al-Fath. The camp was surrounded by a wall of earth flanked with square towers enclosing with the sea and the river an area of 450 hectares. The wall is still standing for the most part and is nearly four miles in length; two monumental gates, one north known as Bâb al-Kwâh (Bab er-Rûbi), the other west known as kašaba (Kasha of the Oudaya), date from this period. It was also Yaʿkûb al-Mansûr who ordered the building inside Ribâṭ al-Fath of a colossal mosque which was never finished; rectangular in plan it measured 610 feet long by 470 feet broad; the only mosque in the Muslim world of greater area was that of Sâmarra [q. v.]. It was entered by 16 doors and in addition to three courts had a hall of prayer, supported by over 200 columns. In spite of recent excavations more or less successfully conducted this mosque still remains very much a puzzle from the architectural point of view. But the minaret, which also remained unfinished and was never given its upper lantern still surprises the traveller by its unusual dimensions. It is now called the Tower of Ḥassân (Bâb Ḥassân). Built entirely of stones of uniform shape it is 160 feet high on a square base 53 feet square. Its walls are eight feet thick. The upper platform is reached by a ramp two yards broad and gentle slope. This tower in its proportions, its arrangement and decoration is closely related to two Almohad minarets of the same period: that of the mosque of the Kutubiyya at Marrakesh [q. v.] and that of the great mosque of Seville [q. v.], the Giralda.

Yaʿkûb al-Mansûr's great foundation never received the population which its area might have held and the town opposite, Sale, retained under the last Almohads and in the xiiith and xivth centuries all its political and commercial importance. Rabat and Sale in 1248 passed under the rule of the Marinids and it seems that Rabat in those days was simply a military station of no great importance, sharing the fortunes of its neighbour which had gradually become a considerable port having busy commercial relations with the principal trading centres of the Mediterranean. But a chance circumstance was suddenly to give the town of the "Two Banks" a new aspect. The expulsion of the last Moriscoes [q. v.] decided upon in 1610 by Philip III brought to Rabat and Sale an important colony of Andalusian fugitives who increased to a marked degree the number of their compatriots in these towns who had previously left Spain of their own free-will after the reconquest. While the population of the other Moroccan cities, Faz and Tetwân principally, in which the exiles took refuge, very quickly absorbed the new arrivals whom they had welcomed without distrust, the people of Rabat and Sale could not see without misgivings this colony from Spain settle beside them, for they lived apart, never mingled with the older inhabitants and devoted themselves to piracy and soon completely dominated the two towns and their hinterland. Rabat, known in Europe as "New Sale" in contrast to Sale ("Old Sale"), soon became the centre of a regular little maritime republic
RABAT — RABB

in the hands of the Spanish Moors who had either left of their own accord before 1610, the so-called “Hor
nachuelas”, or had been expelled in 1610, the so-called “Moriscos”, the former however being clearly in the majority. This republic, on the origin and life of which the documents from European archives published by H. de Castries and P. de Cenival have in recent years thrown new light, hardly recognised the suzerainty of the sultan who ruled over the rest of Morocco. While boasting of their dhikād against the Christians, the Andalusians of the “Two Banks” really found their activity at sea a considerable source of revenue. They had retained the use of the Spanish language and the mode of life they had been used to in Spain. They thus raised Rabat from its decadence.

Their descendants still form the essential part of the Muslim population of the town and they have Spanish patronymics like Bargáš (Vargas), Palá
mino, Moreño, López, Pérez, Chiñuto, Dinya (Span. Dénia), Runda (Span. Ronda), Múltin (Molino) etc.

The spirit of independence and the wealth of the Spanish Moors in Rabat soon made the town a most desirable object in the eyes of the sultāns of Morocco. Nevertheless the little republic with periods of more or less unreal independence, was able to survive until the accession of the ‘Alīd sultan Saiyidī Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh in 1771 (1757). This prince now endeavoured to organise for his own behalf the piracy hitherto practised by the sailors of the republic of the “Two Banks”. He even ordered several ships of the line to be built. But the official character thus given to the pirates of Sale very soon resulted in the bombardment of Sale and Larache [v.] by a French fleet in 1765. The successors of Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh had very soon to renounce any further attempt to wage the “holy war” by sea. The result was a long period of decline for Sale which found expression not only in the gradual diminution of its trade but also in a very marked hatred of each town for the other. At the beginning of the xixth century, Rabat like Sale had completely lost its old importance. They were both occupied by French troops on July 19, 1911.

Rabat is one of the towns of Morocco, the population of which is both kafarīya, i.e. essentially town-dwelling, and makhāṣṣa, i.e. used as residence by the sultan of the Sharifian empire. The nonEuropean population has increased in a marked degree since the establishment of the protectorate and its choice as permanent capital of the sultan. The number of inhabitants at the census of 1931 was 27,986 Muslims and 4,218 Jews (20,452 and 3,676 in 1926; Sale wich is a separate municipality had in 1931 22,145 Muslims and 2,387 Jews). They live almost entirely in the madīna, which is the site of the trapezoid, and its annexes formed by the Jewish melan [q. v.] and the kāshāa of the Udaya, a separate walled area with its own mosque, originally inhabited by contingents of the ghīth tribe (q. v.; Ar. ḏayḥ) of this name (Kašba of the Oudaya). The chief mosques of Rabat are the foundations of ‘Alīd sultan’s, Mawālī al-Rashid [q. v.] and Mawālī Subhān (Moulā Shīmān); the mosque near the imperial palace, the Dīānī al-Sunna, was built in the second half of the xviii century. Besides the monumental gates there are several other entrances in the Almohad enceinte: the Bāb al-Usūl (Bāb al-‘Alou) admits from the madīna to the cemetery and the cliffs which rise up from the ocean; the gate called Za‘rā (Bāb Za‘īr) is in the immediate vicinity of the Marinid royal cemetery of Chella (Shālīla).

The French town of Rabat built outside the madīna is developing rapidly: the palace of the Resident-General, the public offices, fine esplanades, villas surrounded by gardens give the new town a particularly attractive appearance. French Rabat at the present day is a masterpiece, famed throughout the world, of successful town planning and architecture. It is connected by railway to Casablanca and Marrākesh in the south, Tangier in the north, Fās and Algiers in the east. Since October 1935 it has been the final resting-place of Marshal Lyautey to whom it owes its position as capital and its reconstruction.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

RABB (A.), lord, God, master of a slave.

Pre-Islamic Arabia probably applied this term to its gods or to some of them. In this sense the word corresponds to the terms like Ba‘al, Adon in the Semitic languages of the north where rabb means “much, great”. — In one of the oldest sūras (cvi. 3) Allāh is called the “lord of the temple”. Similarly al-Lat bore the epithet al-Rabbas, especially Tā‘īf where she was worshipped in the image of a stone or of a rock. — In the Quran rabb (especially with the possessive suffix) is one of the usual names of God. This explains why in Ḥadith the slave is forbidden to address his master as rabbī, which he must replace by sayidī (Muslim, al-Afīn min al-Adab, trad. 14, 15, etc.). — The abstract rūḥūsya is not found in either Kurān or Ḥadīth; it is in common use in mystic theology.

Bibliography: The Arabic dictionaries; Flügel, Concordantiae Corani.
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RABGHÜZI. [See RUBGHÜZI.]

RABI' (A.), the name of the third and fourth months of the Muslim calendar. The name is an Aramaic loanword and in the Syriac translation of the Bible corresponds to the Hebrew malkoth (late rain). This and the fact that the two months following Rabī' II are called Žumādāt (month of frost) suggested to Wellhausen that these four months originally fell in winter and that the old Arab year began with the winter half-year [see al-MUHARRAK]. Rabī' means originally the season in which, as a result of the rains, the earth is covered with green; this later led to the name Rabī' being given to spring. Al-Birūnī expressly describes autumn (kašīf) as the season indicated by Rabī'. As a result of the Kur'ānic prohibition of intercalation [see NAST], since the beginning of the Muslim era the two months no longer fall at a regular season.

Bibliography: Wellhausen, Reste, p. 97; Brockelmann, Lexicon Syriacum, s. v.; al-Birūnī, Aḏārār, ed. Sachau, p. 60, 325.

AL-RABI' B. YUNUS B. 'ABD ALLAH B. ABI FARWA (so-called from his entering Medina with a back), emancipated slave of al-Jāhid al-Haffār (slave-driver), emancipated slave of ʿOṯmān b. ʿAffān. He was really a bastard of obscure origin, a fact which was often brought up against him by his enemies later in his career. Born in slavery at Medina about 112 (730), he was bought by ʿIyād b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Hārijī who presented him to his master Abu l-ʿAbdāf al-Saffār, the first Abbasid Caliph. All his life, he served, with varying fortune, three more Abbasid Caliphs: al-Manṣūr, al-Mahdī and al-Hādī. He reached the zenith of his power under al-Manṣūr (135—158) who, finding him a capable and useful courtier, appointed him ṣāḥib and afterwards made him his wāzir in succession to Abū ʿAlī b. al-Mawrīyānī. His son al-Fāḍil b. al-Rabī', who was destined to play a prominent part in the forthcoming intrigues against the house of Barmaḳ, took his father's duties as ṣāḥib. After the foundation of Bagdad, the new town was divided into three masters of which he was given in fief by al-Manṣūr to al-Rabī' and was thus named after him (kūṭāf al-Rabī').

During the reign of al-Mahdī (155—169), his influence seems to have dwindled for some time. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī ʿObeid Allāh (known as Abī ʿObāda) became wāzir. Hence al-Rabī' participated in the rising by exposing his son as a heretic (zīhān) in 163 (779—780). Even then al-Rabī' only retained his old office as ṣāḥib and never became Mahdī's wāzir. It was Abī Allāh Abī Yaʿkūb b. ʿAbdāf who succeeded the disgraced minister. On al-Hādī's accession (169 = 785), however, al-Rabī' was once more promoted to that dignity, but only for a period, after which he was entrusted with a secretariatship for the Caliph's ḥawīn (ḥawīn al-asimma). He remained in this capacity until his death after a short illness lasting eight days. His sudden end gave rise to the suggestion that he was poisoned by al-Hādī, but this is discredited by the most authentic sources. The exact date of his death is uncertain. While al-Dājjalīyārī and al-Tabari place it in 169, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi and Ibn Ḫāliḳān assert that he died at the beginning of 170 (786).

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.

Details about his administration are scanty, but it is certain that he was an able, industrious, temperate and tactful man of affairs. Even al-Mahdī, who was never lavish in showering favours on al-Rabī', once described him as the model of a good administrator (Yaḥūnī, ii. 456). The literary sources, however, do not single him out as a patron of letters, a quality which both his Abbasid masters and his Barmak successors possessed with distinction.


RABĪ'Ī AL-ADAWIYA, a famous mystic and saint of Baṣra, a freedwoman of the Āl Ṭāṭik, a tribe of Kays b. ʿArīḍ, known also as al-Kaṣīṭa, born 95 (713—714) or 99, died and was buried at Baṣra in 185 (801). A few verses of hers are recorded: she is mentioned, and her teaching quoted, by most of the ʿSīf writers and the biographers of the saints.

Born into a poor home, she was stolen as a child and sold into slavery, but her sanctity secured her freedom, and when celibacy, at first in the desert, then in Baṣra, where she gathered round her many disciples and associates, who came to seek her counsel or prayers or to listen to her teaching. These included Mālik b. Dīnār, the ascetic Raḥāl b. Kays, the traditionist Sūfān al-Thawrī and the ʿSīfī Shākhī al-Balkhī. Her life was one of extreme asceticism and otherworldliness. Asked why she did not ask help from her friends, she said, "I should be ashamed to ask for this world's goods from Him to Whom it belongs, and how should I seek them from those to Whom it does not belong?" To another friend she said, "Will God forget the poor because of their poverty or remember the rich because of their riches? Since He knows my state, what have I to remind Him of? What He wills, we should also will". Miracles were attributed to her as to other Muslim saints. Food was supplied by miraculous means for her guests, and to save her from starvation. A camel which died when she was on pilgrimage, was restored to life for her use; the lack of a lamp was made good by the light which shone round about the saint. It was related that when she was dying, she bade her friends depart and leave the way free for the messengers of God Most
High. As they went out, they heard her making her confession of faith, and a voice which responded, "O soul at rest, return to thy Lord, satisfied with Him, giving satisfaction to Him. So enter among My servants into My Paradise" (Sūra lxxxix. 27-30). After her death Rābi'a was seen in a dream and asked how she had escaped from Mulkar and Nakir, the angels of death, when they asked her, "Who is your Lord?", and she replied, "I said, return and tell your Lord, 'Notwithstanding the thousands and thousands of Thy creatures, Thou hast not forgotten a weak old woman. I, who had only Thee in all the world, have never forgotten Thee. That Thou shouldst ask, Who is thy Lord?'"

Among the prayers recorded of Rābi'a is one she was accustomed to pray at night upon her roof: "O Lord, the stars are shining and the eyes of men are closed and kings have shut their doors and every lover is alone with his beloved, and here am I alone with Thee." Again she prayed, "O O my Lord, if I worship Thee from fear of Hell, burn me therein, and if I worship Thee in hope of Paradise, exclude me thence, but if I worship Thee for Thine own sake, then withhold not from me Thine Eternal Beauty". Of Repentance, the beginning of the Sūfi Path, she said, "How can anyone repent unless His Lord gives him repentance and accepts him? If He turns towards you, you will turn towards Him". She held that Gratitude was the vision of the Giver, not the gift, and one spring day, when urged to come out to behold the works of God, she rejoined, "Come rather inside to behold their Maker. Contemplation of the Maker has turned me aside from contemplating what He has made".

She demonstrated the need for disinterested love and service by taking fire in one hand and water in the other and saying, when asked of the meaning of her action, "I am going to light fire in Paradise and to pour water on to Hell, so that both veils may be taken away from those who journey towards God, and their purpose may be sure and they may look towards their Lord without any object of hope or motive of fear. What if the hope of Paradise and the fear of Hell did not exist? Not one would worship his Lord or obey Him" (Alfākī, Muḥābīb al-ʾArifīn, India Office, No. 1670, fol. 114) Questioned about her love for the Prophet she said, "I love him, but love of the Creator has turned me aside from love of His creatures", and again, "My love to God has so possessed me that no place remains for loving any save Him". Of her own service to God and its motive-force she said, "I have not served God from fear of Hell, for I should be but a wretched hireling if I did it from fear; nor from love of Paradise, for I should be a bad servant, if I served for the sake of what was given me, but I have served Him only for the love of Him and desire of Him". Her verses on the two types of love, that which seeks its own ends and that which seeks only God and His glory, are famous and much quoted:

"In two ways have I loved Thee, selfishly; And with a love that worthy is of Thee. In selfish love my joy in Thee I find, While to all else, and others, I am blind. But in that love which seeks Thee worthily, The veil is raised that I may look on Thee. Yet is the praise in that or this not mine, In this and that the praise is wholly Thine".

Ghazzālī again comments, "She meant, by the selfish love, the love of God for His favour and grace bestowed and for temporary happiness, and by the love worthy of Him, the love of His Beauty which was revealed to her, and this is the higher of the two loves and the finer of them" (Iḥyāʾ, iv. 267). Like all mystics, Rābi'a looked for union with the Divine (waqf). In certain of her verses she says, "My hope is for union with Thee, for that is the goal of my desire", and again she said, "I have ceased to exist and have passed out of self. I have become one with God and am altogether His".

Rābi'a, therefore, differs from those of the early Sūfis who were simply ascetics and quietists, in that she was a true mystic, inspired by an ardent love, and conscious of having entered into the unitive life with God. She was one of the first of the Sūfis to teach the doctrine of Pure Love, the disinterested love of God for His own sake alone, and one of the first also to combine with her teaching on love the doctrine of Ḳaḥyīf, the unveiling, to the lover, of the Beatific Vision.


And my body is friendly towards its guests. But the Beloved of my heart is the guest of my soul". (Iḥyāʾ, iv. 358, margin)

RABĪ‘A AL-DAWLA ABU MAṢĀ‘IR B. AḤĀDĪ P ‘U M M B. A.-HUSAIN, A VIZIER.

When the vizier Abū Shu‘lā Muhammad al-Kūthaisrī (q.v.) made the pilgrimage to Mecca in 481 (1089) he appointed his son Rabī‘al-Dawla and the nakib al-mukabā‘ī Tīrād b. Muhammad al-Zainabī his deputies and in 507 (1113—1114) on the death of Abū l-Ḳāsim ‘Alī b. Fakhr al-Dawla Muhammad b. Dāhir (see the article ‘IN JĀHIR) 3 Rabī‘al-Dawla was appointed vizier of the caliph al-Muṣṭāhir (q.v.). In Dhu ‘l-Ḥijdād 511 (April 1118) the fourteen-year-old Muḥammad b. Muhammad succeeded his father as ẓaḥīquṣulītān and, when he was looking around for an able vizier, he was recommended to choose some one who had had the necessary training in the service of the caliph (min tarbiyytī dar al-khilafā‘), because there was no suitable man in the training of the young ẓulītān. The choice therefore fell upon Rabī‘ al-Dawla who was at once summoned from Baghdad to Isfahān and, as we know from al-Bundārī also, proved himself in every way fit for his difficult task. But his tenure of office was of short duration: he died in Rabī‘ I 513 (June—July 1119) ; according to another statement he died as early as 512 (1118—1119).

Bibliography: Ibn al-Aṯīr, al-Kāmīl (ed. Tornberg); x. 111, 349, 373, 387, 394: Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seljouqides, ii. 115—126. (K. V. Zettersten)

RAṬĪTA. [See Rāṭīta.]

RAṬĪTA (A.), Sucking; as a technical term, the sucking which produces the impediment to marriage of foster-kinsfolk. It is to be supposed that the idea of foster-kinsfolk was already prevalent among the ancient Arabs (cf. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, 3, p. 176, 196, note 1); this is evident from, among other things, the way in which the prescription of the Kurān regarding this is interpreted in Tradition. In Sūra iv. 23, among the female relatives with whom marriage is forbidden are the foster-mother and the foster-sister. This must correspond exactly to the old Arab usage, which regarded blood-relationship also only in these two degrees as an impediment to marriage (cf. Robertson Smith, ter. cit.). But as the Kurān in the passage quoted extends the circle of prohibitions beyond that of blood-relationship, foster-kinsfolk was treated accordingly contrary to the unambiguous language of the passage. To justify this, it is frequently laid down in traditions, in keeping with the principle of the old Arab attitude, that foster-kinsfolk is an impediment in the same degrees as blood-relationship. The isolated case, which is decisive for the principle, that of the prohibition of marriage with the daughter of a foster-brother, is brought into

close personal relationship with the Prophet. Through the prohibition of marriage laid down in Tradition between the foster-children of two wives of the same man, relationship by marriage becomes included in foster-relationship, and in the tradition which expounds the verse of the Kurān quoted, foster-kinsfolk is given among the impediments to marriage on the ground of relationship in law. As a justification for this prohibition it is stated that the šemīn genitalis (which the milk has produced) is the same; against the view that blood-relationship is not to be combined with foster-kinsfolk, so that the brother of the husband of the foster-mother is not to be regarded as a foster-kinsfolk, there is a polemic in a tradition (Kanz al-Imāmī, iii., N°. 3911). The question of the amount of sucking necessary to produce foster-relationship is a very old point of dispute; some traditions do not consider isolated suckings by the sucking or one or two acts of sucking as sufficient, others demand not less than seven acts of sucking, others again say that the child must be fed entirely; on the other side, one group of traditions says the prohibition of marriage is the same whatever the amount of sucking that has been given. There is even said to have been a passage in the Kurān which in the older, later abrogated, version demanded ten feedings and in the later version five. This story which was obviously only intended to support this view is not trustworthy (cf. Noldeke-Schwalley, Geschicchte des Qur'ān, i. 253 sqq.; Kanz al-Imāmī, N°. 3,923 sqq.). That the practice of sucking adults in order to establish an artificial foster-kinship existed is certain; it is recognised by several traditions and by others directly or indirectly denied (by the legal maxim: al-rağīma min al-magā’ā‘, "suckling demands hunger"). The chief case for the validity of such an act of sucking is described as a privilege granted by the Prophet personally (Kanz al-Imāmī, N°. 3,919) and even the sucking of children to establish an impediment to marriage is in an isolated case described as illegal (Ib., N°. 3,885). To prove foster-kinship many traditions are content with the testimony of the foster-mother either or even without oath or with the testimony of a woman simply or with that of a man and of one woman; in refutation of this anomaly, obviously at one time permitted, another group of traditions demands the normal testimony of two men or of one man and two women. These points of difference found in tradition are continued in the differences of opinion among the older jurists. The views of the principal authorities are given in al-Shawkānī, Nā’il al-Awqāf, Cairo 1345, vii. 113 sqq. The most important new point in dispute, discussed in this later period but scarcely touched upon in the traditions, is the period within which foster-kinship can be established by a child; sometimes it is said to be the period till weaning, sometimes the whole of childhood without an exact limitation, sometimes the fixed period of two years, 1 1/2 or 3 or 7 years; for the period of two years the authority of the Kurān is quoted, Sūra ii. 233 ("Mothers shall suckle their children two full years if they wish to carry through the sucking to its end") (on the details cf. al-Shawkānī, op. cit., p. 120). The four regular Sunni law-scholars are agreed that foster-relationship exists between a man and all his descendants on the one side and his nurse, all her foster- and blood-relatives, her husband and all his foster- and blood-relations on
of Rādānūr, the capital of the state, has a total population of 11,225, of whom 3,694 are Muhammadans (1931 Census Report).

**Bibliography:** see *Falanūr.*

**AL-RĀDI BI’LLĀH, ABU’L-‘ABBĀS AHMAD (MUHAMMAD) B. AL-MUKTADIR, the twelfth *Abbasid* caliph. He was born in Raftib 297 (Dec. 909); his mother was a slave named Zalīma. He was proposed for the caliphate immediately after the assassination of his father al-Muktadīr [q.v.] but the choice fell upon al-Kāhir [q.v.]. The latter had him thrown into prison; after the fall of al-Kāhir, he was released and put upon the throne (Dīmād I 322 = April 934). As his adviser in this difficult period al-Rādī chose al-Muktidīr’s vizier āli b. Ḳis [see the art. IBN AL-DIJĀRĀʾI] who however asked to be excused on account of his great age, whereupon Ibn Muḳḥla [q.v.] was given the office. The most influential official however continued to be Muhammad b. Yaḵūṭ [q.v.] and only after his fall in Dīmād I 323 (April 935) did Ibn Muḳḥla gain control of the administration while the caliph himself fell completely into the background. But Ibn Muḳḥla’s rule did not last long; in Dīmād I 324 (April 936) he was seized by al-Muḥṣif b. Yaḵūṭ, brother of the above-mentioned Muhammad, and the impotent caliph had to dismiss him and in the same year summon the governor of Ḩaṣṣāt and Baṣra, Muhammad b. Raʾīf [q.v.], to Baghdād and entrust him with complete authority as wādi ṣulṭānī. This meant a complete breach with the past; the caliph was only allowed to retain the capital and its immediate vicinity and to abandon all influence on the business of government, while Ibn Raʾīf held power for nearly two years; his name was actually mentioned in the Buḥrān for the reigning dynasty along with that of the caliph; in Dū’l-Ḳaḍīa 326 (Sept. 938) however, he was replaced by Bedḵem [q.v.].

To the financial difficulties and the constant quarrels of the viziers and emirs there was now added war with foreign foes. In 935 al-Rādī endeavoured to remove from office the governor of al-Mawsīl Ṣāḥib al-Dawla [q.v.], but failed, and a few years later Bedḵem, accompanied by the caliph, attacked the Hamḍānids in order to force them to pay tribute levied upon them but had to make peace because the fugitive Ibn Raʾīf suddenly appeared in Baghdād. The war with the Byzantines was also continued; the Hamḍānids however in this war came forward as defenders of Islam. In Egypt Muhammad b. Ṭuḡhdī founded the dynasty of the Iḫṣāṣīs [q.v.] and at the same time Bedḵem had to fight with the Būyids who were advancing on several sides and a few years later victoriously entered Baghdād.

In the capital itself al-Rādī had to take measures against the political Hamḍānīs (323 = 935), who had many followers among the common people and committed all kinds of excesses. They entered private houses, destroyed musical instruments, ill-treated women singers, poured away wine that they found, interfered in business, annoyed passers-by in the streets, beat Ṣhaḥīfat and generally behaved as arbitrarily as if they represented a kind of tribunal of the Inquisition.

Al-Rādī died in the middle of Rabī’ I 329 (Dec. 940) of dropsy. The Arab historians praise his
piety, justice, clemency and generosity as well as his interest in literature and it is said of him, for example (Ibn al-TiCKETA, al-Fakhri, p. 380): "He was the last caliph, by whom a collection of poems exists, the last who retained his independence as a ruler, the last to preach a sermon from the pulpit on Fridays, the last to mix freely with his friends and to welcome men of learning, and the last who followed the principles of the earlier caliphs as regards rank, tokens of favour, servants and chamberlains". This characterisation may well be correct in its main lines but al-Radi was not independent; he was on the contrary a ready tool in the hands of his viziers and emirs.


RADIY. [See REDIF.]

RADJA. [See REDJU.]

RADJAB (A.), the name of the seventh month in the Muslim calendar. In the Dabilya it introduced the summer half year until, as a result of the abolition of the intercalated months, the months ceased to fall regularly at the same season of the year [see AL-MUHARRAM and NASI']. The month was a sacred one; in it the 'umra [q.v.], the essentially Meccan part of the pre-Muhammadan ceremonies of pilgrimage, took place. The peace of Allah therefore prevailed in it; the forbidden woman was fought in Radjab between Kuraish and Hawazin and in which the young Muhammad took part is called Firdar (parduy) [q.v.].

In the Kur'an as recorded in the article AL-MUHARRAM, only the "holy" month is mentioned and not the four which have become traditional from the sole reference ix. 36. If the reference in Sura v. 2, is to the 'umra we can therefore understand why the commentators in part identify the holy month mentioned in this verse with Radjab.

In Islam the month attained great importance through the memory of the Prophet's night journey to heaven which in later times was put on the 27th of the month (on the original dates see MI'RAJ). This night is therefore called Liitul al-Mi'raj and is celebrated with readings of the legends of the ascension.


(M. Plessner)

RADJM (A.), the casting of stones—K-dj-n—is a Semitic root, derivatives from which are found in the Old Testament with the meaning of "to stone, to drive away or kill by throwing stones" an abominable creature; radjma is "a heap of stones, an assembly of men, cries, tumult".

—In Arabic, the root means "to stone, to curse"; radjamun, "heap of stones", also means simply the stones placed upon tombs either as flagstones or in a heap, a custom which badit condemns and recommends that a grave should be level with the surface of the ground. On the hadith of 'Abd Allah b. Mughifal, it is discussed whether la turadij-dijmi al-fabi means "do not build my grave in a mound" or "do not utter imprecautions there".

—The lapidation and heaps of stones at Min'a are called djama'a, and djamarat al-arab means the groups of Bedouin tribes; we find there the two old meanings of the root which can be taken back to dj-m, in Arabic djamma and djama's "to reunit". The Arab grammarians derive djamra "lapidation" from djamarat al-arab; and we have to remember the double meaning of radjam and a metathesis from djama(a) == radjam.

In addition to the meaning of "ritual stoning as a punishment for fornication", radjam means the casting of stones at Min'a, which is one of the pre-Muhammadan rites preserved by Muhammad and inserted among the ceremonies of the pilgrimage. We may here refer the reader to the articles DJAMRA, HADJ DJ and MIN'A with their bibliographies.

The Kur'an does not mention this rite; but it knows radjama in its Biblical sense of "stoning of prophets by unbelievers", and also radjam (= marjdum) as an epithet of Satan, "driven away and struck with projectiles of fire by the angels", and lastly (xviii. 21) in an abstract sense which indicates a long semantic evolution.

The rite of casting stones at Min'a was regulated by hadiths in the classical collections. There is a model hadjat, that of the Prophet which we find in the manuals of manasik al-hadjd (e.g. in the Risala of Ibn Taimiya (cf. Rifat, i. 89-99)). Some hadjat of archaic form (e.g. Bukhari, Nikah, b. 2; Sahih, i. and 2: Umda, viii. 489) show that Muhammad had to lay down rules for the essential question of the we'if, the culmination of the hadjd; The Hums. i.e. the Kuraish and their allies, observed it at Djam (Mudzalifa), in the haram; the others, the 'Arab, at Arif, outside of the haram of Mecca. Having to choose between his companions of two different origins, the 'Arab of Najd and the Anjar, Muhammad decided with the latter for 'Arif, but he retained a secondary wufif at Mudzalifa, and the two Ishaa, the new combination of rites culminating in the throwing of stones at 'Aqaba.

Situated at the bottom of the valley of Min'a, on the slope of the defile towards Mecca, al-'Aqaba is "not in Min'a but it is its boundary on the side of Mecca" (Umda, iv. 770) On the morning of the 10th Dhu l-Hijaja the pilgrim goes down into the valley, passes without saluting them in front of the great djamar, 500 yards farther on the middle one, and 400 yards beyond he comes to djamarat al-'Aqaba (Rifat, i. 328). There he throws 7 stones and this is one of the four ceremonies which on the tenth day are intended to remove his state of sanctity. He must also have his hair shaved (haif), sacrifice a victim (nafir)
and return in procession to Mecca (ifāda). This last rite prepares the sexual deconsecration; the three others together abolish the prohibitions of the ḥadījī but the legists are not agreed on the order in which they have to be accomplished. The hadīths say that the Prophet replied to the pilgrims who were worried, not having followed the order in which he had himself followed them: "īl ḥarāfa: no harm (in that)" (Bukhārī, Ḥadīqī, b. 125, 130 etc.). It is explained that the Prophet: on this day of rejoicing did not wish to hurt the feelings of the ignorant Beduins. We may imagine that these 'Arab did not follow the customs of the Kurāshī and that Muhammād had neither the time nor the inclination to impose his own choice between the varying customs.

Muhammād began with the lapidation at al-'Aṣāba. After the ḍalīʾ, the sacrifice and the isfāha, he returned to spend the night in Minā. Then on the 11th, 12th and 13th, he cast 7 stones at the three djamarāt ending with that of al-'Aṣāba. The pilgrims imitating him ought therefore to throw $7 + (7 \times 3) = 70$ stones. But in general they take advantage of the liberty (rubkhā) given them by the hadīth to leave Minā finally on the 12th and therefore only to throw $7 + (7 \times 2) = 19$ stones. It is probable that there was no ancient usage; the presence of the bodies of the sacrificial victims made Minā a horrible place. It is difficult to see how Wavell (Pilgrims, p. 202) threw 63 stones, i.e. $(7 \times 3)$; this is however the number of victims which, according to tradition, Muhammād sacrificed with his own hand, one for each year of his life.

The lapidation of al-'Aṣāba is done on the 10th by the pilgrims in ṣurūq, those of the three days following by the deconsecrated pilgrims. The whole business is not a fundamental element of the pilgrimage (rubkhā).

Little stones are thrown, larger than a lentil, but less than a nut, what the old Arabs called ḍaqa 'l-khaddīf which were thrown either with the fingers or with a little lever of wood forming a kind of sling (mikthāsa: Tirmidhi, iv. 123). A hadīth forbids this dangerous game, which might knock out an eye but is not strong enough to kill an enemy: it must therefore have had something magical or pagan in its character. The stones have to be collected of the proper size and not broken from a rock. Gold, silver, precious stones etc. are condemned; but some texts allow, in addition to date-stones, a piece of camell-dung or a dead sparrow which we find are the means used by the women of the Dīhiliya at the end of their period of isolation to remove the impurity of their widowhood and prepare a new personality. — It is recommended that the 7 stones for the lapidation of al-'Aṣāba should be gathered at the masqār al-karam at Muzdalīfā, outside of Minā. As a rule, the 63 others are gathered in the valley of Minā, but outside of the mosque and far from the djamarāt to avoid having their already been used (Ibn Taimiya, p. 383). Besides it is thought that stones accepted by Allāh are carried away by angels. — Stones collected but not used should be buried; they have assumed a sacred character which makes them dangerous.

The model pilgrimage of the Prophet fixed the time of the djamarat al-'Aṣāba for the day of the 10th. It shows him beginning the ḫisāfa of Muzdalīfā after the prayer at dawn (fādr) and casting the stones after sunrise. But by survival of an ancient custom more than for reasons of convenience other times are allowed by law. Al-Shāfiʿi, against the three other imāms, permits the ḥāṣāba ceremony before sunrise (Rifāʿi, i. 113); in general, the time is extended to the whole morning (ṣawātil), till afternoon (ṣawātil), till sunset, till night, till the morning of the day following: these infractions of the normal routine are stoned for by a sacrifice or alms, varying with the different schools. — The djamarāt of the three days of the tashrīk take place in the sawātil; here again there are various opinions (Bukhārī, Ḥadīqī, b. 134). — In fixing the time of the lapidations the law has always endeavoured to avoid any Muslim, etc. prob, coinciding with one of the three positions of the sun by day, rising, noon, setting. A. J. Wensinek has shown (E. L., ii. 200) the probability of the solar character of the pagan ḥadīqī.

Muhammād made his lapidation at al-'Aṣāba from the bottom of the valley, mounted on his camel, turned towards the djamarāt, with the Ka'bah on his left and Minā on his right, standing at a distance of five cubits (eight feet). But there are other possible positions. — Rifāʿi (i. 328) gives the djamarāt the following dimensions: 10 feet high and 6 feet broad on a rock 5 feet high (see the photographs, ibid.). It is said to have been removed at the beginning of Islām and replaced in 240 (854—855) (Araški, p. 212). — Muhammād made the lapidations of the other two djamarāt on foot turning towards the ḥib'é. In brief, the stones are cast in the attitude one happens to be in. The position facing the Great Devil is explained by the nature of the ground, but it would also be in keeping with the idea of a curse cast in the face of a fallen deity. The position which makes the pilgrim turn towards the Ka'bah is due to the Muslim legend of the tempter Satan and to the rule of the tabbr which will be explained below.

According to the sunna, the stones are placed on the thumb and bent forefinger and thrown, one by one, as in the game of marbles. However the possibility of the stones having been thrown together in a handful as has been foreseen. and it was decided that this should only count as one stone and that the omission could be made good.

— The stone should not be thrown violently nor should one call "look out! look out!" (Tirmidhi, iv. 156), a pagan custom which the modern Beduins still retained quite recently (Rifāʿi, i. 89). It seems that Muhammād put some strength into it for he raised his hand "to the level of his right eyebrow" (Tirmidhi, iv. 135) and showed his armpit (Bukhārī, Ḥadīqī, b. 141).

In Islām the casting of each stone is accompanied by pious formulae. It is generally agreed that the tablibiya is no longer pronounced at 'Arba or at least before the lapidation of al-'Aṣāba (Bukhārī, Ḥadīqī, b. 101); some writers however approve of it after al-'Aṣāba. The tabhīl and tabhīb are permitted, but it is the tabbr which is recommended (Ibn Taimiya, p. 382; Bukhārī, Ḥadīqī, b. 138 and 143). The spiritual evolution of the rites even sees in the stone the essential feature of the rite, the throwing of the stone and the figure formed by the stones, the throwing of the thumb and forefinger forming an 'ājād which represents 70, being no more than symbolic and mimerial gestures. "The throwing of the stones was only instituted to cause the name of God to be repeated" (Tirmidhi, iv. 159).
To Ghazâlî (Ikhshî', i. 192) it is an act of submission to God and of resistance to Satan who seeks to turn man away from the fatigues of the hadîdî but the rite is without rational explanation min gharî' hâzîn 'l-lâzîl wa l-mazîl fitki (cf. Goldziher, Richtungen, p. 252). — The devout man adds a prayer (dârû) which is as a rule quasi-religious. The usual one is: Allahumma 'd'khîn hadîdîn maharrîn wa-dhannan mahfûrân wa-sâ'în mazkûrân "Lord, make this pilgrimage a pious one, pardon our sins and recompense our efforts!". There is, as matter of fact, after thestoning a halt, a wukfîb, before the two higher djamarât, that at the second being especially long: the duration is calculated by the recitation of the sûra of the Cow (ii), or of Joseph (xii), or of the family of 'Imrân (iii) by altering the indication in the hadîdî (Bukhârî, hadîdî; b. 135, 136 and 137). This would take the place of an ancient ceremony of impregnation.

Breaches of the rules for the performance of these diverse ceremonies, especially as regards the number of stones thrown and the time when they are thrown ('l-mâdî, iv. 167 et al.; Rîf'ât, i. 113), are punished by acontones the evident nature of which the legists delight to vary from the sacrifice of a victim to the giving of a muddî of food in alsms.

The Muslim teachers have sought to explain the lapidations of Minâ. Some exegetists (e.g. Ñâbîr, Tâfîlr, xxv. 167) have seen quite clearly that they represent ancient rites and have compared the rwa'iy of the tomb of Abû Râjdî. Others are known, for example at the well of Dhu 'l-Hulafa (Lammens, Ihlyets, p. 94). The works quoted (E. f.) show the spread of this rite and the cases in which we are certain that it is a question of the driving away or the expulsion of evil; they might be further added to. Stones used to be thrown behind an individual whom one wished never to return (Hâmaghâmî, Masâhmû, ed. Bârîrî, p. 23). At Alexandria, tired people used to go and lie down on a fallen pillar, throw 7 stones behind them on the pile "like that of Minâ", then go away quite recovered (5 al-Maghâmî, Sahî al-Ashâb, iii. 322). But comparisons would take us out of Arabia (Lods, Prophètes d'Isrâ', p. 354).

Popular legend has connected the lapidation like many other rites with Abraham. It was Abraham or Hagar or Ishmael or even Muhammad that Satan wished to deter from accomplishing the rites of the hadîdî and who chased him away with stones. If we conclude that he is râjdîm, we are some way to the explanation of Sûra lxvii. 5 (cf. above).

One would like to be able to locate the lapidations among the rites of the pre-Islamic pilgrimage. One would first have to have a clear idea of the meaning and details of the ceremonies and of the part played by lapidations and sacred piles of stones in Semitic and Mediterranean antiquity. — Stoning seems to have been a rite of expulsion of evil which and seems to have been a return to everyday life. It is possible that lapidations at one time followed the sacrifices which perhaps took place at 'Arafa and Muzdalîfâ.

Bibliography: Add to the Bibliographies of the articles quoted: Ibrahim Rîfat Pascha, Mirâj al-Haramain, Cairo 1344, 2 vols.; Ibn Taimiya, Risâlat Manâzil al-Hadîdî, dans Mâdîminât al-Kulûb, Cairo 1323, ii. 355. (Gaudefroy-Demobynes)

Râjdîpûts, inhabitants of India, who claim to be the modern representatives of the Kshatriyas of ancient tradition. (From the Sanskrit râjdîputra "a king's son".) For the connection between Râjdanya and Kshatriya see Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, i., s. v. Kshatriya.

The term Râjdîpût has no racial significance. It simply denotes a tribe, clan, or warlike class, the members of which claim aristocratic rank, a claim generally reinforced by Brahman recognition.

The origin of the Râjdîpûts is a problem which bristles with difficulties. The theory which at present holds the field is that propounded by Bhandarkar, Smith and Crooke. According to this theory the Râjdîpûts can be divided into two main classes, the foreign and the indigenous. The foreign clans, such as the Cauhâns, Calukyas, and Gurdjaras, are the descendants of invaders of the vii and viii centuries of the Christian era. The indigenous Râjdîpûts include the Rashtrakutas of the Deccan, the Râdhors of Râjdûtpûna proper, and the Candels and Bundelas of Bundelkhand.

The theory that certain Râjdîpût clans are of foreign extraction is chiefly based on Râjdîpût legends and folklore according to which their heroes are the descendants of branches of Râjdîpûts: the Strajdîbanshi, or Solar race; the Candrabanshi, or Lunar race; and the Agni Kula, or Fire-group. The legend relates how the Agni Kula Râjdîpûts, that is, the Cauhâns, Calukyas, Parihârs (Parihâras), and the Prâmâra, originated in a fire-rite around Mount Abu in southern Râjdûtpûna. From this it has been concluded that the four clans in this group are related and that the fire-rite represents a rite of purification by which the taint of foreign extraction was removed. Since these writers believed the Parihârs to be invaders of Gîdjar stock, it was concluded that the other three Agni Kula clans were also invaders.

According to Smith the Gurdjaras were invaders who founded a kingdom around Mount Abu. In time the rulers of this kingdom who were known as Gurdjara-Prâtihâras conquered Kauvalî and became the paramount power in northern India about 800 A.D. Smith contends that the Prâtihâras were a clan of the Gurdjara tribe. This seems to be the chief evidence produced by these writers for the foreign extraction of certain Râjdîpût clans.

It seems wrong to base this theory of foreign descent principally upon the Agni Kula legend, for Waidy and other writers have proved this to be a myth first heard of in the Prâtihârs-râjasa of the poet Cand who could not have composed this work before the xiith century A.D. Recent research has brought to light the fact that the inscriptions of the Prâtihâras and Cauhâns before the xiith century represent them as Solar pûts, while the Calukyas are represented as of the Lunar race. The Agni Kula legend does not therefore deserve the prominence given to it by Smith and other writers.

Even the contention that the Prâtihâras were a branch of the Gurdjara tribe has met with much hostile criticism.

According to the orthodox Hindu view the Râjdîpûts are the direct descendants of the Kshatriyas of the Vedic polity, but this claim is based on fictitious genealogies. The Kshatriyas of ancient India disappear from history and this can probably be explained by invasions from Central Asia which shattered the ancient Hindu polity. It is accepted that these invading hordes, such as the Vûhechî and Hûnas, became rapidly Hinduisized, and that
their leaders assumed Khatriya rank and were recognized as such. Out of this chaos arose a new Hindu polity with new rulers, and the families of invaders which became supreme were recognized as Khatriyas or Rajputs. In later times many chiefs of the so-called aboriginal tribes also assumed the title of Rajput.

It is therefore safe to assert that the Rajputs are a very heterogeneous body and probably contain some survivors of the older Khatriyas. A mass of legend arose assigning to the various septs a descent from the sun and the moon, or from the heroes of the epic poems. These are the legendary pedigrees recorded in great detail by Tod. The main argument which can be brought forward in support of the foreign descent of certain Rajput clans is the incorporation of foreigners into the fold of Hinduism to which the whole history of India bears testimony. Even though the Agni Kula, legend he discredited it is still possible to argue that the Rajputs are not a race. Anthropologically they are definitely of mixed origin. That some Rajputs were of foreign origin can be proved by the acceptance of the Hindus in the recognized list of Rajput tribes.

Whatever may be the origin of the Rajputs we know that disorder and political disintegration followed the death of Harsha, and that until the Muslim invasions of northern India the chief characteristic of this period was the growth and development of the Rajput class. Except for about two hundred years, when the Gurjara-Pratihārās were the paramount power in Hindustān, there was constant intertribal warfare between the various Rajput kingdoms. This weakness considerably facilitated the Muslim conquest. It was not however until the days of Muhammad of Ghūr that the Rajput dynasties in the plains were finally overthrown [see above, iii. 742b]. Driven from Dīlī and Kanauj they retreated into modern Rajputāna where they eventually built up a strong position and were able to resist the Muslim invader, for it cannot be said that the Sultans of Dīlī ever really subdued the Rajputs of Rajputāna. Nevertheless, throughout this period there was constant warfare, fortresses and strongholds frequently changing hands. The Rajputs nearest to Dīlī were naturally the weakest because the eastern frontier of Rajputāna was exposed to attack. The Sultans of Dīlī appear to have realized the value of communications with the western coast and we find that the route between Dīlī and Gudjārāt via Aḏḏār was usually open to imperial armies. The chief menace to the Rajputs was not from Dīlī but from the independent Muslim kingdoms of Gudjārāt [q. v.] and Mālwā [q. v.].

The outstanding feature of the period from the end of the so-called Saiyid rule to the final invasion of Bābur was the growth of Rajput power in northern India under Rānā Sāṅgā of Māwar. Taking advantage of the weakness of the Lodis under Tāhūm [q. v.] and of the war between Gudjārāt and Mālwā he had extended his sway over the greater part of modern Rajputāna. The battle of Khānāūn in 1527, when Bābur shattered his power, marks a turning-point in the history of Muslim rule in India, for the Rajputs never again attempted to regain their lost dominions on the plains and contented themselves with remaining on the defensive. After Khānāūn the place of the Sosodias in Rajput politics was taken by the Rāthors, the growth of whose power under Mālēdē of Māwar was facilitated by the struggle between Humāyûn [q. v.] and Shīr Shāh. Akbar's Rajput policy was based on conquest and conciliation. The fall of Cīrān and Ranthambhār made him master of the greater part of Rajputāna, with the exception of Māwar which was not completely subdued until the reign of Dhāhāṅgīr [q. v.]. The reversal of Akbar's conciliatory policy produced the great Hindu reaction of Awrangzēb's reign, when, faced at the same time with the Rajputs of the north and the Marāṭhās of the Deccan, Awrangzēb [q. v.] was unable to concentrate on either campaign. But internal dissensions once more prevented the Rajputs from taking advantage of the decline of Mughal power and, in the second half of the eighteenth century, they proved no match for the Marāṭhās who easily overran their country. It was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century when the British were at war with the Marāṭhās that they entered into political relations with the Rajput states. Before the end of the year 1818 the group of states which now comprise Rajputāna had been taken under British protection.

To-day India contains 10,743,091 Rajputs distributed throughout the country as follows: United Provinces, 3,756,936; Pandījāb, 2,351,650; Bihār and Orissa, 1,412,440; Rajputāna, 660,516; Central Provinces and Berar, 506,027; Gwālīor, 393,076; Central India, 388,942; Bombay, 352,016; Dījjāmū and Kashmir, 256,020; Western India States, 227,153; Bengal, 156,978; Baroda, 94,893; and Haidarābād, 58,434 (1931 Census Report). It will be noted that in Rajputāna only 660,516 Rajputs are to be found out of a total population of 11,225,712. The states of Rajputāna are ruled by Rajputs, with the exception of Tonk which is Muslim, and Bhatāpur and Dholpur which are Dījāt. The chief Rajput clans in Rajputāna are the Rāthor, Khānwa, Cāuñhān, Dījāon, Sesodia, Panvas, Parāhār, Tonwār and Dījālā. Rādžaśmrānī is the mother tongue of 77 percent of the inhabitants of this area. It is interesting to note that in some parts of India Rajputs have embraced Islam, as for example the Mānhs, Kāṭīls, and Sahalīs of the Pandījāb.

RAFI. [See RAPA.]

RAFIL AL-DIN, MAWLĀNĀ SHĀH MUHAMMAD, b. SHĀH WALI ALLĀH B. 'ABD AL-RAḤĪM AL-OMĀRĪ (after the Caliph 'Omar b. al-Khattāb), was born in 1163 (1750) in Dihli, in a family which enjoyed the highest reputation in Muslim India for learning and piety, from the xviiiith century onwards, and produced a number of eminent scholars up to the "Mutiny" (see Siddīq Ḥasan Kān, Iḥāṣ al-Yūbatāt), Cawnpur 1288, p. 296 sq.: F. A. S. B., xii., 310. He studied hadīth with his father, who was the most celebrated traditionist in his time, in India.

After the death of his father in 1176, he was brought up by his elder brother Shāh 'Abd al-ʿAzīz (1159—1239 = 1746—1823) with whom he completed his studies in the usual sciences, being specially interested in hadīth, kalām and usūl. When about twenty, he entered upon his career as muḥtis and muḍārris, and later succeeded in these capacities his brother and teacher, who, in his old age, had lost his eye-sight, and had indifferently health. He died on the 6th Shawwāl 1233 (Aug. 9, 1818), at the age of 70 (lunar years), of cholera, and was buried in their family graveyard outside the city of Dihli.

He wrote about 20 works, mostly in Arabic and Persian, and a few in Urdu. He is praised for the subtility of his ideas and the conciseness of his language. His works are:

In Urdu:
1. a translation of the Qur'ān, interlinear to the Arabic text, which it follows closely and faithfully. He and his brother ʿAbd al-Ḵādir [q. v.] were the pioneers in this field, though their work was considerably facilitated by their father, Shāh Wali Allāh's Persian translation of the Qur'ān (entitled Fath al-Rahmān fi Tahrījamat al-Kur'ān). The first edition of Shāh Rafi'al-Din's translation appeared in Calcutta in 1254 (1838—1839) and another, in 1265 (1849—1850). For some of its numerous editions (from 1866 onwards) see Blumhardt, Cat. of the Hindustān Printed Books of the Libr. of the British Museum, London 1859, p. 290 sq., and the Supplement to the same, London 1900, p. 403.

In Arabic:
1. Takhīm al-Ṣinā'a or Takhīm li-Ṣinā'a al-ʿAdhkhān, dealing with a. logic, b. taḥfīz, i.e. principles of dialectics, teaching, learning, authorship and self-study, c. Muḥābdh min al-ʿUmūr min al-ʿumāma (some metaphysical discussions) and, d. Taḥfīz al-Arūd (i.e. an inquiry into the causes and the criteria for judging conflicting opinions in religious matters). A considerable portion of the work has been quoted in the Akhīfād al-ʿUṯūm, p. 127—135 and 235—270; 3. Muḥaddimāt al-ʿilm, see Akhīfād al-ʿUṯūm, p. 124; 4. Risālāt al-Mahabbā, a discourse on the all-pervading nature of love; see Akhīfād al-ʿUṯūm, p. 254; 5. Tafsīr Ayāt al-Nūr, a commentary on Sūra xxiv. 35; 6. Risālāt al-Aʿrūd wa ʿl-Kabāya: see Aḥbād, p. 915; 7. Daʿwāt al-ʾBīṭil, dealing with some abstruse problem of the ʿilm al-ḥaḵīf. 8. a gloss on Mīr Zāhid al-Ḥarawī's commentary on Kūf al-Din al-Rāzī's Risālāt al-Taṣawwufa wa ʿl-Taṣdīk (see Brockelmann, ii. 209); 9. Iḥāṣ al-Bārāhīn al-hikmatīya wa ʿl-ʿUsūl al-Ḥanābī.[Nrs. 4—9 are unpublished.]

In Persian:
10. Kānīm al-Nāma (Lahore 1339; Haidarābād, unedited ed.), on the last judgment, also called Kānīm Nāma (see Browne's Supplementary Handlist, p. 189). For the two poetical versions, in Urdu, of this popular work, viz. Aḥār-i Maḥshar (chronogrammatic name, which gives 1250 as the date of composition), and Aḥār-i Kīvāmā, see Sprenger, Ouḍh Catalogue, p. 624, and Blumhardt, Caith., p. 290, and for an Urdu prose version, Kīvām Nāma or Daʿī al-Ḥakār, see Blumhardt, loc. cit.; 11. Faddās, Dihli 1322; 12. Mawdūʿa al-Ṭīr al-Qulwā (Dihli 1314), 3 small treatises on religious and mystical topics; 13. Shāh al-Sudur bi-Shāh al-Maṣūm wa ʿl-Kubār, an eschatological work, covering ff. 2002 of a small size, in a MS. copy in the Dār al-ʿUlam, Deoband, which institution also possesses the MS. of his 14. Laṭīf al-Khamsa, a mystical work (ff. 32).


(MUHAMMAD SHAṬI')

AL-RAḠĪB AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ, ABU ʾL-KĀSIM AL-HUSAIN B. MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD (according to others: al-Faḍl, al-Sayyid, etc., wrongly: Muḥammad b. Muhammad). A rabbinical writer, of the details of whose life nothing is known beyond that he died at the beginning of the viiiith century, perhaps in 502 (1108). Some regarded him as a Muʿtazili but Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī in his Aṣās al-Taṭbīkīs established his orthodoxy. His work was concerned with Ḥaḏīthic exegesis and editorising. His studies on the Qur'ān from which al-Brāhīwī is said to have taken a great deal were opened with a Risāla muḥkamah ʿalā sawda al-Qur'ān now lost, perhaps identical with the Muḥaddimāt al-Tafsīr, pr. at Cairo 1329 at the end of ʿAbd al-Dībābīr's Taṭbīkāt al-Qur'ānī ʿṭālāt al-Maḥbūn. He next compiled an excellent dictionary of the Qur'ān arranged alphabetically according to the initial letters entitled Kitāb Muḥaddimat Ālīn al-Qur'ān, which in addition to the MSS. mentioned in G. A. L. i., 289, survives in many others in Stambul [see e.g. M. O., vii. 106, 127] and in Bankirop (Cat., xviii. 1454) and under the title al-Muḥaddimāt fi Ṣawād al-Qur'ān was printed on the margin of Ibn al-Athīr's Nikāya, Cairo 1322 and edited by Muhammad
al-Zuhri al-Ghumrāwī. Cairo 1324. In the preface he outlines the prospect of a second work that was to deal with the synonymy of the Kurān (al-ʿAlif; al-mutawadda ʿala l-ʾAlif, wa-ʾl-wādāʾī wa-ʾl-wādāʾī wa-ʾl-wādāʾī wa-ʾl-wādāʾī), the Tafsir al-Kurān, Aya Sofia 212, perhaps came to be compiled in this way. The reference might however be to the Diwār al-Tawāʾil, on the Kurān verses found in more than one passage although expressed differently, Brun. Mus. Or. 5784 (Descriptive List, ibid. A. G. Ellis and E. Edwards, p. 3) which is probably identical with the Hall Mutashābhat al-Kurān, Stambul, Rāzhīg 180. As a quotation in the preface shows he had already written his principal work on ethics Kitāb al-Dhārī ila Maqārim al-Shariʿa, before the Kitāb Mufradāt; al-Ghazzāli is said to have always had a copy of this by him. In addition to the MSS. mentioned in G. A. L., it is also preserved in Brun. Mus., Or. 7016 (Deser. List, No. 62) and in Stambul (see e.g. M. O., vii. 101–102; M. F. O., B., v. 460) and finally in Cairo, 1299 (ʿSarkis 1899, 1324. The Tafsir Tafsir al-Naṣif al-Wādāʾī wa-ʾl-Tawāʾil al-Suwāṭain, pr. Cairo n. d., ed. by Tāhir al-Dārārī from the Jerusalem MS. Khtilidiya, No. 71, in 963 A. H. Barût 1319, 1323 is a companion work: on both works see Asin. Patience, Aherkhān de Cordero, ii. 19. His most popular book was the work on adab: Muḥaddad al-ʿUdārāʾ wa-Muhaddad al-ʿUdārāʾ wa-ʾl-Bulghārāʾ or simply Kitāb al-Muḥaddad, which is divided into 25 ḥudūd, which are again divided into faṣūl and abwāb, which deal with the usual adab themes beginning with intelligence and stupidity and ending with angels; dūn and animals in quotations in prose and verse; in addition the MSS. preserved in G. A. L., it is also preserved in Stambul Selim ʿAghā, No. 957; Damascus, ʿUmmūliya, Siyūṭī, 96, 5, 7; in Cairo, Fihrist, 2, ill. 334. A synopsis by al-Suyūṭī, ibid., p. 345; an anonymous Berlin, No. 8350 and Damascus, loc. cit., 8a. In Europe the work was first made known in the part edited by G. Flugel as "Der vertraute Gefährte des Einsamen im schwebenden Gegenstand" von Abu Mansur Abdulmelik ben Muhammad ben Ismaʿıl Etteṣailī aus Nisahur mit einem Vorwort von J. v. Hammer, Vienna 1829 (see Gildeimper, Z. D. M. G., xxciv, 171). The work (with Ibn Ḥiḍjadi’s Ṭamārat al-ʿAwwāz on the margin) in 2 vols., is printed in Bālā, 1284, 1287, 1305; Cairo (without the edition on the margin) 1310, 1324, 1326. Ibrahim Zaidan published in Cairo in 1902 a synopsis, which only contains 12 ḥudūd, which lacks 10 and 13 of the Vienna MS., and is abbreviated in other ways. A Persian translation entitled al-Nawādir by Muḥammad Sāḥib b. Muḥammad Bākīr al-Kazwīnī is in Teheran (see Y. Etteme, Cat. de la Bibliothèque du Madjles, ii. 308). Lastly there is also an adab al-Shirhandī in Kasan (see Menzel, in., xxvii. 94). The work on adab: Tahākī al-Bayān (on language and writing, ethics, dogmatics and philosophy, "al-ʾawālī") cited in the preface of the Kitāb al-Shariʿa is founded in Maḥād, 5 (Okṭá, Fihristi Kutubhānā-i mazālikā-i Aṣṭani Kudsi Rēdē, 1845, i. 24, No. 56). Bibliography: al-Suyūṭī, Buḫayyāt al-ʾUwāʾīt, p. 396; al-Dhahabi, Tabākāt al-Muṣafāratīn (Cod. Bankiopere), fol. 121b; Muḥammad Bākīr al-Khwānsārī, Rauḍat al-Lanūṭī, p. 249; ʿSarkis, p. 922 sq.; Brockemann, G. A. L., i. 269. (C. Brockemelen)

RAGUSA (Rausium), a town in Dalmatia, formerly a free state (now Dubrovnik), on the south side of a peninsula which runs out into the Adriatic, picturesquely situated (50 feet) at the foot and on the slopes of Mount Sergius with about 14,500 inhabitants, mainly Croats, was founded in the viiiith century by Romance fugitives from Epidaurus which had been destroyed by the Slavs, later belonged to Byzantine Dalmatia which had been settled by a Romance population. At the end of the tenth century the town, which had become strong and rich through its prosperous maritime trade, was paying homage to the Venetians under whose suzerainty it remained after various interludes continuously from 1204 to 1358. In this year Ragusa passed to Hungary and soon attained such power through its flourishing trade that it formed a free state with an aristocratic form of government. Authority was in the hands of the nobles (Grand Council) who chose the Senate (45 members). The latter chose the Little Council (16, later 7 members) which chose every month a Rector (rector) as head of the state. Al-Idrīsī [q. v.] mentions Ragusa in his Kitāb al-Rudger as ʿAlam al-Rugūs (other readings: ʿAlam al-Rugūs) and is evidently quoting Frankish sources (cf. thereon Wilh. Tomaseck, Zur Kunde der Humat-Halbinsel: II. Die Handelswege im XII. Jahrh., nach den Erkundungen des Arabers Idrişī, Vienna 1887 = S. B. Ak. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., vol. xxii., fasc. 1). In the Ottoman period the Slav name Dubrovnik is found exclusively, in place of Ragusa. Ragusa's relations with Islām, at first completely hostile, go back to a remote date. When the Arabs in the ninth century conquered Sicily and established themselves on the mainland in Bari (Apulia) they besieged Ragusa on one occasion which defended itself bravely and was relieved by the navy of the emperor Basil I (867–886). Under the emperor Romanus III (1028–1034) the Ragans distinguished themselves in the sea-fights between Byzantines and Arabs. It was not till a later date that relations became more peaceful when Ragusan commerce, which extended to Egypt and Syria, to Tunis and as far as the Black Sea, began to flourish. As early as the xivth century, corn was exported to Ragusa from the harbours of Anatolia and the rest of the petty states (pōvā뜨i: milhē) in Anatolia were well established. The first document related between Ragusa and the Ottoman empire belong to the period of Bayazid I. Vildirm (1380–1402; q. v.) as the relations of the free state to Orkhan [q. v.] and Murad I [q. v.] mentioned in later Ragusan histories will not be serious investigation. It is however certain that at quite an early date it became necessary for the Ragusans to remain on good terms with the Ottomans, who were advancing westward, for the sake of their trade. They were able to deal with tact and skill with their new neighbours. Ragusan trade in Turkey developed considerably as the many frontiers and customs offices of the numerous petty rules of the Balkans, which had been disappeared by the Turks, disappeared and the Turkish duties were uniform and low. Articles manufactured in Ragusa itself, like cloth, metal, soap, glass, wax etc. or goods imported from Italy for the Balkan peninsula were taken into the interior on safe roads. There was a caravan trade which went from Ragusa via Trebinje, Tien-
tiste, Foča, Goražde, Plešivje, Prijeponje, Trgoviste, Novi Bazlar [q. v.], Niš, Sofia, Philippiopolis to Adrianopole and later to Stamboul (cf. J. J. Jireček, Die Handelsstrassen und Bergwerke von Serbon und Bosnien während des Mittelalters, Prag 1875, p. 149: Von Ragusa nach Niš). In the interior of the Peninsula there were the factories of the Ragusans like Rudnik, Prizren, Novo Brdo, Pristina, Zvornik, Novibazar, Skopje, Sofia with many other settlements extending as far as the mouths of the Danube. On May 12, 1392 the Little Council of Ragusa gave the nobleman Teodorico Gisla in Novo Brdo orders to travel to the Turkish sultan and to make representations about the capture of some Ragusan merchants. There is a Turkish safe-conduct (litera securitatis) of June 20, 1396 prepared for Ragusan merchants. In 1397 Sultan Bayazid I allowed the Ragusans to trade unhindered in the Ottoman empire, and a few years later (1399), the first Ottoman embassy led by Kefalija Firuž (Firuz)-Beg arrived in Ragusa from the citadel of Zvečan (in Kosovo) (cf. F. V. Kraelitz, Die ersten ernsten Verhandlungen zwischen Sarajevo, Berlin, 1879, p. 30). The first embassy from Ragusa to the Sublime Porte was however not sent until 1430. It was received by the sultan in his court at Adrianopole and received from him the extant charter of trading privileges, dated Adrianopole, Dec. 6, 1430 (cf. Ciro Truhelka, Turskojedjni spominici dubrovačke arhite, in Glasnik senažnog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo, vol. xxii. [1914], No. 2). To protect her widespread trade on the Balkan Peninsula Ragusa, after the first temporary conquest of Serbia by the Ottomans, found herself forced to offer the Porte an annual present of 1,000 ducats in silver plate (argentiferi) but when Georg Branković restored the independence of Serbia in 1444 this promise was promptly withdrawn; on the final subjection of Serbia by the Turks in 1459 this tribute (štarići) became a regular institution. From 1459 it was 1,500 ducats and gradually increased to 15,000 ducats. From 1481 it was 15,000 ducats and was annually brought to the imperial court by special captarii with very detailed instructions (cf. the text of these commissions for the Paladins Marino de Gondola and Pietro di Uccari of 1458 and of a later one for the ambassador of the tributary too Gio. Mar. di Resti of 1572 in Ljus knez Vojnoci, Dubrovnik i osmansko carstvo. Prva knjiga: Od prve ugovore s portom do usvojenja Hercegovine, Belgrad 1898, p. 118—155 and p. 256—266;) (cf. C. J. Jireček, Die Beleidung von Ragusa etc., note 49. A number of the earliest documents relating to these missions have been published by F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, in his Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache aus der zweiten Hälfte des XV. jahrhunderts (= S. B. Ak. Wiss., phil.hist. Kl., vol. 197, Vienna 1922); they come without exception from the area of Ragusa, part of the Turkish portion of which is at present in Albania.

On their journey the envoy had to give all kinds of presents, for example to the Sandjak of the Herzegovina in Sarajevo [q. v.] and the Begarberg of Rumelia whose headquarters were in Sofia. The readiness with which the Ragusans adapted themselves to the requirements of dealings with the infidel Turks did not at first find approval at the Holy See. Paul II in 1468 gave the Ragusans express permission to trade with the heathen Ottomans (cf. W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, ii., Leipzig 1885, p. 347 sq. with further references to Ragusan trade with the Ottomans). The lands of the free state of Ragusa which stretched from the mouth of the Cattaro (Kotor) to the Gulf of Cattaro (Kotor), thanks to the skilful policy of its leaders, thus remained intact till its end in 1808. Only occasionally the Ragusans had to suffer from the covetousness of Ottoman rulers, e.g. about 1667 when Kara Muštafa [q. v.] demanded from the Ragusan envoys 150,000 talers “blood money” for the Dutch ambassador G. Crook who perished in the great earthquake in Ragusa (April 6, 1667) (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vi. 203 sq.), or when ten years later the same grand vizier endeavoured to extort the same sum and threw the ambassadors of the free state into prison (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vi. 346). When Ragusa had fallen several years behind with the tribute, it had in 1695 to pay a considerable sum in compensation (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vi. 616). In 1722 a similar case occurred (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vii. 312 sq.) when three years in arrears. It is however a fact that Ragusa cunningly used every opportunity to avoid its oppressive obligations (cf. the significant saying in the Levant quoted by von Hammer, G.O. K., vii. 29: Non sanno Christiani, non sanno Ebrei, ma perovi Ragusi), until the peace of Carlowitz (1699) made it possible for the Ottomans to collect the tribute again (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vii. 29). From 1703 it was paid every three years and in 1804 delivered for the last time in Stamboul by the envoys Paul Goze and Blasius Menze.

In the Turkish wars of 1683—1699 and 1714—1718 the Venetians occupied the hinterland of Ragusa and Trebinje but at the peace of Carlowitz and Passarowitz the Ragusans, protected by Austria and the Porte, negotiated so skilfully that Turkey was not only left the land as far as the Ragusan frontier but also two strips of territory on the coast (Klek and Sutorina) so as not to become direct neighbours of Venice. This was the last great coup of Ragusan policy.

With the decline in Ragusan trade, which came about for the same reasons as the general decline of Italian trade in the Levant, the political decline of the republic set in. In 1808, Napoleon sent General Marmont, afterwards Duc de Raguse, to dissolve the Senate and a year later made Ragusa a province of Illyria. In 1815 the town passed to Austria and since 1918 it has belonged to Jugo-Slavia.

The Ottoman traveller Ewliya Celebi [q. v.] in his Sīyāḥetname (vi. 443 sq., esp. p. 445—453) gives a full description of Dobrua Venetik which he contrasts with Bunduzi Venets (i.e. Venice (cf. on these terms F. Babinger, Aus Südosteuropas Türkenzeit, Berlin 1927, p. 38 note and H. v. Milt, Beiträge zur Kartographie Albanien, in Geographia Hungarica, series geographica, tomus III, Geographia, 1929, p. 659—19, note 88). In 1074 (1664) he came via Izjibomir, Popovo to Dubrovnik from which he went on to Castelovovo (Hercegovina). On Hungarian and Serbo-Croat translations of this section cf. Babinger, Ewliya Celebi's Reiseritte in Albanien, Berlin 1930. p. 1 and 2, note 8.

Statistics regarding the population of Ragusa in the older period are not available. The town had 800 houses. The whole district had 50,000 inhabitants. With the prosperity and long period of peace, a literary life began; poetry — Latin
RAGUSA — AL-RAHBA

and Slav — was definitely cultivated from the end of the xvth century. Latin was used in the offices for over 1,000 years, in recording the proceedings of the Senate till 1808. Within its walls Ragusa frequently sheltered illustrious fugitives from Turkish persecution (e.g. Skanderbeg).

The archives of Ragusa, kept in the Rector’s palace, still await thorough study and contain a large number of unpublished Turkish documents and countless documents of value for the history of Turkish rule in S.E. Europe. Cf. Friedrich Giese, Die osmanisch-türkischen Urkunden im Archiv des Rektorenpalastes in Dubrovnik (Ragusa). in Feitschrift für Georg Jacob zum siebzigsten Geburtstage, Leipzig 1932, p. 41—56. Cf. also J. Gelitch (Djelić), Dubrovacki arhiv, in Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini, xxii., Sarajevo 1910, and Milan v. Rešetar, Dubrovacki arhiv, in Narodna Eucilikofeka, i. 584 sqq.

Ragusa had busy commercial relations with other Muslim states besides Turkey. In 1510 for example, Ragusa received from Kānṣūl al-Q̄adirī (q. v.) a treaty in which it gave its trade with Egypt protection and freedom (cf. Giacomo Luccari, Copiose ristrette degli Annali di Rusa, Venice 1605, p. 126 and thereon Fr. M. Appendini, Notizie sulle istorico-critiche antichità, storia e letteratura de’ Raguzi, Ragusa 1802, i. 213 with erroneous conclusions). The relations were, it is true, not always of a peaceful nature as the “state of war” in 1194 (1780) between Ragusa and Morocco showed (cf. thereon F. Babinger, Ein marokkanisches Staatschreiben an den Freistaat Ragusa vom Jahre 1194 (1780), in M. S. O. S., xxx., Berlin 1927, part ii., p. 191 sqq. and ibid., xxxi., p. 98 sq.). The archives of Dubrovnik contain further unpublished Moroccan documents of the end of the xvth century, e.g. a government document of the 9th Rabi II, 1195 (April 4, 1781).

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text cf. also the older travellers in so far as they describe the road through the Balkan Peninsula (Slaonov), especially Jean Chesneau, Les Voyages de Montesquieu d’Aramon (1547—1588), ed. by D. Schefer (Des Hayes de [Cournenin], Voyage du Levant fait par le commandement du roy en l’année 1621 par le Sire D. C. F. Paris 1632; Les Voyages de M. Quillet à Constantinople par terre. Paris 1664 and frequently; Sir George Wheler, Journey into Greece. London 1682 or French translation Voyage de Dalraitte, de Grice et du Levant. Amsterdam 1689, 2 vols. — A scholarly account, particularly one based on the documents, of the relations of Ragusa with the Ottoman Empire is still lacking as is a full commercial history of the republic. — The principal work on the history of Ragusa is the Geschichte des Freistaates Ragusa, Vienna 1807, by Johann Christ. v. Engel (1770—1814). On other relations between Ragusa and the lands of Islam see Vladimir Mažuranić, Študijen iz Diesten des Islams (v. X. bis ins XVI. Jahrhundert), transl. into German and publ. by Camilla Lucerna, Zagreb-Leipzig 1928, 55 p., a work which however does not on any point stand the test of strict examination. — On the coinage of Ragusa see Milan v. Rešetar, Dubrovacka numismatika, 2 parts, 1924—1926. — Of the Ragusan historians of the older period in addition to S. Razzi, La storia di Ragusa, Luča 1388 and Jun. Resti, Chronico Ragusina (in the Monumenta Slav. Merid., vol. xxv., Agram 1893), Giacomo di Pietro Luccari [= Jakov Lukarević (1551—1615)] most deserves mention, but a thorough study of the probably unreliable sources of his Copiose ristrette degli Annali di Rusa (Venice 1605, xxxvi., 176 p., 4° and Ragusa 1790, 325 p., 8°) is still a desideratum; cf. for the present V. Mažuranić, Itwori dubrovacka historika Jakova Lukarevića, in Narodna Starina, Zagreb 1924, No. 8, p. 121—153. — An excellent and exhaustive bibliography on Ragusa is given in the introduction to the work of Ivan Đuđević, Avvisi di Ragusa. Documenti sull’ Império turco nel secolo XVII e sulla guerra di Candia, Rome 1935, which is also of great importance for the history of relations between Ragusa and Turkey. — There is no collection or edition of the surviving reports of Ragusan envoys on their journeys to the Porte on the lines of the long available Venetian relationi. The only possible exception is the Relazione della relizia e delle feste dell’ Europa sottofatta al dominio del Turco di Matthaus Gundulič (Gondola) who was in Turkey for 28 months until July 1674 written in Rome in 1675, ed. by Banduri, Imperium Orientale, Paris 1711, vol. i.: Animadversiones in Constant. Paraphrophag. de administrate imperii, p. 99—106 (cf. thereon Drinov in Periodičko Spisanje of Braila, ii. 65, who did not know this edition and published extracts from another manuscript). Nor is there a list of these envos available (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 318) among whom we find representatives of almost all the noble families of Ragusa, like the Bona, Caboga, Gocze, Gondola, Menze. Pozza, Resti etc. Ragusa being a tributary country the Porte never sent ambassadors to it but only commissioners (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 331), so that we have no Turkish reports at all. (Franz Babinger)

AL-RAHBA, RAHIB MĀLĪK b. ṬAWK or RAHIB AL-SHāʾIM, a town on the right bank of the Euphrates, the modern al-Miṣfād. Hardy: anything definite is known mainly from the history of the town before the Muslim era. In the middle ages it was usually identified as the Ḥābiḥ b. Nāḥār of the Bible (Gen. xxxvi. 37) i.e. Ḥābiḥ on the river the Euphrates (Esphratus) especially in the Talmud and by the Syriac authors (e.g. Mich Svr., cf. index, p. 63): Barhebræus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 273 and passim, who usually call it Ḥābiḥ, Ḥabat (M. Hattmann, in Z.D.P. I., xxii., p. 42 note 1). A. Musli (The Middle Euphrates, New York 1927, p. 340) takes it to be the Thapsakos of Tolemy, which he — certainly wrongly — wants to distinguish from the well-known town of the name at the bend of the Euphrates (ibid., p. 315—320) instead of seeing only an erroneous location by the Alexandrine geographers (cf. the article THAPSAKOS in Pauly-Wissowa, R. E., v., A. col. 1272—1280). The name al-Rahba is explained by Yakīt (Muṣjam, ed. Westenfeld, ii. 764 following the grammatical Manhar b. Shumail) as the flat part of a wādī, where the water collects (E. Herzfeld, Archäolog. Reise im Euphrat- und Tigri-Gebiet, ii. 382: cf. A. Socin, in Z. D. P. V., xxii. 45).

According to Arabic accounts it was at one time called Furdat Nu'm (al-Tabari, ed. Goeje, 917) or simply al-Furqa (Ibn Miskawaih, Tadijar,
ed. Caetani, p. 87); in the vicinity was a monastery, Dair Nuʿm (Yākūṭ, ii. 704; iv. 797).

According to al-Baladhuri (ed. de Goeje, p. 180), there was no evidence that al-Raḥba below Ḥaḍramīya is an old town; on the contrary it was only founded by Malik b. Ṭāwūb b. ʿAttāb al-Taghlibi (cf. Abu ʿl-Mahāsin, ed. Popper, ii. 34) in the caliphate of Maʾmūn (813−833) (a legendary embellishment of the story of its foundation by ʿUmar al-Bīsṭāmī in Yākūṭ, ii. 764). The new foundation was in the form of a long rectangular head cloth (qatālašān). After the death of its founder (Ibn al-ʿAṭār, ed. Tornberg, vii. 188) in 260 (873−874) he was succeeded as ruler of the town by his son ʿAbd Allāh who was driven out of it in 883 by Ibn Abī ʿl-Sādār, lord of al-Anbār, Ṭārīḵ al-Furāt and Raḥbat Ṭawk (al-Ṭabarānī, iii. 2039).

The ʿAlmaṭī tribe who in 1161 had plundered the district of al-Ḥilla and the Kufa returned to Raḥbat al-Shām followed by the government troops where they were reinforced by other nomads and scattered the enemy (Ibn al-ʿAṭār, xi. 182 sq.). Nūr al-Dīn granted the Kurd Asād al-Dīn Shīrkuh b. Ahmad b. Shādī of Dīn, Salādīn’s uncle, in 599 (1164) al-Raḥba and Ḥims (Mich. Syr., ii. 325; Barhebr., Chron. syr., p. 330). The latter entrusted the government of al-Raḥba to an officer named Yūsuf b. Malikshī Khurshā built al-Raḥbat al-Diādīna with a citadel about a farsaḵk (3 miles) from the Euphrates because the town of Raḥbat Malik b. Ṭawk was now in ruins (Abū ʿl-Fida’, Tuhfāt al-Bāḥrīn, ed. Rénaud, p. 281; Ḥudaydī Khalfī, Diwān al-Khalīfī, p. 444). The new town of al-Raḥba became a caravan station between Syria and the Trak, as we learn from Ibn ʿAbd Allāh among others (Tuhfa, ed. Defrémy and Sanguinetti, iv. 315) who travelled from there via al-Suḵkha to Taḥmūr.

The town remained for a century in Shīrkuh’s family until in 1264 Baibars installed an Egyptian governor there (Ibn al-ʿAṭār, xi. 341; xii. 189; Abū ʿl-Fida’, Anales Misleim, ed. Reiske-Alder, iv. 142; v. 16). Sonḵor al-Asāhḵar of Damascus who rebelled against Kalaʿūn in 678 (1279) fled after a defeat to al-Raḥba to the emir Ḳīsā and from there appealed to Abaḵa Ḳaṭūf for protection (Barhebr., Chron. syr., p. 543).


Muhanna and his family, the Ḳīsā, were driven from the district of Salāmiya in the spring of 1320 and pursued by the Syrian troops as far as
Al-Rahba

Rahba and Āna (Abu 'l-Fidā', v. 340 sq.)—the town was perhaps destroyed on this occasion.

In 1331 the Euphrates inundated the country round al-Rahba (Ibn al-Athir, Vienna MS. in Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 3, note 3).

According to the Muslim geographers, al-Rahba lay on the Euphrates (Kathāna, in B. G. A., vi. 233; Ibn Isma'il, ed. Vossesx, in B. G. A., iii. 138; al-Idrisi, transl. Jaubert, ii. 137 sq.; al-Dimishki, ed. Mehren, p. 93; Abu 'l-Fidā', ed. Reinand, p. 51) and also on the site of the Sa'id led off from it at Fām Sa'id on the right bank, which rejoined the Euphrates below the town, the gardens of which it watered, and above al-Daliya also called Dalīyat Mālik b. Ţawk (Suhāh, ed. v. Mīkh, in Bibl. arab. histor. u. Geogr., v, Leipzig 1930, p. 123; Yākūt, iv. 840; Abu 'l-Fidā', Tākāmī, p. 281). The town lay 3 farsāks from Kārkišiya (al-Āzīnī, in Abu 'l-Fidā', ed. Reinand, p. 281) and, according to al-Makdisī (B. G. A., iii. 149), a day's journey each from this town, al-Daliya and Bā', (the latter statement is quite inaccurate; cf. Musil, op. cit., p. 253 sq.) Musil (ibid., p. 250) wrongly takes al-Daliya to be al-Sūliya, which is impossible as 8—10 miles above it the Euphrates flows close to the foot of Djabal Abu 'l-Kāsīm, so that the Sa'id canal must have flowed north of it back into the Euphrates (cf. the Karte von Mesopotamien of the Prussian Survey, Feb. 1918, 1:400,000.

Sheet 52: 'Āna; Cumont, Foulles de Douara-Europes, Paris 1926, Atlas, pl. i.: Cours de l'Euphrate entre Circeium et Douara-Europes d'apres l'Observatoire de 'l'Armee du Levant' on the same scale and the maps in Sarre-Herzfeld, Arch. Reise. The town of al-Rahba was a Jacobite bishopric (a list of the bishops in Mich. Syr, iii. 502); that it — for a time at least — was also a Nestorian bishopric is shown from a life of the Katholikos Eliyā I (on him see Baumstark, Geschichte der syr. Literatur, p. 286 sq.) who shortly before his death on May 6, 1049 appointed a bishop to this town (Assemi, in B. O., iii. 263).

In the statements of the Arab geographers, it is clear that the old Rahbat Mālik b. Ţawk lay on the bank of the Euphrates (al-Iskāhri, in B. G. A., ii. ed. v. Meherzi, p. 172; Ibn Hawāk, B. G. A., iv. 135; al-Makdisī, B. G. A., iii. 138; Vākūt, Muğamān, v. 860; Ibn Khurādābīhīb, B. G. A., vi. 233) i.e. presumably corresponded to the modern al-Miyādīn (plur. of miyādīn) (G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syr. Akten pers. Martyrer, p. 165; E. Herzfeld, Arch. Reise, ii. 382, note 1; A. Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 253, 340) while the new al-Rahba, as we see, was built a farsāk from it, where in the S.W. of al-Miyādīn there still are the ruins of the citadel al-Rahaba or Rāba. According to Abu 'l-Fidā‘ (ed. Reinand, p. 281), towers were still standing among the ruins of the old town. Opposite al-Rahba on the left bank of the Euphrates stood a fortress, taken by Marwān II (744—750) in the fighting with Hishām (Mahdīb in Mandāb, Kītāb al-U'mūn in v. Road. Orient., v. 517 sq.) In this fortress Musil (op. cit., p. 338 sq.) has recognized al-Za'īna (al-Āludūr, al-Doveji, p. 180; Tabāri, ii. 1457 sq.; Ibn Khurādābīhīb, p. 74) and the ancient Za'ād which is still called al-Marwānīya after this caipht, but really is not opposite al-Miyādīn, but fourteen miles farther down.

Ibn Hawāk (B. G. A., ii. 155) praises the fertility of the well-watered region of Rahba, where the orchards on the east bank of Euphrates also produced date-palms; their quinces were also famous (al-Makdisī, in B. G. A., iii. 145). The Karte von Mesopotamien (1:400,000 mark, at "Mājādīn", the first (most northerly) palm) dates really only ripen in specially favourable weather in the region of Alūd Kamāl (Musil, op. cit., p. 342). According to al-Istakhri (B. G. A., i. 77), Rahbat Mālik b. Ŷawk was larger than Kārkišiya; al-Makdisī (B. G. A., iii. 142) calls it the centre of the Euphrates' district (aman al-Furāt or nāḥiyat al-Furāt) as in the early Muhammadan period the fertile plain from Dar al-Zawr to Alūd Kamāl with the towns of al-Rahba, Dāliya, 'Āna and al-Hadjīth was called (Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 382). According to him the town was built in a semi-circle on the edge of the desert and defended by a strong fortress.

Yākūt visited the town, which according to him was eight days' journey from Damascus, five from Halab, 100 farsāks from Baghdād and a little over 20 farsāks from al-Ḳaḥkā. In al-Dimīthā (ed. Mehren, p. 202) it is called Rahbat al-Furātīya (in the time of Ḫālid al-Fārūkī (Zubda, ed. Ravaisse, p. 50) it belonged to Ḫalab. According to al-Umrānī, Syria, to be mentioned among the cities, marched to the capital Hims, reached as far as al-Rahba; he mentions there "a citadel and a government and there are Bahrit's, cavalry, scouts and mercenaries stationed there" (al-Umrānī, transl. R. Hartmann, in Z.D.M.G., lxx, 23, 39). Ibn Baṭṭīta (op. cit.) calls the town "the end of al-'Irāk and the beginning of the Shām". Ḫālidī Khālīfa reckons from 'Āna to al-Rahba three days' journey and from there to al-Dair one day's journey (Zihārīn-nunā, Stambul 1145, p. 483; cf. thereon Musil, op. cit., p. 257). The Venetian jeweller Gasparg Balbi who passed the town on Feb. 6, 1588 on the Euphrates says (Viaggi dell' Indie orientali, Venice 1590, without pagination) "vedemmo castello Rahabi appresso il qual castello si vede una città rovinata, ma in alcuni lati di essa habitatà da alcune poche persone di nome di Rahaballecito" (on the form Rahabi, cf. M. Hartmann, in Z.D.P.F., xxi. 44, no. 596). Pietro della Valle (Viaggi, Venice 1544, i. 571) with the town of "Rahasa" at a distance from the Euphrates and heard that there were some old buildings there. Tavernier (Les six voyages, i., Paris 176, p. 285) mentions a place called "Machet-rahba", i.e. Maschhad al-Rahba (six miles S. W. of al-Rahba).

In modern times al-Miyādīn and the ruins of the Rahba (the usual formation) have been repeatedly visited (see Bibl.). The plan of the castle forms a triangle with flattened angles; pictures of the castle will be found in Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 7, fig. 2 or Sarre-Herzfeld, Arch. Reise, iii., pl. lixxix sq.

RAHBANIYA (A.), monasticism. The term is derived from rāhīb [q.v.]; it occurs in the Kurān once only, in a passage (Sūra lixi. 27) that has given rise to divergent interpretations:

"And we put in the hearts of those who followed Jesus, compassion and mercy, and the monastic state, they instituted the same (we did not prescribe it to them) only out of a desire to please God. Yet they observed not the same as it ought truly to have been observed. And we gave unto such of them as believed, their reward; but many of them were wicked doers".

According to some of the exegists the verb "we put" has two objects only, viz. compassion and mercy, whereas the words "and the monastic state" are the object of "they instituted". Accordingly the monastic state appears here as a purely human institution, which moreover has been degraded by evil doers.

According to others, however, the object of the words "and we put" is: compassion, mercy and the monastic state. According to this exegesis monasticism is called a divine institution. Professor Masson has pointed out that this exegesis is the older one; the younger one expresses a feeling hostile to monasticism, which coined the tradition "No rahbāniya in Islām".

This tradition does not occur in the canonical collections. Yet, it is being prepared there. When the wife of ʿOṯmān b. Maʿṣūn [q.v.] complained of being neglected by her husband, Muhammad took her part, saying: Monasticism (rahbāniya) was not prescribed to us (Abū Ḥanīfah, vi. 226; Dānīl, Nikāb, bāb 3). The following tradition is less exclusive: Do not trouble yourselves and God will not trouble you. Some have troubled themselves and God has troubled them. Their successors are in the hermitages and monasteries, "an institution we have not prescribed to them" (Abū Dāwūd, Adāb, bāb 44).

Islām, thus rejecting monasticism, has replaced it by the holy war: "Every prophet has some kind of rahbāniya; the rahbāniya of this community is the holy war" (a tradition ascribed to Muhammad in Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 266; to Abū Saʿīd al-Ḵudrī, ibid., iii. 82). Cf. also Ṭvariqa, zuhd.

Bibliography: L. Masson, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, p. 123 sqq.; the commentaries of the Kurān on Sūra lixi. 27; Ibn Saʿīd, Tabaḥkāt, ed. Sachau, ii/1, 287; Ḥarītī, Muḥammād, ed. de Sacy, p. 570–571; Zamakhshārī, al-Fāʾlī, Hājdarābād 1324, i. 269; Ibn al-Athīr, Nihāyāt, s.v.; Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Muhammad, i. 389; Goldzifer, Muḥammādīsche Studien, ii. 394; do., in R. H. K., xvii. 193–194: xxvii. 314. (A. J. Wensinck)

RAHĪB (A., plur. rahbūn, rahābīn, rahbānāna), a monk. The figure of the monk is known to pre-Islamic poetry and to the Kurān and Tradition. The pre-Islamic poets refer to the monk in his cell the flight which by the traveller by night sees in the distance and which gives him the idea of shelter.

In the Kurān the monk and the ʾıṣāl, sometimes also the ṣabīr, are the religious leaders of the Christians. In one place it is said that rabbis and monks live at the expense of other men (Sūra ix., 34) and that the Christians have taken as their masters instead of God their ṣabīr and their monks as well as al-Masīḥ b. Maryam (Sūra ix. 31). In another passage the Christians are praised for their friendship to their fellow-believers which is explained from the fact that there are priests and monks among them (Sūra v. 57). In Ḥadīth the rāhīb is frequently encountered in stories of the nature of the ʾīṣā al-anbāyā (cf. Buhārī, Anbāyā, bāb 54; Muslim, Zuhār, Tr. 75; Tawāb, Tr. 46, 47; Tirmidhī, Tafsīr, Sūra 85, Tr. 2; Māniḥāb, Tr. 3; Naṣāʾī, Musāḏārīd, Tr. 11; Ibn Māḏūla, Flītan, Tr. 20, 23; Dāmirī, Faḍāʾil al-Kurān, Tr. 16; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 461; ii. 434; iii. 337, 347; v. 4; vii. 17, 18). From the fact that in the Muhammadan literature of the early centuries a.h. the epithet rāhīb was given to various pious individuals it is evident that there was nothing odious about it. Cf. however the article RAHBANIYAH.

Bibliography: cf. that of RAHBANIYAH. (A. J. Wensinck)

RAḤIL, in the Bible Rachel, wife of Jacob, mother of Joseph and Benjamin, is not mentioned in the Kurān. There is however a reference to her in Sūra iv. 27: "Ye may not have two sisters to wife at the same time; if it has been done formerly God now exercises pardon and mercy". This is said to allude to Jacob's marriage with Liyā and Rāḥil; before Moses revealed the Torah, such a marriage was valid. Ṭabārī gives this explanation in the Annals, i. 356, 359 sq. Ibn al-Athīr, p. 90, adopts it. But already in Tafsīr, iv. 210, Ṭabārī explains the verse correctly: Muhammad forbids for the future marriage with two sisters but he does not dissolve such marriages concluded before the prohibition. — Islamic tradition generally adopts the view that Ya稷ūb only married Rāḥil after Liyā's death. So already in Ṭabārī, i. 355, Zamakhshārī, Baidawī, Ibn al-Athīr etc. Al-Kisā'i even thinks that Ya稷ūb only married Rāḥil after the death of Liyā and of his two concubines. Here again Muslim legend differs from the Bible, in making him not marry Rāḥil until after 14 years of service; in the Bible, Jacob serves seven years, marries Leah and after the wedding week Rachel
and serves another seven years. — Ya'küb's wooing and Laban's trick by which he substitutes Liyā for Kāhūl as 'neither lamp nor candle-light' illuminate the bridal chamber, is embellished in Muslim legend.

Kāhūl is also of importance in the story of Yūsuf. Yūsuf inherits his beauty from Kāhūl; they had half of all the beauty in the world, according to others two-thirds, or even according to the old Haggadic scheme (Ḳiṣṣat al-Ḳabail, 409), nine tenths Ṭḥalabī, p. 69. — When Ya'küb left Lāban, he had no funds for the journey; at Rachel's suggestion, Yūsuf steals Lāban's idols. — As Yūsuf, sold by his brothers, passes the tomb of Kāhūl, he throws himself from his camel on the grave and laments: "O mother, look on thy child, I have been deprived of my coat, thrown into a pit, stoned and sold as a slave". Then he heard a voice: "Trust in God". The old Haggada does not know this touching scene. But it has found its way into the late medieval book of stories Ṣefer Ḥagadot (ed. Goldschmidt, p. 150). The Jewish-Persian poet Ṣahin (sixth century) adapts this motif from Firdawsi's Yāsān u-Zulālāigha in his book of Genesis.


(B. HELLER)

RAHIM. [See ALLAH, i. 303b, 304b.]

AL-RAHIM. [See KISRAW FRIZ].

RAHMA, compassion [See ALLAH, i. 303b, 306.]

RAHMANIA, Algerian Order (farība) called after Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Ghūthtul, al-Darbārī, al-Qasīm, al-Qādir, who died 1208 (1793-1794). It is a branch of the Khalwaṭa and is said to have at one time been called Bahāt after Muṣṭafā b. Muḥammad al-Bahrāmī. At Nefta, in Tunisia, and some other places it is called Ṭāzūtī after Muṣṭafā b. Muḥammad b. 'Azīzū, life of the Founder. His family belonged to the tribe Aṭīma, part of the confederation Gaḥūta in the Kabīliya Ḳabīlā: having studied at his home, and then in Algiers, he made the pilgrimage in 1152 (1739-1740), and on his return spent some time as a student at al-Ḳazāh in Cairo, where Muḥammad b. Ṣālim al-Ḥanawī (d. 1181: Silk al-Darbūr, iv. 50) initiated him into the Khalwaṭ Order, and ordered him to propagate it in India and the Sudan; after an absence of thirty years he returned to Algeria, and commenced preaching in his native village, where he founded a sāwīya; he seems to have introduced some modifications into Khalwaṭ practice, and as his Seven Visions of the Prophet Muḥammad made some important claims for his person and his system; immunity from hell-fire was to be secured by affiliation to his order, love for himself or it, a visit to himself, stopping before his tomb, hearing his dhikr recited. His success in winning adherents provoked the envy of the local mārahīn, in con-

sequence of which he migrated to Ḫamāna in the neighbourhood of Algiers. Here too his activities met with opposition from the religious leaders, who summoned him to appear before a madfīta under the presidency of the Mālikī Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Mumin, and under the influence of the 'Turkish authorities, who were impressed by the following which he had acquired, he was acquitted of the charge of unorthodoxy, but he thought it prudent to return to his native village, where shortly afterwards he died, leaving as his successor Aḥmad al-Ḳādirī, al-Maghribī. His corpse is said to have been stoned by the kānūnīs and burned in a great pomp at Ḫamāna with a Ḳubba and a mourning over it. The Ait Smālī however maintained that it had not left its original grave, whence it was supposed to have been miraculously duplicated, and the title Aḥmad al-Kabīrī "owner of two graves" was given against him.

**History and propagation of the Order.** Aḥmad al-Ḳādirī was undisputed head from 1208 (1793-1794) to 1251 (1835-1837); his successor died shortly after, and from the following year, though the Order continued to win adherents, it divided into independent branches. This was owing to the objections raised by the Ait Smālī to the succession of al-Ḳādirī, Aḥmadb, another Maghribī; in spite of the support of Aḥmad al-Kādirī (the famous enemy of the French) he had to quit his post, which was held for a time by the widow of 'Ali b. Ṣālim, who, however, owing to the dwindling of the revenues of the sāwīya had ultimately to surrender to Aḥmad. Meanwhile the foundresses of other sāwīyās were assuming independence. After the death of Aḥmadb in 1259 (1843-1844) her son-in-law al-Ḳādirī 'Anamī succeeded to the headship. Finding his influence waning owing to his failure to participate in the attack on the French organized by Bū Baḡlah he in August 1856 called his followers to arms and obtained some initial successes; he was however compelled to surrender in the following year, and his wife (or mother-in-law) at the head of a hundred kānūnīs shortly after. Aḥmadb retired to Tunisia, where he endeavoured to continue the exercise of his functions, but he was not generally recognized as head of the order, and his place among the Ait Smālī was taken by Muhammad Aẓmān b. Ḳāḥdāḥ al-Ṣaddūk, who at the age of 80 on April 8, 1871 proclaimed Ḫudayr against the French, who had recently been defeated in the Franco-Prussian War. The insurrection met with little success, though it spread far, and on July 13 the kānūnīs surrendered to General Saudier, who sent him to Bougie. The original sāwīya was closed as a precautionary measure.

His son Aẓiz, who had been transported to New Caledonia, succeeded in escaping to Djidda, whence he endeavoured to govern the community; but various muḥaddīnīs, who had been appointed by his father, as well as other foundresses of sāwīyās, asserted their independence. Lists are given by Depont and Coppolani of these persons and their spheres of influence, which extend into Tunisia and the Maghrib. In the Seven Visions of the Prophet Muḥammad made some important claims for his person and his system; immunity from hell-fire was to be secured by affiliation to his order, love for himself or it, a visit to himself, stopping before his tomb, hearing his dhikr recited. His success in winning adherents provoked the envy of the local mārahīn. In con-

Practices of the Order. The training of the mārahī consists in teaching him a series of seven
names", of which the first is the formula la 'ilākh illsa 'ilāhā, to be repeated from 12,000 to 70,000 times in a day and night, and followed by the others, it the šahāq is satisfied with the neophyte's progress; these are 2. Allāh three times; 3. huwa; 4. ḥādh three times; 5. qayyūm three times; 6. ḥābyr three times (Rinn's list differs slightly from this). Rinn states that the dījār of the Order consists in repeating at least 80 times from the afternoon of Thursday to that of Friday the prayer ascribed to Shādūli, and on the other weekdays the formula la 'ilākh illsa 'ilāhā. Favourite lessons are the "Verse of the Throne" followed by Sārasī, etc.-xiv. (prescribed in the Founder's diploma, translated by A. Delpech, in R. A., 1874) and the Seven Visions mentioned above (translated by Rinn, p. 487).

Literature of the Order. Most of this would seem to be still in Ms.; the founder is credited with several books. A. Cherbonneau, in J. A., 1852, p. 517 describes a catechism called al-Qāhāmīyā by Muhammad b. Bāṣṭarzī with a commentary by his son Mustaḥfīz, perhaps identical with a work called by French writers Présentations dominicaux. Another work belonging to the Order, which they mention is called al-Raṣūd al-bāṣīm fi Mānāzib aš-Šāhīyā Muhammad b. aš-Šāmī.


RAHINT (A.), pledge, security rāhin, the giver and murtāhin, the taker of the pledge. The Kūfān (ll. 282), obviously in confirmation of pre-Islamic legal usage, provides for the giving of pledged rīkānān maṣhaba in business in which a definite period is concerned, if the preparation of a written document is impossible. The part here played by the security as evidence of the existence of an obligation is in Islamic law much less important than that of securing the fulfilment of a demand. From the latter point of view the traditions are mainly concerned with two questions: a. whether the security in case of non-fulfilment passes without more ado into the ownership of the creditor or not (the two answers are crystallised in the legal maxims al-rāhin humā fih al-rāhin la yaghšūt); and b. who is entitled to use it and to how he is to use it (the answer is found in earlier authorities that the taker of the pledge may enjoy its use if he sees to its maintenance, later fell out into disuse). According to the doctrine of Muslim law, the giver of the pledge is bound to maintain it, but can enjoy the use of it only according to the Shāfī; its use by the taker of the pledge is also forbidden (except by the Ḥanbalī); the yield (increase) belongs to the giver of the pledge but also becomes part of the security (except with the Shāfī); the taker of the pledge is responsible for it according to the Ḥanafī and (with limitations) the Mālikī. Among the Shāfī and the Ḥanbalī the agreement regarding the security is regarded as a bailment-relationship (with much less responsibility). The basis for the condition of a pledge must be a claim (dārī); the accessory character of the security is in general allowed, but exceptional cases are recognised in which the debt is extinguished by the disappearance of the security i.e. the risk passes to the taker of the pledge. While the ownership of the pledge remains with the debtor, he has no power of disposal over it and possession passes to the creditor; the latter has the right to sell it to satisfy his claim if the debt becomes overdue or is not paid. Mortgage is unknown as well as a graded series of rights to the same object of pledge. To be distinguished from the pledge is the disposition (habs) of a thing to enforce fulfilment of a legal claim, which represents a concrete right afforded by the law in individual cases so that it has contacts with the legal right to pledge.


RA'IS AL-KUTTAB, RA'IS EFENDI. [See REF.]

RA'AY, the ancient Ra'ā, a town in Media. Its ruins may be seen about 5 miles S. S. E. of Teheran [q. v.] to the south of a spur projecting from Elburz into the plain. The village and sanctuary of Shāh 'Abd al-Āṣim lie immediately south of the ruins. The geographical importance of the town lies in the fact that it was situated in the fertile zone which lies between the mountains and the desert, by which from time immemorial communication has taken place between the west and east of Iran. Several roads from Māzandarān [q. v.] converge on Ra'ay on the north side.

In the Avesta, Widētātā, i. 15, Ra'ā is mentioned as the twelfth sacred place created by Ahrō-Maza. Yasna, xix. 18, calls it ta'ārutāt Ra'āgā zarān birdza "Zoroastrian Ra'āga possessing four degrees of hierarchy" because at Ra'ā the representative of the prerogatives going back to Zoroaster (Zarān birdza) held also the powers of a prince (ratāt dāhynūb) while elsewhere these two dignities with the three categories of chief subordinates, formed five degrees of hierarchy. The Middle Persian commentary deduces from this that Zoroaster must have belonged to Ra'ā. The town is also called birān birdza (Widētātā, i. 15) which Bartholomeus interprets as possessing "three districts" (drei Gaue besiedeln) although the explanation of the Middle Persian commentary is: "possessing three estates (social classes) for the priests, warriors and cultivators there were good" (cf. Bartholomeus, Aliāran. Worterbuch, col. 579, 811, 1497; cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 122). The later commentators put Ra'ay in Atrapatene in conformity with the late tendency to localise events in sacred history in this province.

In the Old Persian inscriptions (BH. 2, 10–18) Ra'ā appears as the province of Media in which in the autumn of 521 B.C. the false king of Media Frawartish sought refuge in vain; from Ra'ā also Darius sent reinforcements to his father Wīshāspa when the latter was putting down the rebellion in Parthia (BH. 3, 1–10).

Rages is also mentioned in the apocrypha. Tobit sent his son Tobias from Niniveh to recover the silver deposited in Rages with Gabel, brother of
Raiy (Tobit, i. 14). The book of Judith (i. 15) puts near Ragau (if it only were Ragha) the plain in which Nebuchadnezzar defeated the king of Media, Arphaxad (Phraortes).

In the summer of 336 B.C., Alexander the Great following Darius III took 11 days to go from Ecbatana to Rhagae (Arrian, iii. 30 a). Dio-dorus relates that Antigonus passed near Rhagae after his victory over his rival Eumenes (316 B.C.). According to Strabo, xi. 9, and xii. 136, Seleucus Nicator (322-280) rebuilt Rhagae under the name of Eupropus (in memory of his native town in Macedonia) and that near Eupropus the towns of Lacin and Apamaea and Herculea were peopled with Macedonians. After the coming of the Parthians the town was renamed Arsakia. It is however possible that all these towns although situated in the same locality occupied slightly different sites for they are mentioned side by side in the authorities. Rawlinson (J. G. S., x. 119) would put Eupropus at Warraim (q.v.). Athenaeus in Deipnosophistae, says that the Parthian kings spent the spring at Rhagae (iv Pauca) and the winter at Babilon (see the details in A. V. W. Jackson, and Weissbach). The Greek popular etymologies which explain the name Rhagae as alluding to earthquakes seem to reflect the frequency of this phenomenon in this region so close to Damavand.

In the Sassanian period Yazdgird III in 641 issued from Rāi y his last appeal to the nation before fleeing to Khurrašan. The sanctuary of Bībi Shahr-Bānāt situated on the south face of the already mentioned spur and accessible only to women is associated with the memory of the daughter of Yazdgird who, according to tradition, became the wife of Husain b. Aft. In the years 486, 499, 553 A.D. Rāi is mentioned as the see of bishops of the Eastern Syrian church.

Arab conquest. The year of the conquest is variously given (18 = 639-644) and it is possible that the Arab power was consolidated gradually. As late as 25 (646) a rebellion was suppressed in Rāi y by Abi Wālī. The Arabs seem to have profited by the dissensions among the noble Persian families. Rāi y was the fief of the Mihrān family and, in consequence of the resistance of Sīwakbāsh b. Mihrān b. Bahram Cūbin, Nuʿaṁ b. Mūkarrin had the old town destroyed and ordered Farrukhan b. Zainab (Zainabi 2) b. Kūla (cf. Masmūghan) to build a new town (Tabari, i. 365). In 71 (690) again a king of the family of Farrukhan is mentioned alongside of the Arab governor.

The passing power of the Omayyads to the Abbasids took place at Rāi y without incident but in 136 (753) the "Khurrami" Sunbadh, one of Abi Musīm's stalwarts, seized the town for a short time. The new era for Rāi y began with the appointment of the heir to the throne Muhammad Mahdi to the governorship of the east (141 = 758-768). He rebuilt Rāi y under the name of Muhammadiya and surrounded it by a ditch. The suburb of Mahdi-Bābād was built for those of the inhabitants who had to give up their property in the old town. Hārūn al-Rashid, son of Mahdi, was born in Rāi y and used often to recall with pleasure his native town and its principal street. In 95 (810) Muḥammad's general Tāhir b. Ḥusayn won a victory over Amlas' troops near Rāi y. In 250 (865) the struggle began in Rāi y between the Zāidi 'Alids of Tabaristān and first the Tāhrids and later the caliph's Turkish generals. It was not till 272 (885) that Adhḫū-ṭeqīn of Kāzīm took the town from the 'Alids. In 261 (874) the caliph Ma'amīd wished to consolidate his position appointed to Rāi y his son, the future caliph Muktāfī. Soon afterwards the Sāmānids began to interfere in Rāi y. Isma'il b. Ahmad seized Rāi y in 289 (902) and the fait accompli was confirmed by the caliph Muktāfī. In 296 Ahmad b. Isma'il received investiture from Mūktādīr in Rāi y (Gardizi, p. 21-22).

In the tenth century Rāi y is described in detail in the works of the contemporary Arab geographers. In spite of the interest which Baghdad displayed in Rāi y the number of Arabs there was insignificant and the population consisted of Persians of all classes (abhar; Ya乎bīb, in B, G. A., vii. 276). Among the products of Rāi y Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 253, mentions silks and other stuffs, articles of wood and "lustrous dishes," an interesting detail in view of the celebrity enjoyed by the ceramics "of Rhages". All writers emphasise the very great importance of Rāi y as a commercial centre. According to ʿIsāḥārī, p. 291, the town covered an area of 1/2 by 1/2 farsaḵhs, the buildings were of clay (jin) and the use of bricks and plaster (dīḏ = gav) was also known. The town had five great bazaars and eight large bazaars. Mūkaddaši, p. 39, calls Rāi y one of the glories of the lands of ʿIslām and among other things mentions its library in the Raḥba quarter which was watered by the Sūrkanī canal.

Dailami period. In 304 (916) the lord of Adhharbalīdīn Yūsuf b. Abī l-Sādī occupied Rāi y out of which he drove the Dailami Muhammad b. Abī Ṣulṭān who represented the Sāmānīds Nuʿaym (Ibn al-ʿAthir, viii. 74). This occupation is commemorated in coins struck by Yūsuf at Muḥammadābād, it was the beginning of a troubled period. Rāi y passed successively into the hands of the Dailami Abī l-Wahshābīn, Ṣafīḏ Bektāmīrī, the Dailami Ahmad b. Abī and of Nuʿaym, slave of Yūsuf (in 313 = 925; cf. R. Vasmer, O monetāhaj Sadžī, Baku 1927). Lastly the Sāmānīds encouraged by the caliph succeeded in bringing Rāi y again within their sphere of influence but soon their general Aṣfār (a Dailami) became independent in Rāi y. In 318 (930), Aṣfār was killed by his lieutenant Mardāwīdī [q.v.] (a native of Gilān and one of the founders of the Zīyārīd dynasty) who took over his master's lands (C. Huy, Les Zīyārīdīs, 1922, p. 363 = 11).

After the assassination of Mardāwīdī (123 = 925) the Buyids established themselves in Rāi y, which became the fief of the branch of Rūkūn al-Dawla which held out there about 100 years. In 390 (1002) the last Sāmānī al-Muṭnasir made an attempt to seize Rāi y but failed. In 420 (1027) the Buyid Majdī al-Dawla was ill-advised enough to invoke against the Dalaitids the help of Mahmūd of Ghazni, who seized his lands (cf. Muhammad Nazim, Sulṭān Mahmūd, 1931, p. 80-85). The brief rule of the Ghaznavids was marked by acts of obscurantism, like the destruction of books on philosophy and astrology and the atrocious persecutions of the Karmatians and Muṭtaṣilīs (Gardizi, p. 91; Ibn al-ʿAthir, ix. 262).

The Saldūrīs. The Ghūz laid Rāi y waste in 427 (1033) and in 434 (1042) the town, where Majdī al-Dawla still held out in the fort of Tabarah (Ibn al-ʿAthir, ix. 347), fell into the power of the Saldūrīs and became one of their principal cities. The last Buyid al-Malik al-Raḥīm died a prisoner
Raiy

The ruins of Raiy. Olivier in 1797 sought them in vain and it was Trulhierr and Gardane who first discovered them. The earliest descriptions are by J. Morlier, Ker Porter and Sir W. Ouseley. The first has preserved for us a sketch of a Sasanian bas-relief which was later replaced by a sculpture of Fath 'Alī Shāh. The description and particularly the plan by Ker Porter (reproduced in Sarre and A. V. W. Jackson, Persia) are still of value because since his time the need for agriculture and unsystematic digging have destroyed the walls and collapsed the strata. Large numbers of objects of archaeological interest and particularly the celebrated pottery covered with paint have flooded the European and American markets as a result of the activity of the dealers. Scientific investigation was begun by the universities of Philadelphia and Boston in 1954 (cf. The Illustrated London News, June 22, 1955, p. 1122—1123; E. F. Schmidt, The Persian Expedition [Raiy], in Bulletin University Museum, Philadelphia, v., 1936, p. 41—49; cf. p. 25—27). In the citadel hill, Dr. E. R. Schmidt found a great variety of pottery and the remains of buildings among which the most interesting are the foundations of Mahdi's mosque (communication by A. Godard to the Congress of Persian Art at Lenigrad in Sept. 1935). In an interesting passage, Mukaddasī, p. 210, speaks of the high domes which the Būyids built over their tombs. According to the Siyāsat-nāma, p. 145, in the time of Fakhr al-Dawla a rich Zoroastrian built an arzdān with double roof (sīvādān ba-du pūzō)h on the top of the hill of Tabarakan, above the domed tomb (gubād) of Fakhr al-Dawla. The arzdān, turned to a new use received the name of did-a-yi sipāh- sālārīn "fort of the commandants" and was still in existence in the time of Nizām al-Mulk. The two towers now to be seen among the ruins of Raiy [both are round in plan, but one repaired under Našir al-Dīn Shāh has ribbed flanks] are attributed to the Sallūds but may continue the Dailami type of building. The hill of Tabarakan on which was the citadel (destroyed in 588 [1192] by Tughrīl III) according to Yākūt was situated to "the right" of the Kūrāsan road while the high mountain was to "the left" of this road. Tabarakan therefore must have been on the top of the hill opposite the great spur (hill G in Ker Porter's plan: *fortress finely built of stone and on the summit of an immense rock which commands the open

The life of man was not completely extinguished at Raiy is evident from the dates of pottery which apparently continued to be made in Raiy (cf. Guest, A dated Rayy bowl, in Burlington Magazine, 1931, p. 134—135; the painted bowl bears the date 640 = 1243). The citadel of Tabarakan was rebuilt under Ghāzān Khan (1295—1304) but certain economic reasons (irrigation?) if not political and religious reasons, must have been against the restoration of Raiy and the centre of the new administrative Mongol division (the tumān of Raiy) became Warāmān [q.v.] (cf. Nasihat al-Kulub, in G.M.S., p. 55). After the end of Hūlagi's dynasty, Raiy fell to the sphere of influence of Tughā-Timūr [q.v.] of Āstābād. In 1384, Timūr's troops occupied Raiy without a striking blow but this must mean the district and not the town of Raiy, for Clavijo (ed. Srezenyevskī, p. 187) who passed through this country in 1404 confirms that Raiy (Xaharīpīra = Shahr-i Raiy) was no longer inhabited (agera deshabitata). No importance is to be attached to the mention of "Raiy" in the time of Shāh-Rukh (Muša'-i Sa'dān, [1192], under the year 841 = 1437) or of Shāh Ismā'īl, Ḥābīb al-Siyār.

From the reign of Ghīyāth al-Dīn Mas'ūd (529—547 = 1133—1152) Raiy was ruled by the amir Inandī whose daughter Inandī-Khāṭūn became the wife of Pahlāwan, son of the famous atabeg of Ardabārī Khan, Ildigiz. When the latter put on the throne Subh al-Arslān-Shāh (whose mother he had married) Inandī opposed this nomination but was defeated in 555 (1160). Inandī withdrew to Būstān but with the help of the Khwārizmshāh II-Arslān the cannot was murdered at the instigation of Ildigiz who gave Raiy as a fief to Pahlāwan. Later the town passed to Kultūgh Inandī b. Pahlāwan who, like his maternal grandfather, brought about the intervention of the Khwārizmshāh Takhīg in the affairs of Persia (538 = 1192). Two years later in a battle near Raiy, the seven Dājdūk Tughrīl III was killed by Kultūgh Inandī but the country remained with the Khwārizmshāhs. In 614 (1217) the atabeg of Fars Sa'd b. Zangī succeeded in occupying Raiy but it was almost immediately driven out by the Khwārizmshāh Djalâl al-Dīn (cf. Nasawī, ed. Housâdī).

Civil wars. Muḥammad, p. 391, 395—396 mentions the dissensions (gayyābīr) among the people of Raiy in matters of religion. Under 582 (1186—1187) Ibn al-Ṭahur, xi. 237, records the damage done in Raiy in the civil war between Sunnis and Shīʿis: the inhabitants were killed or scattered and the town left in ruins. Yâkūt who, fleeing before the Mongols, went through Raiy in 617 (1220) gives the results of his enquiry about the three parties: the Ḥanāfīs, the Shīʿis, and the Shīʿis of which the two first began by wiping out the Shīʿis who formed half the population of the town and the majority in the country. Later the Shīʿis triumphed over the Ḥanāfīs. The result was that there only survived in Raiy the Shīʿi quarter which was the smallest. Yâkūt describes the underground houses at Raiy and the dark streets difficult of access which reflected the care of the inhabitants to protect themselves against enemies.

The Mongols. The Mongols who occupied Raiy after Yâkūt's visit dealt it the final blow. Ibn al-Ṭahur (xii. 184) goes so far as to say that all the population was massacred by the Mongols in 617 (1220) and the survivors put to death in 621 (1224). It is however possible that the historian, echoing the panic which seized the Muslim world, exaggerates the extent of the destruction. Djiwâini (ed. Muḥammad Ḥān Khārīzīn, i. 115) only says that the Mongol leaders put many people to death at Kābīr Raiy (in the country inhabited by Shīʿis) but it only appears that there were only two of the Shīʿi who submitted to the invaders (il ëchûd), after which the latter went on. Rashīd al-Dīn (ed. Bērzine, in Trūlī V. O., xv. 135 [transl. p. 89]) admits that the Mongols under Djihe and Subudai killed and plundered (ākhiżīh wa-chârāt) at "Raiy" but he seems to make a distinction between Raiy and Kūm in which the inhabitants were completely (ba-kullī) massacred.

...


-Ancient history: Marquart, Erman, p. 122–124; A. V. W. Jackson, Persia, loc. cit.; do., Historical Sketch of Ragha, in Spiegel Memorial Volume, Bombay 1908, p. 237–245; do., in Essays in Modern Theology to Ch. A. Briggs, New York 1911, p. 93–97; Weissbach, art. Arsacidae, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie; Herzfeld, Archäol. Mittl. aus Iran, ii, 1930, p. 95–98. -Muslim History: A Tâdž Kâkâ was written by Abû Sa'd Manṣûr b. Ḥusain al-Abî (= Awâ'; the author was the vizier of the Bâyíd Mâqdi al-Dawla and had access to very good sources; Yaḥyâ often cites this history (i. 57, s. v. Abî); Quatremère, Histoire des Mongols, p. 272–375 (many quotations from the Muhallalat-Tawârub; Barbier de Meynard, Dict. géographique, 1861 (quotations from the Haft Iklîm of Ahmad Râzi); Barthold, Istor.-geograf. ocher Irana, 1903, p. 84–86; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 214–218; P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, p. 740–809 (very complete utilisation of the Arabic sources; complete list of the dependencies of Râkâsan). (V. MINORSKI)

Râkâ. [See ŠALXT.]

RAL-RAKASHI. [See ABBAN B. `ABBâD-AL-HAMîD.]

RAKIM. [See `ABBâD AL-KAHÎF.]

AL-RAKKA, capital of Diyar Muṣar in al-Djazira on the left bank of the Euphrates, shortly before it is joined by the Nahr Bâlîkh (Bâlîkh, Bâlkhe, Bâlghâ). The town was in antiquity called Kallinikos. Nikophoros is to be located in the same region (Strabo, xvi, 747; Isidors of Charax, in Geogr. Graeci Min., p. 247; Dio Cass., x, 13; Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, 86; vi, 119; Poelamy, Geogr., v, 17; Stephen Byz.); but its usual identification with Kallinikos is certainly wrong and it may be a case of two adjoining towns as with the "black" and "white al-Râkka" of the middle ages. Nikophoros was, according to Appian (Spyr., v, 57), a foundation of Seleucus I Nikator; later it was ascribed to Alexander the Great (Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, 119; Isid. Char., c, 1) who can hardly have been here and it is hardly likely that towns were founded so shortly before the battle of Gaugamela (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, R. E., v, A, col. 1274, s. v. Thagadai).

Kallinikos owed its name to Seleucus II Kalli- nikos, who founded the town in 244 or 242 B.C. (Chron. Pasch., ed. Dindorf, i, 330; Mich. Syr., ed. Chatob, iv, 78). Libanios (Epipt., p. 21, s, Opera, ed. Förster, x, 19, 8–19) wishes to derive the name from the soiht Kallinikos who was murdered there; it is however hardly likely that the town, the name of which (Syracal Kolonikos, Kallinikos) the Christian Syrians retained in the middle ages, was called after a pagan orator, and in any case, if it were so, we would expect a name like Kallinikela. In any case the site of Kallinikos corresponds to that of the mediaeval al-Râkka, with which the Syrian historians always identified it. In the time of the emperor Julian, Kallinikos was a strong fortress and an important commercial centre (Amnian. Marcell., xxiii, 3, 7). In the year 361 a.p. it was burnt by the Christians in the Cæsarean Callinicum; the emperor Theodosius therefore ordered the bishop of the town to rebuild it (Ambrosius, Epist. ad Theodosii. Migne, Patrol. Lat., xvi, col. 1105 sqq.). The emperor Leo in 777 (Jul. 466 A. D.) rebuilt Kallinikos in Osroene, called it Leontopolis and appointed a bishop there (probably the successor of the Damians mentioned in 451 and 458 (Edessene Chronicle, ed. Hallier, in Texte u. Untersuch., i, 1, Leipzig 1893, p. 116, 152; Barherb., Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 77; Leontopolis: Hierokl., Synchrdem., p. 715, s. Geogr. Cypr., ed. Gelzer, p. 897). Towards the end of the year 503, Timostratos bravely defended the fortress against the Persians and took one of Kâwâd I's officers prisoner but had to release him as the king threatened to destroy the town completely (Joshua Syltes, ed. Martin, in Abh. K. M., vi, 1, Leipzig 1896, p. 1xv). The Syrian church historians from the beginning of the 6th century frequently mention the monastery of Nazakken, Arabic: Dar Zakka, in the area formed by the Nahr Balîkh and the Euphrates or the Nahr al-Nil Canal not far from Kallinikos (Vitae virror. apud monophysitae celebrat., ed. Brooks, in C.S. C. O., ser. iii, vol. xxv, Paris 1907, p. 38; Mich. Syr., iv, 414 sq.; al-Shushtâh, Kitâb al-Diyârâd., ed. Berol., fo., 95; Yaḥyâ, Mu'âjam, ed. Wustenfeld, ii, 664; iv, 862). Between al-Râkka and Balîsh lay the celebrated monastery of Dair Ḥannâni not far from Sur (G. Hoffmann on Zacharias Rhetor, transl. Ahrens-Kruger, p. 159, 201; Johann. v. Epheus., iv, 22; Mich. Syr., iii, 453 and passim; Barherb., Chron. eccles., ed. Abbeloos-Lamy, i, 244, 250; F. Nau, in R.O.C., xv, 1910, p. 63, note 1; Yaḥyâ, iii, 350 and passim; often wrongly called "monastery of Ḥanânil", e.g. in Muhl, The Middle Euphrates, p. 329).

In 529, Justinian enacted that trade with the Persians should be conducted at the frontier towns of Nisibis, Kallinikos and Antoaxata (Cod. Iust., ed. Kruger, iv, 53, 49; 188; Sury, History of the Later Roman Empire, ii, 1923, p. 3). Khusraw I on his third campaign against Syria (542) took the town without difficulty (Procop., Bell. Pers., ii, 21, 31; Anecd., iii, 31) because at the time the walls had been partly taken down in order to be rebuilt. The town was destroyed but later fortified again by Justinian with walls and bulwarks and "made impregnable" (Proc., De aed., ii, 7; James of Edessa, Chronol. Canon, ed. Brooks, in Z.D.M.G., iii, 300; Mich. Syr., ed. Chatob, iv, 287). The khan `Amrâq, Maurikios in 580 had to retire to Kallinikos before Adharmahan but put him to flight there (Theophil. Sim., iii, 17, 8 sq.; Chapot, La Frontière de l'Euphrate, p. 289, note 3 and F. Hirthfeld, Archäol. Reise, i, 159 make the "emperor" Maurikios flee to the fortress before Hormisdas).

The Arabs in 18 (539) or 19 (540) under `Iyâd b. Ghanm encamped before the N. W. gate of the town, Bâb al-Ruḥâ'; after 5 or 6 days the Patriarche who governed the town asked for peace and surrendered it to him and the inhabitants.
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were promised security of life and property. Their churches were not to be destroyed or occupied so long as they paid their tribute and committed no act of hostility; on the other hand, they were not to build new churches or sacred places and to observe Christian customs or festivals publicly (al-Baladhuri, Futuḥ al-Buldān, ed. de Goeje, p. 173 sq.; Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, ii. 439). On the death of 'īyād, Sa'd b. 'Amir b. Dijāḏam became governor of al-Dżāzira; he built a mosque in al-Rakka (al-Baladhuri, p. 178; Herzfeld, Arch. Reis, ii. 353). It was built of bricks of clay and marble taken from ancient buildings (Herzfeld, op. cit., with fig. 324-329); its Manārat al-Mun Alright still marks the ruins that represent the ancient al-Rakka.

In the great battle of Sīfīn in 36 (656) 'Ali crossed the Euphrates at al-Rakka on a bridge of boats, which he ordered the inhabitants to build, with his infantry and whole equipment to the Syrian bank (al-Ṭabarī, i. 3529; Ibn Miskawayh, Taʾrīḵ al-Sultānī, ed. Caetani, p. 571). According to the Diwan of ʿUthmān b. Ḥakīm al-Rakīyāʾ, who died in 690 (ed. Rhodokanakis, in S. B. Ak. Wiem., cxlix., Vienna 1902, p. 222), al-Rakka and al-Kalas (?) were then in ruins and practically uninhabited but this is poetic exaggeration (Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 329 sq.). He calls the town (p. 285) al-Rakka al-Sawdāʾ to distinguish it from al-Rakka al-Balādī, which is mentioned in the Diwan of al-Aḫṭalīf for example (ed. Sāḥbātī, p. 304). The name al-Rakka itself may be of Arabic origin ("swampy marshes on a river with periodical inundations"); the similarity of the names of al-Rakka and al-Ra kita to those of two Aramaic tribes of the Assyrian period, Rakišu (sic!) and Rapišu (Herzfeld, Arch. Reis i. 159, note 9) is no doubt quite accidental.

On the south bank, opposite the town between two canals (al-Ḥanī wa l-Ṭawr), was the suburb of Yābkūt al-Rakka, where Ḥishām b. 'Abd al-Malik build two houses of brick and a bridge over the Euphrates (Yābkūt, ii. 802; iv. 889, 994; Ps.-Dionysos of Telmahre, ed. Chabot, p. 26, 31; Mich. Syr. iv. 457: Barhebr., Chron. syr., ed. Bedjān, p. 118). The governor of the al-Rakka, the Kāṣīf Manṣūr b. Ḥaḍaʿwāna b. Ḥafiẓ al-ʿAmīrī, after whom Ḥiṣn Manṣūr was called, was executed after his rebellion in 414 (758-759) by the ʿamīl of Abū l-ʿAbbās, al-Manṣūr, in al-Rakka (al-Baladhuri, p. 192).

The caliph al-Manṣūr in 155 (772) built alongside of al-Rakka a new town al-Rakka and settled Khurāṣānians there who were devoted to his dynasty (Ibn al-Fakih, in B.G.A., v. 132). The superintendence of the building of the new town was given by him to al-Mahdi, the heir-apparent. It was planned in the shape of a horse-shoe and was in many respects modelled on the round city of al-Manṣūr in Baghdaḏ (al-Ṭabarī, iii. 276, 372 sq.; Ibn Ḥawkal, in B.G.A., ii. 153; al-Baladhuri, p. 798; al-Yaḵḥūzī, Kātib al-Baḥrī, in B.G.A., vii. 278; Tāʾrīḵ ed. Houtsma, ii. 430; Ibn al-Fakih, in B.G.A., v. 132; Yābkūt, Muṣʿab, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 734 sq.; Mich. Syr., ii. 526, 10, 297 = iv. 476, 483, 640; Ps.-Dionysos of Talmahre, p. 120 sq.; Herzfeld, op. cit., i. 160). Two canals were led from the Euphrates and from the region of Sarṭūḏ to supply the new town with water (Mich. Syr., ii. 10). This new town to which the name al-Rakka came to be transferred from the old town now falling into ruins, had, according to Arab authors (e.g. al-Baladhuri, p. 179), no remains of antiquity and indeed the modern al-Rakka, the "horse-shoe city", except for a few fragments built into the walls seems to possess no ancient ruins. The ancient Kallinikos has therefore wrongly been located here (Sachau, Reise in Syrien u. Mesopot., p. 242; Chapot, La Frontière de l'Euphrate, p. 289 sq., where fig. 8 "Nichphorum-Cullenium" is really the plan of the medieval al-Rakka).

Between al-Rakka (al-Hamra of Musil's map) and al-Rakka there soon rose a suburb with bazaars to which the markets of al-Rakka (including the largest, Sīk Ḥiṣām al-ʿAtīḵ) were transferred by 'Ali b. Sulaimān b. 'Ali, governor of al-Dżāzira, and as a result the two adjoining towns gradually developed into a twin city (al-Rakkaṭan) (al-Baladhuri, p. 179; Yābkūt, ii. 734, 802; Ibn Ḥawkal, B.G.A., ii. 153). This suburb was burned in 1123 Sel. (812) by the rebels "Amr and Ṣaʿīd b. Ṣaḥabah along with the adjoining "pilared monastery" (Mich. Syr., iii. 26). Abū al-Malik b. ʿṢāḥīf (q.v.) died in the same year in al-Rakka. In the fighting that followed, the "ʿĀlāʾīyāʾ (of al-Raḵīa) became lords of al-Rakka and the Persians of al-Rakka (Mich. Syr., iii. 30). In the reign of Maʿmūn in 816, Tāhir built a wall between al-Rakka and al-Rakka (Mich. Syr., iii. 36).

The walls of the old town fell into ruins at quite an early date (Aḥmad b. al-Tājīyīb al-Sarḵāšī in Yābkūt, loc. cit.), and in 375 (985-986) the old al-Rakka was now only a suburb of the western town. As the name al-Rakka came into use for the latter (Yābkūt, loc. cit.), in the end it became no longer possible to distinguish between al-Rakka and al-Rakka (also al-Makdisi, cf. E. Herzfeld, Arch. Reis, i. 160, note 7, p. 161). At the beginning of the xiii century the old al-Rakka was completely in ruins (Yābkūt, ii. 734, 751; Ibn Ḥawkal, p. 153; al-Makdisi, p. 141; Abū l-Fīḍāʾ, ed. Reinaud, p. 277).

Besides al-Rakka, the capital of Diyar Ṭaḡar, al-Makdisi and others mention also "burned al-Rakka" (al-Rakka al-Muṭṭarīkā, i.e. al-Rakka al-Sawdāʾ on the Balikh, a farṣābakh below the "white town" (Yābkūt, i. 31; ii. 802; Ibn Rū斯塔, p. 90; al-Makdisi, p. 20, 54, 141). It was also called "crooked al-Rakka" (al-ʿAbdārā) and corresponds to the present ruins of al-Rakka al-Samrāʿ.

Badr al-Dīn Abū al-Raḥmān al-Baʿlabakī (Ahlwardt, v. 413, on No. 6104) wrote a risāla on al-Rakka.

According to Herzfeld, the following larger groups of ruins lie in the area of al-Rakka in addition to Hirākla which is in the neighbourhood:

1. The "horseshoe town" with high walls, still standing, which form a semicircle on the north, while in the south they run in a straight line. The banks of the Euphrates and enclose an area of 1.92 sq. km. (Herzfeld, Arch. Reis, ii. 356 sq.). This is a plate, or platform, which corresponds to al-Rakka founded by Maṣūr, to which the name of al-Rakka was later transferred. Roughly in the centre of the northern part of this part of the town lie the ruins of a large mosque, the "mosque intra muros" the front of the court of which with a round minaret (Sarre-Herzfeld, ii. 359; iii. pl. lxv.-lxxiv. and fig. 33-340), according to an inscription, was restored by the Zangid Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd in 561 (1165-1166) (van Berchem in Sarre-Herzfeld, i. 4-6). Nūr al-Dīn occupied al-Rakka in 554 (1159) and gave it from 562 (1167) to 566 (1171) to his brother Maḏwūd.

RAKKĀDA, residential city of the Aghlabid emirs of Ifrīqiya about 6 miles south of Kirawān, was founded in 263 (876) by Ibrahim II, seventh prince of the dynasty. Until then the Aghlabids had resided in Ṭabbisyia [q.v.] nearer the capital. A chance trip into the country by Ibrahim, it is said, determined the site of the new residence. The emir was suffering from insomnia and on the advice of his physician, Ishāb b. Sulaimān, went out to take the air. Stopping in a certain place he fell into a deep sleep and decided to build a palace there which was called Raḵkāda, the "soporific". The story is probably based on a popular etymology of the name, which is found elsewhere in North Africa. Another explanation, equally suspect, is that which attributes the name to the memory of a massacre of the Warfaḍjīma by the Ībashī chief Abū l-Khaṭībah [q.v.] in 141 (758) and the many dead left lying there.

In the same year that the work of building was begun, Ibrahim settled in Raḵkāda in the Castle of Victory (Kaṣr al-Faṭḥ). He was to live there the rest of his life, as were his successors, except for the stays the emirs made in Tunis. Raḵkāda became a regular town as al-Abbasīya had been before it. Besides Kaṣr al-Faṭḥ (or Kaṣr Abī l-Faṭḥ) there were several other castles in it: Kaṣr al-Baṭr (the castle on the lake), Kaṣr al-Saḥn (castle of the court), Kaṣr al-Muḫṭar (castle of the elect) and Kaṣr Baghdaḏ, a large mosque, baths, caravanserais and sūḥ. Al-Bakrī says that it had a circumference of 24,040 cubits (over 6 miles), al-Nuwairi makes it smaller (14,000, nearly 4 miles). A wall of brick and clay surrounded this vast area, and this wall was renovated by the last Aghlabid with a view to final effort at resistance. Al-Bakrī further tells us that the latter part of the encinte was filled with green. The soil was fertile and swampy. The emirs and their followers enjoyed in Raḵkāda a liberty of movement which would have caused a scandal in Kirawān. The sale of nāḏīk [q.v.], forbidden in the pious old city, was officially permitted in the royal residence.

It was from Raḵkāda that Ziyādat Allāh III, the last of the Aghlabids, fled on the approach of the Shīʿis. The victorious Abū ʿAbd Allāh [q.v.] installed himself in Kaṣr al-Saḥn. His master, the Mahdi, Ubaḍa Allāh, lived in Raḵkāda until 308 (920) when he moved to al-Mahdiya. After being deserted by the ruler, Raḵkāda fell into ruins. In 342 (955) the caliph al-Muʿizz ordered what was left of it to be razed to the ground and ploughed over. The gardens alone were spared.

A few traces of the Aghlabid foundation are still to be seen at the present day. A great rectangular reservoir with thick walls strengthened by buttresses may be identified with the lake (ba‘r) which gave its name to one of the palaces. A pavilion (?) of four stories stood in the centre. Nothing is left of it, but on the west side of the reservoir may be seen the remains of a building which must have been reflected in the great mirror of water. Three rooms may still be distinguished with their mosaic pavements. The technique and style of decoration closely connect these Muhammedan buildings of the third century A.D. with the Christian art of the country.


RAMADÁN (a.), name of the ninth month of the Muhammedan calendar. The name from the root r-m-d refers to the heat of summer and therefore shows in what season the month fell when the ancient Arabs still endeavoured to equate their year with the solar year by intercalary months [see NAS’].

Rama’dân is the only month of the year to be mentioned in the Kur’ân (Sûra ii. 185; eastern numbering): “The month of Rama’dân (is that) in which the Kur’ân was sent down”, we are told in connection with the establishment of the fast of Rama’dân. The discussion on the origin of this edict cannot yet be considered ended; to what has been said in the article SAWM have to be added the researches of F. Goitein, Zur Entstehung des Rama’dân, in Isis, xviii. (1929), p. 189 sqq., who in connection with the above mentioned verse of the Kur’ân calls attention to the parallelism between the mission of Muhammad and the handing of the second tablets of the law to Moses, which according to Jewish tradition took place on the Day of Atonement, and the Day of Rama’dân (‘Ashârâh; the predecessor of Rama’dân) and actually was the cause of its institution. Goitein suggests that the first arrangement to replace the ‘Ashârâh [q.v.] was a period of ten days (SAWM ma’dû’du’dât, Sûra ii. 184), not a whole month, which ran parallel with the ten days of penance of the Jews preceding the Day of Atonement and survives to the present day in the 10 days of the ‘I’tikâf [q.v.].

If we consider further that the Muslim ideas of the Lailat al-Kadr which falls in Rama’dân, in which according to Kur’ân lxxvii. 2, the Kur’ân was sent down, coincide in many points with the Jewish on the Day of Atonement, we must concede a certain degree of probability to Goitein’s suggestions, in spite of the undeniable chronological difficulties (alteration of the length of the period of the fast, within a very short time) and although the final settlement of the term as a whole month is not thereby satisfactorily explained. On the other hand to strengthen Goitein’s position, it ought perhaps to be pointed out that the Lailat al-Bara’â [q.v.] precedes Rama’dân in the middle of the preceding month of Shawâbân. The ideas and practices described by Wensinck in the article ‘I-d’ân, which are associated with this night really to some extent resemble Jewish conceptions associated with the New Year — which precedes the Day of Atonement by a rather shorter interval than the Lailat al-Bara’â Rama’dân — that the connection between the latter and the Day of Atonement is thereby strengthened. If we try to connect the so far unexplained word bara’â with the Hebrew bërâ‘ “creation” and reflect that according to the Jewish idea the world was created on New Year’s Day (numerous references in the liturgy of the festival) we have perhaps a further link in the chain of proof; but first of all the age of the ideas associated with the Lailat al-Bara’â must be ascertained.

The legal regulations connected with the fast of Rama’dân are given in the article SAWM [cf. also TARÂWÎTH]. Of important days of the month, al-Birînî, among others, mentions the 6th as birth-day of the martyr Husain b. ‘Ali, the 10th as the day of death of Khâdîjâ, the 17th as the day of the battle of Badr, the 19th as the day of the occupation of Mecca, the 21st as the day of ‘Ali’s death, and of the Imam ‘Ali al-Ridâ’s, the 22nd as birth-day of ‘Ali and finally the night of the 27th as Lailat al-Kadr [q.v.].

The name of this night is Khûrânîc; Sûra xxvii. is dedicated to it. It is there described as a night “better than a 1,000 months” in which the angels ascend free from every commission (bi-tîhâm Allâh min kull amr) and which means blessing till the appearance of the red of dawn. The revelation of the Kur’ân, as already mentioned, is expressly located in it. The same night is obviously referred to in Sûra xliiv. 2 as a “blessed” one. The date, the 27th, is however not absolutely certain, the pious therefore use all the odd nights of the last ten days of Rama’dân for good works, as one of them at any rate is the Lailat al-Kadr [cf. ‘ITIKÂF].

Trade and industry are largely at a standstill during Rama’dân, especially when it falls in the hot season. The people are therefore all the more inclined to make up during the night for the deprivations of the day. As sleeping is not forbidden during the fast, they often sleep a part of the day; and the night, in which one may be merry, is given up to all sorts of pleasures. In particular the nights of Rama’dân are the time for public entertainments, the shadow plays [cf. KHAYYÂL-IZ ZILL] and other forms of the theatre.

On the termination of the fast by the “little festival”, cf. ‘ID AL-FITR.

Bibliography: Wellhausen, Reste 2, p. 97; al-Birînî, Aqîd, ed. Sachau, p. 60; 325; 331 sqq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Melko, ii.; do., Die Afghen, i.; Lane, Manners and Customs, chap. 25; Mehmed Tefîq, Ein Jahr in Konstantopol. 4. Die Rwman-Nachte, transl. by Th. Menzel (T., iii., 1905); Wensinck, Arabic New-Year, in Verh. Ak. Amst., N. S., xxv. 2, do., The Muslim Creed, p. 219 sqq.; Pipper, Fragmenta Islamica; Littmann, Über die Ehren­nemen etc. (Ist., viii. 228 sqq.).

(M. PLESSNER)
RAMADAN-OGHULLARI, a petty Anatolian dynasty. The earlier history of the Ramadän-Oghullari is, like that of most of the minor Anatolian principalities (jewed-i muluk), wrapped in obscurity. According to tradition, this Turkoman family came in Ergözrûl time from Central Asia to Anatolia where they settled in the region of Adana and founded their power. Their territory comprised the districts of Adana, Niz, Ayas, a part of the territory of the Waspak Turkomans, Tarsûs, etc. The date of the earliest known prince of the dynasty, Mir Ahmad b. Ramadän (see below), is put at 780–819 (1359–1416). Nothing definite is known about the real founder, Ramadân-Beg. The French traveller Bertrandon de la Broquière, thus characterizes Mir Ahmad b. Ramadân: “lequel estoit tresant personne d’honneur et tershardy et la plus vaillante espée de tous les Turcsc et le mieulx ferant d’une mache. Et avoit esté filz d’une femme crestenne laquelle l’avoit fait baptiser à la loy gregiesque pour luy enlever le flaire et le senetr qu’ont ci ne sont point baptisés. Il n’estoit ne bon crestenne ne bon sarazin” (cf. Le Voyage d’Outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1892, p. 90 sq.).

Mir Ahmad was succeeded by Ibrahim Beg (819–830 = 1416–1427). The beginning of his reign is put by some, e.g., Mehmed Nûzhet Bey, as early as 810, while its end is put in 819. Khalîl Edhem Bey was the first to propose a new chronology, which is here followed. Ibrahim Beg was deposed before his death (831) by his eldest son ‘îzîz al-Dîn Hamzâ-Beg, who reigned from 830 to 833. He was succeeded by his uncle Mehmed Beg b. Mir Ahmad and the latter’s brother ‘Altîn, who seem to have reigned jointly. Of his successor, his nephew Arslân Dâ’ûd b. Ibrahim, we only know that he fell in 885 (1480) in a battle in the vicinity of Dıyârbakr. His body was brought to Aleppo and buried there. The history of the Ramadän-Oghullari now becomes a little better known. His son and successor, ‘Hârs al-Dîn Khalîl, known from a number of inscriptions (cf. Max v. Oppenheim and Max van Berchem, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasiën, Leipzig 1909, p. 109 sqq.), ruled for 34 years with his brother Mahmûd-Beg and died in battle in 916 (1510). The date of his death (beginning of Djûmâda I 916 = beginning of Aug. 1510) is known with certainty from his epitaph in Adana, in M. v. Oppenheim and Max van Berchem (op. cit., p. 110, No. 145). His son Pir Mehmed Paşa, who appears as ruling from 916–976 (1510–1568), distinguished himself as an Ottoman vassal, fighting against the rebels of Iç-eli (Anatolia; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 71) in May 1528 (‘îsâbân 934) as well as in the civil war between the princes Bâyazid and Selim at Konya (May 1559; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 368 sqq.). He died in 972 (1568) in his capital Adana. He had an equal command of Persian and Turkish and composed a Dînutsan. His son Derwîsh-Beg, who had been mutessarîf of Tarûs in his father’s life-time became after his death governor (wâli) of Adana but died young in 986 (1578). He was succeeded by his eldest brother Ibrahim Beg, who had previously been sanâjîh-beyî of ‘Aintûb. He acted as governor at his father’s capital till his death in 1002 (1594). His son Mehmed Beg was the last dynast of the Ramadân-Oghull but he can only have had a nominal rule. The family of the Ramadân-Oghulli however has survived to the present day. The following is the genealogical table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ramadân</th>
<th>1. Ahmad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Ibrahim I</td>
<td>4. Mehmed I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hamza</td>
<td>5. Dâ’ûd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pirî Mehmed Dâ’ûd</td>
<td>Kôrkud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mehmed II</td>
<td>Khalîl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Franz Baringer)
AL-RAMÁDI, whose full name was 'Abū 'UMAR (wrongly Abū 'Amr) Yūsuf b. ḤARUN al-KINDĪ al-KURTUDI al-RAMÁDI, poet of Muslim Spain, who lived in the fourth (tenth) century and died early in the fifth (eleventh) century in 403 (1013), on the day of the 'Adūr or Feast of St John (June 24), according to Ibn Haiyān (in Ibn Bashkawāl, cf. Bibli.), in 413 (1022—1023), according to al-Maḳkāri (quoting the same Ibn Haiyān); he was buried in the cemetery of Cordova known as Maḳḳārat Kala’.

The ethnic al-Ramādi is explained in two ways: 1. the poet is said to have come from al-Ramāda, a little town between Alexandria and Barqa; this explanation is to be rejected for al-Ramādi (with gemination of the mim — and this orthography is attested by the geographers who mention the place, e.g. al-Ya‘qūbī, al-Bakrī and al-Idrīsī) — would not give an ethnic like al-Ramādi (with one m); 2. the second explanation which derives Ramādi from ramādī: “ordinary ashes” or “ashes for washing”, is the only possible one; the poet perhaps in his youth followed the trade of an ash-merchant; in confirmation of this we may call attention to the Romance surname which was originally given him: Abū Qaṭār (wrongly Abū Šaṭīḥ in the Yatimmat al-Dahr), i.e. padre senzana, “father cinders” or “cinderman”.

Al-Ramādi, a native of Cordova, spent all his life in his native town except for a brief period of exile in Saragossa. His life was dominated by three great factors: his attachment to Abū ʿAlī al-Kālī, his devotion to the cause of the kadhīj Abū l-Ḥasan al-Muṣṭafī and his love for Khwāla.

Abū ʿAlī al-Kālī, summoned from the east to Spain by the Umayyad caliph Abū al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir (300—350 = 912—961) had from his arrival in Cordova in 330 (942) no more faithful disciple than al-Ramādi who studied under his direction the Kitāb al-Ṭarādīr (“the book of philological rarities”). The young scholar’s admiration found expression in a poem which has remained famous (rhythm li, metre kāmil) of which some thirty lines are preserved in the Yatimmat al-Dahr of al-Thālīlī and the Muṣṭafī al-Āmīn of al-Ṭaḥā b. Khākān (cf. Bibli.). It is this poem which gained him the title of Muṭamābbī al-Gharb (which had already given to Ibn Ḥāni al-Andalusī and which was later to be given to Ibn Darrādī al-Kastallī and to Abū Ṭalīb (Abū al-Djāḥbār). Al-Ramādi studied also under an Andalusian scholar named Abū Bakr Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥusayn al-Kaṭif or al-Āmīn (“the blind”), of whom we know very little.

When at the height of his powers, al-Ramādi became laureate to the Umayyad caliph al-Hakam II al-Muṣṭafī (350 = 961—976), then to his son and successor hisgām II al-Mu‘ayyad (366—390 = 976—1009); but his attachment to the cause of the kadhīj Abū l-Ḥasan Dja‘far b. Ḥuṣayn al-Muṣṭafī and his participation in the plot fomented by the eunuch Dja‘far to overthrow Hakam II and proclaim another caliph than his son hisgām brought down upon him the wrath of the great minister al-Maṣūrī Ibn Abī ‘Amir. Thrown into prison at al-Zahrā’, he suffered all sorts of ill-treatment: during his imprisonment, he wrote the most touching verses (including a poem in ḥi, metre ṭawwāl, and another in ḥuṣi, metre ṭawwāl) and he prepared a poetical work on birds, the description of which concluded with a poem in praise of the heir-presumptive hisgām II. Liberated through the intercession of friends he had to go into exile. He went to Saragossa to the governor Abū al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Tudjīhī whose merits he celebrated in a poem in miṣr. Amnestied by al-Maṣūrī he was able to return to Cordova, but on condition that he did not go into society. Finally, he pardoned, he entered the entourage of the all, powerful kadhīj as a pensioner (murtazīf) and it was in this capacity that he took part in an expedition against Barcelona in 375 (985). During the sināa which was to lead to the collapse of the Umayyad caliphate and the formation of petty independent states ruled by the murtakī al-ṭawāfīf, al-Ramādi led a miserable existence and it was in the greatest distress that he died in the early years of the fifth (eleventh) century.

Al-Ramādi became celebrated chiefly for his chaste love for the enigmatic Khwāla (wrongly: Ḥalwa or Ḥulwa) whom he met one Friday in the public gardens of the Banī Marwān on the left bank of the Guadalquivir at the end of the bridge but was never able to see again. It was Abū Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm al-Zahīribī, whose ascetic tendencies on this subject are well known, who did most to spread this love-story; but it seems that the memory of Khwāla occupied the heart or mind of the poet only very little; if it still possessed him at Saragossa to the extent of inspiring all the nasīḥāt of the penury in honour of the Tudjīhī governor, on his return to Cordova, it disappeared completely for we see al-Ramādi henceforth completely overwhelmed by a new passion, the object of which is not a woman but a Mozarab boy to whom the poet gives the name of Yahyā (John) or Nusair (Victor?).

The Divān of al-Ramādi never seems to have been collected; of his book on birds, Kitāb al-Ṭair, written in prison, there survives only the Lāmiyya in which he described the falcon hunting; the more important fragments that have survived have already been mentioned. A pupil of Abū ʿAlī al-Kālī, al-Ramādi is inclined to imitate the poetry of the east, but after Ibn Abī Rabbībī and before ʿUbda b. Mā al-Samīb, he shows a marked fondness for the mawṣawṣūḥ into the construction of which, he introduced several innovations. In spite of its classical structure, his verse has a very personal character, especially when he calls upon Khwāla or describes his sufferings in the prison at al-Zahrā’. The few lines in which he alludes to the weakness of hisgām II and to his complete domination by his mother Šābī and by the kadhīj al-Maṣūrī, the in which he speaks of Dja‘far’s plot are not without historical interest; finally the information which he gives about Mozarabs (worship and costume) in connection with his favourite enable us to check what Abū ʿAmir Ibn Shuhaid says on the same subject and for this reason of some documentary importance.

Rám-Hormuz (the contracted form Rámis, Rúmas) is found especially as early as the tenth century, a town and district in Khuzistan [q. v.]. Rám-Hormuz lies about 55 miles southeast of Ahwáz, 65 miles S.S.E. of Shush, and 60 miles N.E. of Behbehan. Ibn Khurátúbí, ibn al-Maghribí, 'Ur-ßân al-Murúšt, Bálík, ed., p. 57; al-Nuwarí, Niñayat al-Áraá, Cairo, x. 213; Ibn Faádl Alláh bi-Márrí, Maráth, Paris MS., No. 2237, fol. 56 (H. Perks).

**Rám-Hormuz**

(Rám-Hormuz) was executed in Rám-Hormuz, but Tabárí, i. 834, says that Mání was exposed on the "gate of Mání" at Dánda-Sabur (cf. also al-Brítin, Chronology, p. 208). The Nestorian bishops of Rám-Hormuz are mentioned in the years 577 and 587 (Marquart, Erdkunde, p. 27, 145). Al-Mukaddásí, p. 414, says that 'Abd al-Dawla built a magnificent market near Rám-Hormuz and that the town had a library founded by Ibn Sawwar (according to Schwarz, the son of Sawwar b. 'Abd Alláh, governor of Básra, who died in 157 = 773), and was a centre of Mu'tazilite teaching. According to Ibn Khurdáábí, p. 42, Rám-Hormuz was one of the 11 kíras of Kháristán (Kúdáma, p. 242, and Al-Mukaddásí, p. 407: one of the 7 kíras). Its towns (Mukaddásí, v. 3, 99, 118; Sanabil, Isha'áq [q. v.], Tyrm [?], Bánk, Lád, Ghrwa [?], Bájadí, and Kúrzak, all situated in the highlands. To these Yákit, i. 183, adds Arbuk (with a bridge, 2 farsákhs from Ahwáz). On the other places in the kíra of Rám-Hormuz (Ásak, Bústán, Sásán, Táshán, tr) see Schwarz, op. cit., p. 342—345. According to Mukaddásí, p. 407, Rám-Hormuz had palm-groves but no sugar-cane plantations (in the xivth century however, Mustawfí, Náxät al-Kálb, p. 111, says that Rám-Hormuz used to produce more sugar than cotton); among the products of Rám-Hormuz Isájkírí (p. 93) mentions silks (díyáb abrástam) and Dimishkí, p. 119 (transl. p. 153) the very volatile white naphtha which comes out of the rocks. At the present day the Anglo Persian-Oil Company possesses deposits above Rám-Hormuz.

**Bibliography**: J. Macdonald Kinzie, A geographical and military account of Persia, 2 vols., 1873, p. 597; Ralvisson, Notes on a March from Zábák, in Tr G. S., 1839, ix. 79 (region of Mungáksh), in the N.E. of Rám-Hormuz; Bode, Travels, London 1845, i. 281 (Behbehán-Táshán-Mándánk-Túl-Málámír-Sháhshárt), ii. 39, 76, 82 (distribution of tribes); Layard, Description of Khuzistán, in Tr G. S., 1846, p. 13 (country round Rám-Hormuz; in the town 250 families, taxes 3,000—5,000 tomans), p. 66 (valley of Járaráhí); Herzfeld, Eine Reise durch Lúristan, in Pet. Mit., 1907 (Ahwáz-Shákhi Gójal-Médibíyé ("Mir-ába?"?), Rámúz (sic)—Pálámí—Járaráhí—Behbehán); Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 145—152; Schwarz, Iran in Mittelalter, i. 332—345; cf. also the index; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 243, 247.

V. Minorsky)

**AI-RÁMÍ**, whose full name was Háshán b. Múhammad Sha'ír al-Dín, a Persian stylist. No details of his life are known; even the few chronological references that we possess are rather vague. His importance lies in his well known work Anís al-'Ukkásh, a treatise on the most common poetical figures for describing the different parts of the human body. According to his own statement, the author made up his mind to compile this work while he was in Marágá on a visit to the observatory of the famous Násir al-Dín Túsí. The book is dedicated to Suláman Abú 'l-Áthar Uwais Bahádúr (1356—1373). Ikáni of Ádharbáýján, and according to Hádíjí Kháltá (ed. Flugel, i. 488) was finished in Shawwál 826 (Sept. 1423). This is in obvious contradiction to chronology for at this date Ádharbáýján had belonged to the Timúrid Sháhrukh since 823 (1420). The author further mentions in this work the poet Awhádí (d. 738 = 1337) as his contemporary and a certain
Hasan b. Mahmud Kashi (d. 710 = 1300) as his teacher. It may therefore be assumed that Hadjdi Khaifa's statement is based on a misunderstanding and that the work was written not later than 1373. The work is divided into 19 chapters, each begun with the hair of the head and end with the feet and deal with the human body from head to foot. Besides this book, which is of great value for the study of classical Persian poetry and was used by the great Turkish commentator Mostafa b. Shahbani Sururi (d. 909 = 1561) in his Bahre al-Ma'arif, Sharaf al-Din Rami also prepared a commentary on the well-known work on poetics of Rashid al-Din Waywati, Hadidk al-Sahir (new edition of the Persian text by 'Abbas Ikbai, Teheran 1930) entitled Hadidk al-Hadidk or Sanati al-Badai (Hadjdi Khaifa, ii. 77), a work called Hulat al-Maddah of which nothing else is known (Hadjdi Khaifa, i. 112) and a Dawa, which consisted of kadidas, kita's and quatrains, but as early as Dauwla's time it could only be found in the 'Irak, Agharbadjiyan and Fars. Nothing of all these works has come down to us except the Anis al-'Insha. There is said to be a kasida of Rami's in the Dauwlar al-A'arr (compiled in 840 = 1436-1437) of Shaikh Adhari (d. 866 = 1461-1462) (Hulat al-Maddah, Ta'khirat al-Madara, ed. E. Browne, p. 308). 


Rami Mehemed Pasha, an Ottoman grand vizier and poet, was born in 1665 or 1666 (1654) in Eiyüb, a suburb of Stambul, the son of a certain Hasun Agha. He entered the chancellery of the Re's Efendi as a probationer (qadari), and through the poet Yusuf Nabi (q.v.) he was appointed an annuitant as muqaf kadih, i.e. secretary for the expenditure of the palace. In 1695 (1684) he was transferred to the influence of his patron, the newly appointed Kapudan Pasha (q.v.) Mustafa Pasha, he became davam efendi, i.e. chancellor of the Admiralty. He took part in his chief's journeys and campaigns (against Chios) and on his return to Stambul became re's kedatari, i.e. persuasor to the Re's Efendi. In 1102 (1690) he was promoted Beylikdji, i.e. Vice-Chancellor and four years later Re's Efendi in place of Abu Bakr, in which office he was succeeded in 1108 (1697) by Kuzuk Mehemed Celebi. After the battle of Zenta (Sept. 12, 1697), he became Re's Efendi for a second time and was one of the plenipotentiaries at the peace of Carlowitz by the conclusion of which "he put an end to the ravages of the Ten Years War but also for ever to the conquering power of the Ottomans" (J. v. Hammer).

As a reward for his services at the peace negotiations he was appointed a vizier of the dome with 3 horse-tails (tagh) in 1114 (1703) and in Ramad'an 6, 1114 (Jan. 24, 1703) appointed to the highest office in the kingdom in succession to the grand vizier Daltaban Mustafa Pasha. In this office he devoted particular attention to the thorough reform of the civil administration, through the reforms in which he saw the security of the state threatened (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., vii. 64). "By lessening the burden of fortresses on the frontiers in east and west, by raising militia against the rebel Arabs, by securing the pay of the army from the revenues of certain estates, by making aqueducts, by restoring ruined mosques, by taking measures for the safety of the pilgrim caravans and for the security of Asia Minor, by settling Turkmen tribes, by ordering the Jewish cloth manufacturers in Sisamik and the Greek silk manufacturers in Briza in future to make in their factories all the stuffs hither imported into Turkey from Europe" (J. v. Hammer), he exercised a most beneficent activity, which however soon aroused envy and hatred, and, especially as Rami Mehemed Pasha as a man of the pen entirely and not of the sword, was unpopular with the army, particularly the Janissaries, finally was bound to lead to his fall (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., vii. 72). In the great rising in Stambul which lasted four weeks, beginning with theenthronement of Selim Mustafa and ending with his deposition (9th Rabii ii, 1115 = Aug. 22, 1703), his career came to an end. He was disgraced, but pardoned in the same year and appointed governor, first of Cyprus, then of Egypt (Oct. 1704). His governorship there terminated as unhappily as his grand viziership (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., vii. 133 following Rashid and La Motraye). In Djumada i 1118 (Sept. 1706) he was dismissed and sent to the island of Rhodes, where he died in Djumada ii (March 1707) either under torture or as a result of it (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., vii. 134 quoting the interminstus Talman). Rami Mehemed Pasha is regarded as a brilliant stylist, as the two collections of his official documents (inghad) containing no less than 1,400 pieces, distinguished by their simple clear and elevated style, amply show (cf. the MSS. in Vienna, Nat. Bibl. Nrs. 296 and 297 in G. Fligel, Die arab., pers. u. türk. Hist., i. 271 sq.). Rami Mehemed Pasha also left a complete Divan of which specimens are available in the printed Tezkire of Sisolm (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 272 sq.; Stambul 1315). His poetical gifts were inherited by his son Abd Allah Re'fet (cf. Brussali Mehemed Tahir, Othmanli Muwelliferi, ii. 187). His son-in-law was the tezkireci Solim (q.v.).


(Franz Baringer)

Al-Ramlah, capital of Filastin. 25 miles E.N.E. of Jerusalem. The Umayyad caliphs liked to choose little country towns, usually places in Palestine, to live in rather than Damascus. Mu'awiya and after him Marwan and others frequently resided in al-Sijasbara on the south bank of the Lake of al-Tarba, Ya'qub I in Hawwara, Adhriy, 'Abd al-Malik in al-Djibiyah, Walid in Usai (now Tell Sais S. E. of Damascus) and al-Karyatain and his

In the reign of al-Walid his brother Sulaimān was governor of Filsāni. Stimulated by the examples of ʿAbd al-Malik, the builder of the Kubbat al-Ṣakhrā in Jerusalem, and of his brother who had restored the mosque of Damascus (Yaḥūṭ, Muʿājam, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 818), he founded the new town of al-Ramla and removed to it the seat of the provincial government which had been in Ludd since the “plague of Anwās” (q.v.) in 16 (638—639). As caliph also he continued to live in al-Ramla, (96—99 = 715—717).

The whole population of Ludd was transferred to the new capital of the Ḥidjdja of Filsāni and the latter fortified, which was allowed to fall into ruins. Sulaimān first of all built his palace (fār) then the “house of the dyers” (dār al-ʿabbaṣ, ʿānīn) which was provided with a huge cistern; at a later date it was consecrated with all the property of the Ṣamūyāḍ and came into the possession of the heir of the ʿAbbāsidīs, ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh. Sulaimān also began to build the mosque and continued it when caliph. It was finished under ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz although not on the scale originally intended. The financial management of the building of the palace and of the chief mosque was in the hands of a Christian of Ludd, al-Bayṭirī b. al-Nakā (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 145 sq.; var.: Bayṭirī b. Bakā in Ibn al-Ḥakīm, B.G.A., v. 103, and Ibn Bayṭirī in Yaḥūṭ, ii. 818). According to Yaḥūṭ (ii. 817) the latter asked the people of Ludd to give him a house near the church, and when they refused, he decided to pull down the church; according to al-Maḳṣūsī (B. G. A., iii. 164 sq.), the caliph Ḥiṣām threatened the people of Ludd that he would destroy their church if they did not hand over the marble columns, which they had intended for a splendid building and concealed. Sulaimān also began to bring a canal called Barada to the new town and to dig wells of fresh water, as it was 12 miles distant from the nearest river, the Abī Futrus (Yaḥūṭī, B.G.A., vi. 328). The considerable cost of keeping up the canal was later taken over by the ʿAbbāsid Caliphs and at first voted annually but from the time of al-Muṭʿaṣim included as current expenditure in the budget.

The advantages and disadvantages of the new town are vividly described by al-Maḳṣūsī. Rich in fruits, especially figs and palms, good water and all foodstuffs, it combined the advantages of town and country, those of a position in the plain with the proximity of hills and sea, of places of pilgrimage like Jerusalem and coast fortresses. It had a splendid chief mosque, fine bānā, comfortable baths, commodious dwellings and broad streets. On the other hand in winter, it was like a muddy island, in summer a sandbank and as it was not on a river bed the ground was hard and without grass, and the lack of ample running water was the chief defect of this otherwise so favoured town, for the little drinking water in the cisterns was not accessible to the poorer part of the population. The town covered an area of a whole square mile. Its buildings were of fine building stone and brick. The town's wares were exported chiefly to Egypt.

The chief gates of al-Ramla were: Darb Bīr al-ʿAskār (called after the al-ʿAskar quarter; cf. Yaḥūṭ, iii, 674; Safī al-Dīn, Marāṣīl, ii. 258), Darb Maṣjīd ʿAnnabah (as it was called, as de Goeje conjectured, from the town elsewhere however called "Annaba 4 miles E. of al-Ramla), Darb Bāīs, Darb al-Madīs, Darb Bīs (i.e. Bāīs or Bāţīgh; or Kāyata al-Ṭabāla, the ancient Kīratat Bāʿala now Abu Ghawāḥ), Darb Ludd, Darb YaĪsī, Darb Diṣr and Darb Diṣdūn, the latter called after a neighbouring town with a mosque, mainly inhabited by Samaritans (Bīth Dagon, now Bīt Diṣdūn).

In the centre of the market-place of al-Ramla was the chief mosque Dāmīr al-Abīyāq, the miḥrāb of which was regarded as the largest of all that were known, the pulpit of which was second only to that in Jerusalem and whose splendid minaret was much admired.

Whether there had been an older town on the site of al-Ramla is problematic. The old attempt to identify it with Arimathia, Ramath or Rahab have now been generally abandoned. An ancient Pekāsmek, “Camp”, should rather be considered, a place-name particularly frequent in Palestine, which was borne for example by the camp of Jerusalem (Hēbr., xii. 11, 13; Act. Apost. xxii. 34—xxviii. 32) and bishoprics in Palestine I (now a Bīr al-Zaūrā, e.g. Fēderin in Gēnēr, Vie de S. Euthyme le Grand, p. 104—111) and in Iōnīkhe Libanias (R. Aigrin, art. Arōbēs, in Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclés., iii. 1194—1196; for the Egyptian al-Ramla 4 miles N.E. of Alexandria corresponds to an ancient Nicopolis and later Parembole. But the Arabic writers say there was no town previously on this site but only a sandy area after which the town was named (al-Baladhuri, p. 143 etc.).

The population of al-Ramla was in the time of Yaḥūṭī (B. G. A., viii. 327 sq.) a mixture of Arabs and Persians (on the settlement of Persians in Syria cf. al-Kindī, Gouvernor de l'Egypt, ed. Guest, p. 19); the clients were Samaritans.

The great cistern ʿUmāziyya (ʿAneẓiye) to the N. W. of al-Ramla near the road to YaĪsī, known as the cistern of St. Helena, has a Kīfic inscription of Duḥ ʿl-Hidjdja 172 (May 789), i.e. of the time of Ḥārūn al-Rašīd (van Berchem, Inscri. arabes de Syrie, Cairo 1897, p. 4—7; M. de Vogüé, La citerne de Ramla, in Comptes-rendus de l'Acad. des Inschr. et Belles-lettres, xxxix., 1911, p. 352—493 sq.).

By the Frankish pilgrims the town is first mentioned in 870 as 'Ramula'. The Crusaders made it a bishopric. In the 13th century there was built the beautiful church of the Crusaders now the mosque (Dāmīr al-Kabīr, in the east of the town) with its noble Gothic portal, to which was later added very unskilfully an inscription of Sulṭān Kathūgī. It also has an inscription, according to which its square tower (now replaced by a round minaret) was built or restored in 714 (1314—1315) by Sulṭān Muḥammad.

The old "white mosque" was restored by Šalādīn in 587 (1191) and given by Baibars in 666 (1267—1268) two domes, above the minaret and the miḥrāb. The Esquiline gate opposite it (Mudījr al-Dīn, Bāīṣī, p. 419: transl. Sauvage, p. 207; the inscription in van Berchem, op. cit., p. 57—64). The minaret, the so-called "tower of al-Ramla" or "Tower of the 40 martyrs", was, according to Mudījr al-Dīn and an inscription over its gateway, rebuilt in
Shābān 718 (Oct. 1318) [Zwei arabisch Inschriften, in Jerusalemer Warte, lixx., 1913, p. 100 sq.]; the mosque as well as the minaret have both been wrongly cited for the work of the Crusaders (cf. against this van Berchem, op. cit., p. 63 sq.).

Nāṣir-i Khusraw who visited al-Ramla in Ramadān 438 (1047), calls it a large town with high and strong walls of stone and gates of copper; the inhabitants had a receptacle for the collection of rain-water at the door of each house. There was also a large cistern for general use in the middle of the Friday mosque.

An earthquake of Muharram 15, 425 (Dec. 1034) destroyed a third of the town and its mosque fell into ruins (cf. also Ibn al-Athir, ix. 298).

Most of the public and private buildings and public streets fell with marble and adorned with fine sculptures and ornaments. Figs were the chief export of al-Ramla. The name of the province of Filaštīn was also given to the capital al-Ramla (Clermont-Ganneau, Reconnu d’Arch. Orient., vi. 101).

Saladin in 583 (1187) destroyed the town so that it never again fell into the hands of the Franks and it remained in ruins (Yākūt, i. 818; Sāfī al-Dīn, Muhāfazat, i. 483). Ibn Bāṭṭūta visited it in 756 (1355); he mentions the Dālī’ al-Ābyād in which, he was told, 300 prophets were buried. A Latin monastery was founded in 1420 in al-Ramla by Duke Philip the Good, and restored at a later date by Louis XIV.

In 1798 the town was Napoleon’s headquarters.

The modern al-Ramla has about 6,500 inhabitants; it has a healthy climate and fertile country round it.


(E. Honigmann)

RAMPUR, an Indian state in Rohilkhand and under the political supervision of the government of the United Provinces. It is bounded on the north by the district of Naini Tal; on the east by Bareilly; on the south by the Baisauli tahsil of Buduān; and on the west by the district of Morādabad.

The early history of Rāmpur is that of the growth of Rohilka power in Rohilkhand. After the establishment of Muslim rule in India large bodies of Afghans or Pathans settled down in the country. So powerful did they become that they were twice able to establish their rule in northern India, under the Lodis [q. v.] in the second half of the xvth century, and under the Surs [q. v.] in the time of Shīr Shāh. After the death of Awrangzīb and with the decline of the Mughal empire Afghān settlements increased until in the words of the Sīyar al-Mutākīhārīn “they seemed to shoot up out of the ground like so many blades of grass”. The name Rohilla was applied to those Afghans who settled in what is now known as Rohilkhand.

The real founders of Rohilla power were an Afghān adventurer, named Dādū Khan, who arrived in India immediately after the death of Awrangzīb, and his adopted son, ‘Ali Muhammad Khan, who succeeded him as leader of a band of mercenary troops. It was during the lifetime of ‘Ali Muhammad Khan that his possessions came to be called Rohilkhand or the land of the Rohillas. In course of time ‘Ali Muhammad Khan became so powerful that he refused any longer to pay his revenues to the central government, in which course he was encouraged by the anarchy consequent upon the invasion of Nādir Shāh [q. v.]. The growth of his power so alarmed Šafī ‘Alī of Oudh [see Oudh] that he persuaded the emperor to send an expedition against him, as a result of which ‘Ali Muḥammad Khan surrendered to the imperial forces and was taken prisoner to Delhi. After a time he was pardoned and appointed governor of Sīrkīnd. In 1748, according to the Marthās Rāmūnī, he was transferred to Rohilkhand, but it seems more probable that he took advantage of the invasion of Ahmad Shāh Durrānī [q. v.] to recover his former possessions. Two factors contributed to the growth of Rohilla power: the weakness of the central government and the fact that they were able to take advantage of the internal struggles between the various Rajput chiefs and zamindārs of Rohilkhand.

‘Ali Muḥammad Khan left six sons, but the absence of the two eldest in Afghanistan, combined with the extreme youth of the other four, meant that all real power remained in the hands of a group of Rohilla sardārs, the most important of whom were Ḥāfiz Rāmūn Khan, and Dūndū Khan. This naturally produced intrigues and disputes and eventually weakened the Rohilla power.

In 1771 the Marthās turned their attention to the conquest of Rohilkhand, whereupon the Rohillas applied for aid to Šudjā’ al-Dawla, the nawāb-wazir of Oudh. It was agreed that Šudjā’ al-Dawla should receive forty lakhs of rupees for his services (Aitchison, i. 6–7), but the Rohillas later refused to abide by their pecuniary engagements. In accordance with his promise at the Conference of Benares in 1773, Warren Hastings agreed to assist the nawāb-wazir in expelling the Rohillas from Rohilkhand, for which he was to receive forty lakhs of rupees. On April 23, 1774, the Rohillas were defeated and their leader, Ḥāfiz Rāmūn Khan, slain. At the end of this war Faujullāh Khan, a son of ‘Ali Muhammad Khan, concluded a treaty with Šudjā’ al-Dawla at Lالدāng (India Office MSS., Bengal Secret Consultations, October 31, 1774; see also extracts from the Persian interpreter’s journal, February 14, 1775).

By this treaty Faujullāh Khan received a ғāzīr consisting of Rāmpur and other districts with a
RAMPUR — RANGOON

RAMPUR. Several Indian poets have used this tākhallus. The Rijād al-wifāk of Dhu 'l-Fikār 'Afi, biographies of Indian poets who wrote in Persian, and the Tadhkira of Yusuf 'Ali Khan (analysed by Sprenger, A Catalogue of the Arabic, Persian and Hindustani Mss... of the King of Oudh, i. 168 and 250) mention five of them. The first, a native of Kashmir, lived in Delhi in the reign of Muhammad Shāh (1719-1748); his ghazals were sung by the dancing-girls. — The most celebrated, however, was Sa'ādat Vār Khān of Delhi. His father, Tāhmasb Beg Khān Turānī, came to India with Nadir Shāh and settled in Delhi where he attained the title of haft-hāzārī and the title of Muḥākmīn al-Dawla. In his turn, Sa'ādat Vār Khān entered the service of Mirzā Sulaimān Shikh, son of the emperor Shāh 'Alam, who lived in Lucknow. He was a good horseman and able soldier; for a time he commanded a part of the artillery of the Nīpām of Haiderābād but he gave up this post to go into business. He was in his youth a friend of the poet Ināhā in Lucknow; a pupil of the poet Muḥammad Ḥafīm of Delhi (cf. Ram Bahū Saksera, A History of Ondu Literature, p. 48; Sprenger, op. cit., p. 235), he afterwards submitted all his verses to the criticism of Nīhār (cf. Sprenger, p. 273); then of Muṣafīr (Saksera, p. 90); he died in 1251 (1835) aged eighty (or a year later; cf. Garcin de Tassy). — The following are his works in Urdu: Mathnawi Dilpasr, a poem of romantic adventure (1213 = 1798); Ijādī al-Rāngīn, a mathnawi of fables and anecdotes (Lucknow 1847 and 1870); another mathnawi of anecdotes: Muqarr bī-Agāhī or Qurābī al-Mughūr (lit. Agra and Lucknow); four divāns collectively known as Naw Ratan ("the Nine Jewels"), the two first lyrical, the third humorous and partly in rikhāhi (language peculiar to women), the fourth in this same language with a preface by Rangīn explaining the principal words (on the development of rikhāhi and Rangīn's skill in this licentious genre, cf. the article URDU vol. iv., p. 1026v, l. 1—11, and Saksera, op. cit., p. 94); in prose a treatise on horsemanship (Faraa-nāme, 1210 = 1755; several times re-edited) and a collection of critical observations on a number of poets, entitled Mājūš-i Rāngīn. In Persian (if the work is really his; cf. Sprenger, op. cit., p. 54, No. 462), Rāngīn under the title Mihr u-Māhī, sung of the adventure of a son of a sāyīd and of a daughter of a jeweller, based on an incident that occurred in Delhi in the reign of Dhañhāngīr (cf. Gr. i. Ph., ii. 254).

Bibliography: In addition to the text: Garcin de Tassy, Litt. hindoue et hindoustanie i, 45 and iii. 2; Pertsch, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königl. Bibl. zu Berlin, iv., index, p. 1157; Blumhardt, Cat. of the... Hindustani Mss. in the British Museum, No. 74. (H. Massé)

RANGOON, a city in the Pegu division of Burma lying on both sides of the Hning river at its point of junction with the Pegu river and the Pazuandaung creek, twenty-one miles from the sea.

Legend, not entirely undocumented, relates that the great pagoda at Rangoon (Mon, Yaikd Logun; Burmese, Swwe Dagon) was founded during the life-time of the Buddha and was repaired by the emperor Apyoka (7 B. R. S., xxiv. 4 and 20).

History proper begins with the establishment of Pegu as the capital of a Mon kingdom in 1369.
A convenient port was required for this kingdom. Bassein, which had been the chief port of Burma in the early middle ages, was too distant and too difficult to control. Martaban on the Gulf of Sittang was nearer but had no good river connection with Pegu. It was natural, therefore, that the Rangoon or Hlaing river, of which the Pegu river is a tributary, should come into prominence as a line of approach for over-seas trade. Syriam, to the southeast of Dagon at the mouth of the Pegu river, and Dala, now part of Rangoon on the opposite bank of the Hlaing, were the chief ports. But the Shwe Dagon pagoda standing on the last spur of the Pegu Yomas was a landmark to ships coming up the river and was chosen by a succession of kings for the exercise of their pujy.

An inscription on the Dagon pagoda hill, engraved by order of King Dhammazedii in 1845 A.D., records additions to the pagoda by his royal predecessors for a century back, as well as by himself (J. B. R. S., xxiv. 8). Similar works of merit by subsequent kings are recorded in the histories (by this period fairly reliable) culminating in the rebuilding of the pagoda by King Bay in Nauang after it had been damaged by an earthquake in 1568 A.D. There are also frequent references by early travellers, such as Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, Caesar Frederick, and Gaspar Balbi to Dagon and its celebrated pagoda.

It was the customs revenue of the Rangoon river that financed the Portuguese adventurer de Brito, who rose to power in Syriam between 1600 and 1612. Later in the eighteenth century the Dutch, French, and English from time to time maintained trading stations.

The capital was transferred from Pegu to Ava in 1635 and royal authority gradually declined, but even the weakest kings contrived to keep control of the Irrawaddy and the now important customs station of Syriam. With the seizure of Syriam by the Pegu rebels in 1740 the kingdom of Ava, deprived of its revenues, necessarily came to an end.

The recovery of Syriam was one of the first objects of Alaungpaya, the founder of the dynasty which ended with King Thibaw. His siege operations were for some time unsuccessful and he had to be content with the capture of Dagon in 1755. It is recorded that as he had been successful over all his enemies (yan ake) he changed the name of the town to Yangon (Rangoon). Syriam fell in 1756 and was destroyed. A governor was appointed at Rangoon, which now replaced Syriam as the principal sea-port of Burma.

The history of the early kings of the Alaungpaya dynasty was to encourage foreign trade. A British factory was established at Rangoon and maintained till 1782. Parsi, Armenian and Muslim traders settled here and flourished. But with the weakening of the central government the exactions of the local officials increased and constituted a serious discouragement to commerce. Symes describes Rangoon as a flourishing port in 1795 and estimates its population at 50,000 (p. 214).

Rangoon was first captured by the British in 1824 during the first Burmese war but was evacuated in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Yandabo at the end of the war. According to the Kon-baung set maha-yazaw-in-dji (vol. ii., p. 15), a Burmese history of the Alaungpaya dynasty, King Tharawaddy visited Rangoon in 1841 (1203 b. e.) and founded a new town south and west of the Shwe Dagon pagoda, to which the population of the old town on the banks of the river was ordered to remove. The order was not at once obeyed, but, by the outbreak of the second Burmese war in 1852, the transfer of the population was pretty complete and the British government was unimpeaded in the measures, which it lost no time in undertaking, for the reclamation and lay-out of the riverine area. In the space of three years Rangoon rose from a squatted collection of huts into a thriving and populous town. [For improvements to Rangoon and development of Pegu, see Fyfe's Burma Past and Present, ii., appendix G]. To-day it is the capital of Burma and has a population of 400,415, of whom 70,791 are Muhammadans (1931 Census Report).


(R. A. Kern)

RAPAK (Jav.: Ar. raḍ?) is a technical term used among the Javanese, in this one case only, for the charge made by the wife, at the court for matters of religion, that the husband has not fulfilled the obligations which he took upon himself at the ṭalḵ of ḥalāf [see TALKA]. These obligations are of a varied and changing nature. Among the conditions the following always occurs: “If the man has been absent a certain time on land or (longer) over seas” i.e. without having transmitted nafaṣa [q.v.] to his wife. A clause that is never omitted is the following: “If the wife is not content with this”. She is therefore at liberty to be quite satisfied with the husband’s non-fulfilment of his vows, without taking steps for a divorce. The work of the court is only to ascertain the fulfilment of the condition and the arising of ḥalāf. As always, the ḥalāf is still entered in the register. — It is evident that this procedure guarantees the integrity of the law otherwise endangered.


RĂS AL’-AIN (‘Ain Warda), a town in al-Dżaira on the Khabur. In ancient times it was already known as Resan-Theodosiopolis (Notitiae dignitatum, ur. xxxvi. 20) or Ḥāriya (Steph. Byz.), Syriac Resh ‘Ainā. On account of its position at the sources of the Khabur it has been identified with the road-station Fons Scabora of the Tabula Peutingeriana (fons Chabura in Pliny, Nat. hist., xxxi. 37; xxxii. 16) (E. Hersfeld, Reise im Europä-
and Rās al-'Ain. The latter was taken by Joscelin and a large part of the Arab population killed and the remainder taken prisoners (Mich. Syr., ii. 228; Barhebr., Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 259). But the Franks cannot have held the town for very long.

Saif al-Din of Mawṣil and 'Izz al-Din Masʿūd of Ḥalab in 570 (1174—1175) attacked Salāḥ al-Din and besieged Rās al-'Ain but were soon afterwards defeated by him at Kūrīn Ǧama. In 581 (1185—1186) Salādīn crossed the Euphrates and marched against Khwārizm, Rās al-'Ain and Dārūr to Balad on the Tigris. His son al-ʿĀdīl in 597 (1200—1201) received from al-Adīl the towns of Sumaṣṣa, Sarūḏī, Rās al-'Ain and Dūmāla; when he then marched on Damācsus, Nūr al-Dīn of Mawṣil and Ḥuṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad of Sinjār again took the Džāzira from him but fell ill in Rās al-'Ain in the heat of summer and concluded peace again. In 599 (1202—1203) al-ʿĀdīl took from al-ʿĀdīl the towns of Sarūḏī, Rās al-'Ain and Dūmāla (other fortresses also are mentioned). When the Kūrūd (Georgians) who had advanced as far as Khišāt in 606 (1210—1210) learned that al-ʿĀdīl had reached Rās al-'Ain on his way against them, they withdrew (Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Blochet, in R. O. L., v. 46). Malik al-ʿĀṣfāra, who had defeated Ibn al-Mashīḥ in 616 (1129—1220) forgave him for rebelling and gave him Rās al-'Ain as a fief (Kamāl al-Dīn, op. cit., p. 61; according to Barhebr., Chron. syr., p. 439, however, Ibn al-Mashīḥ died in prison in Harrān).

Salādīn's nephew al-ʿĀṣfāra in 617 (1220—1221) was fighting against the lord of Mārdīn. The lord of Mārdīn made peace between them, when Rās al-'Ain was ceded to al-ʿĀṣfāra, Muwazzar and the district of Ṣhabākhtān (around Dūnaisir) to the lord of Mārdīn. In exchange for Damācsus, al-ʿĀṣfāra, in 626 (1229) gave his brother al-Kāmil the towns of al-Ruḥā, Ḥarrān, al-Rašāq, Sarūḏī, Rās al-'Ain, Muwazzar and Dūmāla (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., v. 77; Barhebr., Chron. syr., p. 458) who occupied them in 634 (1236—1237) (Kamāl al-Dīn, op. cit., p. 92). After the defeat of the Khwārizmīs at Džalāt Džalāhānīn near al-Ruḥā, the army of Ḥalab in 638 (1240—1241) took Harrān, al-Ruḥā, Rās al-'Ain, Dūmāla, Muwazzar, al-Rašāq and the district belonging to it (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 12). But in 639 (1241—1242) the Khwārizmīs, who had made an alliance with al-Malīk al-Muṣaffar of Māyyāfīrīn, returned to Rās al-'Ain, where the inhabitants and the garrison, including a number of Frankish archers and crossbowmen, offered resistance. An arrangement was made by which they were admitted to the town by the inhabitants, whose lives were promised them, and captured the garrison. When al-Malīk al-Manṣūr had returned to Harrān and al-Muṣaffar had retired to Māyyāfīrīn with the Khwārizmīs, they sent their prisoners back (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 14). In the same year also the Tatār came to Rās al-'Ain (ibid., p. 15). When the Khwārizmīs and Turkmen raided al-Džāzira, the army of Ĥalab under the emir Džamal al-Dawla in Dūnaisir II 640 (1243—1244) went out against them and the two armies encamped opposite each other near Rās al-'Ain. The Khwārizmīs combined with the lord of Mārdīn and finally a peace was made by which Rās al-'Ain was given to the Ortoqīd ruler of Mārdīn (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 19).
In a Muḥammadan cemetery in the North of Rās al-'Ain, M. von Oppenheim found an inscription of the year 717 (1317–1318). The Syrian chroniclers mention Rāshid al-'Ain as a Jacobite bishopric (11 bishops between 793 and 1199 are given in Mich. Syr., iii. 502) in which a synod was held in 684 (Barhebræus, Chron. ecle., i. 287). Towards the end of the sixth century the town was sacked by Timūr.

Rās al-'Ain is built at a spot where a number of copious, in part sulphurous, springs burst forth, which form the real “main source” of the Ḫubāri (al-Dimashqi, ed. Mehren, p. 191). The Wādī al-Lūjjādib, which has not much water in it and starts further north in the region of Wirāḥāsher, and which may be regarded as the upper course of the Ḫubāri, only after receiving the waters from the springs of Rās al-'Ain becomes a regular river, known from that point as the Ḫubāri. According to M. von Oppenheim (cf. his map in Petrosianus Mutilus, 1911, pl. 18), the springs at Rās al-'Ain are called ‘al-Hasan, ‘al-Ankal-bitt and ‘al-Ain al-Zarkā; according to Taylor (J.R.A.S., xxviii. 349, note) ‘al-Ain al-Bajādī and ‘al-Ankal-bitt are the most important; he also gives the names of 10 springs in the N. E. and 5 in the S. of the new town.

The Arab geographers talk of 360, i.e. a very large number of springs, the abundance of water from which makes the vicinity of the town a blooming garden. One of these springs, ‘al-An-zahiriyā was said to be bottomless. According to Ibn Hawkal, Rās al-'Ain was a fortified town with many gardens and mills; at the principal spring there was according to al-Majdisi a lake as clear as crystal. Ibn Rusta (B.G.A., vii. 106) mentions Rās al-'Ain, Ka‘ṣīf, and Rās al-Akka as districts of al-Džazīra. Ibn Lūbbâr in 580 (1184–1185) saw two Friday mosques, schools and baths in Rās al-'Ain on the bank of the Ḫubāri. According to Ḥamd Allāh al-Muṣafī (xivth century) the walls had a circumference of 5,000 paces; among the rich products of Rās al-'Ain, he mentions cotton, corn, and grapes. The historical romance Fawād Ḍiyār Rābū wa-Diyār Rābū (with century) wrongly ascribed to al-Wāqīfī, which contains much valuable geographical information, mentions at Rās al-'Ain a plain of Muḥāṣṣilāb and a Mardj al-Jīr (var. al-Dair); it also mentions a Nestorian church in the town and several gates (in the translation by B. G. Niebuhr and A. D. Mordtmann, Schriften der Akad. von Hamburg, i, part iii., Hamburg 1847, p. 76, 87: the “gate of Istacherm” in the east and the “Muḥtakhaus or gate of Chubur” not precisely located. I have not been able to see the Arabic text of Ps.-Wāqīfī, ed. Ewald, Göttingen 1827).

At Rās al-'Ain were the Jacobite monasteries of Beh Irīr and Sperulos (speculæ; Ps.-Zacharias Rhet., viii. 4, transl. Ahrens-Krüger, p. 157; so also for Apholos in Mich. Syr., iii. 50, 65, cf. ii. 513, note 6; Saphylus in Mich. Syr., iii. 121, 449, 462; Barhebræus, Chron. ecle., ed. Abbeleos-Lamy, i. 281 sq.; Sophocles, Add., p. 397 sq. probably so to be read through).


(E. HONIGMANN)

AL-RAŚHID BI 'LLĀH ABD UL-QĀDIR AL-MANṢŪR B. AL-MUSTAŻARHID, ‘ABBĀSĪD caliph. On the 24th Rabī‘ II, 513 (July 13, 1119) the caliph al-Mustaṣāhid [q.v.] had homage paid to his twelve-year-old son Abd al-Qādir al-Manṣūr as heir-apparent and in Dhu ’l-Qa‘da 529 (Aug.—Sept. 1135) the latter was acclaimed caliph under the name al-Raṣḥid bi ‘llāh. When the Sāluḫid Sultan Mas’ud b. Muḥammad [q.v.] soon afterwards demanded 400,000 dinārs from him, al-Raṣḥid refused, because, as he said, he had no money. Mas’ud’s envoy then attempted to search the caliph’s palace and seize the money by force; but the caliph re-issued the Sultan’s troops were scattered and his palace plundered. Several emirs also withdrew their homage from the sultan. His nephew, Dāwūd b. Maḥmūd, advanced from Aḏharibājīdān against Bagdād and reached it in the beginning of Safar 530 (Nov. 1135). In the meanwhile the number of the caliph’s supporters increased. He was joined among others by the Aṯābog of al-Mawṣil ʿImād-al-Dīn Zangi [q.v.] and Dāwūd was proclaimed sultan in Bagdād. On hearing this Mas’ud prepared for war, advanced on Bagdād and laid siege to it; he did not succeed in taking it, so after some fifty days he withdrew to Nahrawān [q.v.] and then went to Hamadhān [q.v.]. Toronāñi, governor of Wāsiṭ, then appeared and placed a sufficient number of boats at his disposal so that he was able to cross the Tigris and occupy the western bank. The result was that the allies separated. Dāwūd returned to Aḏharibājīdān and Zangi with the caliph to al-Mawṣil, while Mas’ud in the middle of Dhu ’l-Qa‘da 530 (Aug. 1136) entered the ancient city of the caliphs, where he forbade looting and other excesses and restored order. He then summoned an assembly of judges and legists who accused the fugitive caliph unworthy of the throne. The latter was accused among other things of having broken his oath to the Sultan; he was said to have solemnly promised Mas’ud never to take up arms against him nor to leave the capital; he was also accused of other crimes. In his stead, his uncle Abd al-Ālih Muḥammad al-Muṭafī b. al-Muṣṭarḥ [q.v.] was appointed commander of the faithful.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
Al-Rashid however did not stay long in al-Mawsil but went to Almarā'īdān where he joined Dāwūd. Several emirs, dissatisfied with Maš'ūd, also made common cause with Dāwūd with the object of restoring al-Rashid to the throne; the latter however took no part in the military operations (see also the article Maš'ūd). On Ra'mādān 25 or 26, 532 (June 6 or 7, 1138) the former caliph, who had not quite recovered from an illness, was murdered by Assassins near Isfahān.


(K. V. Zettersten)

RASHID, MEHMET, an Ottoman imperial historiographer, belonged to Stambul, where he was born as the son of the Kâdi Muluk Mustafa, a native of Malatya. He completed his studies in his native city where he was appointed official historiographer (waqā'ī nuwāṣ, q.v.) in 1126 (1714). He held this office till his appointment as kâdi at Aleppo in 1134 (1720). Later on he went as ambassador to Persia with the rank of Kâdi of Mecca, became in Šahbān 1142 (Feb. 1730) Kâdi of Stambul, was dismissed a few months later and on 1st Jamādā 1147 (Oct. 1734) appointed kâdi 'Aziz of Anatolia. He died in 1148 (July 10, 1735) in Stambul (cf. Subhi, Tarihi, fol. 13, 22, 66 remarkably brief) and was buried opposite the mosque of Al-Fadlāzē in the Kāra Gurmuk Street. On his tombstone see Brässlali Mehmed Tāhīn, Oğlanının Müelliflerleri, iii. 55 note.

Mehmed Rashid in continuation of Našīmā's (q.v.) work wrote a history of the Ottoman empire from 1071 (1660) to 1134 (1721) usually called briefly Taʾrīkh-i Râshid (cf. Haşibī Khāfī, No. 14,526) which is the authoritative source for this period. His successor in the office of imperial historiographer was İsmāʿīl ʿĀṣim, known as Küçük ʿĀṣim-bey (cf. Rashid, Taʾrīkh, iii., fol. 114).

In addition to numerous MSS. (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 269 to which we have to add Cpsala, No. 667—668 [Rashid's autograph] and Stambul Lālā İsmail, No. 378) Rashid’s history has been twice printed (folio, Stambul 1153, 4 vols.; octavo, 6 vols., Stambul 1282; cf. theron F. A., 1868, i. 477). Portions have been translated by M. Norberg, Türkiska rikets annaler, Hernosand 1822, iii. 635—709, and J. J. S. Sekowski, Collectanea des Dieipljov Turcekich, ii., Warsaw 1825, p. 1—208.

Bibliography: cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 269 sq. (Francis Babinger).

AL-RASHID. [See ‘Abd al-Wajhid, Harun.]

AL-RASHID [Mawlah] b. AṢHRIF b. ‘Alī b. MUHAMMAD b. Qayyim. ‘Ali, ‘Alī ʿAlīd ʿAlīd Sultan of Morocco and the real founder of the dynasty which still rules the Sharifian empire. He was born in 940 (1530—1531) in Tafilalt (q.v.) in the south of Morocco, where his ancestors, the Ḥasanī Shāhāra (Sharfa) (q,v.), of Sidjumāsa (q.v.), had founded a flourishing zāïviya (q.v.) and gradually acquired a fairly considerable political influence, which increased with the decline of the Saʿād (q.v.) dynasty.

Morocco being at this time plunged into anarchy, the Shorfa of Tafilalt were able rapidly to become masters of the great tracts of steppe-like country in the north of the cordon of oases which formed their appanage. The eldest son of the chief of the zāïviya, Mawlah Muḥammad, having successfully fought the marabout of the zāïviya of Ilīgh in Tāzārāwā (S.W. of Morocco), 'Abd ʿAbd Ḥassān, who had political ambitions of his own, assumed a royal title in 1050 (1646). He did not however yet succeed in crushing the power of the marabouts of the zāïviya of al-Dīla' in central Morocco; he had to be content, after a very brief occupation of Tāzā and Fāz in 1650, with effective sovereignty over eastern Morocco only.

On the death of Mawlah al-Shārīf in 1069 (1659) his son, Mawlah al-Rashid, not trusting his brother, Mawlah Muḥammad, left the ancestral zāïviya for the rival zāïviya of al-Dīla', where in spite of a superficially warm welcome, he was soon given the hint to go; he proceeded to Āṣrīl, then to Fāz, which, regarded as an undesirable by the lord of the city, the adventurer al-Duraydī, he was not allowed to enter. He next went to eastern Morocco, and very soon succeeded in gaining a large number of followers, particularly, in the important tribe of the Banū Ināsān (Ben Saessen), the ʿAlīsh, ʿAlīsh, a religious dignitary, then of great influence. At the same time he attacked a very rich Jew, who played the regular lord and lived in the mountains of the Banū Ināsān, at the little town called Dār Ibn Maḥāl: al-Rashid slew him and seized his wealth. This coup vividly impressed the imagination of the people of the district and was to give rise, as P. de Cenival has brilliantly shown, to a legend, the memory of which still survives in the annual festival which follows the election of the ʿṣulān (the hadib) at Fāz. Mawlah al-Rashid by this murder not only acquired considerable material resources, but also a real ascendency over the people of the neighbourhood. In 1075 (1664) the large tribe of the Angād rallied to his authority, and he set up in Ujādā (q.v.) as a regular ruler. On the news of the proclamation of al-Rashid, his brother Mawlah Muḥammad, much disturbed, hurried from Tafilalt to eastern Morocco; his troops were met by those of al-Rashid, and Mawlah Muḥammad having been killed early in the battle, his men then went over to the surviving prince. Thenceforth Mawlah al-Rashid went on from success to success.

He very soon seized Tāzā without difficulty, and directly threatened Fāz, but he first of all took care to secure his position at Tafilalt; the cradle of his line, and added to his lands the mountains of the Rif (q.v.) on the shores of the Mediterranean, which were then ruled by an enterprising individual named ʿAbū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allah ʿAāraṣ. This shaykh had made an agreement, first with the English and then with the French, for the establishment of factories on the Rif bay of Alhucemas (transcribed in the documents of the period as Alouzème). Mawlah al-Rashid deprived him of the Rif in March 1666, just when the Marseillais Roland Fréjus, having obtained from the King of France the privilege of trading in the Rif, was landing on the Moroccan coast. Fréjus then went to see Mawlah al-Rashid at Tāzā, but the negotiations into which he endeavoured to enter with the shaykh soon collapsed.

Al-Rashid without delay turned his attention to
the capital of northern Morocco, Fas, which still withstood his authority. He laid siege to it and took it by storm on the 3rd Dhu 'l-Hijja 1076 (June 6, 1666); the adventurer in command there, al-Duraidi, took to flight. Al-Rashid took vigorous steps to punish certain of the notables of the town, and the people proclaimed him sultan. He was at the same time able to rally to his side the important group of Idrissid Shorfā' in the political and cultural atmosphere of his time.

The years that followed were used by Mawlawi al-Rashid to extend his possessions towards west and south. He first made an expedition against the Charb, out of which he drove the chief al-Ra'id al-Ghalānān, and seized al-Kasr al-Kabīr (Alezaarqu'or [q. v.]; he also took Meknes [q. v.] and Tetuan [q. v.] as well as Tārāz, the inhabitants of which had rebelled. In 1079 (1668) he took and destroyed the zāwiyah of al-Dlā'ī after having routed its chief Muhammad al-Hāfdjī at Baṣṭ al-Rumman. The same year, Mawlawi al-Rashid seized Marrākeş and put to death there the local chief ʿAbd al-Karim al-Shabbāni, surnamed Karum al-Hāfdjī. In 1081 (1670) he undertook an expedition into Sūs [q. v.] where agitators still disputed his authority. He took Tūrīdānt [q. v.] and the fortress of Ṭīghī and returned to Fās, now lord of all Morocco. At this time, says the chronicler al-Ifrīnī, "all the Maghribīs, from Tlemcen to the Wādī Nāl on the borders of the Sahara, was under the authority of Mawlawi al-Rashid'..

The next year the sultan went from Fās to Marrākeş where one of his nephews was endeavouring to set up as a pretender to the throne. During his sojourn in the southern capital, Mawlawi al-Rashid, not yet 42, died as a result of an accident on the 11th Dhu 'l-Hijja 1082 (April 9, 1672): the horse he was riding having reared, he fractured his skull against a branch of an orange-tree. He was buried at Marrākeş, but later his body was brought to Fās where he was interred in the chapel of the saint 'Alī Ibn Ḥirzīmūn (vizg. Sūdī Ḥirzām)." His brother, Mawlawi Ismaʿīl [q. v.] who succeeded him, was proclaimed sultan on the 15th Dhu 'l-Hijja 1082.

The brief political career of Mawlawi al-Rashid was, we have seen, particularly active and fruitful. The Muslim historians of Morocco never tire of praising this ruler whose memory is still particularly bright, especially in Fās. He was he who built in the town the "Madrasa of the Rope-makers" (Madrasat al-Sharrāfīn), the bridge of al-Rafīṣ, the ḥāsiba of the Ṭārāz (Casba of the Cherrada) and 2½ miles east of Fās, a bridge of nine arches over the Wādī Sabū (Sebou).


RASHID AL-DĪN SINĀN (or, as the Ismā'ilīs themselves usually call him, Sinān Rāshīd al-Dīn), the famous leader of the Syrian Ismā'ilīs in the second half of the 11th century, is better known to the world as Sīyīzhī dī-series, the "Old Man of the Mountain". His full name was Abū ʾl-Ḥasan Sinān b. Sulaimān b. Muhammad. He was born near Bayra, educated in Persia, and, in 558 (1163), was appointed by Imām Ḥasan of Alamūt as the head of the Syrian Ismā'ilī (Nīżārī) community. This post he occupied till his death at an advanced age in Ramādān 589 (Sept. 1193), at Mašrūf. He played a prominent part in the Syrian and Egyptian politics of his time, successfully defending his people from the continuous pressure of the orthodox Muḥammadan rulers, especially the famous Salādīn [q. v.], on the one hand, and against the Crusaders on the other. The fact that this small community still continues to exist (in the villages near Ḥamā, in spite of the persistently hostile attitude of its neighbours, must to a great extent be attributed to the solid foundations laid by him. References to him are to be found in the works of all historians who deal with the events of his period, but the most detailed account is given in the paper by Stanislav Gourayd, Un grand maître des Assassins, au temps de Saladin (J. A., 1877, p. 324–489). It gives the original Arabic text of the Fāsī, a genuine Ismā'ilī work probably by a contemporary of Sinān, containing the swahelī about him, i.e. various anecdotes based on the oral tradition of the sect. This text is accompanied by a French translation and an introduction containing a detailed review of the historical information about Sinān, and the Ismā'ilī sect in general, which, in the main, still preserves some value. The Fāsī appears to be now unknown to the Syrian Ismā'ilīs; they do not appear to have any reliable and genuine histories of their own community. The recently published al-Falak al-dawwār fi Samā' al-Asmā' al-ašrāfī, by an Ismā'ilī author, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Murtuḍā from Khaważī (Aleppo 1352 = 1933), shows no trace of such local tradition, and the account of Sinān given in it is entirely based on well-known general histories, such as those by Ibn al-Aţār, Abū 'l-Fādī, etc.

The stories connected with Sinān chiefly centre around his organisation of jādīdān, which he used as an instrument for removing his political opponents by assassination. Undoubtedly there is some grain of truth in these stories; but it is obvious that excited bazaar rumours greatly exaggerated them, wrongly attributing to him and his organisation many exploits for which they were not responsible. Many historians state that
he was regarded as the supreme and superhuman head of the sect. Unfortunately, he is never referred to in any available genuine works of the Persian Isma'is, and it is difficult to ascertain what was his real position in the sectarian hierarchy. Most probably he occupied the highest rank after the Imam, i.e. that of the kudghat, which, according to the reformed Naari doctrine, implied a considerable "dose" of the superhuman. In any case, there is no reason to think that he either claimed to be, or was regarded as an Imam, although, just as in the case of other eminent Isma'ilis, such as Nasir-i Khusraw and Hasan b. al-Sabbah, popular tradition furnished him with noble descent from ʿAli himself.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(W. Ivanow)

RASHID AL-DIN ṬABĪB, one of the greatest historians of Persia. Faqih Allah Rashid al-Din b. Imad al-Dawla Abu l-Khair was born in Hamadan about 1247. He began his career in the reign of the Mongol ruler Abaqa Khan (1265—1282) as a practising physician. But as in addition to a remarkable knowledge of medicine he was an exceedingly talented and farseeing statesman, he rose under Ghazan Khan (1295—1304) from his earlier position to the rank of a sandr (and also court astrologer) which was given him after the execution of Sa'dr-i Dihyan Sadr al-Din Za'djamia (May 4, 1298). In 1303 he accompanied his sovereign in this capacity on a campaign against Syria. Under Uljaitu (1304—1316) Rashid attained the zenith of his career. He used his fabulous income for a number of charitable buildings. For example in order to beautify the new capital of the Mongols in Persia, Sulṭānīya, he built a whole new suburb, called after him Rub-i Rashidiyah, which consisted of a mosque, a madrasa, a hospital and several thousand houses. At the same time he was working steadily on his history of the world, the first volume of which he presented to his sovereign on April 14, 1306. At this period there was no limit to his influence. He even succeeded in converting Uljaitu to the teaching of the Shāfs. Two eminentBaghdad scholars, Sihāb al-Din Sahrawardi and Djamal al-Din, who were accused of negotiating with Egypt and were expecting death, were rescued by him. In 1309 he resumed his building activity and erected a new suburb near Ghāzānīya, east of Tabriz, the water for which he provided by a great canal from the Sarawrūd. But his high position now procured this great man a number of enemies. In 1315 he experienced considerable unpleasantness through the shortage of money which prevented the soldiers being paid. After Uljaitu's death his enemies exerted every effort to destroy Rashid al-Din. In October 1317 he was dismissed from his high offices and the death of his patron Amir Sawīndjū (Jan. 1318) deprived him of his last support, until finally he was executed with his young son Khwadja Ibrāhim on a false charge of having poisoned his former master Uljaitu (July 18, 1318). His corpse was exposed to every contumely, his pride, the Rub-i Rashid, destroyed and plundered. His elder son Ghiyath al-Din, however, succeeded in retaining a high office even after his father's death, but in 1336 he also was sentenced to death. Even after death Rashid's body was not allowed to rest in its grave, for eighty years later Tumb's son, the mad Murān-
 Already in his last years at school he showed a fondness for art and literature and therefore decided to become a writer, and to this profession, or, as he himself calls it: the Sublime Porte Road (Bâb-i 'Alil Dâdâst), he has remained faithful, untroubled by all the political changes that have taken place. Like many other writers he began as a journalist, and almost all the more important Turkish papers received contributions from his pen, such as the Lider-i Havâdî, Tercânânâ-i Hâkîat, Iskâm, Sabâb, Târik, Şâde, Mâlîmât, Taqrî-i Afkar and Hâkî, and periodicals like Zâvuri-i Funun and Râsimî Gazete. He afterwards collected his numerous articles and essays, for example in the two volumes "Articles and entertaining Sketches" (Maqâllât va-Imâmât, 1325) and in the four volumes "Life of a man of Letters” (Omri-Edebi, 1315—1318). The latter is not an account of his life but reflects his spiritual development and his feelings and emotions reflected in publications of different years.

Ahmad Râsim's output became in time very extensive; in all there are said to be over 100 works of larger or smaller size from his pen. Nevertheless he was not a polygraph in the bad sense of the word, but before he dealt with a subject he always first studied it thoroughly and then wrote on it seriously, sometimes also in the lightly humorous fashion of which he is a master, or again in a pleasing conversational way, but always with artistic feeling and in a particular style which is his own. He always well knew the taste of his readers and he had great success with them. His style was a new one and independent of existing schools and coteries; he created a school himself and his influence must long and strongly be felt in Turkish literature.

His literary work covers the fields of the novel, long short story and tale, e.g. his early novels, "Heart's Inclination" (Mâlî-Dîl, 1890) and "Life's Experiences" (Taqûârîb-i Hayât, 1891); short analysis of both in Horn, Geschichte der türkischen Moderne, p. 46 sq.), also his patriotic novel "The Difficulties of Life" (Maqâllât-i Hayât, 1308), the stories "Inexperienced Love" (Telî-yi ibisâz, 1310), "My School-friend" (Mekteb-i Arzû), 1311), a little later "The Unfortunate Man" (Nâkim, 1315) and another patriotic novel "A Soldier's Son" (Aster Özbüli, 1315) and somewhat more lyrical "The Book of Grief" (Kifâye-i Şâhâm, 1315) and "Nightingale" (Andûlîb, in verse). At the same time he had from the first a preference for history. He does not, of course, in any way claim to further this study of history by independent research but rather sees it as his duty to arouse an interest in history among his countrymen by presenting it in popular form, and from this point of view his historical writings may be regarded as carefully prepared compilations. In his early period he wrote a history of ancient Rome (Eski Româli, 1304), a short history of civilisation (Ta'rikh-i mukhtasar-i Beher, 1304), on the progress of knowledge and culture (Tûrekkiyet-i 'ilséy ve-nesâneti, 1304), later essays on similar subjects entitled "History and Author” (Ta'rikh ve-Muâharrî, 1320 = 1911), a history of Turkey from Selim III to Murât V, entitled Istîhâddâm hâkîm-i milâyâtî in two volumes, 1341—1342, and a meritorious general survey of the history of Turkey, "Othâmînî Ta'rikhî in 4 volumes, 1326—1330. A valuable supplement to these historical works is
formed by the four volumes of "City Letters" (Şehir Mehkâbi, 1328–1329), in all 216 epistles, which we have an unsurpassed description of the city life in its religious aspect, written moreover in a very stimulating and vivid, sometimes bantering, fashion which makes it one of his best works. In "İslâm's Pages of Honour" (Mənâbi-i İslâm, 1325), the Muslim festivals, mosques and other religious matters are dealt with.

It seems to be only recently that our author has turned to the history of literature, e.g. in his book on Şıhâsî [q. v.], which is intended to be an introduction to the history of the Turkish Moderns (Məfâ'it Ta'Rîkhiye Madâhil, ilk büyümük Muhammîr-kerden Şıhâsî, 1927), while his personal recollections of Turkish writers are collected in another book (Məfâ'it al-Qâbir-i Lokma, Muhammîr, Şıhâsî, Ašt'ar, 1924), also recollections of his own school days, and the old system of education in general, in his "Bastînda" (Falâka, 1927).

Ağhâd Rasim was also prolific as a writer of schoolbooks on grammar, rhetoric, history etc. He also wrote a letter-writer (İlâhî bül Kilise-i Meşkûlî yahut mukemmêm Münch'ûlt, 5th impression, 1318). In all his works are to be found translations, and a large collection from his early period is called "Selection from Western Literature" (Adâbiyyat-i qâbir-i Vedîr bir Nâbûsû, 1887).

For this great literary activity Ağhâd Rasim required considerable freedom, such as did not exist under Abd al-Hamid, and such as he could hardly have had as at all a state official. He was however twice a member of a commission of the Ministry of Education, Conseil de l'Instruction Publique (Endüstrîn-i Tefîstî ve-Müdîyanâ), but only for a very short time. He showed his interest in religious matters in 1924, when after the abolition of the caliphate he wrote an article in Wâlî on March 4, 1924 on the relics (amânûn, muhâkâtây) of the Prophet, cloak (gâhrû), banner (înci), praying-carpet (ndsîgâda) etc., which also appeared in Cairo and Damascus in Arabic. He proposed to make these relics accessible to the public in a Museum (cf. Nâlînî, in Ö.M., iv. 1924, p. 220 sq.).

In recent years Ağhâd Rasim has so far been politically active as to be a deputy for Stambul along with men like Abd al-Hâkîm in his "Sublime" (cf. Ö.M., vı. 1927, p. 416 and xi., 1931, p. 227 and Mehemd Zekû, Encyclopédie biographique de Turquie, i., 1928, p. 23 and ii., 1929, p. 88).


RASSIDS, name of a dynasty. Zaidi historians make no distinction between the Zaidi imâms in Dailâm [q. v.] and those in the Yemen [q. v.]; this article deals only with the Yemen. For some periods the Zaidi historians are detailed, for others there are only casual references in writers whose main interest was elsewhere, so details are often uncertain and it is doubtful if some rulers claimed to be imâms. The name is taken from a property near Mecca, al-Rass by name, which belonged to the grandfather of the first imâm, al-Kâsim al-Rassi, who was a descendant of Hasan, the son of 'Ali b. Abî Tâlib. In 280 (893) Yahûdî, named al-Hâdî ila 'l-Hâkî, entered the Yemen from the Hijâz and advanced nearly to Şan'a'(q. v.) but, failing to conquer the country, had to retreat. Later he was called back and in 284 he occupied Şâ'da [q. v.] and conquered Nadjîrân [q. v.] though his hold on these districts was not secure and there was constant fighting. He took Şan'a'(q. v.) more than once and his son was again held captive there in 290. Then the Karmaţians [q. v.] appeared in the Yemen, took Şan'a' in 294 and held it for three years, besides taking many other towns. The imâm helped to drive them out of Şan'a' but could not hold the town for himself. He died in 298 (910—911). During his lifetime 'Abbasâd governors and troops were in the Yemen. Yahûdî fought seventy battles with the Karmaţians and was so strong that he could obliterate the stamp on a coin with his fingers. He was a Însâfî in law and wanted to set up an Islamic state where women wore the veil and soldiers divided booty according to the precepts of the Kurâân. He tried to make the 'Âjîmîs [q. v.] of Nadjîrân sell any land they had bought during Islam; he had to be content with imposing a tax of one ninth of the produce.

Homage was at once paid to his son Muhammad who kept Şâ'da as his capital and ruled Nadjîrân, Hamdân [q. v.], and Kâhwâlân. He died in 301 and was followed by his brother Ağhâd who was always fighting various chiefs and the Karmaţians. In 322 (934) he was defeated by the Banût Ya'fur [q. v.] and died, Şâ'da being occupied by the victors for four months. A son îsân claimed to be imâm but homage was paid to another son al-Kâsim al-Mu'khrîr. Discord ensued and at last both brothers were deposed; still al-âzîm could capture Şan'a' in 345 (956), though he was murdered before the year. Hasan had died earlier. In the troubles that followed Yûsûf al-Dâ'î was lord of Şan'a' until he was driven out by a new-comer from the north. In 388 (998) there was propaganda in the Yemen for al-Kâsim al-Mansûr, then delegates met him in Hîsâ [q. v.] and, helped by the tribe of Kâhthâm, he established himself in Şâ'da and took Şan'a' while prayers were said in his name in Kafrân and Mikhâf Dâ'fâr. He died in 393 and his son ruled from Alhân to Şâ'da and Şan'a' till he was killed in 404. Some said that he was not dead but was the mukhîd [q. v.]; another report says that he made this claim for himself. Up to this point one may perhaps speak of a dynasty of imâms; afterwards the name does not apply. The army consisted of about 1,000 horse and 3,000 foot. The next imâm came from the Hijâz and had some success; before he died another outsider, Abu 'l-Fath, came from Dâîlâm in 430 (1038—1039), captured Şâ'da and other places, and was killed fighting the Sulâhîd [q. v.] sultan. It is said that Abû Tâlib Yahûdî (d. 520 = 1126), the imâm in Dâîlâm, was recognised in north Yemen where he appointed a governor, Ağhâd b. Sulâimân was proclaimed in 532 and ruled
The text you provided includes a historical account of the Tahirids, a dynasty that ruled in the region of Yemen. The Tahirids were opposed by the initial imams, who were followed by Malik ibn Anas, a key figure in Islamic jurisprudence. The text also mentions Malik ibn Anas's death and his influence on future generations.

The text further describes the conflict between the Tahirids and the Tahirid dynasty, which led to the deposition of Malik ibn Anas. The Tahirids were eventually defeated by the Yaman, and their rule came to an end.

Bibliography: The text concludes with a bibliography, listing works such as "Kur'an," "Historia Yemanae sub Hassan Pasha," and "Admiralty Handbook of Arabia."
RASUL — RASULIDS

Old Testament (Exodus, iii. 13 sq.; iv. 13; Isaiah, vi. 8; Jeremiah, i. 7). The term rasul Allāh is used in its Syriac form (dzēdēk dalēka) passim in the apocryphal Acts of St. Thomas.

Post-Kurānīc teaching has increased the number of apostles to 313 or 315 without giving the names of all (Ibn Saʻd, ed. Sachau, i. 10; Fikih Akhbar III, art. 22; Reland, De religione mohammedica, sec. ed., Utrecht 1717, p. 40).

The doctrine that they were free from mortal sin is part of the faith [see ‘tima]. For the rest, the difference between rasūl and nābi — apart from the considerable difference in point of numbers — seems in later literature to disappear in the general teaching about the prophets. Thus, in the ‘Ajīda of Abū Ḥāfiz ʿUmar al-Nasafi the two categories are treated together and the author makes no difference between rasūl and nābi. Similarly al-Idji deals with prophets in general, so far as can be seen, including in them the rasūls. If one difference can be pointed out, it is that the rasūl, in contrast to the prophet, is a law-giver and provided with a book (commentary on the Fikih Akhbar III by Abu al-Munthahā, Ḥaḍārahūb 1321, p. 4). According to the catechism published by Reland (p. 40–44), the rasūl-lawgivers were ʿĀdām, Nūḥ, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, ʿĪsā and Mūḥammad.

In the catechism of Abū Ḥāfiz ʿUmar al-Nasafi, the sending of the apostles (risāla) is called an act of wisdom on the part of God. Al-Taftāzānī’s commentary calls it waqāya, not in the sense of an obligation resting upon God but as a consequence arising from his wisdom. This semi-rationalist point of view is not however shared by all the scholars:— according to e.g. al-Sanāʾī (cf. his ʿUmm al-Ba-rādīn), it is wāsīṭ in itself but belief in it is obligatory.


— Cf. also the Bibliography to the art. NAḤI (A. J. Wensinck).

RASULIDS, a name of a dynasty. The family of Rasul came to the Yaman [q. v.] with Tārānsāḥ, the Ayīyībīd [q. v.] conqueror. Rasul was probably a Turkmen though descent from the royal house of Ghassān [q. v.] was claimed for him; he got his name because a caliph employed him as ambassador. ʿAlī b. Rasul and his three sons became important. The last Ayīyībīd Masʿūd put two of the sons in prison in 624 (1227) but the third Nūr al-Dīn ʿUmar, who had already been governor of Mecca, was made atābek [q. v.] and, on the departure of Masʿūd, governor of the Yaman and on his way to Egypt so ʿUmar prepared to make himself independent. Zābīd [q. v.] was his capital and from 627 on he captured many places in the hills, such as Saḥā [q. v.], Taʿīz [q. v.], and Kawkabān [q. v.]. After two temporary successes he took Mekka in 638 and held it for fifteen years. In 628 he made peace with the Zaidī sharifs and there was little fighting till the imām Ahmad b. Husain declared himself in Thulā [q. v.] in 646 (1248–1249). ʿUmar may have declared himself independent in 628 but he was not recognised by the caliph till 632. In 645 his nephew, Asad al-Din Mūḥammad, quarreled with his uncle and fled to Dhamar [q. v.]. He allied himself with the imām but was soon reconciled to his uncle and fought against the sharifs, the descendants of the imām ʿAbd Allāh b. Hamna. ʿUmar was murdered in 647 by mamlūks in al-Djanad. His kingdom stretched from Mecca to Ḥadramawt though many places in the hills were independent. He was a great builder of schools and mosques and a patron of letters like most of his family. His reign is an epitome of the dynasty; family quarrels, wars with the imām and the sharifs, who were often at variance with the imām.

The murderers won over the rest of the mamlūks, proclaimed a nephew of the dead man, and marched on Zābīd. Palace intrigues had banished al-Musaffa Yūsuf, the sultan’s eldest son, to Mahdjam. With 150 horse he too marched on Zābīd where the inspired resistance to the pretender. He gathered troops as he advanced and the mamlūks surrendered to him the murderers and the pretender. He had to reconquer the country, for his two brothers each hoped to be sultan, Asad al-Dīn Mūḥammad was in a strong position at Ṣaḥā [q. v.], and the imām, Ahmad b. Husain was active; even the caliph was disturbed at his power. At the end of three years Ṣaḥā, Taʾizz, and the strong fortress of Dumulʿa had been retaken and peace made with the imām, who broke it by joining Asad al-Dīn; though the latter soon returned to his duty. In 658 he joined many of his kin in prison, staying there till his death. Ṣaḥā was taken in 652 but could not be held. The imām Ahmad had been appointed with the approval of the family of his predecessor but dissensions arose so the sharifs with the help of the sultan fought and killed him in 656. One imām was captured in 658, another was taken and blinded in 660, and a third was proclaimed in 670. The sharifs were tribal or territorial chiefs, sometimes the enemies and sometimes the allies of the sultan. In 674 rebel mamlūks in Ṣaḥā [q. v.] joined the imām and sharifs but the combination was signally defeated. Zafār [q. v.] in Ḥadramawt was taken in 678 and an embassy came from China. Yūsuf was a strong and successful ruler, and al-Kharradī calls him caliph at the end of his reign. He died in 694 (1294–1295).

His son and successor reigned only three years and encouraged the cultivation of palms round Zābīd where others had tried to introduce corn. His brother, the governor of Shīb [q. v.], took ʿAden [q. v.] and tried to make himself sultan but was defeated and imprisoned. From prison he was called to rule as al-Muʿayyad Dāwūd in 696. His reign was a succession of small fights both in the hills and the plains, the same places and opponents recurring again and again. In 697 (1247–1248) he took two castles from the Karmātians [q. v.]. In 709 the Kurds in Dhamar rebelled, joined the imām and attacked Ṣaḥā and later some of the Kurds killed some of the Ghuzz. In 712 peace was made with the imām Mūḥammad b. Mūṣīr for ten years at a price of 5,000 dinārs yearly. Five years later the sultan broke the treaty. Warfare was savage and usually accompanied by the destruction of houses and trees; the heads of the slain were cut off. In 718 the army was reorganised on the Egyptian model. Towards the
end of the reign governors were changed frequently, perhaps a sign of weakness. It was easy for a foreigner to rise to high rank. More than once the same man was chief minister and chief kadi. In 721 a son, al-Muqābīlī ʿAbī, succeeded but he was soon in prison where he stayed four months only till he was set free by his friends and the usurper took his place. In 724 he was a sultan without a kingdom; ʿAden was lost, one cousin al-Zāhir was independent for ten years, other relatives set up for themselves in Bait al-Fakhr [q.v.], mamluks attacked Taʿizz and took Zabid; it was not till they had been in rebellion some months that their pay was stopped. Sharifs defeated the mamluks; troops came from Egypt but did so much damage that all were glad when they soon left. The imām's death in 728 removed a dangerous enemy, and the sultan did establish some sort of order. Sons and other relatives revolted as did the mamluks because their pay was in arrears. The sultan crushed the Maʿṣūba, a tribe of the plains or foothills, and made a woman chief of what was left. In 736 (1335—1336) the peasants fled from the district of Zabid because of a combination of taxes and a new coinage. An officer touring to collect taxes used his Ghuzz escort to put to death an insubordinate chief's son. The sultan went on pilgrimage in 751 and was carried off to Egypt, being allowed to come back a year later. From this time on the Arabs of the plain gave trouble. Normally the tribes kept each other in check but the sultan had so weakened one side that now the Maʿṣūba could raid at will, they even cut communications between Zabid and the north. The government policy was to deprive them of their horses. A tyrannical governor was killed and the murderer was not punished. Mahdī was captured by a sharif, a rebel governor defied the sultan for two years, and three sons of the sultan rebelled. Al-Afaṣṣ al-ʿAbbās succeeded in 754. One of his rebel brothers joined the imām, attacked Ḥarad, and later Shīr Zabīd was taken by the Arabs, other places by sharifs, the imām Saḥāb al-Dīn raided as far as Zabīd, there was fighting round Dhamār, and the sultan died in 778. Al-Afṣār ʿIsāmīl was chosen as successor. The mamluks mutinied, a sharif was lord of Sanʿa, and the imām was actively hostile till his death in 793. His son ʿAbī was driven out of Sanʿa by a rival and made Dhamār his capital. The imāmāte seems to have been hereditary in one family for at least five generations. In 798 the imām ʿAbī sent presents to the sultan. It is clear that much of the highlands was lost and there was continual trouble in the plains. Yet the sultan was still powerful; he kept a firm hand over his officers and received letters, presents, and embassies from India and Abyssinia. He died in 803 and is called a good ruler. The next sultan, al-Nāṣir Ahmad, worthily upheld the state. In the north he made Ḥaṭā [q.v.] accept him as overlord, in the south the imām who had attacked his vassals, the Banū Tāhir, and in Wusāḥ he captured forty castles. Rich gifts came to him from Mecca and China. A brother rebelled and was blinded. At his death in 827 the state rapidly went to pieces. A series of short reigns with many rebellions of the mamluks ushered in the end. The land was ravaged by plague, the imām died of it in 840 leaving his authority to a daughter. In the same year died another imām, Almād b. Yahiyya, who was a prolific writer. Civil war was complicated by attacks by the Arabs, who sacked Zabīd in 846. A new imām, al-Nāṣir Muhammad, strengthened his position by marrying a granddaughter of ʿAlī of Ṣaʿd. The Banū Tāhir joined in the fighting and took Ṭabīṣ and ʿAden, till in 858 (1454) the last Rasūlīd abdicated before them and went into exile at Mecca.

Most of the sultans were builders of mosques and madrasas, some were writers. In the byeday of the dynasty the sultan regularly spent a holiday in the palm groves of Zabīd (these were called sabūr) and at the sea. The land was governed by officials or by vassal chiefs who paid tribute. In all big towns were two officers, one called wālī or amīr and another called nāṣir, zimām, or mūsāhadd. High officers regularly went on tour to collect the taxes. The army consisted of the cavalry of the state, mamluks both Kurds and Ghuzz, and levies. A thousand horse and ten thousand foot made a big army. A man's horses were sometimes slain at his funeral.

Rūṭūb (A., plur. rawṭūb), a word meaning what is fixed and hence applied to certain non-obligatory šalāt or certain litanies. The term is not found in the Kurʾān nor as a technical term in Ḥadīth. On the first meaning see the article NAFTILA, p. 826. As to the second, it is applied to the dhikr which one recites alone, as well as to those which are recited in groups. We owe to M. Snouck Hurgronje a detailed description of the rawṭūb practised in Atchin.


(AR. WENSNICK)

Rāṭl, unit of weight dating from pre-Islamic times, varying with countries and periods. Ṭarīqī (p. 3, 5) says that, except for the mithkāl, which had remained uniform, the pre-Islamic weights were double the Islamic ones, and that the ratio contained 12 ṣūḥā or 144 dirhems. In medieval Damascus it equalled 600 dirhems and in Aleppo 720 dirhems. In modern Egypt it is uniform = 1/100th ṣaḥūr = 12 ṣūḥā = 144 dirhems = 0.449 kg. = 0.99 lb. avdp. 2.75 raṭa = 1 օkք = 1.248 kg. = 2 lb. 11 oz.


(R. S. ATIYAH)

Rāwalpindi, a division, district, tahsil, and town in the north-west of the Punjab. The division has an area of 21,347 square miles and a population of 3,914,849 of whom 3,362,260 are Muhammadans. The district, which is divided for administrative purposes into four
RAWALPINDI — RAWANDIZ RUIYNDIZ

tahí, has an area of 2,050 square miles, with a population of 634,357 (524,965 Muḥammadans). The tahí covers an area of 770 square miles and supports a population of 289,073 (212,256 Muḥammadans). The town and cantonment, situated on the north bank of the river Lih, have a population of 119,284, about half of whom are Muḥammadans (1931 Census Report).

Since Rawalpindi lies in the path of invaders from the north-west much of its history resembles that of the Pandž [q. v.]. The district formed part of Gandhāra and was included in the Persian Empire of the Achaemenids. About ten miles to the north-west of the town lie the ruins of the ancient city of Takshaqāla (Taxila) which was an important seat of learning in the fourth century B.C. The Muslim invaders experienced much trouble from the turbulent Gakkhar tribes of this area who are still the most important tribe socially in the district. In the days of Akbar [q. v.] the territories included in the modern district of Rawalpindi formed part of the sarkar of Sind Sūgar Dīnāb in the rūba of Lahore (A¬-i Akhbar, trans. Jarrett, ii. 324). To-day Rawalpindi is one of the most important military stations in northern India.

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited in the article PANDŽ: Imperial Gazetteer, s. v. Rawalpindi; J. H. Marshall, Archaeological Discoveries at Taxila, 1913; do., Guide to Taxila, 1918; Rawalpindi District Gazetteer, 1907; ii. A. Rose, A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province, 1919, s. v. Gakkhrs. (C. COLLIN DAVIES)

RAWANDIZ RUIYNDIZ (the first word is composed of two elements: rawánt, of uncertain etymology and dis meaning fortress; the second word of this word, sahá, capital of the kingdom of Rawánt, in the wilayet of Mawsil on the caisran route, halfway between this town and that of Sādūlālūk [q. v.], including the following maháls (the names and figures given in brackets are those of the corresponding Kurd tribe and the number of the hearses: n. nomad; s. settled): Ḩalwán (Zerāš, s. 500); Ḥarir (Helān, n., 800; Māsān, n., 2,000; Māsām, s., 500); Wellish (Bālek, s., 2,000); Dergel (Dergelli, s., 700); Deš-t-i Diyan (Bāleikyān, s., 800); Piresniyān (Pīrān, s., 1,000); Rawendik (Ravendik, s., 600); Deš-t-i Baragir (Barādsot, s., 1,000); Beresiyān and Mergesia (Sirwān, s., 1,200). The Sidan and the Sertiž, two subdivisions of the powerful tribe of the Hurka, number about 6,000 hearths and have their winter-quarters between Rawándiz Ruiyndiz and Arbil (Hawler in Kurdish) while the Mīndān, the third section of this tribe, serve the winter around Akra. The summer pastures of all three are in Persia at Mergawar. Under the Kurd feudal system the district of Rawándiz Ruiyndiz contained the following subdivisions: Ḥevdíyan, Sheteneh, Dūlemeri, Sidekēn, Khaktīr, Piresni, Deš-t-i Sīrān, Bāsīt, Rawándiz, Akīlan, Bālekān. After the League of Nations (Dec. 1925) had given Mawsil to the Iraq, Rawándiz Ruiyndiz became definitely a part of the mountainous Kurdistan zone running along the Persian frontier which was given the name of Southern Kurdistan at the establishment of the British mandate. The figures given for the population here are only approximate, the tribes having in some cases been decimated by war and influenza in 1918—1919. According to the census of 1935 the town of Rawándiz Ruiyndiz had 2,176 inhabitants and the sahá 38,342.

Topography. The district of Rawándiz Ruiyndiz, which roughly speaking lies on the other side of the bend made by the Great Zāb when it leaves the mountainous part of its course (running westwards to the Tigris), consists of parallel valleys and chains which rise gradually as they approach the Persian frontier and which have a general orientation from N.W. to S.E. The average height may be put at over 1,500 feet. The two principal watercourses of the region, the Rūbar Rawándiz and Rūbarı Rūkūk, left bank tributaries of the Great Zāb, have their sources on the Persian frontier. The roads are naturally more practicable in the direction N.W. to S.E. except the passages in the vicinity of the Great Zāb with its deep gorges. The Great Zāb is 500 feet above the level of the sea. Rawándiz Ruiyndiz, at the present day an insignificant little town, owes its importance mainly to its position with relation to the roads of Kurdistan.

Road system. It would be in a way wrong to mention, in the matter of high roads which from all time have connected the Iranian plateau with the adjoining countries in the west, only 1. the silk route in the north (Justi, Geschichte Iranis, p. 476) going from Trebizond via Khoi to Lhithinos Pygros (the modern Taş Kurgan), and 2. the southern road, that from the Median gate or the defile of the Gyndes (Dyāla). Besides these two main arteries of traffic, axial to the route always taken by commercial and cultural relations and in time of war, and lying between them is the road which went from Niniveh to Media and forked twice at Arbil and Rawándiz. At Arbil the road entered Persia by the pass of Gomeshān, Khoi Sandjāk, Rānān, Seredjāt and thence by the pass of Kurtek at Sādūlālūk [q. v.] to Kūrān. The Achaemenid royal road also passed this way (Justi, op. cit., p. 475). It was, we believe, the southern section, running towards the land of Elam, while, according to Th. Reinauch (Un pays oublié, les Mattiennes, in Rev. des Et. Gr., vi., 1894), the main highway from Sardeš ran through modern Armenia and central Kurdistan, although we cannot say exactly on which side of the Zagros it lay. Among the Arab geographers, Yākūt alone gives a few notes on the road through Rawándiz Ruiyndiz (ed. Wusentfeld, p. 441). The road Arbil-Margāh was known to the Mongols after their occupation of Arbil (1298). The itinerary by the pass of Garū Shinka (Zinwe-Shaikh) has been described by Perkins (J. A. O. S., ii., 1853, p. 83 sq.) and Thielmann (Streifzüge im Kaukasus, Leipzig 1875, p. 321 sq.). The latter (cf. Yākūt) mentions as stages, starting from the pass: Rāyāt-Dargula (ruin of a fortress); Rawándiz; Kāt-Atmān (Kānī Wermān 9); Derre Brusht (ford on the Great Zāb, between Girدمامish and Kāzān); Tez-Kherāb; Mawsil, in all seven stages from Sādūlālūk. According to information received from Russian soldiers who took part in the expedition against Rawándiz Ruiyndiz (summer of 1916), the pass of Garū Shinka (6,000 feet) is a kind of promontory with valleys on either side starting from the ruins of Khāneh (Persian Lāhishān) and joining on the other side in Turkish territory. There is a siyārāt there under the Nāsibhānī Shāhīd Dīmašl to the influence of which is to be attributed the parti-
cipation of the neighbouring Kurdish tribes in the villages of Badflan and Bapfštán (should we not recognise in the these ba prefixes the remains of the Semitic beth? [cf. e.g. BÁDAMÁJ]). Becoming rich — some say by having found a treasure —, the ancestor established himself at Badflan, acquired houses and fields and became mayor there. His heirs in time became agá, then beg. Arrogant and rapacious, they had at the same time the reputation of being patrons of learning (čilm u-mudhráfát). At the beginning of the xiiith century, one of them, Menmed Bék the Blind, established at Rawándiz, was honoured by Sulán Mqdíd who gave him the title of pásá, whence his sobriquet of Pásá-i Kárá. He had some claims on Mergawar and Šmíň in which he met with the resistance of Āziz Bék of Letán near Nálos. With the help of guns founded for him at Rawándiz by a certain húsú (= utsú) Réggb, he broke this resistance. Since then the tribe of Letán has not had any independent tribal existence. Its remnants were absorbed into the neighbouring tribes of Šamdıán. The Blind Pásá next took possession of Arbl Kerkuk, Suláimáníye, Šamdıán, Ākrá, Amádiya. The resistance he encountered in the tribe of Žbári and notably that of its hero Āzó of the village of Sáwti has become legendary. Taken prisoner, Āzó is said to have replied to the offer to take him into his service by the Pásá, who had no son, that he would make him one. The Pásá built several fortified towers the ruins of which can still be seen (Sidákán; among the Šjirváníaŋ; Ākrá, Rawándiz, Dárz). He also repaired the road in the pass of Rawándiz “with nails of iron”. He built many schools. In his time plunder, robbery and rapine disappeared. “The grapes hung above the roads till autumn and no one dared to touch them”. Justice was administered by ʿulámá. Finally in 1836 the Pásá was defeated by the Turks after a sieze of four months and died soon afterwards in Constantinople, or others say in Cyprus. Of the descendants of the Pásá his grandson Saʿíd Bék was kálımμákám of Rawándiz. He was murdered by his servants. Yúsuf Bég, son of Muṣṭáfá Bég at Badflan, ağa of the tribe of Fíresínán, was of the same line and in constant rivalry with Saʿíd Bég of Rawándiz. The memory of the Pásá seems to have been kept alive in the tribe of Múkri where F. de Morgan records a curious game of this name, in which one of the players pretends to be the “Blind Pašá”. A Kurdish work (Mírání Sóran by Saïyíd Husáin Ḥusní Múktrání, Rawándiz 1935) gives a full account of the story of the Pašá, his struggle with the Turks, his relations with Persia and with Mehméd ʿAli Pásá of Egypt, giving as its principal source, a Kurkish MS. (Melikṣá by Mirá Múhammadí Weḵáyé Nígár). The Pašá struck coins in his own name: darakā fi Raويةd z al-Amr al-Mansúr Muḥammad Bég. — During the Great War the Rawándiz road was used in the winter of 1914—1915 by Hálil Bey’s troops advancing on Urmía (contrary to H. Grothe, Die Türken und ihre Gegner, Frankfurt a. M. 1915) and later in July 1916 by the Russian Ribálenko, a column which Major K. MASON (Central Kurdistan, in J. R. G. S., 1919) wrongly accuses of massacring 5,000 Kurds, women, children and old men at Rawándiz. After the armistice and during the period till Dec. 1925, when the League of Nations made its decision, Rawándiz was occasionally the head-
quarters of an English political officer; sometimes it slipped from the English and was a centre of concentration for hostile Kurdish elements. Thus in Sept. 1922 (cf. B. Nikitine, L'Iraq économique, in Rev. des Sc. Pol., July–Sept. 1923) the English were forced to withdraw their feeble forces from the mountains and to occupy the line Arbil–Kirkük–Kifri. A Kurdish government was then proclaimed in Sulaimaniyya with a "Pādišāh of Kurdistān", a role assumed by a certain Šāhīk Mahmūd, of a noble Kurd family. Driven out by the English in 1919 after the rising, which he had led, he was pardoned in 1922 and his followers proclaimed him Pādišāh. Threatened by English aeroplanes and without resources, Šāhīk Mahmūd retired to Rawandž and to the Turkish emissaries. Finally in April 1923, Rūyندž was taken by the Anatólian Mesopotamian troops composed almost exclusively of Assyrio-Chaldean highlanders. Two months later in the name of H. M. King Faisal a more tractable Kurdish administration was installed there as throughout southern Kurdistān (cf. above). The first governor thus appointed was a certain Saiyid Ṭa of the family of Šādāte Nehrt (cf. Shāmīnān). A brief history of Rūyندž since the war is given in Mirānd Şāvān. At the present moment the Persian government is considering a system of roads which may give Rawandž a certain importance. It is a question of a carriage road connecting Taurus to Mawṣil via Rawandž. The Teherān government is anxious to have an outlet without the necessity of going through Trauscaucasia.

Humān Geography. The route through Rawandž as well as the roads leading from it have never played a part comparable to that of the two historic arteries of traffic. This is explained by the lack of security, which is the first condition for the making of a trade route. Now this region has always lain between two hostile states: Assiyria and Media, Muṣṣār and Zamau, Turkey and Persia, Turkey and the ʿIrāq. The configuration of the country, the mode of life of its people contribute rather to break them up than bind them together. The road, the means of communication, has here the character of a weapon or line of defence except for brief periods of peace.

Language. Kurdish is the language spoken in this region, except by the town dwellers (Arbil, Alṭūn Kepru, Kirkuk etc.) of Turkish origin. With the establishment of the Kirmānic administration and the opening of Kurdish schools following the decisions of the League of Nations, Kurdish will probably develop still more and we may look for the creation of a Kurdish intellectual centre. According to O. Mann (Die Mundart der Māhr Kurden, ii. 205), the dialect of Rawandž is very like that of Shāmīnān, but E. B. Soane does not share this opinion (Kurdish Grammar, London 1913). F. Jardine's manual, Bahdānīn Kurmany, a grammar of the Kurmanji of the Kurds of Māṣil division and surrounding districts of Kurdistān, London 1922, is more particularly devoted to this dialect.

Cartography. The Government of India Survey is preparing a revision of the maps of this region. Until their results are published as well as those being prepared for other reasons by the Turkish Petroleum Co., there is accessible the excellent geographical material in the Report presented in 1925 to the League of Nations by the Commission of Enqvary whose task it was to collect material of an ethnographic and economic nature regarding the wilāyat of Mawṣil (League of Nations, Question of the Frontier between Turkey and ʿIrāq, Report submitted by the Commission instituted by the Council Resolution of September 30, 1924 [C. 400 M. 147, 1925, viii]).

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text: Spiegel, Ṣrān (p. 27–28); Rawlinson in J.R.G.S., x. (p. 22 sqq.); M. Streek, Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften . . . Kurdistān, in Z.A., xv., 1900 (p. 267, 382), on the ancient and Sāsānid periods; Hammer, Iḥānān (li., p. 125 and 337), on the Mongol period. The Sherēf Namek, St. Petersburg 1860 (i., introd.) mentions the castle of Roukh (read Rawyem).

AL-RAWDA. One of the series of large islands in the bed of the Nile before it divides into the Danialita and Rosetta branches. Situated near Old Cairo and extending to ʿAṣr al-ʿĀmī, it is separated from the right bank by a narrow canal known as al-Khalīḍīj, while the river runs to full width on the other side between the Island and Giza (Dīzā).

In early medieval times, it was used for three purposes: 1. as a convenient site for the Nilometer [cf. Mīḵāyās] on the S. E. side, rebuilt in the reign of al-Mustāʿīn (862–886); 2. as a dockyard for the construction of the fleet (Masʿūdī calls it "the island of shipbuilders") until the reign of the first Kāhshīdī who transferred the docks to the Mīṣr bank of the Nile further north in the direction of the present port of Būlāq, which developed at a still later date; and 3. as a naturally fortified resort in case of danger on the mainland, by destroying the customary bridge of boats which connected it with the fort of Babylon. Mūḵawaks did so when he wished to preserve his freedom in negotiating with the Arabs. Realizing this, Ibn Ṭūlūn built a fort on the Island (c. 877) and al-Sāḥīb Ayyūb built another where his body was concealed after his death by his wife Shādjar al-Durr [q. v.] until the defeat of the French at Manṣūra (1249). As a fortification, al-Rawda reached its highwater-mark under the Bahri Mamlūks who returned to it after the death of al-Sāḥīb Ayyūb and, entrenched behind the water of the Nile, ruled Egypt for nearly a century and a half. They further strengthened the defence of the Island by building walls and towers along its shores. In earlier times it was occasionally used as a pleasure resort where spacious gardens were planted and magnificent palaces erected, such as the Rawdādī built c. 1255 by the Caliph al-ʿĀmīr for his Benguin mistress. During the Bahri Mamlūk period, noble buildings increased in number to house the rulers of Egypt and a mosque and a madrasa (whose remains are still to be seen) were established for the use of the inhabitants.

During the Dārūji Mamlūk period, Mīṣr and the quarters outlying the Citadel were better favoured, though at the time of the Ottoman conquest Selim I found in the Island a safer residence. When Egypt became an Ottoman province, Mīṣr and the Citadel became the seat of the Turkish governor, while the Mamlūk forces took to the Dīzā side of the River. As a result, al-Rawda was deserted, its fortifications ruined, and it furnished robbers and highwaymen with refuge.

The Island did not again attract the rulers of Egypt until the time of Muḥammad Ṭallī, whose
son 'Ibrahīm Pāsha ordered large gardens to be planted there. At present it has become an Egyptian residential quarter connected with Cairo by two bridges and with Djeza by a third. The facilities of modern means of communication have brought it within easy reach of the centre of the capital. The construction of a new large hospital is planned as a substitute for the antiquated Kašr al-Āzīn on the northern extremity of the Island, where

Bibliography: See Bibliographies of articles on CAIRO and MIKYĀS. An elaborate account of the Island and especially the Miḥrāṣ is to be found in ʿAli Pāsha Mubarrak: al-Ḳhitat al-Tawfiqīyā, 20 vols., Cairo 1906, xxvi. 2–111; Ibn Duʾnīkār, Description de l’Égypte, ed. Pollers, Cairo 1893, iv. 109–120. (A. ĀTĪYA)

RAY (A.), opinion. As a technical term denoting the purely intellectual function it is used in the system of Islam in opposition to such terms as ʿilm, sunna, Kīthār Allāh, ʿinān, and hadīth. See the art. Fiqh.

RAWSHANIYA, Afghan sect founded by Bāyazīd b. ʿAbd Allāh, who took the title Pir-i Rawshāni: called by their enemies Tārīkhān.

1. Life of the Founder. Bāyazīd was born at Dūjjilān in the Pandjāb about 931 (1525), his father’s native place being Kaniguram, an Afghan town, whither his parents returned. When his mother Banūn was divorced by ʿAbd Allāh, Bāyazīd became alienated from his father, who disapproved of his seeking the solution of religious difficulties from a poor relation, the ascetic Ismāʾīl; he started earning his living by transporting goods from Samarkand to Hindustān with Turkish horse. In the town Kālīnjār, S. W. of Allāhābād, he became acquainted with one Mullā Sulaimān from whom he imbibed Ismāʾīlī doctrine. Returning to Kaniguram he lived as a hermit in a cave, and evolved eight precepts for his followers; he was in consequence attacked and wounded by his father. Thence he fled to Nirgrahar, where he was given protection by a Mohmand chief Sulṭān Ḵām, and presently won adherents among the Ghoria Khel in the neighbourhood of Peshāwar from the Ḵālil and Mahmūdīzā, who had recently overrun the Peshāwar plain. He established himself at Kalīdhār in the territory of the ʿUmrāzī, and sent out missionaries who were also raiders. At this time one Sayyid ʿAli Tirmīdīh aided by Akhūnd Derwezech (one of the authorities for his biography) started controversies with him; they were unsuccessful, and Bāyazīd, at some time had taken the title Pir-i Rawshāni (Luminous Shaikh, parodied by his enemies as Pir-i Tārīk), conceived the idea of annexing the empire of Akbar, on whose treasury he presently issued drafts. He was arrested by Muḥṣīn ʿĀlī Tārīkh, governor of Kābul, whither he was taken. He was there accused of heresy before the ʿulamāʾ, who however, for a consideration, acquitted him. He retired first to Tekī, thence to Tārīkh, where he proposed to substitute a new religion for Islam. After a time many of his Tārīkh followers reverted to Islam, and were expelled by him; they fled to Nirgrahar, and were attacked by Bāyazīd, who however was defeated with great slaughter by Muḥṣīn ʿĀlī. He fled to a village in Kalapani, where he died (993 = 1585).

2. Later History of the Community. Bāyazīd’s activities were resumed by the eldest of his five sons, ʿUmar, who attacked the Yūṣūfzān, a tribe which had followed Bāyazīd, but reverted to Islam; in the battle which ensued ʿUmar was killed, as was also his brother Khāir al-Ḏīn; another brother, Nūr al-Ḏīn, was put to death by the Gujārīs. The youngest son, Djalāʾ al-Ḏīn, was captured by the Yūṣūfzān, who surrendered him to Akbar in 989 a. H. Escaping from Akbar’s court he returned to Tārīkh, where he assumed the role of sovereign of Afghanistan, and Akbar found it necessary to send an army against him in Safar 994. This army met with a serious defeat, which was repaired by a later expedition (995).

The numbers of the Rawshānīs are given on this occasion as 20,000 foot and 5,000 horse. A further expedition was sent in 1000 a. H. (or 999) which captured some 14,000 men (according to Badauni) with Djalāʾ al-Ḏīn’s wives and children, but not apparently himself; since in 1007 he took Ghazni, but was unable to maintain himself there, and on retiring was attacked by the Hāzārā, wounded and put to death. This last affair is by some assigned to a son of his bearing the same name.

The next head of the community was Djalāʾ al-Ḏīn’s son Aḥḍād, who figures in the history of Djalāʾ al-Ḏīn. In 1020 A. H. he surprised Kābul in the absence of its governor Khān Dāvrān. The attack was beaten off with great loss to the raiders, yet in 1025 Aḥḍād was again in the field, but sustained a serious defeat at Peshāwar by Fīrūz Khān. After a series of enterprises with varied success he was besieged in the fortress of Nuqāhar, and killed by a musket-shot.

The historian of Shāh Djalāʾ, Muḥammad Sāḥib Kāsī, asserts that in the second year of his reign (938) that monarch took effective steps to suppress the heresies started by Bāyazīd; nevertheless in the following year he records how the Afghān Kamāl al-Ḏīn was joined in the attack on Peshāwar by ʿAbd al-Ḵādīr, son of Aḥḍād, and Kurīmdād, son of Djalāʾ al-Ḏīn (Djalāʾ al-Ḏīn). The place was relieved by ʿṢaʿīd Khān, and ʿAbd al-Ḵādīr induced to submit; in 1043 he was recommended by ʿṢaʿīd Khān, “who had caused him to repent of his evil deeds” to Shāh Djalāʾ, who gave him a command of 1,600 horse. Other members of Aḥḍād’s family received honours and rewards in 1047. In the same year Kurīmdād, who had taken refuge in the Mohand country, but had been recalled by the tribes of Bangash, was attacked, captured and executed by ʿṢaʿīd Khān. It is asserted that some relics of the community still exist in this region. A branch of the sect, called ʿIsawī, was founded at Swat by one Sayyid ʿIsā of Peshāwar (T. C. Plowden, translation of the Kālid-i Afghānī, Lahore 1875).

3. Doctrines of the Sect. According to the Dabīstān, which is friendly to the sect, Bāyazīd’s doctrine was extreme pantheism; “If I pray” he said, “I am a musḥīḥ; if I pray not, I am a kāfīr.” He marked eight stages (maṣāfāt) in religious progression: khātirā, iṣqū, ḵāṣṣā, maṣrīfā, kurbā, sqaṭta, wǎḥda, suḥīna; the four last are said to be technicalities of his system. The explanation of these stages, quoted from Bāyazīd’s Pālāmai, inculcates lofty morality, e. g. to hurt no creature of God. The account which follows is inconsistent with this, as noxious persons were to be killed because they resembled wild creatures, harmless persons who did not possess self-knowledge might be killed, because they resembled domestic animals. They might be regarded as dead, and their property
might be seized by the “living”. Further he abrogated the direction of prayer and the preliminary ablution. Other details are furnished by a hostile writer, the historian of Shāh Ḍjahān quoted above, copied in Muntakhab al-Lubāb. Marriage, he says, is without a contract, there being merely a feast at which a cow is slaughtered. Divorce is ratified by placing some pebbles in the wife’s hand. The widow is deprived of inheritance, and indeed is at the disposal of the heirs, who may marry her themselves or sell her to some one else. When a son is born to one of them, an incision is made in the ear of an ass, and the blood dripped on the infant’s tongue. This in order to ensure that the infant shall be bloodthirsty and have the mind of an ass. Any stranger who falls into their hands is enslaved and can be bought or sold. Daughters receive no share in the inheritance. They massacre whole tribes when they conquer them. Even on the Day of Judgment their victims, though martyrs, will not hold them to account. — According to others, however, they recognized neither Paradise nor Hell.

4. Literature of the sect. Bāyāzīd is said to have written much; works by him cited in the Dabestān are the Ḥabībān or autobiography, mentioned above, and Kāhin al-Bayān, the sacred book of the sect, in the style of the Kurān, addressed by the Divine Being to Bāyāzīd. This was issued in four languages: Arabic, Persian, Hindi and Pushto. A work in Arabic, Makān al-Munidnān, by him is also mentioned.

Bibliography: The account of the sect given by J. Leyden, in Asiatic Researches, xi. 363–428, London 1810, based on the Dabestān al-Maḏghāhīb (p. 247–253 in ed. Bombay 1922) and the Pushto work Maḵān al-Isānān of Akbund Derw verbal, furnished the material for the account of the sect in Graf T. A. von Noe’s Kaiser Akbar, Leyden 1855, ii. 179 sqq., and largely for that in Glossary of the Punjab Tribes and Castes, Lahore 1915, iii. 355 sqq. Notices of the sect were also got from Indian historical works; from the Akbar-nāme (printed, Calcutta 1891) by M. Elphinstone, History of India, London 1866, p. 517 etc., from the Tababār- Ḍakhār (lith., Lahore 1892) by H. Elliot, History of India, London 1873, v. 450; from the Tāsāʿī-l Ḍajhāṅgīrī, transl. A. Rogers and H. Beveridge. London 1909 by Beni Prasad, History of Jāhāṅgīr, Oxford 1922, who also uses the Ḏajhāṅgīrī, translprinted, Calcutta 1865. For Shāh Ḍjahān’s time the Shāh Ḏajhāṅgīrī is called ‘Amal-i Ṣāḥib of Muhammad Ṣāliḥ Kambo, ed. Ghulam Yazdani, Calcutta 1923 and 1927, is the chief authority. The printed text of the Bādāsh-nāme (Calcutta 1867, 1868) which, according to Muntakhab al-Lubāb (Calcutta 1869), should contain an exaggerated account of the atrocities of the sect, has very little about it.

(D. S. MARGOLIOUTH)

AL-RĀZĪ, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD b. ṢAKARĪYA, a celebrated physician, alchemist and philosopher. Almost nothing is known of his life. He was born in 250 (864) at Raiy. There he seems to have studied deeply in mathematics, philosophy, astronomy and belles-lettres. He perhaps also studied alchemy in his youth. It was only after attaining a rather advanced age that he devoted himself to medicine. Entering the service of the ruler of Raiy, he soon became head of the new hospital in this town and later we find him in the same capacity in Baghdad. We do not know exactly how long he remained there. The reputation of being the greatest physician of his time brought him from one court to another. The fickleness of the favour of princes as well as the uncertainty of the political situation are the causes of his unsettled life. He returned several times to his native town where he died in 313 (925) (according to al-Bīrūnī on 5th Shāban 313) or in 323.

We are no better informed regarding Rāzī’s teachers. Several Arabic biographers regard him as a pupil of the physician ‘All b. Rabāḥ al-Ṭabarī which is chronologically impossible. As his teacher in philosophy the Fihrist mentions a certain Bālkhi (not the geographer Abu Za‘id al-Balkhī) from whom Rāzī is said to have taken some ideas. Nāṣir-i Khusraw says the same thing about a rationalist philosopher with the curious name of Erānshābī (cf. Zād al-Mustūfīrī, p. 73, 98; cf. also al-Bīrūnī, Hindī, p. 4, 326; ‘Alī, p. 222, 225); it is very probable that the two sources refer to the same individual. Although the influence of Rāzī was considerable, we know nothing of his pupils. The philosopher Yāhūy b. ‘Adī, an Aristotelian, Jacobite and disciple of Farābī, is said to have begun to study philosophy with Rāzī (cf. Mas‘ūdī, Kitāb al-Tanāṣī wa-l-Tabrīz, and a later source (Hudjwīrī, Rāzī al-Maḏghāhīb, transl. Nicholson, p. 150) speaks of connections between him and the mystic al-Hallādī. It was in Šīrāz circles that the philosophical doctrines of Rāzī left the deepest mark. Abu Ḫasqīr Barmānī b. Nawshakht, a theologian of the “Twelvethe” Šī’a, borrows from him, in his Kitāb al-Yāḥūt, his theory of pleasure, and the Ismā‘īlīans Abu Ḫātim al-Rāzī (d. 322 = 926), Kirmānī (d. after 412 = 1021) and Nāṣir-i Khusraw (q.v.) attempted to refute certain parts of his philosophical system. Among the other authors who combated his views may be mentioned Farābī, Ibn Hašām, ‘Ali b. Riḍāwān and Maimonides.

Rāzī is above all a physician and he is rightly regarded as the greatest physician of Islam. In addition to numerous monographs on various maladies of which the most famous is his treatise on smallpox and measles (Kitāb al-Qāhara ‘l-Ḥasba), he wrote several large manuals of medicine which were the most remarkable that the middle ages knew. A number of his works were translated into Latin and down to the xvth century the authority of al-Rāzī was undisputed. His Mansūrī (Liberr Almanor) is dedicated to Mansūr b. Ḫātīq, governor of Raiy, and his Muḥi-l-Dīn (Regius) to ‘Ali b. Wēh-Sūkhān of Tabaran. The Ḥāwī (probably the same as the Ḫawī) is the largest medical encyclopedia in Arabic. Rāzī is said to have devoted 15 years of his life to writing it and seems to have died before finishing it. The book is a compilation of extracts from all the Greek and Arab physicians on every problem of medicine and Rāzī concludes by giving the results of his own experience. While accepting earlier tradition, Rāzī is the least dogmatic of the Arab physicians and in the field of medical practice surpasses the knowledge of the ancients. We still possess his clinical notebook in which he describes very carefully the progress of his patients.

The same empirical spirit is found in the other branches of science which he studied. In chemistry, about which we are better informed, Rāzī, rejecting
all occultist and symbolic explanations of natural phenomena, confined himself exclusively to the classification of substances and processes as well as to the exact descriptions of his experiments. In spite of the statement of the Fikhrīd, Rāzī does not seem to have been acquainted with the alchemical writings attributed to Dājībīr b. Hālāyān. Pseudo-Madhūrī in his Kītāb Rūḥūt al-Ḥākim endeavoured to reconcile the alchemy of Rāzī with that of Dājībīr. Of his writings on mechanics we only possess a synopsis of his treatise on the balance (mīṣālāt ābi'). All his works on physics, mathematics, astronomy and optics, of which a large number are enumerated by the bibliographers, have perished.

It is the same with his metaphysical works of which we only have a few fragments preserved in later authors. Besides the Shī'a theologians mentioned above, we must make particular mention of al-Bīrūnī, who in his various works frequently refers to Rāzī. He also devoted a complete risāla to a study of the life and works of Rāzī.

The following are the characteristic features of his metaphysics: Rāzī asserts the existence of five eternal (kadim) principles which are the Creator, Soul, Matter, Time and Space. The eternity of the world is, according to Rāzī, the necessary corollary of the concept of God, the unique and immutable principle (the line of argument of the Aristotelian philosophers). Now Rāzī denies this eternity. Only the plurality of the eternal principles, their opposition and combination, can explain temporal creation. The origin and destinies of the world are imagined by Rāzī under the form of a myth with gnostic affinities. The Soul, the second eternal principle, possessing life but not knowing, is seized with the desire to unite with matter, and to produce within itself forms susceptible of procuring corporeal enjoyments. But matter is elusive. The Creator then in his pity creates this world, with its durable forms in order to permit the soul to enjoy and to produce man. But the Creator also sends the intelligence (āfār) partaking of the substance of his divinity to awaken the sleeping soul in its abode (kathal) which is man and to teach that this created world is not its true home, the place of its happiness and of its peace. To escape the bonds of matter there is only a single means for every man, which is the study of philosophy. When all human souls have attained liberation the world will dissolve and matter deprived of forms will return to its primitive state.

In his physics, Rāzī, an opponent of the Aristotelians and mutakallimīn, relies on the authority of Plato and the pre-Socratic philosophers. His atomism, fundamentally different from the parallel theories of the kalām, is related in many ways — an exceptional case in medieval philosophy — to the system of Democritus. In Rāzī's view matter in the primitive state before the creation of the world (haybīlā muṭlabak) was composed of scattered atoms (ἀόσια Ταῦτα ἀτομικά). Atoms possessed extent. Mixed in various proportions with particles of the Void — of which Rāzī against the Aristotelians affirms the positive existence, — these atoms produced the elements. The latter are five in number: earth, air, water, fire and the celestial element. All the properties of the elements (lightness and heaviness, opaqueness and transparency etc.) are determined by the proportions of Matter and Void entering into their composition. Earth and water, dense elements, tend towards the centre of the earth, while air and fire in which particles of the void predominate, tend to rise. As to the celestial element, a balanced mixture of Matter and Void, circular movement is peculiar to it. Fire springs from the striking of iron on stone because iron as it moves cleaves the air and rarifies it so that it is transformed into fire.

Rāzī distinguished universal space (masālī kulli) or absolute space (masālī muṭlaq) from partial (dunyāi) and relative (muṭlaqi) space. Absolute space, denied by the Aristotelians, is pure extent, independent of the body which it contains. It extends beyond the limits of the world, is infinite. There is reason to believe that Rāzī affirms the plurality of worlds. The term relative or partial space is applied to the size or extent of any particular body.

In his theory of time, which he says is Platonistic, Rāzī differentiates in analogous fashion absolute (muṭlaq) time and limited (muṭlaqi) time. It is only to limited time that the Aristotelian definition of time, considered as a number of movement (in the first place the movement of the celestial spheres), is applicable, according to the Prior and Posterior Analytic. Absolute time is an independent substance which flows. It existed before the creation of the world and will exist after its dissolution. Abandoning a distinction made in the Timaeus and handed down by the Neo-Platonists to the Arabic philosophers, Rāzī identifies it with eternity (dahr, ḍaw'). To attack the Aristotelian conceptions of space and time, Rāzī makes use of the view of the man in the street with a healthy mind not broken in to philosophical subtleties.

In his ethics, Rāzī, in spite of his pessimistic metaphysics, is against excessive asceticism. Socrates, whom he regards as his model, far from being the ascetic of cynical tradition, took an active part in public life. According to the maxim of Aristotle, blame cannot be attached to the human passions but only to their excessive indulgence. At the basis of his moral teaching is a special theory of pleasure and pain. Pleasure (al-ga'yu) is not something positive but the simple result of a return to normal conditions, the disturbance of which has caused pain (al-zāyū). The sīra fālṣafya (μίσος φιλοσοφικός) aspires, according to the saying of Plato (Thetetēs, p. 170b), to resemble the Creator to be, like him, just towards man, indulgent to his faults.

In view of the individualistic ethics of Rāzī, we can understand his critical attitude to established religion. In many writings he refuted the Mu'tazili theologians (Qāḥiq, Nashī, Abū 'l-Kāsim al-Balūkhi, Mīsma'ī [= Ibn Akhī Zurhān]) who attempted to introduce scientific arguments into theology. Nor was he sparing in his criticism of the extreme Shī'a (refutation of Ahmad al-Ka'īyānī) and of the Manicheans. Among his adversaries in philosophy we find, besides the Dāhri Abū Bakr Ḥusayn al-Tāmārī al-mutuṣabbīh, the Sabean Thābit b. Kurra, the polyhistorian Mas'īdī and Ahmad b. al-T'aiyib al-Sarākhshī, a pupil of al-Kindi.

Unlike the Muslim Aristotelians Rāzī denies the possibility of a reconciliation between philosophy and religion. Two heretical writings figure in his bibliography: the Māḥkūrī al-Anbūyā or Hiyy al-Mutanabbiyyah was read in heretical circles in Istām and notably among the Karmātians (cf. Bagdādi, Fārīk, p. 281). It seems even to have influenced the famous theme of the De Trīnus
The principal theses of this book are as follows: all men being by nature equal, the prophets cannot claim any intellectual or spiritual superiority. The miracles of the prophets are impostures or belong to the domain of pious legend. The teachings of religions are contrary to the one truth: the proof of this is that they contradict one another. It is tradition and lazy custom that have led men to trust their religious leaders. Religions are the sole cause of the war which rages humanity; they are hostile to philosophical speculation and to scientific research. The alleged holy scriptures are books without value. The writings of the ancients like Plato, Aristotle, Euclid and Hippocrates have rendered much greater service to humanity. Rāzi’s book undoubtedly contains the most violent polemic against religion that appeared in the course of the middle ages. It takes up to some extent the arguments of the contemporary Manichaeans against positive religions but above all it seems to be inspired by the criticism of religion in antiquity.

Rāzi believed in a progress of scientific and polemic knowledge. He claims to have advanced beyond most of the ancient philosophers. He even thinks himself superior to Aristotle and Plato. As regards medicine, he had attained the level of Hippocrates and in philosophy he feels himself close to Socrates. But after him there should other learned men who would reject some of his conclusions just as he had sought to supplant the teachings of his predecessors.


(P. Kraus and S. Pines)

AL-RĀZĪ, the name of three historians of Muslim Spain. Muhammad b. Muṣā b. Bāṣhr b. Dīyāk b. l. Ṭaqī b. al-Kinānī al-Rāzī, who took his nība from the town of al-Rāyi in Persia where he was born, came from the east to Cordova about the middle of the third century A. H. (884 A. D.) to trade there. His high degree of Arabic culture gave him a welcome in intellectual circles in the Umayyad capital and the emir Muḥammad b. Abū al-Raḥmān entrusted him on several occasions with diplomatic missions in the east or in Spain itself. His successor, his son al-ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Mandhūr, showed him the same confidence that was on his return from an embassy to Elvira ([q. v.] for this prince that al-Rāzi died in Rabi' II 373 (Sept. 5—Oct. 3, 886).

We would have known nothing of Muḥammad al-Rāzī as an historian but for a statement by Muḥammad Ibn Muzain reproduced by the Moroccan writer Muḥammad al-Wazīr al-Ghassānī in his account of an embassy to Spain in 1691, entitled Risāla al-Wazir fi 'ṣīhāk al-Āsīr (cf. E. Levi-Provençal, Les Historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1922, 284—286). Ibn Muzain there says that in 471 (1078—1079) he found in a library in Seville a little book by Muḥammad b. Muṣā al-Rāzī entitled Kitāb al-Rażīt, relating to the conquest of Spain by the Muslims and giving details of the Arab contingents, each distinguished by its standard (rāziya) who entered the Peninsula with Muṣā b. Naṣair [q. v.]. The passage of Ibn Muzain has been reproduced in the Madrid edition of the Fath al-Andalus of Ibn Kūṭya (cf. the Bibl.). However little we know of this work of Muḥammad al-Rāzī, we cannot but regret its loss bitterly.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Abbar, Tawakkilat al-Ṣūqa (B.A.H., v.), Madrid 1887, No. 1048; al-Maṣkhārī, Nasf al-Ṭib (A mediator), vol. ii., p. 76 (reproduces the notice of Ibn al-Abbar); R. Dory,
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mughrib of Ibn 'Idhari al-Marrākushī, p. 22; J. Ribera, Historia de la conquista de España
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p. 130.

Ahmad b. Muhammad, son of the preceding,
surnamed al-Tāriqī ("the chronicler"),
the first in date of the great historians of
Al-Andalus. He was born in Spain on the 10th
Dhu 'l-Hijjād 274 (April 26, 888) and died on the 12th
Rājdāb 344 (Nov. 1, 955). He was the pupil of Cordovan scholars of repute like Ahmad
b. Khalid and Kāsim b. Aṣbahān. He wrote several
monographs on the history of Spain: a Tāriqī
dalīlī al-Andalus; a description of Cordova (Kitāb
fi ḥībat Kūrtubā) written on the plan of the
description of Baghdād by Abu l-Fadl Ibn Abī
Ṭahir; a book on the Spanish mawāsī; lastly
a voluminous work on the genealogies of the Arabs
of Spain, Aṣba al-Itlāb, which was to form one of
the essential sources of the Qamārāt al-Ansāb
of Ibn Ḥazm [q. v.]. These various works have
unfortunately not come down to us and until quite
recently we had only a few quotations from Ahmad
al-Rāzi preserved by later writers. The recent
discovery of a fragmentary manuscript of a chronicle
relating to the 13th century in Spain now puts at
our disposal a work that we may reasonably extol
from this author and from his son ʿIṣā (see iii.); these
passages are collected in Documentos inéditos d'histoire
hispano-maṇiyade, to appear shortly.

The majority of Ahmad al-Rāзи's biographers
do not attribute to him any geographical work,
but some, e.g. al-Daybi and Yākūt, note a Spanish
geographer whom they call Ahmad b. Muḥammad
al-Tāriqī who is clearly Ahmad al-Rāzi; this
individual, according to these authors (al-Makārī
ttributes it directly to Ahmad al-Rāzi), wrote a
lengthy work on the routes (marāzīk) of Al-Andalus,
its anchorage (marāzī), its principal towns (um-
mahāt al-mudīn) and the six Arab ġundūs [q. v.]
which were settled there after the conquest. This
description of Spain has been preserved in a
Castilian translation published in 1580 by P.
de Gayangos as an appendix to his Memorias sobre
la autenticidad de la Crónica denominada del Mundo
Rasis (supplemented by R. Menéndez Pidal, Catá-
logo de la Real Biblioteca. Manuscritos, Crónicas
generales de España, Madrid 1898). The description
forms the first part of this Crónica and in its
present Castilian form comes from a translation
into Portuguese, now lost, prepared by order of
King Dom of Portugal towards the beginning
of the 16th century, by a cleric named Gil Pérez;
the latter was no doubt the author of the second
part and in the third he confined himself to summing
up very briefly the historical work in the strict
sense of Ahmad al-Rāzi.

The description of Spain by al-Rāzi, in
spite of the many difficulties offered by the fact
that it has passed through two translations, both
very inaccurate and corrupt in the place-
names, is nevertheless a very important document
from the geographical, as well as the political
and social point of view for the Muhammadan part
of Spain in the reign of ʿAbd al-Rahmān III. After
a number of general reflections on al-Andalus, its
situation with regard to the rest of the inhabited
world, and its climate, we have an individual
description of each of the principal districts, of
which special use was made by Yākūt [q. v.]
for the Spanish references in his Muqām al-Buldān.
A comparison of the Spanish text of al-Rāзи's
description with that of Yākūt enables us to discover
a close relationship between the two works. They
both give the same number of administrative titles
(kūtāb) in Umayyad Spain of the 3rd century, 41
in all: Cordova, Cabra, Elvira, Jaen, Todmir, Valencia,
Tortosa, Tarragona, Lérida, Barbatiaria, Huesca,
Tudela, Saragossa, Calatayud, Baruhsa, Mèlinaceli,
Shantabaniya, Rucupel, Zorita, Guadalajar, Toledo,
Oroto, Fafs al-Ballūt (Llano de las bellotas), Fīrīsh,
Mērida, Badajoz, Bēja, Oconosba, Santarem, Coimbra,
Exitania, Lisbon, Niebla, Sevilla, Carmona, Moron,
Sidona (Shadhāna), Algēciras, Reyo, Ecija and
Takorannā.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Farāḍt, Tāriqī
'Ulama' al-Andalus (B.A.H., vii.—viii.), Madrid
1892, No. 135; al-Dābbī, Buḥyaat al-Multamis
(B.A.H., iii.), Madrid 1885, No. 329 and 330;
al-Makārī, Naṣf al-Tīb (Analects), ii. 111, 118;
Yākūt, Iḥtīṣāl al-Arīs, ed. D. S. Margoliouth
(G.M.S., ii. 2), Leyden 1909, p. 76—77; R.
Dozy, cf. above; Pons Boigues, Ensayo, No. 23;
A. González Palencia, Hist. de la lit. ar. esp.,
p. 130—131; J. Alamyen Boleser, La Geografía
de la Península ibérica en los escritores arabes,
Granada 1921, p. 287. ʿIṣā b. Ahmad b. Muhammad,
son of ii., grandson of i., continued his father's Umayyad
court down to his own time and extended the
portions dealing with earlier periods by using
sources which had not been available to Ahmad
al-Rāzi. He has not been the subject of notice by
any of the Spanish biographers already published
but he is frequently quoted by later historians,
notably by Ibn Haiyān [q. v.], Ibn Saʿīd [q. v.]
and Ibn al-Abbār [q. v.]. According to the
latter, he also wrote a monograph on the ʿabdiggīs [q. v.]
of the Umayyad court of Cordova: Kitāb al-
Hujīfābī l-Iṣbāla bi l-Andalus.

Bibliography: Ibn Haiyān, al-Muṭtabīb,
Oxford ms., passim; Ibn al-Abbār, al-Hallat
al-siyara, in Dozy, Notices sur quelques manuscrits
arabes, Leyden 1837—1854, p. 74; al-Makārī,
Naṣf al-Tīb (Analects), ii. 671; Pons Boigues,
Ensayo, No. 41; A. González Palencia, Hist. de
la lit. ar. esp., p. 131.

(E. LEVI-PROVENCAL).

Amin Ahmad Rāzī, a Persian biographer.
Hardly anything is known of his life. He belonged
to Ra'i where his father Khwādja Mirāz Ahmad
was celebrated for his wealth and benevolence.
He was in high favour with Shāh Tahmāsp and
was appointed by him kalātār of his native town.
His paternal uncle Khwādja Muḥammad Sharīf
was vizier of Khurasān, Yazd and Isfahān, his
cousin Ghiyāth-Beg a high official at the court
of the Emperor Akbar. Amin himself is said to
have visited India. The work to which he owes
his fame is the great collection of biographies
Haft Eklīm (finished in 1592 = 1594). For many
years he collected information about famous men
until finally he yielded to the entreaties of one
of his friends and arranged his material in book
form. The final editing of it took six years. The

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
biographies are arranged geographically according to the 7climes. In each clime the biographical part is preceded by a short geographical and historical introduction which is followed by notes on poets, ulama’s, famous shaikhs etc. in chronological order. The work is of special importance for the history of Persian literature, as the biographies of poets contain numerous specimens of their works, some of which are very rare. It contains the following sections:

Clime I: Yaman, Bilad al-Zandj, Nubia, China.
Clime II: Mecca, Medina, Yamuna, Hurmut, Dekkân, Ahmadnagar, Daculabil, Golkonda, Ahamdabad, Sûrat, Bengal, Orissa and Kâsh.
Clime III: Bârat, Baghdân, Kûfa, Nadaf, Bâya, Vâzî, Fârî, Sistân, Kandahâr, Ghâzîn, Lâhûr, Dîhil, India from the oldest times down to Aklâr, Sirya, Egypt.


(E. BERTELS)

REDIF (Ar. rîdîf), “what follows immediately after a person or thing (Fagran, Additions); one mounted on a croup, pillion-rider”: cf. for use in the figurative sense in a composite epithet in Turkish (Persian): o râyî zîzê rîdîf “the victorious, another (one which has his victory on his croup)” (Târîkh-i Lîzâdîr, 1293 A.H., 1. 223). The synonyms rîdîf and, more rarely, rîdîf, “the act of causing to follow or join, to make to accomplish”, are also sometimes used in Turkish as well as the words tevâxân and sâbîx. As a technical term rîdîf, pronounced rîfî, has been used: 1. in Persian and Turkish prosody; 2. in the Ottoman army.

1. PERSIAN AND TURKISH PROSODY. — Redî is a kind of “hypermetre” (taking this word in a wider sense than in classical or even English prosody), i.e. the part of the line which follows the rhyme (kâzâr: in Neo-Turkish: âkâr) or more exactly the last syllable of the latter (râzî), or which comes between two words forming a rhyme. The rîdîf may consist of one or more suffixes, particles or dependent words. The old theorists however disputed the quality of rîdîf to repeated suffixes and gave different names to each of the (Arabic) letters representing them: râzî (first letter); khâbâhî (second); nîzî (third); mâdâ (fourth). In Persian and Turkish prosody the same rîdîf is repeated at the end of all the lines of a piece of poetry. Although it made its appearance in Turkish as early as the sixth century, the redîf is an especially Persian invention. Indeed in the national Turkish poetry (syllabic metre) suffixes or particles repeated at the end of the lines count as rhyme (Kowalski, Ze studije nad formou perské literatury dle-slovene, Cracow, 1922, p. 33). The redîf existed in classical Arabic only in an embryonic form and under another name (Garcin de Tassy, Rhétorique, p. 143). The redîf fell into disuse in Turkey in the sixteenth century, probably under the influence of French poetry.

In addition to this special use in prosody the name redîf is sometimes given to the second term of an idbîf, i.e. of a hendiatre (mayaddâ) of which the two terms rhyme or are alliterative, as for example Pers. fuzûn bûzûn, bûzûn fuzûn, khâbâhî mâyâhî, Turk. ùzûn ùzûn, ùzûn ùzûn (“Turkmên-kûl”), Turk. transl. p. 328, 329, 371). Mutâdâf (mutâdâ’if) means “synonym”.

2. TURKISH MILITARY USAGÉ. — Mahâlîd b. Abû al-À mãdîd gave the name of redîf (nasîhîr redîf-i mensûre) to the reserve army created in 1834 (Jouanin and van Gaver, Turquie, p. 425). The historian Lüftî (iv. 144) speaking of the project for this army, under the year 1249 (May 21 1833—May 9 1834) explains the meaning of the term by saying that it was a force “came after” the regular army (meyvâzâyef-e redîf olavâb). They were therefore not soldiers who had, at need, to mount behind the cavalry on the croup, like the Roman velites. Redîf was contrasted with nizî (or asâhîr-i nizîmî) or asâhîr-i maywâzeyf, taken in the strict sense of active or regular army (standing army) and with tibyayf “reserve of the regular army”. For the lack of an exact equivalent we may say militia in English and “armée de réserve” or “garde nationale” in French. The German term “Landwehr” is perhaps nearest it but in the Prussian rather than the Austrian sense. Sometimes the redîf are included in the nizîmîye, taking the latter term in a wider sense of regular or disciplined troops (synonym musettel). Lüftî (loc. cit.) calls the redîf bir nemî “asâhîr-i nizîmîye “a kind of regular troops”.

The characteristic feature of the redîf army was the existence of permanent cadres, whence its mixed character. It was linked with the regular army by its officers and with the reserve by its men (sefâd-î redîf). It was the object of its creators that this army should provide a large number of men if necessary without imposing too long a period of service on the rural population (Lüftî, ibid.).

It was decided from the first that the redîf should consist of battalions (tabûr) and indeed this organisation by battalion depots (tabûr dîvîvride) remained in force as long as the redîf existed. The commanders of these battalions (biynîbâsh) were at first chosen from the chief local families (mahrûlleri khâbânînûdwan). The first battalions formed in 1250 (May 10 1834 to April 28 1835) were those of the sanâbâb, q.v. of Kâráshâr Shâhî, Anâkara, Kangîrî (Çankîrî), Siroz and Mentelles. Ismâ‘îl Bey, hereditary Kurd governor of Palu, was appointed colonel of the three battalions in the karâs known as those of the “Imperial Mines” (mâyâdâ-i humâyûn) in the eyâlet of Siwâs (Lüftî, iv. 171). There were three to four battalions in the sanâbâb, or 10 to 12 to the eyâlet. The officers received a quarter of the usual pay, but were only expected to serve and wear uniform two days a week (Musta‘fâ Nâ’i Pâshâ, Nezîdî al-Wâshîlî, iv. 109).

In 1252 (April 18, 1836 to April 6, 1837), the redîf was organised in wide groups with a high command: muhîrîb (mohîrîb) or “marshals’ ship” (cf. muhîrîb) of redîf, conferred upon the çûlîs. The first were those of the eyâlets of Karaman (Konya), Kusdâwendigzâr (Brusa: guard or kâzî), Anâkara, Aydîn, Erzurum, Edirne. At
the same time plans were made to raise the money required for this purpose. The wall-marshals were given the hârâvâni (kharâmâni) or cloaks of their new rank. Just as the troops of the line (memûrî) were dismissed and those from those of the guards (khâlîf) so there were redif-i memûrî and redif-i khâlîf. The appointment of commanders of divisions was to follow (for details see the Takvî-i ʿâli or report of the grand vizier Mehemd Emin Raʿû Pasha in Lutfî, v. 165—170). If we may believe the khâlîf-i hârâvâni promulgated on this occasion by Mahmûd II, these first steps gave every satisfaction (ibid., p. 74).

When the Military School (mekteb-i harbiye) instituted in 1251 began to supply officers, the redif under arms was converted into active forces and the officers were sent back to their ojdikas (Neşîdîh ul-Wuḥûfiât, iv. 109—110). The service as redif (khidmet-i redif) was now definitely to assume the character of a kind of period of service in the reserve or intermittent service the duration of which (muḥâli-i redif) was to be fixed under conditions which we shall explain below.

In the khâlîf-i hârâvâni of Gûlûhâne (Nov. 31, 1839) there is an allusion to an approaching improvement in the system of regional recruiting. In 1828, five years had been fixed as the period of service in the regular army, previously practically unlimited (one saw young married soldiers leaving their families for life), but this measure did not immediately make its effect felt (cf. von Molske, Lettres sur l’Orient, n.d., p. 211, letter No. xlvii.).

On Sept. 6, 1843 the military law of the seʿâdâr Rıza Pasha (Engelhardt, i. 71) was promulgated, a law of fundamental importance, half French and half German in character, the principles of which have survived even in the most recent legislation. It confirmed the period of regular service at five years (later reduced to four), to be followed by a period of seven years during which a redif could be recalled to the colours for a month each year (later every two years). Each ordu (army corps) was to have its redif contingent (ṣînî-i redif) placed in time of peace under the orders of a brigadier-general (liwa, brigade) who lived at the headquarters of the ordu. In 1853 (Ubicini, i. 456) the redif were organised into 4 (out of 6) ordu, namely those of Khâlîf (Scutâ: [Asia] and Smyrna), Derîseʿâdet (Istanbul and Anâka), Rumelî (Manastîr) and Anatolia (Harput). The ordu of Archives and the ʿIrâq were still to be organised. Ubicini adds this observation: “By means of this organisation the government has secured … a force at its disposal equal to the regular army, and capable of being moved in a few weeks either to the line of the Balkans or to any other point in the empire”. According to Bânciu (Guide de la conversation, 1852, p. 230), the organised reserve (mûrette redif) was then 150,000 men compared with 300,000 of the regular army.

Hussein ʿAwni Pasha’s law of 1869, more clearly French in character (Arastarchi, iii. 514; Engelhardt, ii. 37 sqq.), provided for 4 years active service and one of ḥizâyâ if in the active reserve, a period of 6 years in the redif in two bands (ṣînî-i muḥâliyân and ṣînî-i tahâliyân) of 3 years each (according to Engelhardt of 4 and 2 years respectively). In practice in 1877 there were 3 bands, the third (ṣînî-i tahâliyân) being represented by the territorial army (muṣṭâhîz) then mobilised (Zboinski, p. 98). A conscript who obtained a lucky number in the draft was drafted directly into the redif army (art. 17).

The law of 27th Şâfâr 1304 = 18th Teşrih-i ʿâsâni 1302 (Nov. 25, 1856; resumed by Lamouche, p. 77 and Young, ii. 394) prepared by a commission of reorganisation which included Muṣaffar Wali Rıza Pasha and von der Goltz Pasha, fixed the period of redif service at 9 years, but was soon afterwards followed by a special law (redif kanunun) of 10th Muḥarram 1305 (Sept. 28, 1887). According to this, which was however not put into force till 1892, the period of redif service was 8 years. The ranks in the redif were the same as in the regular army from general division down to sergeant-major. These officers formed at the same time the personnel of the recruiting offices for the whole army.

According to the law regulating the uniforms of the army on land (elbîs-i askeriye nişâm-nâmesi) of the 29th Dhumâdâr I 1327 = 5th Hazirân 1325 (June 18, 1909), the redif soldiers wore as distinctive badge a dark green (nīzîf) piping (ṣīr, Pers. sîr, Arab. zîf) at the bottom of the collar (yaka) of the tunic (ṣaḥket or ʿirîket, modern spelling: şeket, ʿiriket). The officers wore a piece of cloth of the same colour 7 centimetres in length fastened on the collar of the undress tunic (cetek) or the full dress tunic (ceṭet, older cetek; cf. Pers. ceṭet) (Dustûr, Tertib-i ʿıdâni, i. 276; A. Biliotti and Ahmad Seddâd, Législation ottomane, Paris 1912, p. 171 sqq.).

The redif system was abandoned by the Young Turks. The law of 18th Ramadân 1330 = 19th Aghosts 1328 (Aug. 31, 1912) without proclaiming the dissolution of the corps ordered the formation of units of muṣṭâhîz with elements furnished by the battalion depots in the second inspection (muṣṭenîvât) of redif (Dustûr, Tertib-i ʿıdâni, i. 615). The Young Turks have been reproached with this measure and some have even seen in it the cause of the Turkish defeat in the Balkan War.

Bibliography: 1. Garcin de Tassy, Rhétorique et prosodie des langues de l’Orient musulman, 2. Paris 1873, index under riḍf, `ıdîf, `ırdâf, muṣṭîdîf; Quatremère, Histoire des Mongols de Perse, p. 28, note; Muʿallim Nâdîj, L’Études ottomane, Istanbul 1907, s. v. riḍf, `ıdîf, muṣṭîf, p. 78, 84 and 86. Cf. also the Bibliography of the article ARM.}

2. Léon Lamouche, L’organisation militaire de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1895; H. Zboinski, Armée Ottomane (loi de 1869), Paris 1877; A. von Schlozer, Das türkische Heer, Leipzig n.d.; Ubicini, Lettres sur l’Orient, Paris 1853; Ed. Engelhardt, La Turquie et sa Com- manze, Paris 1882; Aristarchi Bey, Législation ottomane, publ. by Démétrius Nicolades, part 3, Constantinople 1874; George Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman, vol. ii., Oxford 1905. — (The collections of Turkish laws or Jisrî Gebel generally refrain from including the principal laws relating to the army and the two works just mentioned contain only a very few). (J. Deny)

Redif, an Ottoman poet and Hürâfî. Of Redif’s life we only have a few hints from himself; the Ottoman biographers and historians do not seem to mention him at all. He himself describes how in his youth he studied many branches of knowledge but did not know what he should believe, and how sometimes he turned to the Sunna, sometimes to philosophy and sometimes to
materialism. He often travelled a great distance to visit a particular scholar but always was disappointed. The poet Nesimi [q.v.] was the first to teach him the grace of God and the truth, and ordered him to teach this truth in his turn to the people of Kain, and for this purpose he had to speak in Turkish. He therefore wrote his Resatetname, "the message of joy", which he finished on the first Friday of Ramadan 811 (Jan. 18, 1409). This work is not yet printed; it is quite short and written in the same metre as Ashik Pascha's Gharibname, a remel of six feet with irregular prosody. The Hurufi teaching is expounded in a very prosaic style, the means of the names and letters, the sacred number 32, the prophets, the throne of God, the human countenance, the splitting of the moon, Fa'il Allah [q.v.], the founder of the Hurufi sect—all this is dealt with from the usual Hurufi point of view. As sources an As-adname, a Djawadianname, and a Mahab'atname are quoted; the latter third are probably the works of the same names by Fa'il Allah, the second according to Rieu was written by Af'dal Kashi (d. 707 = 1307).

Another of Resi's works is the "Book of Treasure" (Gendjname). It is printed in the Stambul edition of the Diwan of Nesimi. The Gendjname is better as poetry and on the whole less Hurufi than generally Süfi in tone. Man from the Hurufi and philosophic point of view. Fa'il Allah and Ali Mad (Muhammad), the 72 sects, the greatest Name (ummi'd jam), the water of life etc., are discussed in it.

Nesimi and his pupil Resi seem to be the only Ottoman Hurufi poet of importance, and while the sects, in spite of all persecutions, continued to exist long after and even had connections with the Bektaşhiye, these two poets as such do not seem to have produced any school. So far as I am aware no historian of Turkish literature has taken any interest in Resi, until quite recently Koprulu-Zaide Mehmed Fuad, who has even promised us a special study of him. Bibliography: Gibb, H. A. R., i. 336, 341, 344, 351, 369-380: Mehmed Fuad, Türk Edebiyatında ilk Mutfaksefer, Stambul 1918, p. 363, 3882—MS. of the Gendjname: Vienna, Flugel, ii. 261 sq., No. 1908 (incomplete) and 1970; London, British Museum, Rieu, p. 164 sq. Add. 5986; of the Gendjname: Vienna, Flugel, ii. 720, No. 178, fol. 51-58; printed in tahl-i Diwan-i Nesimi, Stambul 1260 (1844), p. 9-14: both works in the Browne MS.


**RETIs UL-KUTTAB** or **RETIs EFENDI** (Ar., used in Turkey), properly "chief of the men of the pen": a high Ottoman dignitary, directly under the grand vizier, originally head of the chancery of the Imperial Diwan (devsi-i humâyûn), later secretary of state, or chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs. According to d'Herbelot he was called also Reis Kicik.

This office, unlike many others, is purely Ottoman, at least as regards the particular line of development that it took. Establishing itself at the expense of the functions of the nishândgi [q.v.], we may say that it owes nothing to the influence of the more or less iranised Salâtâ, nor to the Byzantines. Its origins it seems rather to be connected with a more general and more vague institution of the East, one which deserves more profound study: that of the secretaries of the diwan or chiefs of the secretariat of the diwan. This office is found in different Muslim countries under different names: persânâmeh among the Mongols of Persia, diwan beg among the Timurids, musâhi in Persia, (cf. Chardin, vi. 175; Ewliya Celebi, ii. 267). In the Ottoman provinces there was attached also to the wâli an important official known as the diwan efendisi; in Egypt, under Mehemed Ali, the diwan efendi became a kind of president of the council of ministers. The resis ul-kuttab were in brief the diwan efendisi of the capital. It is perhaps to this that we owe the use of the title resis efendi, by which they were more commonly known. We know that the term efendi was generally applied to people of the pen. This usage seems to have already been noticed by E. Blochert (Voyage en Orient de Cartier l Pinon, Paris 1920, p. 85).

Until the time of Sultanmé the Magnificent, the title resis ul-kuttab (or resis efendi) was not used. At least this is what we are told by Ahmad Resmi, who quotes in this connection the Bedî'î-ul-Wegâči of the historian Köda Hüseîn Efendi of Sarajevo (cf. Babinger, O. W., p. 186). The latter, who was himself resis ul-kuttab, says that before Sultanmâ, the official correspondence was in the hands of the eunûh-ahîman or "depository of the decisions (of the Diwan)" along with the nishândji. This point of view has been adopted by other historians (v. Hammer; cf. also the Sâhînîn-i Neşâret-i Kürâgît). There is however no agreement as to who was the first resis ul-kuttab; it is usually said to have been Ljâf (Ijâf)-Zâde Mustafa Celebi [q.v.] (cf. Babinger, O. W., p. 102). This well known historian, whose genealogy is taken back to the legendary founder of Byzantium, Yankâ B. Mâdâ, was resis ul-kuttab in 931 (1524-1525) before becoming nishândji, but the Nihâkât-ul-Tâbûrî of Mehemed B. Mehemer refers to his death in 930 (1523-1524) of a resis ul-kuttab of the name of Hâdar Efendi. According to other indications, it would even appear that the office goes back to Mehemer II [cf. the article NISHÂNDJ]. The resis or office of resis efendi lasted over three centuries during which its holder changed 150 times, the average tenure of office being 2 years and 5 months, which reveals a remarkable lack of ministerial stability: some of the occupants held the office once, twice, and even four times. Duties of the resis efendi. As secretary state the resi kept records of memoirs and reports (telkhiy and takfir) presented to the sultan by the grand vizier acting as representative of the government and of the Diwan. These documents which were prepared by the amâdel-i diwan-i humâyûn or umââde (referendar or reporter of the Imperial Diwan) were brought in a bag (kise) kept for the purpose to the ceremonial sitting of the Diwan by the resis himself who handed them to the grand vizier. After being read they were given to a special officer, the telkhiy, whose duty it was to present them to the sultan. As chancellor the resis had a kind of jurisdiction over all the civil functionaries and was the immediate
head of the department of the Imperial Divan (divân-i kümâyûn kälemi).

This chancellory was divided into three offices (oda or kalem):
1. the beylik, the most important, saw to the despatch of imperial rescripts (firmân), orders of the viziers, and in general all ordinances (evâmîr) other than those of the department of finance (defterdâr dâ'îresi). This office kept copies of them as did the grand vizier also. Ordinances bearing on the back the signatures of the clerk, of the chief editor (mi'me'yiş), and of the head of the office (beylîkî) were submitted by the latter to the reîs who placed his sign (resid) upon them and, if it was a firmân, sent it to the nîşângî the for the tâhsha [q.v.] to be placed upon it. — The beylik in addition retained the originals of civil and military regulations (kânûn or kânûn-nâmâ) (usually elaborated by the nîşângî as well as of treaties and capitulations (sad-nâmâ) with foreign powers. The reîs had to consult these treaties, notably when certifying the der-kênar or "marginal" answers put by his subordinates on the requests or notes, known as verbal (tâhirî), which the ambassadors addressed to the grand vizier. It is this side of his activity which, gradually becoming more and more important and absorbing, ended by making the reîs a Minister of Foreign Affairs.

2. office of the takwîl or "annual renewal" of the diplomas of the governors of provinces (berât), of the brevets of the mollaâ or judges in towns of the first class (takwîl), of the brevets of the timariots or holders of military fiefs (zâbt firmân). 3. office of the reîs or "provisions" of different officials, as well as of the orders for pensions from the treasury (tepêgî) or from wa'îfîs (cf. the details of the organisation of this office in Mouradog d'Ohsson, p. 107).

The reîs accompanied the grand vizier to the audiences which the sultan gave him and to those which the grand vizier himself gave to ambassadors. He shared with his master the midday meal as did the awâneh beşî or (cf. awâne) and the two tekeredîji, except on Wednesdays when these two were replaced by the four judges of Istanbul.

In the official protocol the reîs had the same rank as the awâneh beşî, with whom he walked in official processions, before the defterdârs (which showed he was of lower rank than the latter). The elîbî or epistolary formula to which they were entitled will be found in Ferîdûn, Munsârûlî, p. 10. It is the same as for the aghas of the stirrup [cf. riqandar] and the defter emini. For the dress of the reîs see Brindesi, Anciens Costumes Turcs, pl. 2; Castellain, iv. 107.

According to Mouradog d'Ohsson, the reîs used to act as agents for the khans of the Crimea.

Administrative career of the reîs. The reîs, like all Ottoman officials, were chosen by the sultan or grand vizier as they pleased, but except in case of appointment by favour, they followed a fixed line of promotion (parîk) in the administration. It was in the administrative offices, i.e. among the khejizâ'ân (Persian plur. which was given as an honorific title to the principal clerks or khejî or kalem zâbitîlerî) that this career was spent.

In examining the Sefînet ut-Rı'â'îd of Ahmed Resmi, we find that up to the reîs Boyall Mehmend Efendi (Pâsha) (d. 977 = 1569-1570) there is no information available about the career of the reîs, but starting with him we find that the reîs were regularly chosen from among the former tekeredî of the wa'îfîs or of the grand vizier. From Sheikhzâde 'Abdi Efendi (d. in 1014 = 1605-1606) the reîs were mainly taken from the wa'îfîs mektübgî or private secretaries of the grand vizier. These secretaries were themselves at the head of an office (oda) which contained a very small number of officials (khalîfe or kalifa, pl. khalîfâ). There were only two between the years 1090 and 1100. When the number increased (at a later date there were about 30) the career of the future reîs was as follows: khalîfe in the office in question, called also mektüb-i sard-i 'ali odaî, then see-khalîfe or bakâ-kalifa "chief clerk"; then mektübgî. The post of mektübgî was much sought after. It brought its holder into close contact with the grand vizier and it was then very easy to advance oneself. More rarely the future reîs rose through the similar but less important office of secretary to the lieutenant to the grand vizier or Kâhya Bey (kethânda kâtibî odaî).

The riyâsîd did not mark the end of a career but gave access to still higher posts (see art. nishângî for the old rules of promotion by which the reîs became nishângî). It was one of what were known as the "six [principal] dignities", mektübî sitte, namely, the nishângî, defterdâr, reîs ul-kütâb, defter emini, shikbi-thânî defterdâr, shikbi-thânî defterdâr (Ahmed Rûsmî, Tâhâlî, p. 756).

According to the Nâşihatnâmê (p. 39-40 of the French translation; cf. this Encyclopaedia, iv. 815-816), the reîs was under the authority of the Grand Defterdâr (for financial matters only).

Increasing importance of the office of reîs. — The growing influence of the reîs is explained by the increasing importance of foreign policy in Turkey (the Eastern Protocol).

Down to the end of the xvîth century the nishângî were certainly superior to the reîs; they controlled and even revised the orders and decisions of the divân (akbâm), but from the xvîth century onwards reîs like Oâqût-zâde Mehmend Shân Efendi, Lâm-Allî Cîlebi and Hükmê Efendi sêd a certain lustre on their office. From 1066 (1659) the incapacity of certain nishângi precipitated the decline of their office in spite of the ephemeral efforts by grand viziers like Sheikh 'Ali Pâsha and of the nishângî appointed by him (Râshid Efendi and Selim Efendi). It was in this period that the office of beylîkî was created (cf. above).

The Ottoman protocol (tekhîrât) was nevertheless still to revert for a long time traces of the originally rather subordinate position of the reîs. For example they did not sit in the office of the Divân itself, called Divân-akbâm (in the Top Kapu Sarayî or "Old Serai"), but remained seated outside of the room in a place called reîs tâhkâr, "the bench of the reîs"; where there were also seats for certain other officials to wait upon. In the formal sittings, even in those like the distribution of pay (çulîfe) to the Janissaries which took place in the presence of foreign ambassadors, the part played by the reîs was rather limited. He carried in with slow step and the sleeves of his jacket turned up the bag containing the vîkhis (cf. above). He kissed the hem (etek) of the grand vizier's robe, placed the bag on his left, kissed the hem of his robe again and withdrew to his place. He came in again to open the bag, handed the documents to
the grand vizier, took them back from him to fold them (kühüllüms); sealed them and gave them to the teşkilât. If he was unable to be present, the bag of the teşkilât was handed to the grand vizier by the şuâ's teşkeleği (Kamu-nâme of Ābd ul-Rahmân Pasha, p. 85, 123 etc.).

Lucas (Società It. San Remo) Paris 1712, p. 216) writes that during the audience given by the grand vizier to the French Ambas-sador "le Ray Afsendy ou Grand Chancelier demeuré debout et appuye contre la muraille".

Things were changed at the reform of the Diwan effected at the beginning of his reign (1792) by Selim iv., by limiting the power of the grand vizier. The old Diwan consisted of six wazirs of the dome (having only one consultative voice), of the Mafi (Šaikh al-Islam) and the two kâşîbers. The new Diwan was to consist of 10 members, by right of office and others chosen in different ways (about 40 in all). The members, by right of office were the Kâsha Bey, the Re's Efendi, the Grand Deftednâ, the Çelebi Efendi, the Tersânci Eminî, the Çawsh Bâhi (Zinkesm, Geschichte, viii., 1861, p. 321).

The office of reis tended more and more to become the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Sublime Porte, parallel to the post of Kâsha Bey (interior). Suppression of the dignity of reis. — The title of reis was suppressed by the kâçi-kümayrân of Sultan Mahmut II addressed on Friday 27th June "Kâsha 1251 (March 11, 1836), to the grand vizier Mehmed Emin Pasha. The Turkish text will be found in the Silâhname of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs: the French translation (or at least parts of it) was published in the Moniteur Ottoman of April 23, 1836 (according to A. L. Vicent, Lettres Sur la Turquie, p. 38, note 1). This document at the same time created two new minisîres (meczîret) which in memory of their origin are continued in the end by the same building as the grand vizierate [cf. Fâti'ül in Suppl.]: 1. the Ministry of the Interior (originally of civil affairs or umâr-ü mârûf, later hâşhâbi) replacing the department of the Kâsha Bey, and 2. the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (hâşhâbi) replacing that of the reis. The preamble said that, abandoning the old regulations of the service, the sultan had thought it advisable to create real posts of wazir (meczevîret) and not honorary ones, but without its being necessary to give the new wazir of foreign affairs the title of pâsha (q.v.), "which is mainly a military one".

Bibliography: By far the most important source is the work known as Seifalet al-Kâri'c, which consists of: 1. Ahmad Resmî's work (Babinger, G. O.R., p. 300 sqq.) which contains the biographies of 64 reis down to Râhîb Mehmed Efendi (1157 = 1744), and 2. its continuation by Sulaimân Fâti Efendi which contains the biographies of 30 reis down to Ahmad Wâsîf Efendi at the beginning of the 19th century. According to the preface to Sulaimân Fâti's (not Fâtik) continuation, Ahmad Resmî had entitled his work Halefs al-Kâri'c in imitation of the Halefs al-Wazirât of ʿOthmân-nâme Tâhi, but changed it at the suggestion of Râhîb Pasha to Seifalet al-Kâri'c. The references in the Catalogue of Turkish MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale by E. Blochet, n. 158, should be corrected accordingly. The word hâşhâbi apparently makes no sense, that of hâshîfat which is usually found in other works (Flügel, Cat., ii. 407, No. 1250; Babinger; Brusali Mehmed Tahir, iii. 59 note), does not seem correct either. One ought undoubtedly to read khâşîfat (which rhymes with the hâshîfat of the prototype). The Seifalet al-Kâri'c was published by the State Press in Istanbul in 1869. Cf. also in addition to the references in the text: Mouradgea d'Ohsson, Ekat de l'Empire Ottoman, vii., 1824, index; Joseph von Hammer, des Osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, Vienna 1815, ii. index; Kanun-nâme of Tewfik (nizâamî) Ābd ul-Rahmân Pasha, written in 1887 (1676–1677) and ed. by F. Koprulu (M. T. M., p. 508); Es'âd Efendi, Teşkefîâtî Develî-i 'Aliyê, p. 85, 123 etc.; Silah-nâme-i Neîşet-i Khâlîfîye, 1st year, 1301 (1885). Impressive Ebuzziya, Istanbul (contains in addition a historical resume and a chronological list of all the grand visiers and all the reis). Charles Perry, A View of the Levant, particularly of Constantinople etc., London 1743, p. 36. — On the şâhib al-dowlan or reis ('al-dowlan, see Kâsha Khâşib, Sâbâ al-Asbâb, i. 101 sqq.; vi. 14, 17–18, 50: Massé, Code de la Chancellerie d'Etat... d'Ibn al-Sa'îrâf, in R. F. C. C., xi. 79 sqq. — Among the Sâjidüs, the offices of şâhib al-dowlan and peraâme were quite separate: cf. Houtsma, Recueil d. Textes... Seldi, iii. 105. (J. Deny) REIYO, the name given in Muslim Spain to the administrative circle (kâra) comprising the south of the Peninsula, the capital of which was successively Archidona (Arabic: Irdughâna) and Málaga. The usual Arabic orthography is ج. م. A particular this is the form found in the Muğan al-Bulûn of Yâkût: but some Spanish MSS. give the true orthography ج. م. more in keeping with the local pronunciation Reiyo (Raiyû) attested by Ibn Hawkal. It is only, as Dozy thought, a transcription of the Latin regio (no doubt Malacitana rei): the suggestion put forward by Gayangos of a connection with the Persian town-name al-Raiy - of course untenable. When the fiefs in the south of Spain were assigned to the former companions of Baldâb Mehzeh (q.v.), the district of Reiyo was allotted to the dâmir of Aljôn (al-Ordûm). During the Umayyad caliphate of Cordova, the kâra of Reiyo was bounded by those of Cábra and Algeciras in the west, by the Mediterranean in the south and by the kâra of Elvira in the east. Bibliography: al-Idrisî. Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, ed. and transl. Dozy and de Goeje, p. 174, 204 of the text, 209, 250 of the transl.: Yâkût. Muğan al-Bulûn, ed. Wustenfeld, n. 892 (cf. ii. 826); Ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min al-Himyari, al-Rawd al-mâsîr, Spain, No. 81; Dozy, Recherches 3, i. 317–320; Alemany Boulanger. La geographie de la Peninsula ibérique en los escritores arabes, Granada 1921, p. 118: E. Lévi-Provençal. L'Espagne musulmane au XVe siecle, Paris 1932, p. 116–118. (E. Lévi-Provençal) RESHT, first a district, then a town, and lastly the capital of the province of Gilan in Persia. As Y. Barthold points out (Gilan p. 1), it belonged to the Umayyads, but in the first Clement, and afterwards, to the Seljuks. The Seljuks held it as a portion of their domains in Persia, and it was a seat of learned men and of an independent college (tâleke), under the name of the "Sâhib al-Dowlan," till the end of the 13th century.
information regarding the history and historical geography of Gilān is so far very scanty. Le Strange's remark that the position of the chief towns of Gilān cannot be exactly given is still true. The Tumanski MS. (tenth century) is the earliest to inform us that before the foundation of towns their names were already in existence as those of districts. In particular seven districts are mentioned in the eastern part of Gilān on this side of the river — Biepas (Islam having penetrated there from the east), and eleven in the western part on the other side of the river — Biepas. Among the seven eastern districts we find one called Lāhidjān (i.e. Lāhidjān) and among the eleven western ones that of Resht. The towns of this name did not exist at this time. They are not mentioned, in fact, until the Mongol period.

General. Gilān is now divided into 19 districts (of which five are called Hamse-yi-Tavārīk), that of Mawāzī with Resht, capital of the province, being the most important. According to Rabino (1917), the town of Resht has a population of 30,000 and the district of Mawāzī 90,500 out of the total of 339,300 for the province. These figures must have increased by now. Resht, also called Dar ul-Marz or “frontierland”, lies between two small rivers, the Sīhātrūrāb or Seigilān in the east and the Gowher-rūd in the west, which unite and flow into the Bay of Enteli (now Pehlevi), which is eight miles from the town. The bazaars occupy a considerable part of the centre of the town, which is traversed by dark and narrow streets. Only a few years ago Resht had very few broad streets and was only partly paved. Recently there have been steps taken to improve matters. The town is divided into 7 ma‘alles: Zāhedān, Ma‘alles-yey-bāzār, Khumairān, Khumairān-e-Zāhedān, Šātam Sēra, Čumār Sēra and Kiyāb. It has some 6,000 houses, 3,300 shops, 20 caravanserais for merchants and 25 for caravans, 40 mosques, 12 sanctuaries, 36 tekkes, 6 medreses, 35 baths, and 7 bridges (all these figures refer to the period before the War). Among the mosques only the Masdjid-i Şafī, the oldest, seems to be of any interest. Ḥasan Beg, author of the Ahsan al-Tawārīkh, calls it Masdjid-i Şafī and adds that when Ismā’īl Šāh fled from Ardabil to Gilān, he spent some time near this mosque. In its courtyard there is a well into which women throw silver in order that their prayers may be granted. The Imām-Żade Sāyiḏ Abū Dja‘far is the most important sanctuary of Resht, near the governor’s palace. The holy man buried there is called Abī Ḥalīl Fūmeni Šuṭān Dja‘far whence the name of the quarter Šuṭān Sēra. The ladies of Resht have always had the reputation of being of easy virtue. According to a poet of the country, Mewla Sa‘īd Gilānī: “the young women of Resht, like intoxicated peacocks, used to go seeking a purchaser in every bazaar, holding in their hands the knot of their trousers”.

There are in Resht two important classes: the Ta‘īfe-yey Hādījī Sāmī (who came originally from Tabriz) and the Al-e Umīsh (of very humble local country origin). The language of the common people of Resht is a dialect of Gilaki. The upper, lower, and middle classes use Persian. Azari-Turkish is also spoken. The inhabitants are all Shi‘is except for a few Bahā‘. Gilān was converted to Islam only at the beginning of the tenth century by the ‘Ali l-Imām Ḥasan b. ‘Ali al-Uṯrash after a popular rising against the Djuştānīds (cf. Barthold, Istoriya-Geografskii Obzor Irana, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 156). All the people of the Biepas were of the Hanbalī school except the chiefs of Fūmen and the inhabitants of Kūcīsphān (Ṣāfā‘īs). It was only after the annexation of Gilān to the kingdom of Persia by the Šafavīs that the people of the Biepas became converted from the Sunna to the Shi‘a. According to another story however, Islām was preached in Dālam and Gilān in the year 290 (903) by the Saiyid Nāṣir Kāber, one of the ‘Alī pretenders to the caliphate, who belonged to the Zaidī Shi‘a, “of which he was one of the learned men and an author”; in this account the conversion to Islām is placed under the auspices of the Shi‘a (cf. Sheikhār-e-pan nām by S. A. Kasrawī Tabrizī, Teherān 1928, l. 32). The last traces of the religion of Zoroaster have not yet disappeared from Gilān. People look for white cocks because their crowing presages good fortune; the custom is observed of lighting a fire and jumping over it (for šombe-yi Zigzer-e-šāh). On the road from Fūmen, about one mile from Resht, a place preserves the name of Ateşghād. S. A. Kasrawī (op. cit., p. 31) does not however seem certain that Zoroastrianism was widespread in Gilān. Generally speaking, the people were indifferent in matters of religion. We may however note that many trees, called saints, ṣīr or buṣurg-wār, are objects of worship, especially on the part of women (cf. notably: Wellān near the Arteḵ bridge; Čehel Dōkhter and Aghā Bibi Zaināb).

Resht is the principal export and import market for trade with Russia. Its importance as the economic centre of Gilān varies with the rise and fall in the silk-culture. Barthold thinks (op. cit.) that the development of urban life and industry in Gilān belongs to a period later than the tenth century. The geographers of the tenth century mention the cultivation of the silkworm and silks only in Tabariţeh and Kāshān. In the eleventh century and later the silk of Gilān was particularly famous. At the end of this century, the silk of Gilān, according to Marco Polo, was sought by Genoese merchants, whose vessels first appeared in the Caspian shortly before Marco Polo wrote.

History. S. A. Kasrawī (op. cit.) gives a sketch of the dynasties of the Djuştānīds (end of the second to the beginning of the fourth century A.H.), Kangāxids (beginning of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century A.H.), and Șāfīxids (fourth century) who, especially the first, played a certain part in the destinies of Gilān.

In Rabino’s work we have a complete historical survey from the Mongol conquest (1307) to the Persian revolution. The Tumanski MS., unknown to Rabino, contains some information about the preceding period.

In it Gilān is described as a populous and wealthy country. All the work was done by women. The men had no occupation except fighting. Throughout Dālam and Gilān in every village there were one or two fights a day: every village fought with every other. Many people were often killed in a single day. These quarrels and battles went on until the men went to war or died or grew old. When they grew old they became pious and were called mawṣūd mard-e-rā‘īf (knowing the customs). In all the districts of Gilān, if any one insulted another or became intoxicated or committed any act that caused injury, he was punished with
The Tumaniski MS. does not give the distances between the towns nor any form of itinerary. The only one known is that of Makhkīzī who wrote some years later than the author of the Tumaniski MS. The principal town of Gilān at this time was Dūlāb. As Rabino points out, the only period of independence in the history of the district of Resht (Reshtān), was between the beginning of the eighth century (706 = 1306-1307) and the end of the ninth (850 = 1457-1467) which was spent in fighting with neighbouring chiefs of Fūmen and Lāhīdjān. The former were victorious and for a time the Biepas, including Resht, was under the _LSākī dynasty of Fūmen. With the coming of sulṭān Ahmad Khān of Biepal the Lāhīdjān dynasty won the upper hand. This period lasted from 911 (1506) till 1592 i.e. till the annexation of Gilān to Persia by Shāh 'Abbās. Among the events of this period was the establishment in Gilān, of which Resht became the administrative and economic centre, of the “Moscowite Company” founded in 1557 (Anthony Jenkinson, Richard and Robert Johnson), who taking the Russian route sent ten expeditions into Persia between 1561 and 1581. It is to note-worthy that the last independent ruler of Gilān, Ahmad Shāh, sent ambassadors to Moscow to seek help against Shāh 'Abbās and obtained promises of protection which however came to nothing. The Cossacks at the same time were plundering in Gilān and Resht and trying to gain the support of the Persian court. The most notable invasion was that of Shēnka Razīn who sacked Resht in 1645 (1636). On the 2nd Safar 1082, the day of Shēnka’s execution, the Persians in Moscow at the time were invited to be present at it (cf. the magazine Kātedr. No. 12, N.S., Dec. 1, 1921). From 1732 to 1734, Resht and Gilān were occupied by the Russians (Shipov, then Matshikhin) invited by the governor who was threatened by the Afghāns. In 1734, Gilān was restored to Persia after a treaty. Rabino quotes a Persian testimony in favour of the Russian occupation. For military reasons the Russians cleared the jungle round Resht.

The history of Gilān and that of Resht, which has always played a preponderant part in it, merges into the general history of Persia after its annexation. We may however touch on a few points in the very modern period short of which Rabino’s work stops. During the Persian Revolution, a body of Social Democrats was sent by the Regional Committee of the Caucasus to Resht, and there helped in Feb. 1909 to overthrow the authority of the Shāh and to establish a revolutionary committee which elected as governor the Sepedhār ʿArām, who played a prominent part in the history of the period along with Serdār Asad Bakhtryārī (cf. Persia v borše za mexavëšmentor, Pavlovic i Transilvanii, Moskow 1925). Resht then became the base of operations of the northern revolutionary army. A few years later, during the Great War, Resht again attracted attention in connection with the movement of the djangeli. Created by Mirza Kūtik Khān, the object of which was to fight against foreign occupation of Persian territory. Assisted by German (von Paschen), Turkish and Russian officers, an armed force was organised to oppose the passage of the English troops under General Dunsterville on their way to Bākū, without much success however (battle of Mendjil, June 12, 1918). The English were able to force their way through with the help of Bıčerákhon’s detachment of Cossacks and established a garrison in Resht. A second battle with the djangeli in the town itself on July 20, 1918 also ended in an English victory. On Aug. 25, peace was signed with Kūtik Khān at Enzeli. At one time, at the end of March 1918, the position of Kūtik Khān was so strong that the capture not only of Kazdın, but even of Teherān was feared. The English Vice-Consul at Resht, Mr. Maclaren, the manager of the Imperial Bank of Persia in this town, Mr. Oaksbot. and Captain Noel of the Intelligence Service were taken prisoners by the djangeli, the latter being held for five months (cf. The Adventures of Dunsterforce by Maj. Gen. L. C. Dunsterville, London 1920).

Resht again became the arena of the revolutionary movement in 1920. After the capture of Bākū on April 28, 1920, by the Reds, the White Fleet sought refuge in the port of Enzeli, which was held by the English. Comrade Raskolnikov, commander of the Red Fleet in the Caspian, pursuing the Whites occupied Enzeli on May 18, 1920 and forced the English to beat a hurried retreat. The appearance of Soviet troops at Enzeli encouraged the revolutionary movement in Gilān and on June 4. a revolutionary and anti-English government of Northern Persia was proclaimed at Resht with Kūtik Khān at its head.

At the first appearance of Red forces at Enzeli and Resht, the peasants had refused to take the land which the communists proposed to take from the landowners. The peasants feared that the khāns would return and make them pay dearly for their expropriation. But at the second occupation (Oct. 1920) of Resht by the Reds the peasants greeted them frantically. Large numbers of them came among the Red soldiers and said that now they would not deliver rice to the landowners any longer and that they would seize all the harvest. The military situation was however confused. After the evacuation of Enzeli the English at first remained on in expectation of events, but they were forced to retire from Resht in June, setting fire to all their military stores. A month later they left Mondjil blowing up the bridge over the Sefid Rūd and began to return to Baghādād. In the meantime the Teherān Government had sent a military expedition against the revolutionaries in Resht. After initial successes, the Persian Cossack brigade suffered checks. It was after this that the second occupation of Resht by the Reds mentioned above took place.

On their side, the English demanded on Oct. 25, 1920 the dismissal of the Russian (White) officers, the instructors of the brigade, who were to be replaced by English. Musht al-Dawla’s government refused to agree to this and resigned on Oct. 27. It was replaced on Nov. 1 by that of Sepedhār, which acceded to the English demands, so that all the armed forces of Persia were now under English control. The latter then on Dec. 19, 1920, sent an ultimatum to the Teherān government ordering the meqlit to be summoned with a view
to the ratification of the Anglo-Persian treaty of Aug. 9, 1919. The English plans were however thwarted by the rapprochement between Persia and the Soviets. On May 20, 1920, Teheran notified Moscow of her recognition of the Soviet Republic of Adharbaidjan, and her desire to enter into pour-parders with the R.S.F.S.R. Having reached Moscow at the beginning of November the Persian delegate Musghawar al-Memalek opened negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty with the Soviets. On Nov. 28, Moscow asked Teheran to accept the Soviet envoy, M. Rothstein. After an attempt in Jan. 1921 to regain the position lost in the north of Persia, where the Soviets still had their troops, by inspiring the Persian note of Jan. 23, which demanded that the Soviets should withdraw their forces from Gilan, the English, in view of Moscow’s firm refusal, took the first steps to remove their troops from Persia and on Feb. 26, 1921 Persia and the R.S.F.S.R. signed a treaty re-establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries. On April 25, 1921, M. Rothstein came to Teheran and in the course of the year the Soviet and English troops left Persian territory. Gilan and Resht then returned definitely to Persia. The last echoes of the revolution in Gilan were the risings of Kerbeli Ibrahim and of Saiyid Djilali in 1921 and 1922.

Bibliography: H. L. Rabino’s work, Les Provinces Caspiennes de la Perse, Le Gilan, in R. M. M., xxxii., 1915–1916, is authoritative. It contains a very complete bibliography to which we can only add, in addition to a few books and articles mentioned above in the text, a curious brochure entitled Teyseyiye Hafiz, written by Hadrji Saiyid Mahmod of Resht and published in 1910. It deals with the agrarian system in Gilan.—La domination des Dailamites by V. Minorsky (publ. by the Societe des Etudes Iran., No. 3, Paris 1932) may also be mentioned.

(E. NIKITINE)

RESMI, AHMAD, OTTOMAN STATESMAN AND HISTORIAN. Aljmad b. Ibrahim, known as Resmi, belonged to the Kethunyo (Turk. Resmo: hence his epithet) in Crete and was of Greek descent (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., viii. 202). He was born in 1112 (1700) and came in 1146 (1733) to Stamboul where he was educated, married a daughter of the Reis Efendi Ta’bdkji Musafa and entered the service of the Porte. He held a number of offices in various towns (cf. Siqjil-i ottmanii, ii. 380 sq.). In Safar 1171 (Oct. 1757) he went as Ottoman envoy to Vienna and on his return made a written report of his impressions and experiences. In Dhu l-Ka’dad 1176 (May 1763) he was again sent to Europe, this time as ambassador to the Russian court in Berlin. He also wrote a very full account of this mission, which early attracted attention, in the west also, for its views on Russian policy, its description of Berlin and its inhabitants and all sorts of observations on related topics. After filling a number of other important offices he died on the 2nd Shawwal 1197 (Aug. 31, 1783; on this date cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 309, note 2) in Stamboul. His tomb is in the Selimiye quarter of Scutarli.

In addition to the descriptions already mentioned of his embassies (cf. for instance) to Vienna and Berlin, Aljmad Resmi wrote in connection with the Russo-Turkish war and the peace of Küçük Kaynarzane, (1769–1774) a treatise entitled Khatteset-ul-Pitakah, in which as a participant in the campaign and eye-witness, he gave his impressions of this important period in the history of Turkey. Of especial value are his biographical collections, particularly his Khattset el-Ri’esa (composed in 1157 = 1744) with the biographies of 64 chancellors (reis efendiler), and his Humicdlet (Hamidlet) ul-Kubara, in which he gives the lives of the chief eunuchs of the Imperial Harem (bijdar aghzalar). Of a similar nature is his continuation (written in 1177 = 1766) of the “deaths” (cf. Savat) of Mehem Emin b. Haddji Mehemd called Alay-Beyli-zade, in which he gives in twelve lists the deaths of famous men and women (cf. the accurate list of contents in J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 187 sq., No. 14). He also wrote several other works on geology and proverbs. His reports of embezzles are available in numerous manuscripts (cf. the list in Babinger, G. O. W., p. 311, to which should be added: Berlin, SansKri, MS. Or. 4° 1502, fol. 239 to 46 [incomplete], Paris Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Turc No. 510 [2], Paris, Cl. Huart Coll.), printed editions and translations, which are listed by Babinger, G. O. W., p. 311.

To these is to be added the Polish translation Podroz Resmi Ahmed-Efendego de Polski i poselstwo jeg do Prus 1777 (according to Wasif, Ta’bdk, i. 239 sq.) in J. S. Sekowsky, Collectanea z Dziejopisw Turcickich, vol. ii., Warsaw 1825, p. 222–289.

Bibliography: Siqjil-i ottmanii, ii. 380 sq.; Brussali Mehemd Tahir, Ottmanii Med’lifleri, iii. 58 sq. (with list of works); F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 309–312.

(FRANZ BABINGER)

REWANI, AN OTTOMAN POET. His real name was Ilyas or Shuda and he belonged to Adrianople. He is said to have taken his pen-name of Rewani from the river Tandja which flowed past (rewani) his garden. He entered the service of Sultan Bayazid II (1481–1512) in Stamboul and was sent by him as administrator of the suqer, the annual sum for the poor of Mecca and Medina, to the holy cities to distribute the money. He embalmed part of it however and on the accusation of the Meccans his salary was stopped; a malady of the eyes, which then affected Rewani, was described by a poet hostile to him as the just punishment of God, whereupon Rewani answered him, also in verse, and calmly confessed: “He who has honey licks his fingers”. He then fled to the court of Prince Selim in Trebizond and entered his service. But he had to disappear from here also as he had committed some indiscretion and his property was confiscated (some sources put his appointment to the suqer at this date); he was however pardoned by Selim and henceforth served him all the more faithfully. When Selim in 918 (1512) came to Stamboul to dethrone his father Bayazid, Rewani is said at the last decisive council of war to have thrown his turban in the air with joy and to have praised the day. After Selim’s accession he was appointed superintendent of the kitchen (maftab bah emini), then entrusted with the administration of the Aya Sofya and of the hot baths (kutuhija) in Brusa. He built a mosque in the Kik Cehme quarter of Stamboul which was called after him and he was buried there on his death in 930 (1523).

Rewani left a dervish and a mehmetu entitled ‘Isher-name or Kitab-i Walla’i. In the still unpublished mehmetu, which is not very long, he describes the drinking bouts of his time in all
brought it within the range of Islamic expeditions on several occasions.

In the first century of the Hijra, the Caliph Mu'awiya [q. v.] sent a fleet under the command of Diuana b. Abi Umayya al-Azdi to invade Rhodes. The date is variously placed in 52 and 53 (672-73) (see Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, for this variance in the sources). Little is known about this early expedition, except that the Arabs founded a short-lived settlement, which was evacuated in 60 (679-680) by the order of the second Umayyad Caliph Yazid [q. v.]. The island was thus recovered by the Byzantine Empire with whose historical sources the Arab occupation is long remembered by the complete destruction and sale of the famous bronze "Colossus of Rhodes" to a Jewish merchant of Emesa. The metal is said to have amounted to 880 camel-loads.

In 1308 or 1310 A.D., during the reign of Andronicus II Palaeologus, Rhodes was seized by the Knights Hospitallers who had been expelled from 'Akkā in 1291 by Sultan Khalil [q. v.], son of 'Abd al-'Azīz. The Order of Saint John of Jerusalem now came to be known as the Knights of Rhodes, under whose rule the island became a thorn in the side of Islam as one of the strongest outposts of Latin Christianity in the Levant. Thence the Knights played a prominent part in most of the forthcoming crusades against Turkey and Egypt, notably in the capture of Smyrna in 1444, the sack of Alexandria in 1565 and in the Crusade of Nikopolis (q. v.) in 1396. The second of these attacks determined the Egyptians to start a series of counter-offensive expeditions against Cyprus and Rhodes. Three naval expeditions in 1424, 1425 and 1426 resulted in the annexation of Cyprus as a tributary state to Egypt.

The Mamluks then turned their plans to the conquest of Rhodes during the reign of Çânak. In 1440, they manned a flotilla of 15 galleys with 200 regulars and several hundred volunteers. These sailed from Damietta to Cyprus for revictualling and to 'Alīya in Asia Minor, where its Muslim Amir reinforced them with more warriors and four galleys, then direct to Rhodes. The Knights were, however, prepared for the attack, and, after a few skirmishes, the Mamluk fleet retreated under cover of night. In 1443, another fleet sailed from Damietta to Barli, Tripoli, Larnaca, Limassol and Adalia to collect free provisions from subject and friendly states. Their first objective was the little island of Châteauroux or Castellorizo, known in the contemporary Arabic sources as Khâshi al-Rūbi. This island belonged to the Knights, and the Egyptians had no difficulty in occupying it. Afterwards they returned to Damietta owing to the approach of winter. In 1444, a third and more elaborate expedition was launched against Rhodes. The Egyptian fleet, carrying no less than a thousand Mamluks, sailed from Damietta to Tripoli and direct to Rhodes. This time they succeeded in landing on the Island and in setting siege to the city of Rhodes for a period of forty days, during which they pillaged all the neighbouring villages. Finally, the Knights sailed from the beleaguered town and took the offensive. Thus taken by surprise, the Egyptian army sustained considerable losses and sailed back to Damietta.

The success of the Knights in the repulse of so strong an enemy as Mamluk Egypt may be ascribed to three main causes: first, the system
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- Rhodes, the furthest island of the Archipelago to the east. Rhodes extends from S.W. to N.E. and is about twelve miles off the south coast of Asia Minor. Its length is approximately 45 miles and its greatest breadth from 20 to 25 miles. The island rises gradually from the sea to a central range of mountains, the highest peak of which is that of Mount Artamiti. 6,000 feet above sea-level. Its geographical situation within reasonable reach of the three Continents of the Old World explains its importance in maritime history; and its nearness to the empires of the Arabs, Egyptians and Ottomans in succession...
of espionage which the Order maintained in all hostile countries in order to keep their headquarters in perfect readiness for effective action at the appropriate moment; second, the great strength of the fortification of Rhodes which was made possible by its prosperity as one of the chief centres of trade in the Levant; and third, the nature of the military training of the Knights, their unity and their extraordinary valour in battle. Peace was eventually established between Egypt and Rhodes through the mediation of Jacques Cœur, the great French merchant prince of the fifteenth century, who was in favour at the court of the Sultan. The task of a decisive counter-crusade against Rhodes remained for the Ottoman Sultans. Muhammad II besieged the capital with some slender measure of success in 1480; but it was not till the reign of Sultan the Magnificent [q.v.] that the Knights were finally overthrown after one of the most heroic defences ever known.

On December 24, 1522, the island became the seat of a Turkish Pasha, and remained under Ottoman sovereignty until it was captured by Italy during the war of 1912 and finally passed to Italian rule by virtue of the Treaty of Lausanne (July 24, 1923).


In the year 1912, during the war between Turkey and Italy, the Italians occupied the island of Rhodes and the Southern Sporades and held them till 1923 when Turkey (treaty of Lausanne) renounced all claim to Rhodes and the islands, which are now under the sovereignty of Italy, and constitute the "Possedimento delle isole italiane dell'Egeo"; the principal islands are 14 in number; we give them here with their historical Turkish names which are really Greek, in brackets (with the exception of Indjirda): Rodi (Rodos), Calchi (Karki and Khaki), Calino (Kalimnos), Caso (Kaşhî), Castelrosso (Kastelorizo, Meyis), Coo (Istankoy), Lero (Leros), Lissos (Lipnos), Nisiro (Nisinos, Indjirdî), Patmo (Patmos), Piscopi (Piskopis, Tilos, Eliyäki), Scarpanto (Kerpe), Simi (Sambeki), Stampalia (Astropalai). The extent of the "Possedimento" is 2,607 km. and the total population 130,855 (census of April 21, 1931) of whom 54,818 are in the island of Rhodes. The inhabitants are distributed as regards language and religion as follows: 104,485 Greek Orthodox speaking Greek, 8,276 Muslims speaking Turkish, 4,481 Jews speaking Spanish Hebrew, 8,000 Roman Catholics speaking Italian. The Muslims are in the islands of Rhodes and Crete. Like the rest of the population, the Muslims are exempted from military service; they have elementary schools, a madîresse in Rhodes, special unearthly at Rhodes and Crete for questions of private law.

Turkish and Muhammadan monuments. The Turks did not modify very much the topography of Rhodes; at most they did something to intensify an appearance already generally oriental; they turned the churches into mosques and built new ones; the most remarkable are the mosque of the Sultan Pasha (917 = 1540–1541), the mosque of Redjeb Pasha (996 = 1587–1588), the mosque of Murâd Re'îs (celebrated Re'îs killed in a naval battle off Cypria in 1609), built by Âbu Bakr Pasha in 1646 (1636–1637) and repaired by Murâbît (Hasan Bey in 1212 (1717–1718), the mosque of Sultan Mustâfî (1178 = 1764). The mosque of Sultan Sulaimân is modern.

We may also mention the library at Rhodes which contains Arabic, Persian and Turkish MSS., founded as a waqf between 1791–1792 and 1799 by the Rhodian Hâfîz Ahmed Agha.

The Muslim cemeteries, which lie under the walls of the fortress, go back in part to the siege of 1522; there are many tombs of men of note who died in captivity or exile in Rhodes in the enclosures of the tekke of Murâd Re'îs; among them we may mention: Djânî Girîş Khan (d. 1636), Shâhîn Girî Khan (killed 1640), Sa'âdet Girîyân Khan (d. 1665); Sâfi (the pretended son of Husain, Shâh of Persia, d. 1175 = 1755–1756), the poet Hashîmet (d. 1182 = 1768–1769), the grand vizier Yusuf Pasha (killed in 1757), the general 'Abd al-Karim Pasha (d. 1302 = 1884–1885).

**Bibliography:** Bilotti and Cottret, *L'île de Rhodes,* Rhodes 1881; C. Torr, *Rhodes in

RIBA (A), lit. increase, as a technical term, usury and interest, and in general any unjustified increase of capital for which no compensation is given. Derivatives from the same root are used in other Semitic languages to describe interest.

1. Transactions with a fixed time limit and payment of interest, as well as speculations of all kinds, formed an essential element in the highly developed trading system of Mecca (cf. Lammens, La Meque à la veille de l'islam, p. 139 sqq., 155 sqq., 215 sqq.). Among the details given by the Muslim sources, we may believe at least the statement that a debtor who could not repay the capital (money or goods) with the accumulated interest at the time it fell due, was given an extension of time in which to pay, but at the same time the sum due was doubled. This is clearly referred to in two passages in the Qurʾān (Sūra ii. 130: xxx. 39) and is in keeping with a still usual practice. As early as Sūra xxx. 30 of the third Meccan period (on the dating cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qorʾān, i.) the Qurʾān contrasts ribā with the obligation to pay zālidḥ without the foresight for it. What ever ye give in usury to gain interest from men's substance shall not bear interest with Allāh, but what ye give as zālidḥ in seeking the face of Allāh, that shall bear double.” The express prohibition follows in Sūra ii. 130 (Mecca, obviously earlier than the following passage). “Believers, do not seek usury as a gain double” (this prohibition was to be intensified in Sūra ii. 275–280, evidently of the earlier Medinese period, cf. on the following passage). “Those who devours ribā shall only rise again as one whom Satan strikes with his touch; because they say, ‘selling is like usury’. but Allāh has permitted selling and forbidden usury. He therefore who receives a warning from his Lord and abstains shall have pardon for what is past and his affair is with Allāh; but they who relapse to usury, are the people of Hell, they shall remain in it for ever. Allāh abhors usury and maketh alm散布 bring interest; Allāh loveth not sinful unbelievers. … Believers, fear Allāh and remit the balance of the ribā if ye be believers. But if ye do not, be prepared for war from Allāh and his apostle. If ye repent, ye shall receive your capital without doing an injustice or suffering injustice. If any one is in difficulty, let there be a delay till he is able to pay, but it is better for you to remit if ye he wise”. To evade the dogmatic difficulty of an eternal punishment for the sin of a believer, the passage in question (already presupposed in Tabari) has been interpreted to mean that by relapse is meant the holding lawful and no:

the taking of interest; in any case the Qurʾān regards ribā as a practice of unbelievers and demands as a test of belief that it should be abandoned. It comes up again in Sūra iv. 161 (of the period between the end of the year 3 and the end of the year 5, this also gives a clue to the date of the preceeding passage) in a passage which sums up the reproaches levelled against the Jews: “And because they take ribā, while it was forbidden them and nevour uselessly the substance of the people”. The fact that the principal passages against interest belong to the Medina period and that the Jews are reproached with breaking the prohibition, suggests that the Muslim prohibition of ribā owes less to conditions in Mecca than to the Prophet’s closer acquaintance with Jewish doctrine and practice in Medina. In the later development of the teaching on the subject as we find it in tradition, Jewish influence is in any case undeniable (cf. Juynboll, Hand- leiding, p. 286).

2. The traditions give varying answers to the question what forms of business come under the Qurʾānic prohibition of ribā, none of which can be regarded as authoritative. The ignorance of the correct interpretation is emphasised in a tendentious tradition, obviously put into circulation by interested individuals (the tradition is probably older than Lammens, op. cit., p. 214, thinks); according to this view, the principal passage in Sūra ii. 280 is the latest in the whole Qurʾān, which the Prophet could not expound before his death. That the rigid prohibition of usury in Muhammadan law only developed gradually is clear from many traditions. Alongside of the view repeatedly expressed, but also challenged, that ribā consists only in (the increase of substance in) a business agreement with a fixed period (nasalat, nasīrat, dain) we have the still more distinct statement that there is no ribā if the transfer of ownership takes place immediately (raḍan bi-yayf). But even in arrangements with a time limit, a number of traditions presuppose a general ignorance of the later restrictions: for example we are told that in Baṣra under the Tabārānī gold was sold on credit for silver (this may be an anti-Umayyad bias — cf. below on Muʿawya—but it is illuminating); but at a later date such details of the traditions against ribā were to some extent dropped. What was generally understood in the earliest period as the ribā forbidden in the Qurʾān, seems only to have been interest on loans (chiefly of money and foodstuffs); anything that goes beyond this is to be regarded as a later development. The reason for such prohibitions is at different times said to be the fear of ribā and sometimes we have underlying the recognition that there is no tradition of the Prophet relating to this. This is also expressed in the form that nine-tenths of the permitted is renounced or that ribā was conceived as going as far as ten times the capital. The view which later became authoritative is laid down in a group of traditions of which one characteristic example is added: “gold for gold, silver for silver, wheat for wheat, barley for barley, dates for dates, salt for salt, the same thing for the same thing, like for like, measure for measure; but if these things are different, sell them as you please if it is (only) done measure for measure”. Another common tradition expressly forbids the exchange of different quantities of the same thing but of different quality (cf. below).
Other traditions demand equality of quantity even in the sale of manufactured precious metals. This last case seems to have been especially discussed, and on more than one occasion Mu‘āwiyah appears as champion of the opposite view and practice (this again has a distinctly anti-Umayyad bias). Particularly conscientious people went even further in their limitation of ribā than the generality and would only exchange wheat for barley in equal quantities. Still stricter was the view that the exchange of even the same quantities of the same thing, especially of precious metals, was ribā. This view must be older than a difference from the usual opinion (e.g. Muslim, Rîbî bâ’i uthâram miṣbâh bi-miṣbâh), which is based on the secondary interpretation of an already recognised tradition, which obviously only forbade the exchange of different quantities of the same thing but of different quality (cf. above). This same general prohibition of exchange is also given for dates. The question whether any party to an agreement can voluntarily give the other a bonus, is denied for an exchange, but affirmed for a loan. The reduction of the amount of the debt if the loan is voluntarily paid before it falls due, is sometimes approved as the opposite of ribā, sometimes disapproved, sometimes forbidden as being equivalent to ribā; in any case it is clear that the practice existed. On the sale of an animal for an animal on credit, opinion is also not unanimous.

Numerous traditions forbid ribā without defining it more closely; the Prophet is said to have uttered this prohibition at his farewell migration (scarce historical). Ribā is one of the gravest sins. Even the least of its many forms is as bad as incest and so on. All who take part in transaction involving ribā are cursed, the guilty are threatened with hell, various kinds of punishment are described; in this world also gains from ribā will bring no good. In spite of all this tradition foresees that ribā will prevail.

In connection with ribā tradition mentions various antiquated forms of sale of special kinds, like muḥāṣala, muḥāṣara, muḍābana etc., which concern the exchange of different stages in the manufacture or development of the same thing, or of different qualities, and which are forbidden: an exception is made, obviously because of its undeniable practical end social necessity, of what is known as arṣa (plur. arṣâ), fresh dates on trees intended to be eaten, which is permitted to exchange in small quantities for dried dates.

3. While the existence of the Karâr nichrome of ribā has never been doubted, the difference of opinion that finds expression in tradition regarding the relevant facts is continued in the earliest stage of development of Muḥammadan law. Uncertainty prevails regarding the main lines of the limitations to be imposed upon the exchange of goods capable of ribā (māl ribāwî); it is only permitted if transfer of ownership takes place at once and, so far as goods of the same kind are concerned, only in equal quantities. In the case of a loan it is forbidden to make a condition that a larger quantity shall be returned without regard to the kind of article. Gold and silver are generally regarded as māl ribāwî (only quite exceptionally are coins of small denomination included). All the greater are the differences of opinion as to what things outside of the precious metals are liable to the ribā ordinances. In isolated cases one still finds views that show themselves un influenced in principle by the authoritative group of traditions (cf. above), e.g. when everything realisable is subject to the ribā ordinances (Ibn Kaisân) or all business dealings in things of the same kind (Ibn Sirin, Ḥammâd) or when everything liable to zakât is considered capable of ribā (Kâbî b. ‘Abd al-Râhîm). Other opinions differ in the treatment of property capable of ribā from that group of traditions, although it is not known what they understand by this; possibly if at an exchange of the same kind of thing not equality of quantity but equality of value in two quantities is demanded (Ḥasan al-Ḥâṣîr) or equality of quantity also in the exchange of different kinds apparently within a limited circle of goods capable of ribā (Sa’d b. Ḥujâlarî). The old interpretation that there is no ribā if the transfer of possession takes place at once is ascribed to ‘Aṭâ’ and the jurists of Medina. The views of most authorities however and in particular those which survive later in the law schools assume the literal acceptance of the text of that group of traditions and differ only in its interpretation. Thus there are mentioned as precursors of the later Zâhirî doctrine: Tâwâs, Masrûs, al-Sha’bî, Ḥâtâdâ, Ŝalmân al-Bâttî; as precursors of the Ḥanafî view: al-Zâhùrî, al-Ḥâkâm, Ḥammâd (cf. however above), Sufyân al-Thâwîrî; as precursors of the earlier view of al-Shâfî: Sa’d b. al-Muṣâyiüb and others; as precursors of his later view: al-Zâhûrî (cf. however above) and Yâhya b. Sa’d. On the question whether a loan can be made in another kind and whether or not defects are revealed in an exchange of māl ribâwî after it has changed hands, there are old differences of opinion.

4. In the above mentioned group of traditions the following goods in addition to gold and silver are expressly mentioned as bearing the prohibition of ribā at their exchange: wheat, barley, dates and salt (sometimes also raisins, butter and oil). The Zâhirîs, as a result of their refusal on principle to accept analogy (kiyâs), assume that the prohibition applies only to the six things especially named (the other kinds are rejected as not well attested). The other schools of law, on the other hand, consider the kinds mentioned in tradition only as examples of the variety of things that come under māl ribāwî, but differ from one another in their lists of these things. According to the Ḥanâfîs and Zâdîs (also al-Awāzî), gold and silver represent examples of the class of things defined by weight (mâṣâlah) and the four other things those sold by measure (mâlikî). The Islamic teaching is practically the same. According to the Mâlikîs and Shâfîs, gold and silver represent the class of precious metals and the four other things the class of foodstuffs: the latter, in the Mâlikî view, including actual edibles so far as they can be preserved, according to the older view of al-Shâfî, provisions which are sold by weight and measure; according to his later view, which is also that of his school, foodstuffs without any qualification. The teaching of the Ḥanbalîs corresponds to that of the Ḥanâfîs; as regards the “four kinds”, two further opinions of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal are handed down which correspond to the two views held by al-Shâfî. In these, wheat and barley are regarded as two different kinds by the Ḥanâfîs, the Shâfîs and the better known tradition of the Ḥanbalîs (as well as Zâhirîs, Zâdîs and Ima’mîs); as one kind
RIBĀ — RIBĀT

according to the Hanbalis (also according to al-Kath'īb b. Ṣadr and al-Awāzī'). The Hanafis and the Ḥanūfīs, in contrast to the other schools, are content, in so far as it is not a question of the exchange of precious metals, with fixing the quantities, and do not demand actual change of ownership during the negotiation (madā‘īrī). The Zāhiriyya, in the strict interpretation of the text of one tradition, in every case demand a change of ownership in the fullest sense at once. The sale of fresh dates for dried dates is forbidden by all schools except the Hanafis on the authority of one tradition, the bari‘āt on the other hand is not permitted by the Hanafis., but regulated by the other schools, without any uniformity: as regards exchange of the same material in different stages of manufacture there are many differences of opinion. As regards the exchange of goods of the same kind which are not māl nūbūg, the difference of quantity is generally permitted, postponement (yusī‘a, nāsī‘) of the single payment still forbidden by the Hanafis and Zāhiriyya, but permitted by the other schools (with differences in detail). At the sale of wares, even of those which are māl nūbūg, for precious metal, the payment at later date (salām) and sale on credit (bar’āt al-bimar) with postponement of delivery or of payment is permitted. The apparent contradiction of analogy in the salām, which forms a type of transaction by itself, has given rise to discussion on principle. The postponement of both sales of the transaction is regarded on the authority of a tradition as entirely forbidden in all agreements regarding sale or exchange.

The prohibition of ribā plays a considerable part in the system of Muhammadan law. The structure of the greater part of the law of contract is explained by the endeavour to enforce prohibition of ribā and māsit (i.e. risk; q.v.) to the last detail of the law (Biegstrasser, in ib., xiv. 79) Ribā in a loan exists not only when one insists upon the repayment of a larger quantity, but if any advantage at all is demanded. Therefore even exchange (tanzf) is sometimes actually forbidden (as by the Sha‘fi‘īs) because the vendor, who is regarded as the creditor, reaps the advantage of avoiding cost of transport. This did not prevent the widespread acceptance of this arrangement in the Arabic middle ages and its influence upon European money-lending. But they were always conscious that a direct breach of the prohibition of ribā was a deadly sin. Most Muslims to this day therefore not infrequently refuse to take bank interest. The importance of the prohibition of ribā on the one hand deeply affecting everyday life and the requirements of commerce on the other have given rise to a number of methods of evasion. Against some of these there is nothing formally to object from the standpoint of the law; they are therefore given in many lawbooks and expressly said to be permitted. The Sha‘fi‘īs, the later Hanafis and the Ḥanūfīs have recognised such methods of evasion which the Mālikis, the Hanbalis and the Zāhiriyya reject them. The recognition of these methods of evasion is not contrary to the strict enforcement of the prohibition in the fiqh. The inner significance of decrees of the divine law naturally cannot be understood by the mind of man. This is shown in the case of ribā in the limitation to certain kinds of goods. The Zāhiriyya are thus among the most energetic defenders of evasions of the prohibition of ribā. Their line of argument is based not only on their formal negative rejection of deduction by analogy but also upon their positive estimation of the intention underlying the evasions.

One of the oldest transactions of this kind against which several traditions are already directed, is the double contract of sale (from one of its elements it is called bar’āt al-fr‘is, credit sale par excellence); one sells to someone who wants to lend money at interest something against the total sum of capital and interest which are to be due at a fixed date, and at the same time buys the article back for the capital which is at once handed over. This transaction was taken over in mediaeval Europe under the name of mahātra (from the Ar. mahāṭara; cf. Juynboll, Handulding p. 289, note 1, and E. Basd, in Rivista di storia del diritto italiano, v., part 2). Another method of evasion consists of handing over to the creditor the use of a thing as interest by a fictitious agreement to sell or to pledge. All these practices are still in use and in spite of the prohibition of ribā money-lending is a flourishing business in most Muslim countries (50% is often regarded as moderate interest).


(JOSEPH SCHACHT)

RIBĀT (A.), a fortified Muhammadan monastery. Of the various explanations that have been given of this word from the root rat'āt: "to bind, attach," the most reasonable is that which refers to the Qur‘ān, vii. 62: "Prepare against them (the enemies of Allah) all that ye possess of strength and places for horses..." (muta‘ribāt 'l-khailī). The ribāt is originally a place where the mounts are assembled and hobbled to
be kept in readiness for an expedition. Ribāt also has the closely related meanings of relay of bances for a courier, caravaner. The word however was early applied to an establishment at once religious and military which seems quite specifically Muhammadan.

The institution of the ribāt is connected with the duty of the holy war [see DIHĀD], the defence of the lands of Islam and their extension by force of arms. The Byzantine empire was acquainted with the fortified monastery, like Mandrakion built at Carthage near the sea, mentioned by Procopius; but it seems doubtful if the monks living in it played any military part. The regular or occasional occupants of the ribāt are essentially fighters for faith. The ribāt are primarily fortresses, places of concentration of troops at exposed points on the Muhammadan frontier. Like western castles, they offer a refuge to the inhabitants of the surrounding country in time of danger. They serve as watch-towers from which an alarm can be given to the threatened populace and to the garrisons of the frontier and interior of the country who could support the efforts of the defenders. The structure of the ribāt therefore consisted of a fortified surrounding wall with living rooms, magazines of arms and storehouses for provisions and a tower for signalling. This architectural scheme, the development of which will be indicated below, was of course often very summarily treated. The ribāt in many cases was reduced to a watch-tower and a little fort like those the Byzantines built on their frontiers. This explains the considerable number of ribāts mentioned by the geographers. We are told that in Transoxiana alone there were no less than 10,000 (Ibn Khallikān, transl. de Slane, i. 159, N. 3). The coasts were also amply provided for. There were ribāts all along the coast of Palestine and of Africa. The fire-towers, attached to the ribāt or isolated, enabled messages, we are told, to be sent in one night from Alexandria to Cæuta. This is clearly an exaggeration. Nevertheless we may note a fairly rapid system of signalling and the mention of Alexandria, the pharos of which seems to have served as a ribāt. The Spanish coast also had its ribāts, as had the frontier against the Christian kingdoms, especially after the coming of the Almoravids, which saw an intensification of the rifāʿ. For Sicily, Ibn Ḥawḵal gives some curious information about the ribāts near Palermo and the little town of Rabato in the island of Gozo in the Maltese archipelago.

Devotion to religion stimulated individuals to multiply their foundations, notably in Ifriqiya in the vicinity of towns like Tripoli and Sfax. It was a work of piety to build a ribāt at one’s own expense or strengthen its defences. It was equally meritorious to urge men to go there to serve the cause of Islam, to revictual the garrison, lastly and above all to go there oneself. For the coast of Palestine, al-Muḥammadī tells us of another use of the ribāt equally pleasing to Allah. Their fires were used to signal the approach of Christian vessels bringing Muslim prisoners whose exchange had been arranged. Everyone endeavoured to take part in this according to his means.

The building of the large ribāts and of many of the smaller ones was naturally the task of the sovereigns of the country. In Ifriqiya the first was that of Monastir [q. v.] built by the ‘Abbasid governor Ḥaṭṭama b. Aʿyān (179 = 795). The third (ninth) century was the golden age: the Aghlabids all along the eastern coasts multiplied ribāts in the strict sense and muqāras; this word means a fortified area containing a small garrison or a watch-tower. Monastir retained the pre-eminence which the Prophet himself is said to have foretold for it. In the xith century the dead were brought from al-Mahdiyya to enjoy the blessing of being buried there. But the ribāt of Sus founded by the Aghlabid Ziyādat Allah in 260 (821) had assumed considerable importance. We know that Sus was the port from which the troops embarked for the conquest of Sicily.

Compared with the east coast of Ifriqiya, which was directly threatened by attacks of the Rūm or which was the base for expeditions across the sea, the rest of the Barbary coast was less well supplied. There were however ribāts on the coast of the extreme Maghribi, at Nakūr and Arzila to prevent raiding by the Normans pirates, and at Salé to facilitate the war against the Barghawata [q. v.] heretics.

If the majority of the ribāts were official foundations, the service done by the combatants in them does not seem to have been in any way compulsory. The men of the ribāt, the muḥāsifūn, were volunteers, pious individuals who had taken a vow to devote themselves to the defence of Islam. Some may have entered the ribāt like a monastery, to end their days in it, but the great majority only stayed in them for longer or shorter periods, and the garrisons were changed completely several times a year. In the ribāt of Arzila, this change in the garrison took place with the festival of ‘Aḥrār (10th Muḥarram), the beginning of Ramadan and al-ʿId al-Kabīr. An important fair was held on the occasion. In case of alarm the garrisons were reinforced by able-bodied men from the country round, summoned by the beating of drums (Palestine, according to al-Muḥammadī).

Life in the ribāt was spent in military exercises and on guard, but also in devotional exercises. The marabouts prepared themselves for martyrdom by long prayers under the direction of a venerated shāikh. The traveller Ibn Ḥawḵal however reveals a dark side to this edifying picture. Speaking of the ribāts of Palermo in the fourth (tenth) century, he tells us that "they were the rendezvous of the bad characters of the country who thus found a means of livelihood outside of regular society and at the expense of the pious and charitable".

The double character — military and religious — of the life of the marabouts found expression in the architecture of the old ribāts that have survived. Tunisia has preserved those of Monastir and Sus. The first is still very imposing but the frequent restorations have complicated the original plan. The second which is simple may be taken as typical. With its high square wall flanked with semi-circular towers at the corners and the middle of the sides, it recalls the Byzantine forts of the country. The only entrance was by one of the salients in the middle of the wall. A staircase went down in the interior into the central court surrounded by covered galleries and very simple cells. The first storey, reached by two staircases, also consisted of cells on three sides of the court. Along the fourth side was a hall with a niḥāba. This was the oratory of the ribāt. The kiḥla wall was pierced with embrasures. On the level of the
terracas which are above this first storey, is the door of the signal tower, cylindrical in form, which rises from the square base of a salient at one corner and dominates the fortress from a height of about 60 feet. A little douce which also rises above the terraces crown, as in the mosque of the period, the square area in front of the mausoleum in the oratory.

The ribāt of Śūs takes us back to the heroic times when the institution had distinctly a warlike character and these frontier posts played a strategic role on the borders of the lands of Islam. It retained this character in the xi-th—xiiith century in the extreme Maghrib where the struggle with the Christians in Spain kept alive the tradition of the diyād. We know that a ribāt built on an island in the Lower Seguél was the starting place of the career of the Lamtūna Berbers and gave them the name of Almoravids (al-murābīṭīn) under which they became famous in history [see Almoravids]. The Almohads, who succeeded them had also their ribāts, two of which at least are worth mentioning. The ribāt of Tazā [q.v.] was fortified in 528 (1138) by 'Abd Al-Mu'min at the time when he was conducting against the Almoravids a campaign which had all the appearance of a diyād. The Ribāt al-Fath, the term which survives of that of the town of Rabat [q.v.], was, if use was made of embarkation, at least the great camp of concentration for the armies preparing to cross to Spain. The prestige of this Almohad foundation survived the dynasty which built it. Rabat, or rather the adjoining little town of Sbala, also regarded as a ribāt, was the necropolis of the Marinid princes, who in being buried there hoped to share in the merit of the warriors of the faith.

In the xivth century to give Warnung of landings by the Christians on the coast, maqur and signal towers were still being built "to serve as ribāta". Ibn Marrāk, the historiographer of the Marinid Abu 'l-Ḥasan, who tells of them, says however that this task was occupied by paid soldiers. They were not true ribāts, the garrison of which consisted of volunteers. If however we find down to the xvith century, in the extreme Maghrib, a ribāt like that of Asfi playing a military part in the struggle with the Portuguese, in the east, in the lands where the infidels no longer threatened Islam, the institution had changed its character or rather the ascetic discipline and the pious recitations which were the regular practices in the old ribāts had entirely taken the place of military exercises. From the viith (xvith) century or perhaps even earlier, the development of mysticism and the grouping of the Sufis into communities gave these barrack-camp-like structures a new raison d'être by making them monasteries. From Persia, where it originated, this evolution of the ribāts rapidly spread through the Muslim world. In the east the ribāt merged into the Persian khānāka, Ibn Djbair (ed. Wright and de Goeje, p. 243) refers to a khānāka founded by Sūfis which was also called a ribāt, at Rās al-'Ain to the north of the Syrian desert. When however a writer like Ibn al-Shihna describing Aleppo seems to distinguish the khānāka from the ribāt, the difference between them escapes us. It may be supposed that the khārānākī were inhabited by prominent residents who spent their whole lives there and that the ribāts, as before, received devout men for limited periods, but one cannot assert definitely that this was the distinction. In any case the four ribāts within the city of Aleppo (one attached to a madrasa and the mausoleum of its founder with Kur'ān readers and Sūfis) had no longer anything of a military character. It was the same with the two ribāts of Mecca mentioned by Ibn Baṭṭūta. In Cairo the only inscription found by Van Berchem in which a ribāt is mentioned is that of the convent of Malik Āshraf Ṭanāl (860 = 1455). In Barbary, which the wave of eastern mysticism had reached in the xi-th—xiiith century, the term ribāt was likewise retained but applied to the zāwiya [q.v.] in which ascetics gathered round a shaikh or his touch. As a matter of fact Babā Yūn. The ribāt—zāwiya connection makes a distinction which nevertheless still remains obscure. Speaking of the zāwiya founded by Abu 'l-Ḥasan, his master, he tells us first that khānāka, a Persian word, has the same meaning as ribāt and adds: "In the terminology of the fakirs, one understands by ribāt the act of devoting oneself to the holy war and to guarding [the frontiers]. Among the Sūfis it means on the contrary the place in which a man shuts himself up to worship the divinity". This last use of the word seems to be the usual one in his time. The ribāt al-'Ubd ad is the group of pious foundations near Tiemeniz that have grown up around the tomb of the famous mystic Sūfī Madāni. The ribāt of Tarakeddelt to the south west of Oran is dedicated to a saint of the Banū Ismā'īl; the ribāt of Tafertaṣt on the borders of the Wādi Sībī contains the tomb mosque of two Marinid princes and apartments for Ṭanāl [Kur'ān readers].

With this erroneous use of the old Arabic word we might connect the parallel change undergone by the word murābīt (marabout). It is applied to a saint, an individual who by his own merits or the mystic initiation which he had received or his relationship with a zāwiya [q.v.] enjoys the veneration of those around him.

In Muslim Spain, the last land of the diyād, we may suppose that the ribāts continued to study the "successive frontiers with the reconquesta" imposed on the lands of Islam; but to be certain we must wait until the study of the texts and the enquiry being conducted by F. Hernandez and H. Terrasse into the military architecture of Muslim Spain give us precise details regarding the date of the castles and their object. The evolution in meaning of the word ribāt would lead one to think it had ceased to mean a fortress. Among the Arabic authors of Spain and al-Makārī as among the fakirs mentioned by Ibn Marzuk, ribāt is often used to mean a holy war, generally defensive, and it passed into Spanish in the form ribato as J. Oliver Asin has shown with the meaning of "sudden attack executed by body of horsemen, keeping with Muslim tactics". If the Arabic term had lost its original meaning, however, another word derived from it was commonly used in a slightly different meaning. Spain saw the ribāt multipliy and their memory is preserved in place-names in the forms Rápita, Rávita, Rābida. The word ribāt was also known in Barbary. It meant "a hermitage to which a holy man retired and where he lived surrounded by his disciples and his religious servitors" (cf. Makūd, transl. Colin, p. 240 and the article ZAWIYAH). Everything points to its having been the same in the Peninsula. The multiplication of ribātas in Spain and their possible confusion with ribāts are
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BIE = Bulletin de l’Institut Egyptien
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BSOS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution
BTLV = Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned.-Indië
BZ = Byzantinsche Zeitschrift
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CIS = Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum
EC = L’Égypte Contemporaine
GAL = Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur
GGA = Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen
GJ = Geographical Journal
GMS = Gibb Memorial Series
GOR = Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches
GOW = Babinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke
G.F. = Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie
GSAI = Giornale della Soc. Asiatica Italiana
HOP = Gibb, History of ottoman poetry
IG = Indische Gids
IRM = International Review of Missions
Is. = Der Islam
JA = Journal Asiatique
J Am. O.S = Journal of the American Oriental Society
J Anthr. 1 = Journal of the Anthropological Institute
JASB = Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
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JPHS = Journal of the Punjab Historical Society
JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review
JRAS = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
JRG = Journal of the Royal Geographical Society
JSF = Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne
KE = Kōrin Sosa, Archivum
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KS = Keleti Szemle (Revue orientale)
Mach. = Al-Machriq
MDP = Mitteilungen und Nachr. des Deutschen Paläs- tina-Vereins
MFOB(yrouch) = Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth
MGG = Mitteilungen der geometischen Gesell- schaft in Wien
MGMN = Mitt. 2. Geschichte der Medizin und Natur- wissenschaften
MGWJ = Monatschrift f. d. Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judentums
MI = Mir Islands
MIÉgypt = Mémoires de l’Institut Egyptien
MIPAO = Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Inst. Franz. d’Archéologie Orientale au Caire
Mitt. DOG = Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesell- schaft
Mitt. VAG = Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Egypti- MO = Le monde oriental
MOG = Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte
MSFO = Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne
MSL = Mémoires de la Société Linguistique
MSOS = Mitteilungen des Sem. für oriental. Sprachen, Afr. Studien
MSOS As. = Mitteilungen des Sem. für oriental. Sprachen, Westasiat. Studien
MTM = Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde in Berlin
NE = Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Biblio- theque du Roi
NO = Der Neue Orient
OA = Orientalisches Archiv
OC = Orient Chris- tianus
OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
OM = Oriente Moderno
PEEQS = Palestine Exploration Fund. Quarterly Statement
Pet. Mitt. = Petermanns Mitteilungen
PRGS = Proceedings of the R. Geographical Society
QDC = Questions diplomatiques et coloniales
RAAD = Revue de l’Académie Arabe de Damas
RAFr. = Revue Africaine
Ref. = Revue des Études Juives
Re Is. = Revue des études islamiques
RHR = Revue de l’histoire des Religions
RI = Revue Indigène
RMM = Revue du Monde Musulman
RQ = Rerum Orientalis Synopsys
ROC = Revue de l’Orient Chrétiens
ROL = Revue de l’Orient latin
RRAH = Rev. de l’Académie de la Fr. de l’Orient
RRAL = Revue de l’Institut Arabe de l’His- toire
SC = Revue de l’histoire des Religions
SBAk. Heil. = Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wiss. Heidelberg
SBAk. Wien = Sitzungsberichte der Ak. der Wiss. in Wien
SB Bayr. Ak. = Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften
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Verh. Ak. Amst. = Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam
WI = Die Welt des Islams
Wiss. Veröff. DOG = Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichun- gen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
WZKM = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgen- landes
ZA = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
Zap. = Zapiński
ZATW = Zeitschrift f. alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
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connected with the great movement of mystic piety which, starting in Persia, had brought about the substitution of monasteries — khānāqāh — in the east, sāriwī in Barbary — for the foundations, more military than religious, of the heroic age of Islam.


**RIDA,** an Ottoman biographer of poets. Mehmed Rıdâ b. Mehmed, called Zehir Márid which, belonging to Adrianople. Of his life we know only that he was a time mutafl in Uzun Kopru (near Adrianople) and died in 1082 (1673) in his native city. Besides a collection of poems (*Divân*) Rıdâ wrote a *Tedhkiret-i Shāh*, a biographical collection in which he dealt successfully in alphabetic order with the poets who lived in the first half of the 14th century A.H., i. e. c. 1591-1640. In the introduction he deals with eleven sultans who wrote poetry. The book was completed in 1660 (1640) and in the *ta'dīb* shows. It has been edited by Ahmad Djevedt Bey (*Tedhkire-rı Rıdâ*, Stamboul 1316, 109 p. 9th).


**RIDA KULI KHAN,** b. Muhammad Hadi b. Ismai'îl Kamal, Persian scholar and man of letters, "un des hommes les plus spirituels et les plus aimables que j'ai rencontrés dans aucune partie du monde" (Gobineau). A descendant of the poet Kamal Khudjandi [q. v.], the grandfather of Rıdâ Kulî, chief of the notables of Carah Kaleh (district of Dâmghân), was put to death by the partisans of Karim Khân Zand against whom he supported the Shahs (cf. *Khan* i. *H. A. H.* p. 235). His father became one of the dignitaries of the court of the Kâdjar; in 1215 (1800), while on a pilgrimage to Mashhad, he heard the birth of a son in Teheran to whom he gave the name of the imām. Becoming an orphan in 1802, Rıdâ Kuli spent his early years in Fars; he was brought back from Fars to Teheran, lived some time with relatives at Barfurush (Mazandaran), then returned to Fars where he received his education; he then entered the service of the state under the patronage of the governor-general of Fars. His earliest efforts in poetry were published under the pseudonym of Čikir which he soon changed to that of Hidâyat. In 1829 on the occasion of Fath Ali Shah's stay in Shiraz, he composed a panegyric and other poems which gained him the royal favour; but a serious illness prevented him from leaving Shiraz. In 1838 Muhammad Shâh showed such esteem for him that he entrusted his son 'Abbas Mirza's education to him. The political troubles that followed the Shah's death in 1848 sent Rıdâ Kuli into retirement. In 1851 Nasır al-Din Shâh recalled him and sent him on an embassy to Khiwa. He was next appointed to the Ministry of Education, became Director of the Royal College (dâr al-funun), then fifteen years later, tutor (*vali-bāsi*) to the crown prince Musaffar al-Din whom he followed to Tabriz where he spent several years. He returned to Teheran where he died in 1288 (1871).

Of his very numerous works, several are still unpublished, e. g. some treatises on theology and letters (we mention only the *Mifldh* al-`arab, a commentary on difficult verses in Kajānî, and the *Nizâm-nâme* Salţānî-i *ṣagam-*hādî, on early Persian dynasties: analysed in *T. R. A. S.*, xviii., p. 198). The bulk of his lyrical poetry (*Divân*) is also still unpublished; it totals about 30,000 lines. Of his six *mahmowîl* (enumerated by himself, *Magdum al-*Fı̄rhis, ii. 582) only the epic entitled *Bekirî-nâme* (or *Galistanî-i Fram*), lith. *Tabriz, 1270 = 1853* is published: it celebrates the tragic loves of the hero and the Persian poetess of Arab origin Râbaa Kâdiâr Balîgh, known as Zain al-`Arab. His other works which are published are mainly of a documentary nature and therefore very important. The *Fihrist al-*Tawârîk *(-Repertory of Chronicles*), chronology, lith. in part at Tabriz, was presented to Nasır al-Din Shâh before the author's departure to Khâvarizm (1851); the *Aqīdî al-*Tawârîk *(-I. Tabriz 1283) is a short précis of the history of Persia composed for the crown prince Musaffar al-Din; the *Kawdât al-*Ṣafî-yî Nâsîrî, continuation of the *Rawdât al-*Sufî of Mir Khân and down to 1270 (1853) (*Teheran 1270, 3 vols. fol.), is a work of considerable size, based on eastern sources (of which several are still unpublished) and on official documents, most of which are reproduced in full; in addition to the record of political events the work contains much geographical, literary and artistic information. The *Rıdâ* al-*Arîfîn* (*Gardens of the Initiated*), biographies of mystical poets, with an excellent introduction on Sûfism, was prepared for Muhammad Shâh (not lith. until 1305, Teheran). It is closely connected with the *Magdum al-*Fı̄rhis *(-Assembly of eloquent Individuals*)", of first importance for the history of Persian poetry (lith. Teheran, 2 vols. fol., 1294); this last work, the author's best, contains an introduction to the history of Persian poetry, biographies and select pieces from all the poets (the poet-laureates to form the first section); at the end is an autobiography and an anthology of the poems of Hidâyat (lith., p. 581-678), autobiography and a number of the verses reproduced by the author of the *Fars-nâme-yî Nâsîrî*, ii. 125-
The researches necessary for these last two works showed Hidāyat the inadequacy of the dictionary at his disposal; he intended to remedy this defect in his *Fārsi-i-nāmān-i-ārā-yi Nāṣrī* (lith. Teherān 1288) which, preceded by a remarkable introduction, gives the different meanings of each Persian word, with quotations from the classical poets, and with many examples taken from different poets. Lastly we owe to Hidāyat the first editions of the *Dīwān* of Manūchīr (lith. Teherān 1297), of the *Kūsha-nāmeh* (ibid. 1275) and of the *Nafshat al-Maṣūd* (history of the fall of the Khiwārizm empire) of Muhammad Zastārīrī (publ. posthumously, Teherān 1308). Its autobiographical character gives the attractive "Narrative of a Journey to Khiwārizm" (*Nafshat al-Maṣūd* ed. and transl. Schefer, in *P.E.L.O.V.*, Paris 1879) a special place among his works; he undertook this journey in 1853 as ambassador sent to settle the differences between the courts of Teherān and Khwānah. This journal is a valuable document for the history of the Khānates and has been utilised by later Persian historians (notably Muhammad ʿHasan Khān; q.v.); besides valuable historical, archaeological and geographical matter, the book, which is written in a simple and natural style, is a contribution to the study of the manners and customs of the period (notably conditions of travel); we find in it pretty pictures of native life and charming landscapes. Several of Hidāyat's descendants have taken a prominent part in literature, politics and administration.


(I. MASH)
sistance; his troops scattered and there was nothing left for him but to return to Halab. Yâghi Basân then went over to Dûkâk and suggested he should besiege Ridwan in Halab. The latter however appealed to Sûkmân b. Ortoq in Sarâqib, who at once hurried to his assistance, and when the two brothers met at Khânarânî [q. v.], Dûkâk was completely defeated and had to recognise Ridwan as his overlord (489 = 1096 or 490 = 1097). In order to receive financial and military support from the Fāṭimidûs, Ridwan for four weeks had prayers said for al-Mustâsîf, the caliph in Egypt; but on the representations of Sûkmân and Yâghi Basân, who had in the meanwhile made peace with him, he again paid homage to the ‘Abbasîds and asked for forgiveness from the Caliph al-Mustâghâfir in Bâghdâd. About the same time Djanân al-Dawla left Ridwan, settled in Hîmûn, and improved the defences of the town. He then took up a more independent attitude to his overlord Ridwan, on behalf of whom he left the province before.

In June 1098 Antîkîyâ was stormed by the Crusaders and the Muslim army of relief, which included Ridwan, repulsed whereupon Bohemund was recognised as prince of Antîkîyâ. As his nearest neighbour, Ridwan was soon at war with him. In Sha‘bân 493 (July 1100), he set out to drive the Franks from the country round Halab but was defeated. He then joined forces with Djanân al-Dawla; but when the Christians withdrew and Ridwan became jealous of his ally, Djanân al-Dawla returned to Hîmûn. Soon afterwards the Christians under Bohemund and Tancred again threatened Antîkîyâ. But when the latter appealed to the council of Malatyâ [q. v.] by a Muslim army [see DAKSHMANIYÂ], they suddenly withdrew. Bohemund fell into an ambush and was taken prisoner, Ridwan and Djanân al-Dawla won several successes, but in the end quarrelled with one another, and a year or two later (495 = 1102 or 496 = 1103), the latter was murdered at the instigation of the Assassins of Halab. In Sha‘bân 498 (April—May 1105) Tancred, who had succeeded Bohemund as prince of Antîkîyâ and was also count of Edessa, won a brilliant victory over Ridwan. When Tancred besieged the fortress of Artaç, the governor there appealed to Ridwan for help. But being afraid of the numbers of the Sâliyân army—Tancred was the head of a powerful army and the two forces met near Khânasîr. On seeing the superiority of the Muslim forces, Tancred wanted to open peace negotiations; Ridwan, for his part was not unwilling to meet him but allowed himself to be persuaded by a subordinate commander to refuse, and when the battle began, the Franks at once took to flight but returned and cut down the Muslims while they were plundering. Tancred then occupied Artaç. In 499 (1105—1106) the latter also took the important fortress of Afâmîya (Apamea). An Assassin named Abû Tâhir [cf. ASSASSINS] who was on good terms with Ridwan, had disposed of the commandant there, Khâlaf b. Mula‘îbîn. One of his sons had to Tancred and asked him to expel the supporters of Ridwan; Tancred who had already received an appeal from the Christians of Afâmîya, laid siege to the town. He withdrew after a time but soon returned and starved the town into surrender.

When Cawâli Saqâwû, governor of al-Mawsîl, lost the favour of the Sâlîjûk Sultân Muhammâd b. Malikshâh [q. v.] and was replaced by Mawdûd b. Altunegîn, he gave count Baldwin and Joscelin, who were prisoners there, their liberty on condition that they paid a ransom, liberated Muslim prisoners and assisted him against his enemies. But when Tancred refused to restore the county of Edessa to Baldwin, hostilities broke out and the latter sought the help of Cawâli. After peace had been restored between the Frankish leaders and Edessa was restored to Baldwin, Ridwan wrote to Tancred and warned him against Cawâli, who, he said, had already taken the town of Bâliûn, and was now threatening Halab whereby he might become dangerous to Christian rule in this region. In Safar 502 (Sept.—Oct. 1108) Cawâli, who had joined Baldwin and Joscelin, was defeated at Tell Bâshîr [q. v.]. He lost Bâliûn, and since he could not hold his own against Ridwan and Mawdûd, he had to make his peace with the sultân. The Christian princes then combined to besiege Tripolis, Sâdîâ and Bâlûrut. Tancred took the fortresses of al-Athîrîb and Zârdanûa and when the news reached them, the Muslims abandoned Mânûbîjû and Bâliûn again, and Ridwan had to purchase peace very dearly (504 = 1110—1113). When sultân Muhammad summoned the princes, his vassals, for a vigorous attack on the Franks under the leadership of Mawdûd, the latter was appealed to for help by Ridwan, whose lands the Christians were laying waste in revenge for the damage done by him in Syria. Mawdûd came to his assistance but when he appeared before Halab, Ridwan, who no longer needed him, shut the gates and took no part in the war against the common enemy.

Ridwan died in the last days of Djamâd I 507 (Nov. 1113). As a partisan of the Isâmî Assasins he had at first held Abû ‘Abdâl ‘Allî b. Siwâlî; he even had two of his brothers, ‘Ali Talib and ‘Ali al-Ma‘âmî, assassinated. Ibn al-Athîr (x. 349) also says that his manner of life was by no means laudable (kâmam umr Ridwan ghair muyhînâ).
of Oriental scholars like Jaubert, Jamoud, Sylvestre de Sacy and Cauvin de Perceval. He made rapid progress and soon had a deep knowledge of the French language. From his stay in Paris dates a lively and interesting account entitled *Turki al-farisi* (Bâbîk 1853) in which every line reveals a charming naiveté, and the enthusiasm aroused in this Oriental mind by the manifold aspects and lights and shades of French life and culture (cf. Carra de Vaux, *Penseurs*, v. 232 sqq.). On his return to Egypt (1852) he was attached as interpreter and professor of French to the school of medicine directed by Dr. Clot Bey and also entrusted with the editorship of the *Informations égyptiennes* which later became the *Journal Officiel*. In 1852 he was transferred to the school of artillery and in 1853 appointed Director of the school of foreign languages (originally the "Translation Office"). He remained in this post until the accession of Abbas II. In this role he continued the brilliant work of his predecessor: the school of languages was closed and its director sent— a disgrace barely concealed— to the Sûdân to organise the high school at Khartûm.

On the death of 'Abdûl, Rifâ'a returned to Egypt. Sa'id Pasha appointed him Director of the military school, for a very brief period, however, for the school in its turn was closed and Rifâ'a found himself unemployed.

In the reign of Isâmî in 1853, the school was reopened and our author again became Director of the "Translation Office". In 1870, he became editor in chief of the educational review *Bagdad al-Mafrîsî* (fortnightly) and died in 1875. Rifâ'a Bey was one of the most important Arab writers of the 19th century and his name is closely associated with the brilliant revival of literary and scientific activity in the modern east. An enquiring spirit of unusual intelligence, he left behind him a considerable amount of work in all fields: history, geography, grammar, law, literature, medicine etc.; details will be found in Sarks, *Dictionnaire bibliographique*, p. 942—947. We may note here only his translations of Telemâque, of Malte-Brun's *Geography* and the French Code Civil.

To appreciate the magnitude of the part he played, it must be remembered that at the dawn of the last century, the Arab world was in a state of semi-torpor and separated from European learning by a dense barrier: it was with difficulty that al-Ashâr shed a dim light on the darkness that covered this period.

As a result of his works, his activity and the phalanx of experts and translators which he gave the country, Rifâ'a accomplished the miracle of popularising European science, of opening the east to modern ideas, enlightening the minds of his contemporaries, awakening dormant energies and preparing the ground for future developments.

We can measure the effort if we reflect that he and his pupils translated into Arabic and Turkish nearly 2,000 works.

On the other hand by expanding the framework of the old classical language and by varying it and enriching it with a mass of new words, he enabled Arab thought to adapt itself to progress and to extend its light over modern Islam.


(Maurice Chemouil)

**AL-RIFA'I, ABD AL, FOUNDER OF THE RIFA'I SCHOOL**, died 22nd Dhu- 

Mâdâ i, 578 (Sept. 23, 1183) at Umm 'Abâda, in the district of Wasôt. The date of his birth is given by some authorities as Muharram 300 (Sept. 1109), but others say Rajab 12 (Oct. 1118); at Kayrat Hasan, a village in the district of Bassâ. These places being in the region called al-Baṭarî (q. v.), he has the further nickname al-Bâtâlî; al-Rifa'i is usually explained as referring to an ancestor Rifâ'a, but by some is supposed to be a tribal name. This ancestor Rifâ'a is said to have migrated from Mecca to Seville in Spain in 217, whence Ahmad's grandfather came to Bassa in 450. Hence he is also called al-Maghribî.

Ibn Khallîkân's notice of him is meagre; more is given in Dhababi's *Turkî al-Islâm* (Boileau MS.), taken from a collection of his *Manahîj bi Mu'ayyî 'l-Dîn Ahmad b. Sulamîn al-Hasanî*, received by him to a disciple in 688. This book does not appear in the lists of treatises on the same subject furnished by Abu l-Hâdhâk Efendi al-Kâfî al-Kâfîlî al-Sâ'yîdî in his works *Tarkîr al-Ashâr* (Cairo 1306) and *Kâfîdat al-Dawla* (Bairût 1301), the latter of which is a copious biography, frequently citing Târîkh al-Muhâminî by Taqî al-Dîn 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Abd al-Mu'sîn al-Wâsîtî (d. 744); known to Hâjjî Khâtûb, 'Umûm al-Barânihî by Khâsim b. al-Hâjjî, al-Nafî'; al-Mu'âkîya by 'Izz al-Dîn al-Fârûhî (d. 694), and others. Al-Hammâni's statements are cited from *Ya'qûbî b. Kurâz, who acted as mu'âlikî for al-Rifa'i*. Great caution is required in the use of such materials.

Whereas according to some accounts he was posthumous child, the majority date his father's death 519 in Baghdad, when Ahmad was 73 years old. He was then brought up by his maternal uncle Mânûsîr al-Bâtîshî, resident at Nahr Danâ in the neighbourhood of Bassa. This Mânûsîr of whom there is a notice in Sha'râni's *Lawai'î al- 

Anwarî*, i. 178) is represented as the head of a religious community, called by Ahmad (if he is correctly reported by his grandson, Kâthîbî, p. 85) al-Rifa'îyya; he sent his nephew to Wâsît to study under a Shâhiî doctor Abu l-Hasîl 'Ali al-Wâsî, and a maternal uncle Abu Bakr al-Wâsî. His studies lasted till his 27th year, when he received an idhâsa from Abu l-Hasîl, and the kâfîra from his uncle Mansûr, who made him establish himself in Umm 'Abâda, where (it would seem) his mother's family had property, and where her nephew al-Nadjîlî al-Ansâri was buried. In the following year (540) Mansûr died and bequeathed the headship of his community (mawlâyakhas) to Ahmad to the exclusion of his own son.

His activities appears to have been confined to
Umm 'Abida and neighbouring villages, whose names are unknown to the geographers; even Umm 'Abida is not mentioned by Yāqūt, though found in one copy of the Marājī al-Rifā'ī. This fact renders incredible the huge figures cited by Abu l-Hudayf for the number of his disciples (murađūn) and even deputies (khulaḍūf) he so proudly states and the colossal buildings in which he entertained them. Sībū Ḣabīl al-Jauza in Miftah al-Zamān (Chicago, 1907, p. 236) says that one of their shaikhs told him he had seen some 100,000 persons with al-Rifā'ī on a night of Shab'aın. In Shajārat al-Dhahab the experience is said to have been Sībū Ḣabīl al-Jauza's own, though this person was born 581, three years after al-Rifā'ī's death. In Tānīrī al-Akefī (p. 7, 8) his grandfather as well as himself is credited with the assertion.

His followers do not attribute to him any treaties, but Abu l-Hudayf produces 1. two discourses (maṣarīf) delivered by him in 577 (3rd Raḍāb) and 578 respectively; 2. a whole diwan of odes; 3. a collection of prayers (ad'īyā) of devotional and strophic values (auvīrād), and incantations (ašāh); 4. a great number of casual utterances, sometimes nearly of the length of sermons, spoken by frequent repetitions. Since in 1, 2 and 4 he claims descent from 'Alī and Fāṭima, and to be the substitute (aštāh) for the Prophet on earth, whereas his biographers insist on his humility, and deeming such titles as kuth, gawālī, or even šāhīk, the genuineness of these documents is questionable.

In Shajārat al-Dhahab (iv. 260) it is asserted that the marvellous performances associated with the Rifā'is, such as sitting in heated ovens, riding lions, etc. (described by Lane, Modern Egyptians, i. 305) were unknown to the founder, and introduced after the Mongol invasion; in any case they were no invention of his, since the like are recorded by Tānīrī in the fourth century A.H. The anecdotes produced by Ḩabīl al-Dhahabī (repeated by Subkī, Tahāsāt, iv. 40) imply a doctrine similar to the Indian aśīna, unwillingness to kill or give pain to living creatures, even lice and locusts. He is also said to have inoculated poverty, abstinence and non-resistance to injury. Thus Miftah al-Zamān records how he allowed his wife to labour him with a poker, though his friends collected 500 dinārs to enable him to divorce her by returning her marriage gift. (The sum mentioned is inconsistent with his supposed poverty.)

Inconsistent accounts are given of his relations with his contemporary 'Abd al-Kādir al-Gilānī. In Bahdījat al-Ašūr it is recorded by apparently faultless 'Inād on the authority of two nephews of al-Rifā'ī, and a man who visited him at Umm 'Abida in 232/847-8, that when 'Abd al-Kādir in Baghdād declared that his feet was on the neck of every saint, al-Rifā'ī was heard to say at Umm 'Abida "and on mine". Hence some make him a disciple of 'Abd al-Kādir. On the other hand, Abu l-Hudayf's authorities make 'Abd al-Kādir one of those who witnessed in Medina in the year 555 the unique miracle of the Prophet holding out his hand from the tomb for al-Rifā'ī to kiss: further, in the list of his predecessors in the discourse of 578 al-Rifā'ī mentions Mansūr, but not 'Abd al-Kādir. It is probable therefore that the two worked independently.

Details of his family are quoted from the work of al-Faḍḥi, grandson of a disciple named 'Umar. According to him, al-Rifā'ī married first Mansūr's nece Khaddīja; after her death, her sister Rabī'ah; after her death Nafisa, daughter of Muhammad b. al-Kāsimiya. There were many daughters; also three sons, who all died before their father. He was succeeded in the headship of his order by a sister's son, 'Ali b. Ummān.

Bibliography: The sources of this account have been cited above. (D. S. Margoliouth)

RĪHĀ, the name of two towns.

1. The Arabs called the Jericho of the Bible Rīhā or Ariḥā (Clermont-Ganneau, in J.A., 1877, i. 498). The town, which was 12 mi. E. of Jerusalem, was reckoned sometimes to the Dūnad of Fīlasīn (Yāqūt, Muḥīyā, iii. 913, e.g.) and sometimes to the district of al-Balṣā (Yāqūtī, in B.G.A., vii. 113); sometimes however it was called the capital of the province of Jordan (al-Urdunn) or of Ghawr, the broad low lying valley of the Jordan (Nahr al-Urdunn) from which it was 10 mi. distant (Yāqūtī, i. 227). As a result of its warm moist climate and the rich irrigation of its fields the country round the town produced a sumptuous vegetable; among its products are mentioned, some already known in ancient times, dates and bananas, fragrant flowers, indigo (prepared from the waṣma plant), sugar-cane, which yielded the best Ghawr sugar. Not far from the town were the only sulphur mines in Palestine (Ahu 'l-Fidā', ed. Renaud, p. 236). There were however many snakes and scorpions there and large numbers of fleas. From the flesh of the snakes called tīriyākīya found there was made the antidote called "Jerusalem tīriyāgī" (ṣāmikā Fāsumkā).

In the Kurān, Ariḥā is the town of the giants captured by Joshua; there was shown the tomb of Moses and the place where, according to the Christians, their saviour was baptised. The eponymous founder of the town (Ariḥā) was said to have been a grandson of Arphakshād, grandson of Noah. The town was particularly prosperous during the Crusades but then began to decline and was in ruins in the fifth century. The modern Eriḥā in the Wādī el-Kelt occupies the site of the town of the Crusaders; it is about 800 feet below the level of the Mediterranean.

RIHĀ — RIKĀB

Seetzen (1806—1807).Burckhardt (1810—1812)

and many others.

Bibliography: Yāḥūt, Maḏjam, ed. Wan-

(E. HÖNIGMANN)

RIKA. [See Arabia, i. 387.]

RIKĀB (A., Turkish pronunciation: rikāb and rekāb, "stirrup") in Persian and Turkish usage at Muhammadan courts: "the sovereign himself or his presence, the foot of the throne" (metonymy like those of kūltum in Saljūq usage: kōret or kōret, kāšt-i poy etc.).

In Turkish (Ottoman, Altai, Çağhatāi) the stirrup was called uzung (uzung), older form ustung, uzung (kondigung Bileğ, Batšt, ed. Kāzān, p. 49). This word passed into certain foreign languages without the initial vowel: Ar. Svr. ṣangāy and şangānā "stirrup, ladder or other means of assistance in mounting a horse" (Freytag, Cuche, Kazimirski, Böhtor, Bélot, Berggren; ṣangāy is disputed by Dözy); Bulgarian ṣangīya (alongside of ṣangīya and ṷangīya, with a final -ya quite independent of that of the Arabic) "stirrup". In Turkish also there are traces of its use without the initial vowel: Çağhatāi ṣeng (ladder, steps) (Pavet de Courteille; cf. the Arabic al-qalāma "steps, stirrup, mounting-stone"), ṣeng kušši (old Turkish and Persian usage; cf. RIКANĐA). These comparisons show that at first a distinction was not always made between the stirrup and the mounting-stone (Aṣḥāy al-rakāb, Türk. birec tašlī, Persian from the Ottoman usage seng-i rikāb, as in the Türkīḫi Wāṣif, Būṣāq 1246, i. 179). In spite of these semantic coincidences and correspondences like Türk. ṣeng “rich” for Persian ṣeng “heavy, precious”, the resemblance of ṣeng and ṷangīya may be only accidental.

The figurative expression rikābī humāyūn (Turk. pronunciation: rikābī kūmāyūn), or (more rarely) rikābī šāhāne or simply rikāb is already found in Persian of the Saljuq period applied to the sultan himself or his entourage in the field or...
travelling. For example one said that so-and-so was "in the service of the imperial stirrup" (Houtsma, Recueil... 373; ii. 18), or "in the service of the parasol (taht) of the imperial stirrup" (ibid., iv. 7). In modern Persian one says "to be at the stirrup of a prince" for "to be attached to his court" (Kazimirski, Dialogues, p. 493 and 482—483).

In Turkish usage the same expressions were applied to:

1. The imperial cavalcade and the procession formed on this occasion. However, in order to avoid confusion with other uses of the word rikāb, there was also used, especially in the reigns of Mahmud II and ʿAbd al-Medjīd, the Turkish word binîş which was applied to all public appearances of the sultan, whether on horseback or in a boat (Mouradjea d'Ossian, vii. 141, 144; Fouani and van Gaver, Turquie, p. 377 note; Androcsy, Constantinople et le Bosphore, p. 33, 494). The prince's procession was also called mawakib (mez-kib-i hamayyin) (Houtsma, iii. 18; on these words in Ottoman and Egyptian usage, cf. J. Deny, Sommario degli Archivi del Cairo, p. 104 and following).

Cf. also the name of rikāb selâqi given to the eight selâqi lieutenants who walked by the sultan's stirrup in the great procession (Mouradjea d'Ossian, vi. 25, 317).

2. The audience given by the sultan (rum-i rikāb or simply rikāb), whether or not he was in procession. The grand vizier himself could only be introduced to the sultan's presence by the latter's formal order and his admission was called rikāb. There were ordinary rikāb and ceremonial rikāb (Mouradjea d'Ossian, vii. 133 sqq.). Cf. details of the barāma rikāb tehzīfî in Aḥī Târîḵî, p. 29; cf. Zenker, Dict., i. 408; Ahmad Râsim, Târîḵ, iv. 1014.

3. The service of the sultan or simply his presence (Sękowski, Collectanea, Warsaw 1824, ii. 24). The presence was not necessarily immediate. Thus the expression rikāb-i hamayyin (in the locative) "with the sultan" was used in speaking of the troops (kaţ-u-sül) of the capital (ʿAbd al-Râhtmân Sheref, Târîḵ, p. 292) or of the grand vizier in so far as he was endowed with the full powers of the sultan (M. T. M., p. 528). Similarly the words rikāb-i hamayyin (in the dative) were used for petitions (arsušâl) addressed to the sultan (Meninski, Theaurum; "Sulaiman's Canon" or Nâsitāt-nâme, p. 151), whereas the expression mardwrât-i rikābiyye applied to these petitions.

It is from this connection that we have the use of the words rikāb-i hamayyin or rikāb in the sense of interim or substitute. When the grand vizier moved from place to place, the government was thought to go with him and there was appointed "to the sovereign a substitute for the grand vizier who was called rikāb kâ'immaṣdim" (Bianchi, Dict., 1st ed.; Perry, A view of the Levant, London 1743, p. 37). The other chief dignitaries of the Sublime Porte had also their substitutes "of the imperial stirrup".

Rikāb aghâlarî or aghâyan-i rikāb-i hamayyin or ʿezegî aghâlarî. — These names were applied to a certain number of important officers or dignitaries of the palace (from 4 to 11 according to the different sources). They were the mirdânam or "standard-bearer", the two mirdâkâr (imbrokar) or "squires", the kāpûşâlar bâlsâṭ or "chief usher" and other dignitaries with different offices (cf. Lufit Pasha, Aref-nâme, in Türk. Bibliothek, xii. 18 and 21 of the Turk. text ed. by Tschudi; Beauvoisins, Notice sur le Cœur du Grand Seigneur, 1809, p. 54; Mouradjea d'Ossian, vii. 14; v. Hammer, Staatsverj, ii. 61, with references to Castellani and 'Ali; esp. M. T. M., p. 526, for the ʿezegî or "usages" regarding the aghâlar of the stirrup; Feridum, Munvâḫem, p. 10, for the rikāb or protocol relating to them). The following is a translation of the passage in the Aref-nâme which is a comparatively old text (Lufit Pasha died in 1539): "The defterdârs of the finances have precedence (ṭasādṭar) over the sandjak beyi and the ʿezegî aghâlarî. The principal (baḥ ᵒlâm) of these is the aghâ of the Janissaries, next comes the mirdânam, then the kâpûşâ beyi, after him the mirdâkâr, then the šâbri-bi beyli, the teẓwîgir-bi beyli and the boluk aghâlarî." (starting with the aghâ of the Janissaries, we have here then an enumeration of the ʿezegî aghâlarî).

Considering the authority of these sources, we must conclude that the variations are the results of changes which actually took place. We must conclude that the tradition of the palace left the sultan a certain freedom in this respect. We know moreover that admission to the rikāb was in general subject to the istezân or "approval, pleasure" of the sultan.

The most important function, at least in principle, of the aghâlar of the stirrup was exercised when the sultan mounted his horse: the grand mirdâkâr held the inner stirrup (ṭ rikāb), the baḥkâpûşâ-beyi aghâ, the outer stirrup (rīkāb); the mirdânam held the bridle and the teẓwîgîr-bi beyli assisted the sultan by holding him under the arm or "under the arm pit" (boluk-i girîmek). The kâpûşâ beyi or "chamberlains" stood all around and the aghâ beyli (kafâf) held the horse's head (M. T. M., p. 526).

On the functions of the chamberlains, who to the number of 150, headed by the baḥkâpûşâ-bi beyli, already mentioned, were in the service of the stirrup, and for other details see Mouradjea d'Ossian, vii. 18 and especially M. T. M., loc. cit. Their duties were to take to the province important firmans and to carry out various confidential missions.

Sometimes epithets rhyming in -āb were added to the word rikāb in the language of the court: e.g. rikāb-i ʿamātrâb "stirrup shining like the moon" (Târîḵ-i Wâṣf, i. 105); cf. also the epithets: ʿamātrâb-ārī gûrūn dyōnâb, doâvet-inkâ̄sâb (Meninski, Thaurum).

The tribute which the Woiwods of Wallachia and Moldavia sent to the sultan in their own name, supplementary to that (ṣiṣṭâ) paid by their subjects, was known as rikābiyye and ʿīṣâye (Ahmad Râsim, i. 380; cf. Sâneṣneu, Influencia orientala, Bucest 1900, i. 249).

Bibliography: Cf. the works quoted in the text.

(J. Deny)
rikâbdâr meant "a kind of squire, groom or riding attendant who had charge of the care and maintenance of harness and saddlery and of everything required for mounting on horseback". The pronunciation with an 'i' in the second syllable (rikâbdâr or rîkâbdâr) used alike in Egypt (Dozy; Sprio, p. 198) and in Turkey (Moldavian-Wallachian rehîçpâr or ruhîçpâr in Simeanu, ii. 99) is due to a (Persian) corruption analogous to that found in the words šitâbudâr for šîtâbdâr and šîmîd for šîmîd (cf. the Turkish translation of the Burhânî-šâfî, p. 495). In Arabic we find the forms rîkâbî and şîhâl al-ričâb. (Below we leave out of account the use of rikâbdâr in the sense of cup-bearer, derived from rikâb 'cup' [used for drinking the "stirrup-cup"].) If this explanation is correct, the two rikâbdârs may very well be the same.

Makâkî mentions a personage who was şîhâl al-ričâb already to the first Umayyad caliphs of Spain (153–172 = 756–785; cf. Analecites, i. 605, reference given by Dozy). In Egypt at the court of the Fâtîmîd sultan Nasir al-Dîn (1326–1360), there were 2,000 rikâbî or şîhâl al-ričâb al-kâfî, so called "on account of their costume (saçît)", whose duties were the same as those of the šîțâbdâr and šêrîbâr of the time of Kâlakshâdî (Spandone, i. 545). As to the Persian form rikâbdâr, it must have been in use among the Sâlîdîs for we have to admit by analogy that it was from them that the Aiîyâbîds and later the Mâmûlîs borrowed the term, like many others of the same kind.

In Persia itself, the term rikâbdâr was replaced by its (Turkish) synonym uesta (or əz̧taş) kürşîtî (cf. Chardin, 1711 ed., vi. 112; Père Raph. du Mans, État de la Perse, p. 24). According to the Burhânî-šâfî, the rikâbdârs were replaced by the şerîbârs (from şerîbâr, bridge), but it should be noted that the office of the latter was contemporary with and independent of that of uesto kürşîtî.

In Egypt the rikâbdârs of the Mâmûlîs, also called rikâbî, were members of the rikâb-kâmâla, like the other "men of the sword" (arâb al-sâlihî), such as the şandûţâkûr, mahmûdîl, kara-şûlûm and şulûm-mâmûlî. The rikâb-kâmâla (the kâmâla al-sâlihî of the Fâtîmîd sultans) was the depot for harness and in general for all the material required for horses and stables. The heads of this service were called mîkârî (cf. the Ottoman mîcher whose duties were different and humbler). The rikâbdârs were under the command of the emir dântî, "Marshal of the Court" (cf. the khâfedîl khawâṣîl of the Ottoman court). Cf. Kâlakshâdî, iv. 12, 20; Kâhiîl al-Şâhîrî, p. 124; Guedfroy-Demombynes, Syria, p. 112, lv.

The word rikâbî is found in the 1001 Nights, where it is translated "palefremier" by E. Gauthier, vi. 168 and "groom" by Burton, x. 365, note 2. From the context we might also suggest "riding attendant". Bothor gives (for Syria?) r-kâhdâr under the French écurier (qui enseigne à monter à cheval) and r-kîbî al-khîlî under "groom (celui qui monte à cheval)". The synonymous expression şîhâl al-ričâb, in the sense of "good squire, one who mounts a horse well", is found in the romance of 'Antara. In contemporary Egyptian usage rikâbdâr or rabâbdâr means *jockey, groom* (Sprio, Habeliche). (According to the Burhânî-šâfî [Turk. transl.], the rikâbdâr of Egypt were replaced by the sarâdî *saddler* mentioned by Volney and others).

Turkish usage. — In Turkey the office of rikâbdâr must have been taken over directly from the Sâlîdîs but instead of becoming assimilated to that of humble grooms or rikâbî, as in Egypt, it became an important dignity at the sultan's court reserved for a single officer. It is in the reign of Orkhan (1326–1506) that we find the first Ottoman rikâbdâr: he was called Ködja Elyas Ağa (*Atâ Türkî), i. 94). It was however only under Selim I (1512–1520) that the duties of the rikâbdâr were defined. According to the organisation at this time, the rikâbdâr ağa was a kâbâdodîl, i.e. he was one of the kâbâdodîl (and not odâtî) or "company of the corps" (Mouradgea, D'Ohsson; chambrière suprême (Castillan); innerse Kammer (v. Hammer)) which was the first of the six groups of officers of the household (il or enderûn) of the Selâlîs and consisted of the fixed number of 40 officers or pages including in theory the sultan himself. It had been formed by Sultan Selim to guard the relic of the Prophet's mantle (*kîrîk-i tebâdet*) brought back after the conquest of Egypt ("Atâ, i. 208; for details of the organisation see ibîd., and Mouradgea d'Ohsson, vii. 34 sqq.). The rikâbdâr was the third of these officers in order of precedence (following the šîtâbdâr and the şahâdâr and preceding the dișâkodîl ağa). An officer passed in this order from one office to another. The four officers just mentioned were the only kâbådodâl who had the right to wear the turban.

According to the usual definition repeated everywhere, the chief duty of the rikâbdâr ağa was to hold the sultan's stirrup. It may have been so at first, but none of the documents available show the rikâbdâr performing this duty in practice. Indeed we have seen [cf. RIKÅ] who were the *ag剌s of the stirrup* entrusted with this duty. Now in spite of his name, the rikâbdâr was not one of these. The Arabic version of the *Afâs-nâme* (Baîrî, p. 9, note 7) and the German translation (Turk. Bibl., No. 12 [1910], p. 17, note 1) have therefore confused rikâbdâr ağa and rikâb ağa, which has given rise to an erroneous interpretation of the whole passage [cf. the corrected translation in the article RIKÅ].

On the other hand, western writers of the xvith century mention as the third officer of the household (*teğçêhâna*) after the šîtâbdâr and şahâdâr a *"cup-bearer"*! Theodore Spandon (Spandonyn Cantacain) calls him sharâbâdâr (cf. Garzoni, 1573) and Leunclavius kîpîdâr "bearer of the (water-) jar", a name also found in Lonicer (p. 69). This water-carrier was given other names later. D'Ohsson (pl. 158) and the *Atâ Türkî* (i. 282) speak of a *hâşêhêî* or "keeper of the *kîsê*, probably for the Arabic-Persian kâšî (or water-jar)." Wearing a beraza, he carried a ewer (*maggorna*) of warm water at the end of a stick. V. Hammer calls this official mâtâradji or bearer of the gourd (*matesfor matâra*).

The use of warm water is easily explained by the fact that, as an author writing in 1631 tells us, the third gentleman of the sultan's chamber "carried him 'sherbet' to drink, and water to wash with" (De Stochave, *Voyage du Levant*, Brussels 1662, p. 84: Ischiopitar, for rikâbdâr; cf. Baudier who jokes: rechiptar).
who went on his hands and knees on the ground (Castellan, Mours, ... i., 139; "Ata, loc. cit.; d’Ohsson, pl. 157). He was the iskemle aghash or iskemlefilji (musician), chosen from among the eldest grooms (kapudan ehlisi). Wearing a dolama and a kele, he rode like the water-carrier on horseback in processions (rikabdar). Probably through some confusion Castellan calls him rikabdar, but adds that in his time the rikabdar was chosen not from among the kapuz (literally, but from the iskemle (mistake for kapudan) ). Nor must we confuse, as Saineanu (Influência oriental, i., 104, s. v. sessceniago) does, the iskele (or iskemle) aghash with the special commissioner of this name who was charged, along with the sanjab aghash, to install on the throne (iscunus) the new hadipers of Moldavia and Wallachia (cf. Milanges Iorga, 1933, p. 202). There were also iskemle aghais similar to those of the sultan in certain provinces (Rousseau, Description du pachalik de Bagdad, Paris 1809, p. 27).

Among the special duties of the rikabdar, we shall only mention the custody and care of the harness etc. of the sultan (as among the Mamluks) and his pabul or shoes and idzime or boots (Kanlin of Sulaiman or Natiqat-name, p. 132).

It should be noted that, according to the ‘Afża Türkiki (i., 208), the services of the rikabdar like those of the eokhadrars were only required on gala days (eipâm–e famzhe). This practice is said to have been introduced under Mustafa III (1757–1774) out of consideration for the age of these concerned for them they were generally over 60 and had spent 40 years in the service of the court (ofigir yola). According to the same work, these duties were reduced to very little. During the ceremonies (sendâmle) of the Prophet’s birthday (mewul or mewulû), the two barians and at the birik or ceremonial appearances of the sultan, the rikabdar sat opposite the sultan in the imperial barge with the silhdar, hâzîzoda bashi and the two eokhadrars.

From all this we may conclude that if there really was a rikabdar in the time of Orghan he performed not only the duties of a squire but also those of a “cup-bearer” and we know that in Persian rikabdar means “cub-bearer”. In time, the rikabdar became a more and more important personage, these duties were divided between two special officers: on the one hand, the hâzîzoda and similar officers, and on the other, the iskemle aghais.

The rikabdar aghas, like the eokhadrars, received a daily salary of 50 tips (kâfe) while the silhdrar drew 45 (Ilerfenfen, MS. A.F.T. of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 189). Like the eokhadrars they had in their service two ladas of the hâzîzoda, a karabâkkû, a hattach with tasseled caps (silhû), two sofâli, a hekbieh and two yedektâz. The rikabdarars who did not attain the rank of silhdarar were put on the retired list (became tîrek) with a pension of 60–100,000 piastres. In the absence of the eokhadrar, the rikabdarar performed the duties of the silhdrar. On the quarters in the palace occupied by the rikabdarar, cf. "Ata, i., 312, sq.

The four chief officers of the hâzîzoda, including the rikabdarar, were often called by the name — not official, however — of kozuk vërsleri or "visiers of the armpit" because they had the privilege of touching the sultan, particularly of giving him their hand or taking him by the arm during a walk and they frequently attained the rank of

weâr (Cantemir, Hist. Emp. Ott., Paris 1743, iv, 119–121). The rikab ağhaları [cf. rikab] were also koltuk westleri.

The same four officers were also called 'arz ağhaları because they had the right to present (arz) to the sultan any petition which reached them, like the master of petitions (Rycaut, Bk. i., p. 97 of the French transl.; Castellan, iii. 183). According to Ahmad Kâsim (ii. 639), in processions, the iskemle aghais had the task of returning to those concerned petitions which were not granted.

The rikabdarars were abolished by Mah mùd, probably about the same time as the kozuk (in 1248 = 1832–1533; cf. Lutfi, iv. 68) and the silhdarar (in 1246; cf. Lutfi, iv. 61); cf. v. Hammer, Hist., xvii. 191.

Bibliography: See the works already quoted above of which the most important is the ‘Afża Türkiki. See also Ahmad Kâsim, Türkîkî, i. 186, 479; ii. 526; Hammer, Hist., viii, 15 for references not used here. (J. Deny)

RISALA. [See Rusâm].

RIYÂDÎ, Ottoman biographer of poets. Molla Mehmèd, known as Riyâdî, was the son of a certain Müsâfa Efendi of Birge (S.E. of Smyrna) and was born in 1566 (1572). He was first of all employed as a muqarrî, later became kâfat of Aleppo and died on 9th Safar 1054 (April 17, 1644) (according to J. v. Hammer, G. O. W., i., 44 in Cairo). He was known as al-Asâm, the "dumb". His chief work is his Riyâd al-Sagwar, a biographical dictionary of poets containing 384 names. It is known to have been finished by 1018 (1609). He also wrote an abbreviated translation into Turkish of the Wafâyât al-Ayyân of Ibn Khallikan. The lexicon has not yet been published but is accessible in a number of manuscripts, a list of which is given by F. Bâtlinger, G. O. W., i., 178 (add. Sambul, Lâl Ismaiîl, N°. 314). On a German translation of an extract from it by V. v. Rosenzweig-Schwannau, cf. Z. D. M.G. xx. (1866), p. 439, N°. 3 (filling 20 pages).


FRANZ BARINGER.

RIYÂH, an Arab tribe, the most powerful of those that, regarding themselves as descended from Hûlîl [q. v.], left Upper Egypt and invaded Barbary in the middle of the vth (xith) century. Their chief at that time was Mînûn b. Yâhîya of the family of Mîrdas. The Zirid emir al-Mu‘izz [q. v.], who did not foresee the disastrous consequences of the entry of the Arabs into Ifrikia, tried to come to an arrangement with him and to win over the Riyâh. The latter were the first to lay his country waste. But thanks to the protection of the chiefs of the Riyâh, to whom he had married his daughters, al-Mu‘izz himself succeeded in escaping from Kairawân and reaching al-Mahdiya (983).

At the first partition of Ifrikia which followed the invasion, the Riyâh were naturally the best served. They obtained the greater part of the plains, which the Berbers had abandoned to seek shelter among the mountains: they had thrust their relatives, the Abughlij, towards the east. They held Bedja which the caliph in Cairo had allotted to them in anticipation. The people of Gabes took
the oath of loyalty to Mūnis. "It was", says Ibn Khaldūn, "the first real conquest of the Arabs".

The Ḍajānim, a family related to the Riyyah, made Carthage a regular little capital, which they adorned with their buildings. Lastly, a chief of the main tribe, Muhītib b. Ziyād, made himself a fortress in al-Mu'allalā (a Roman circus?), among the ruins of Carthage. The powerful lords of al-Mu'allalā, however, supported the policy of the Zirids of al-Mahdiyya, and joined them in their resistance to the Almohads.

This resistance did not long impede the expeditions sent by the Maghribis against Ibrīkiya in anarchy. Defeated by ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin in 546, 555, 583 (1152, 1160 and 1187), the Arabs were ordered to supply contingents to the holy war in Spain. ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin, leaving a section of the Riyāḥ in Ibrīkiya under command of ʿAssākir b. Sulṭān, took the others to the Maghrib with their chief, ʿAssākir's brother Mazīd, known as al-Mulūk ("the axe"); cf. Dora, Sūsana, 311. (Ed. By Dora, Sūsana, 311.) They halted them in the Moroccan plains to the north of Ḫil Regeg. This control was little in keeping with the traditions of the Riyyāḥ; Mazīd fled to Ibrīkiya and there gave his support to the Banū Ghāniyya [q. v.] who were trying to revive for their own advantage the Almoravīd power.

We know how the trouble stirred up by the Banū Ghāniyya led to the Almohad caliph's appointing a governor of Ibrīkiya invested with very extensive powers, Abū Muḥammad of the Ḥafṣīd [q. v.] family. This governor naturally attacked the Riyāḥ and in order to be rid of them, encouraged the settlement in the country of the Sulaim Arbāds hitherto quartered in Tripolitania. Under the pressure of the Sulaim, the Riyyāḥ, the principal family of whom at this time was the Dawāwīda, migrated to the plains of Constantine where they were henceforth to remain.

In their new home the position of the Riyāḥ remained a very strong one. They had rights over all the centre of the modern department of Constantine, approximately from the region of Guelma to that of Bougie. In the Zāb [q. v.] they were on terms — which were sometimes friendly but more often hostile — with the Banū Moẓi of Biskra, who ruled this Ḥafṣīd province. This is how the Banū Moẓi had to fight against that curious movement, at once religious and social, stirred up by the Riyyāḥi marabout Saʿāda. The Dawāwīda, and in particular their most powerful family, the Awlād Muḥammad, held winter lands and enjoyed revenues paid by the people of the Ḫār in the Sahara region of the Wāḍi Righ.

By the end of the xvith century, the two chief branches of the main tribe, the Awlād Muḥammad and the Awlād Sūbā, were actively engaged in the politics of the Ḥafṣīd princes and the Abū al-Wāddīs of Tlemcen, in the enterprises of the pretenders who threatened their dynasties. The power of the Riyyāḥ of central Barbary lasted till the xvith and xviith centuries. According to Bernardino de Mendoza, they had in 1536 10,000 horsemen and large numbers of foot. The xviith century saw them assuring the Turkish Bey of Constantine, to whom they were connected by marriage and the independent sulṭān of Tuggurt. In 1844, Carette and Warnier noted that the name Dawāwīda was still synonymous with "noble Arabs".

Another group of the Riyyāḥ played a notable part in the history of the Zénāt states. In the extreme Maghrib, bodies of them transported by the Almohads to the plains of the coast faithfully served this dynasty, by trying to check the advance of the Marinids [q. v.]. Defeated near the Wāḍi Shū in 614 (1217), the Riyyāḥ were mercilessly punished by the victorious Marinids. Decimated and weakened, and driven northwards, they submitted to the humiliation of paying an annual tribute. Their name no longer figures on the map of modern Morocco except at a place near the road from al-Kashr to Tangiers.

Finally, at the other end of Barbary, in their first home, the name survives in the nomenclature of the tribes. The Tunisian caidate of the Riyyāḥ lives between Tebrursk and the hills which surround the Gulf of Tunis.


(Roger de Marches)
de Férone Manrand d'Antibes à Constantineople (1544), ed. by Léon Dorez, Paris 1901 (we also find there exceptionally riva, ríal and ritél).

For the pronunciation we may compare the Turkish ríyal with the Turkish ríyal, Šir, ríyal, for the Spanish real (del plata), name of a coin [cf. ríval]; cf. the French "gros royal," Turk, şıra, şıra, şıra, şıra, mod. ānta "piastre, formerly: écu" [cf. āntare]. Here also we find the prothetic form ríyal (Hindouglou, p. 200, s. v. "écu"); Another gives ríyal, under "real""). In the west, the Turkish word ríyal was sometimes transcribed reala, no doubt regarded as more correct (Herbert, L'Ambassade turque sous le Directoire, Paris 1902, p. 238). We cannot see whence comes the spelling with an aspirated ā (rikila), even in Arabic orthography, which we find in Garcin de Tassy, Memoire sur les monnaies propres... mus., p. 87 and in Jal under ríela (we have perhaps a graphical reaction against the hiatus).

The rank of ríyal, as well as those of kapudana and patrona to be discussed later, was at first known among the Turks only as applied to officers of the navies of Christianandom (cf. e.g. Ewliya Ėlɛbî and the Ottoman historians like Na'imâ and others). These ranks came into use among the Turkish sailors, at first unoffically, in the time of Sultan Mehmed IV, 1648—1687 (cf. below in connection with patrona). D'Ohsson, undoubtedly by confusion, says that they were used in the time of Mehmed II (1451—1481). We do not however find these titles of foreign origin in the Tarih ûl-Kibar or Hâdidî Khalifa (1656) nor in Hâdefen (d. 1691). It was, it appears, under Āb d-Al-Hamîd I (1774—1789) that they were officially adopted (Mehmed Şıke, Eşâd-i bâbî-ye ṭeğmanîye [1306 = 1890], i. 145).

We are well informed about the hierarchy of the naval high command at this period, thanks to the Teğrîfî-af kâlime, a work of Naşîática-Sheikhî-nâde Esâd Mehmed Efendi (d. 1848). On p. 1029 we have a list of the old establishment which combined the non-seagoing officers of which we shall be content to give a list here, and the seagoing officers who will be dealt with in more detail because the ríala was one of them and bore like them a name taken from the Venetians.

a. General officers of the Admiralty (terâşni-şârine).

(All three seem to have had, but perhaps only from the beginning of the sixteenth century, the right to the title of pasha).

1. The kapudan-pasha [q.v.] having the rank of vezîr (veziyet). He was the Captain of the Barbary (kapudan-ı derya) or, as was also said, the kapudan par excellence. The name kapudan from the Venetian kapitãne and its modernised form, probably under the influence of English, kapitan was further applied to any commander of a ship, small or large, foreign or Turkish. (The vowel u in the second syllable is due to the influence of the neighbouring labial p and Trévoux's Dictionary gives the intermediate form cauptanâ) under kapitan-bacha; cf. also Relation des 2 rébellions arrivés à Constantinople en 1730 et 1731, The Hague 1737, p. 23): 2. Terâşni-şârine omnîs ağa (câ字段 teşîlet) "Intendant de l'Arsenal" (d'Ohsson), Germ. "Intendant des Arsenal" (Hammer), Engl. "Intendant of the Marine" (Perry). He took the place of the Grand Admiral in his absence. From 1246 onwards: mutfîr.

3. Tarâsan-i âmirî ketkûbâsl (kochâsî) ogâ "Intendant des galères", "Lieutenant of the Arsenal", "Sachwalter des Arsenalen". He was particularly concerned with the police of the Admiralty.

b. Admirals with the title of bey.

(Except the 4th, these officers were sea-going admirals and took the name, of Venetian origin, of the vessels they commanded. The name might have the addition of humâyûn "imperial" in a Persian construction whence the official barbarisms: bashtarra-i humâyûn, kapudan-i humâyûn, etc. The full titles in theory were: bashtarra-i humâyûn kapudanî, kapudan-i humâyûn kapudanî etc.

1. Bashtarra, bashjarda, bashjarda (i humâyûn) - Ital. bastarda, Fr. bastarde or bâtarde. This was not the largest unit of the fleet. In Turkish as in Venetian usage the bastarda was a galley larger than the gala sensile (Turk, kadîâga or tekeâga), but smaller than the galeaza or galianz (Turk, mava) and had a very rounded poop "like a water-melon" (galeaz, sklî). Among the Turks it contained 26—36 otrââ or benches of 5—7 rows. The one which had the Kapudan pasha on board was called kapudan-pasha bashjard and had 26—36 otrââ. It was distinguished by the three lanterns (fener) attached to the poop in addition to that on the main mast (Tâbî, fol. 69; Dâire-i Pasha Türkîhî, 1309, p. 131). As it flew the flag of the Grand Admiral, it was sometimes (Menin-ki, Thevenac, i. 663; Barbier de Meynard) called "captain" but we shall see that among the Turks this name was given to another vessel. Chance has willed it that the first syllable in the word bashjard means in Turkish "head, chief" but it is difficult to say that the Ottomans gave first place to this ship simply as a result of a popular etymology. The disappearance of the ship propelled by oars resulted in the abolition of the bashjarda. Officially dismissed in 1764, according to d'Ohsson, it was still used from time to time on certain ceremonial occasions. The sailing-ship (başman, "galley") which became the flagship of the kapudan-pasha, was commanded by the "Flag-Captain" who, according to d'Ohsson, was called in Turkish shwarî kapudanî "captain of the ship-commanders" and, according to von Hammer (Staatsverf., ii. 493), sandjaş kapudanî, Germ. "Flaggenkapitain", Engl. "flag captain". Esâd Mehmed Efendi calls this officer, probably by an archaism, bashjard (i) humâyûnî pasha (commander of the imperial bashjarda of the (kapudan) pasha.

2. Kapudan-bey. Kapudana comes from the Venetian (galle or nave) capitana "galley or ship carrying the leader of a naval expedition, flagship" (Jal). In France it was called "la capitaine" or "capitannes" but these terms disappeared in 1669 with the office of general of the galleys, and in the French navy pride of place was given to the Rêale [see below]. On the kapudana which took part in the naval battle of Ceyme (1779) cf. Jaubert, Grammaire, appendice, p. 3. Kapudana and kapudan have often been confused (Hammer, Staatsverf., ii. 291; Blochet, Voyage de Cartier de Pinon, p. 128; Douin, Navarin, p. 250, 276, 295, 311). We find the full title of kapudan-i humâyûn kapudanî, e.g. in a letter from Mehmed 'Ali Pasha (of Egypt) to the grand vizier of the
of different colours [cf. below]. It was what the Venetians called the giunetta or cana (canna), from canna d’India. “Indian cane”, often taken in the sense of “bamboo” from which we also have the English word “cane”. They alone wore small turbans and fur-trimmed robes (cf. d’Ohsson, pl. 228).

When under ‘Abd al-Hamīd I [q.v.] or later under his successor Selim III, the naval hierarchy was organised and to some extent modernised, three grades of admiral were instituted (independent of the kapudan paša, who was the Grand Admiral or “amiralissimo”). They were:

1. the kapudana bey “Admiral”. Mehemd Shukri regards his rank as equivalent to the modern one of şhâri-i bâhiye reisi “president of the Higher Council of the Navy”. He had a fixed monthly salary of 4,500 piastres (1 piastre = 3 fars.) and in addition received pay for 1,000 men (on which he was liable to make various grants) but with the obligation to give to the kapulpaşas spica or djâisse to the value of 4,000 piastres.


It may be noted that in theory there was only one officer of each of these ranks at one time. All three took part in the battle of Navarino in 1827 (Douin, Navarin, p. 250 and passim). They were under the command of Tahir Paša who had the rank of mirmiran. He was himself patrona but this does not mean duplicating the office of the patrona who was subordinate to him because the commanders-in-chief of the fleet (terâsker or bash-kâğı) were chosen without regard to rank. Hizir-Elyas (Endüřan Türükî, p. 481) mentions a liman reisi with the rank of patrona in 1826.

The flag-commander of the kapulpaşa retained his functions but seems to have occupied a position on the edge of the hierarchy which the presence of the Grand Admiral on board sometimes made unenviable (v. Hammer, Staatsverf., ii. 293).

We do not know at what period these ranks were replaced by the more modern terms of muşhir, ferik and iyec. The equations of rank varied considerably. The riyalas are regarded as mir alay, mirmiran, iyec, ferik and even ibinijji ferik. It is probable that it was necessary to choose a grade between these. At Sebastopol in 1854, the Turkish fleet was commanded by a patrona, Ahmed Paša (cf. Ahmad Kusim, Türükî, p. 115).

In Egypt under the Khedives there was for a time a riyalas paša in command of the fleet.

Bibliography: Only d’Ohsson gives definite information about the officers mentioned above. Bk. viii. of vol. vii. (p. 420–438) (Tableau de I’Empire Othoman), devoted to the Navy will be read with interest. Cf. also Ubicini, Lettres sur la Turquie, second ed., Paris 1853, i. 484
ROKAIYA, daughter of Muhammad. That he had four daughters by Khaddija is repeated by all authorities, but there is no agreement regarding their order, which clearly shows that they aroused little interest in the early period. It is further suspicious that practically the same story is told of two of them, Rokaiya and Umm Kuhlum. They are both said to have married sons of Muhammad's uncle Abū Lahab [q.v.] but were forced by their father to divorce them when Muhammad began his career as a prophet. Still more suspicious is the circumstance that it is told of both that the marriages had not been completed when the divorces took place (lam yakun dakhala biha) although some time must have passed before there was a breach between Abū Lahab and his nephew. If we wish to save the tradition, we must assume that the sisters, like 'Aisha at a later date, were betrothed to Abū Lahab's sons and that the divorce took place before the wedding was carried through. It is however more probable that this story is an invention in order to keep the holy family pure from any contamination by relatives of the Prophet's arch-enemy [see also UMM KULTHUM], but the difficulties which this involved were not clearly seen. After the divorce the fair Rokaiya was married by 'Uthman b. Affân and went with him and other Muslims to Abyssinia, from which they returned after a time. They then went with the Prophet and other Muslims to Madīna. But when Muhammad was preparing for his raiding expedition to Bādīr, Rokaiya fell ill and died before her father returned home victorious. After several miscarriages she presented 'Uthman with a son who however lost his life as the result of an accident (a cock pecked him on the face).


RONDA (Ar. Runda), ethn. al-Rundi, a town in the south of Spain to the north of Algeciras and west of Malaga, 2,400 feet above sea-level in the centre of a vast mountainous amphitheatre at the edge of a rocky plateau which ends in precipitous walls on the western side and is cut in two by the great natural cleft of the Tajo 500 feet in depth, at the bottom of which runs the torrent here known as Guadalevin (Wâädî al-Laban) and later known as Guadiaro (Wâädî Aro). Its peculiar position makes it an almost impregnable natural fortress. At the present day the town is the capital of a partido judicial of the province of Malaga; it has a population of nearly 21,000 souls. The Muslim town of Ronda, which succeeded the ancient Roman and Visigothic Arunda, was from the viiith to the xvith centuries always reckoned one of the most important strongholds of Andalusia. Under the Umayyads [q.v.] it was the capital of the khâra of Takorônî [q.v.]. A number of descriptions of it, unfortunately very brief, have been preserved by the Arab geographers; al-Idrisi however does not mention it. We still see there several remains of the Muslim period, such as a remarkable gate in the suburb of San Francisco. The cathedral of Santa Maria La Mayor has taken the place of the great mosque; the ancient citadel or Alcazaba of the Nasîrid period was destroyed in 1808.

The principal fortress of the district of Tâkaronân was for a long period Bobastro [q.v.] which was the headquarters of the rebel 'Umar b. Ḥafṣün [q.v.]. On the fall of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain, Ronda became the capital of a little independent state in the hands of the Berber Banû Irân; among these rulers were Abû Nîr Hîlî b. Abî Kurra b. Dûnâs who was proclaimed in 431 (1039) and died in 449 (1058) after having been the prisoner of his redoubtable neighbour, the king of Seville, al-Mu'tadid [q.v.] Ibn ʿAbbâd, and his son Abû Naṣr Fâlîb, who after having held out for some months at the capital of his principality was killed at the instigation of the 'Abîdîd ruler, who annexed his state in 450 (1059). Ronda then became the residence of a prince of Seville until a son of al-Mu'tamîd [q.v.], al-Râjî, had to surrender it to the Almoravid forces under Gâdîr in 1091.

Ronda played an unimportant part under the Almoravids and Almohads. In the Nasîrid period [q.v.] it was for some time the appanage of the vizier and family of the Banû ʿl-Hakîm and was directly concerned in the internece fighting of this period. It was taken by the Catholic Kings after a siege of 20 days on May 20, 1485.


ROSETTA (Arabic Ras-Hîlîd), a town in Egypt, situated at 31° 24' N., 30° 24' E., on the Western bank of the Rosetta branch of the Nile (the ancient Balbitine) about ten miles above its mouth, which is known as al-Ârûsîyya and is dangerous to enter. Till the ixth century A.D., ships sailed direct to Fùwa; but owing to the excessive depositing of the silt in this region, Rosetta began to take its place during the reign of al-Muta-wakîl. In the xith century, however, Abu 'l-Fidâa remarks that it was still smaller than Fùwa; and, in the xivth, Ibn Dûmâkj (v. 114) says that it was exclusively inhabited by garrison troops (âhî hâdihi l-madîna kullumum mutûfîn). After the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517 A.D. and the decay of European trade through Alexandria, Rosetta became an important centre for maritime trade with Constantinople and the Aegean territory of the Turkish Empire. The Viceroy ʿAli Pâšâ, in 915 (1509), restored its old khâns (warehouses) and fundûks (hostelries), built new ones, and cleared the silt from its docks. The town continued to flourish until Muḥammad ʿAli [q.v.] reconstructed the Mâhüdiyya Canal for navigation between Alexandria and the Nile, and thus diverted the course of trade from Rosetta which declined rapidly to a mere fishing town with but few minor local industries such as rough cotton weaving, rice pro-
dication and oil manufacture. Its population in 1907 was only 16,666.

The topography of the town is largely medieval in character and it still retains many noble buildings which mark its past prosperity. Its streets and lanes are both narrow and circuitous with only one large fish market. Till modern times its wall was maintained for defence against Arab raids. At the mouth of the River, near Kûm al-‘Afrâh, two castles guarded the waterway entrance to Rosetta in the past. Vansleb, who saw these castles in May 1672, describes them thus: *one stands at the East-side of the River, and the other on the West. That which is about a mile and a half from Rosetta is square, encompassed about with strong Walls, built according to the old Model, having four Towers. One hundred fourscore and four *fantasures are in the Garison... The other Castle is but a *Monume, before it stands seven Pieces of Artillery on the Guard: Here commands also an *Aqu over a Company of *Moors, who examine all that go in, or out of the City* (State of Egypt, London 1678, p. 105).

In history, only few events may be gleaned about Rosetta. In 132 (749—750) it was the scene of a great but abortive Coptic Revolt, in 356 (962) the ʿAbd-‘al-Malik fleet of Tāṣū‘ under the admiral Shāmil routed the North African fleet of ʿObaid Allāh al-Mahdī [1], v. commanded by a certain Sulaiman in the waters of Rosetta; in 1218 (1803) it witnessed al-Hārid’s victory over the combined sea and land forces of the Ottoman Porte; and in 1222 (1807) it was saved by the English who came to help al-Must and his Mamlûk successors. It must also be remembered that in 1799 a.d. in the neighbourhood of the town, Boussard, an officer of the French Expedition, discovered the famous Rosetta Stone now in the British Museum.

Bibliography: See works already mentioned in articles on other Egyptian towns.

(Al-S. Atiya)

ROUBA B. AL-‘ADJDÁDJ AL-TAMYÍ, an Arab poet. The name Ru’ba is more frequent among men from eastern Arabia than is generally supposed. Arabic philologists give many explanations of this peculiarity: I am however certain that it is the Persian word رُبّā meaning *flute*. Al-Tamim in the *Kitâb al-Mu’talaf wa l-Mu’allaq* mentions three poets of this name (p. 121—122), but only Ru’ba b. al-Adjdâd b. of the tribe of the Banû Malik b. Sa’d b. Zaid Manâb b. Tamim became celebrated as a poet of *rajaz* verses, in which genre he surpassed both his father and the latter’s rival Abu l-‘Najîm al-‘Idîjî. Of his life very little is known. Like his father he spent most of his life in the desert (*ṣâï̄f*), and only came into the towns when he sought presents for his panegyrics from the great. Born about 65 (685), in his middle years he went about with the armies which were spreading the power of Islam. His earliest productions are certainly lost, but we have a panegyric (N°. 22) on al-‘Kâsim b. Muhammad al-Thâkifî, the conqueror of Sîdîn, on his return from India in 94 (713). As in the following year al-‘Kâsim was thrown into prison and murdered, the date of this poem is fairly certain. Our poet then travelled in Eastern Persia, either as a soldier or a merchant, and a further poem by him (N°. 26) is dedicated to another governor of Sîdîn, ʿAbd al-Malik b. Kâîs al-Dhibî who was there about 10 years later. Whether he was in Khurāsân during the troubles that broke out after the death of Khâtab al-Husîm (90 = 715) is not certain, but several poems are dedicated to individuals who took part in the fighting there. His poem attacking al-Muhabal (N°. 27) shows that he was against the Yamanis as do his poems in praise of Mâlama b. ʿAbd al-Malik whom conquered Yazîd b. al-Muhabal and killed him (102 = 720). But he must have again been in eastern Arabia or the Ṣlāk, as is shown by his poems on Khâlid b. ʿAbd Allâh al-Kâsîrî, Abân b. al-Walîd al-Badjâlî and al-Muhabalî b. ʿAbd Allâh al-Kilâbî. At a later date, he dedicated poems to men who were active in Persia like Muhammad b. al-Asâfîth al-Khuzîî who was in Kirmân in 129 (747) and particularly Naṣr b. Saiyâr, who failed to put down the rising of Abu Muslim and died in 131 (749). A poem (N°. 41) is dedicated to the last Umayyad caliph Marwân b. Muhammaal of whom he still hopes that he will conquer all his enemies.

As he had in this way shown his attachment to the Umaiyads, it is no matter for surprise that Ru’ba did not feel his life safe when he was summoned before Abu Muslim. Of the audience we only know that Abu Muslim showed himself a connoisseur of Arabic. Two poems of his, in praise of Abu Muslim are to be found in Geyer’s *Nachtrag* (Diiamb 4 and 6). Several other poems in praise of members of the new dynasty have survived; one (N°. 55) is dedicated to Abu l-‘Abbâs al-Saffîfî and two to his uncle Sulaimân b. ʿAli (Nrs. 45 and 47), and the latest poems of Ru’ba are in praise of al-Manṣūr, who succeeded his brother as Caliph in 136 (754) (N°. 14 and Diiamb 8). He was then an old man and is said to have died in 145 (762).

All Ru’ba’s poems are in the *rajaz* metre; the few verses in other metres ascribed to him I have found to be by other poets and wrongly attributed to him. He had learned the art from his father, whom he even accuses of having taken credit for his poems when Ru’ba began to write, and we actually have a poem by Ru’ba against his father (N°. 57). From his father he also inherited a fondness for unusual words and his poems are among the most difficult in the Arabic language, as they are full of words which are never or only very rarely found in other poets. One even suspects that for the sake of effect the poet coined new words which did not previously exist. He is fonder than any other poet of a kind of alliteration or, to be more accurate, an accumulation of a number of forms from the same verbal root. No one can make this sort of thing beautiful and Ru’ba’s poems have probably survived only because the lexicographers found them a rich quarry for unknown words. A proof of this is the number of lines from his poems which are quoted in the great dictionaries, and in the *Lišân al-‘Arab*, for example, run to several thousands.

It is no wonder then that the learned men of al-Bâṣra and, less often, of al-Kûfâ visited him to increase their knowledge of the *lungh* until he became tired of them. We even find that Ibn Khâlalwâhî in his *Fraîh Îtâqîn Sûrâ* quotes Ru’ba for readings of the Kûran which have no other justification that they are different from the known readings. Ru’ba simply claimed to know better.

Ru’ba had two sons, ʿAbd Allâh to whom two poems are dedicated (20 and 56), and ʿUkba who
also wrote poems in the same metre as his father (Dīthīkī, Rūbāt, i. 23; Ibn Kūtalū, Shī‘rī; Marzūbān, Muwāshāhāt, p. 218 and 366; Ibn Rakhīqī, Ūmda, i. 136).

Rūba‘ī’s poems were collected by several scholars, among them Abū ʿAmr al-Šabābī, Ibn al-ʿArabī, and al-Šukkārī, of whom the last two are probably represented by the surviving manuscripts (cf. Diamb. 40—44). The contents of these manuscripts have been edited by Ahlwardt (Berlin 1903), unfortunately without the commentary which is absolutely necessary for the poems of Rūba‘ī, and in the alphabetical order of the rhymes which makes it difficult to recognize the original arrangement of the collection. As this edition was incomplete, Geyer in 1908 published in a collection of several rubā‘īs poets eleven further poems with the commentary under the title Altarabische Diyamen. Ahlwardt had in his editions of other poets added a collection of verses which he had found in various works quoted as Rūba‘ī. This collection was extended by Geyer in his Beiträge zum Dwân der Rūba‘ī (S. B. d. A., Wiss. Abt., Leipzig, 1908, 165—197). Even then there remain lines attributed to Rūba‘ī which have escaped both editors, while many lines are not by Rūba‘ī but belong to other poets. Confusion seems to have begun at quite an early date between the poems of Rūba‘ī and those of his father al-ʿAdīdājī. Ahlwardt also published a complete German translation of the whole Dwân in rhyme. The value of this translation is unfortunately small as it is really only a paraphrase and does not help us with the difficulties of the Arabic text.

Biography: Biographical notices on Rūba‘ī are found in Djiama bī, Tāhā bī, ed. Hell, p. 147 (where unfortunately the MSS. have a lacuna); Ibn Kūtalū, Kītāb al-Shī‘rī, ed. de Goeje, p. 376—381; Marzūbān, Muwāshāhāt, p. 210; Kītāb al-Aghdānīkh, xxi, 84—91; Ibn Khallikān, ed. Cairo 1310, i. 187. — Lines by Rūba‘ī are quoted in large numbers in all the large dictionaries.

(F. Krenkow)

RUBĀĪ, quatrains (plural rubā‘īyat, from the Arabic rubā‘ī, ‘quadripartite’). Its fundamental characteristics have already been defined (cf. the article ‘Arba‘ī, i. p. 470); on p. 468 sq. are given the forms of Arabic popular songs in quatrains. It consists of two distichs (ba’it) or four hemistichs (miyār) rhyming together with the exception of the third (aaba), the third being called khāfīi (‘castrated’); the two hemistichs of the first ba’it (muṣarrat) must rhyme. The ruba‘ī in which the two hemistichs have the same rhyme is found particularly among the old poets (cf. ʿIṣārī’s Dīwān). The ruba‘ī lends itself to every kind of inspiration. According to one theorist, the first three hemistichs serve as an introduction to the fourth which ought to be sublime (buland), subtle (laft) or epigrammatic (izā). According to E. G. Browne (Lit. Hist. of Persia, i. 472), the ruba‘ī is “almost certainly the oldest product of the poetical genius of Persia”. The Persian philologists attribute the invention of this metre to a child playing at nuts with its playmates: one of the nuts having fallen out of the hole by a rebound then fallen back rolling, the child called out ghālān ghālān hāmī rastāfī bu nābī-ī saw, “rolling, rolling it goes to the bottom of the hole”. According to the Tādākhara of Dawlatshāh (ed. Browne, p. 30), the child was the son of the emir Yaḥbū b. Lālī the Safarīd and the officials of the court recognised in this hemistich a variety of ḥazāf, “the second hemistich (miyār)” to it with the same scansion, then a second line (laft) which they called dū-ba’iti ("poem in two verses"); but some scholars, considering that it consisted of four hemistichs (miyār) adopted the name rubā‘ī and Rūdākī was the first to excel in it” (it should be noted that Asadī’s dictionary Lughatī Frās, ed. Horn, quotes two rubā‘īs by poets at least as old: Abū b-Mu‘ayyad, p. 68 and Ṣāhīd, p. 112). The anecdote is again found in a work written in 1220 (nearly three centuries before Dawlatshāh), the Muḥammad ibn Ḥāfiz al-Šaybānī ‘Aḥādīm of Shams-i Kās (ed. Mirzā Muḥammad and Browne, p. 88): one holiday, in a street of Ghaznī, the poet Rūdākī (“at least I believe so”, says the author) was watching some children playing at nuts: a boy of ten or fifteen improvised the same hemistich in the same conditions. “These words seemed to the poet a suitable metre, a pleasing poetical form; he consulted the rules of prosody and recognised in it one of the derivatives of the haṣaṣf; ... on account of the high place which needed fine eyes, Rūdākī confined himself to two lines (ba’it) for each poem; ... as the inventor of the metre was a young and innocent boy (tor), Rūdākī called the metre tarānum” (cf. Horn, Grundr. der neu-persischen Etymol., No. 382 and n. 3: Nīẓāmī’s hemistich is no doubt quoted from the Farhang-i Dīwānī: bul tarānum tarānum miyārī, ‘every young man was singing verses’). The Haft Kūlūsī describes tarānum as the rubā‘ī of which the four hemistichs (miyārī) have the same rhyme (which is at least disputable). According to Shams-i Kās (op. cit., p. 90), “the connoisseurs of poems set to music (maḥfīz) called tarānum the ruba‘ī set to music and du-ba’iti the ruba‘ī without music, because it had no more than two lines; the arabised Persians (musta‘riba) called the ruba‘ī the dū-ba’it, because in Arabic the haṣaṣf has four maṭalīn [while in Persian it has eight]; each line of this [Persian] metre makes two Arabic lines [in other words: a Persian miyār is equal to an Arabic ba’it]. From the fact that the metrical change used in this metre did not exist in Arabic poetry, Arabic was not written in this metre, but now the modern poets use it freely. Arabic ruba‘īs have become common in Arab lands’. On this point in his Dmawat al-Karīm (Aleppo 1349, p. 174), al-Bakhārizī (10th century; q.v.) says that his father repeated several Arabic ruba‘īs to him; these may be reckoned among the earliest in this language. In the Sādīqā period the vogue of the ruba‘ī seems to have reached its height. Rawandi (Rūhāt al-Ṣadīr, ed. Muḥammad ʿIqbal, p. 344) says a propos of a man of letters of Hamadān: “He was called Nādjam (al-Din) Dūbait; he possessed wealth which he lavished on men of talent; with an inkwell and a pen he put into writing all ruba‘īs that he found; he left neither property nor furniture; his heirs shared 50 ma‘n of manuscripts containing du-ba’its”. No Persian metre admits of so many variations. Indeed, the theorists number 24 types of ruba‘ī derived, half from the haṣaṣf-i ʿakhrān, half from the haṣaṣf-i aḥkrān (the latter more pleasing to the ear, according to Shams-i Kās). The Khurāsanī philologist Ḥasan Ḥatīn divides these two series into two trees (haṣaṣf) which figure in the treatises on prosody (Shams-i Kās, p. 92; Blochmann, Prosody of the Persians, p. 68)
and which clearly show the variations (za'ajj) of the hada'i muqaddamân salâm (maflâlu'), 5 times. Four different metres may figure in the four hemistichs of rubâ'i. Shams-i Kâis thus explains the mechanism of this poetical form: "The beginning of the hemistichs of the dib-bati is maf'ulun (called aṣkârâh) or maf'ulun (called akhrâm). When the first foot is maf'ulun, the second becomes maf'ulun (salâm) or maf'ulun (called aṣkârâh) or maf'ulun (called akhrâm). When the first foot is maf'ulun, the second becomes maf'ulun or maf'ulun or fâllûn (this last aṣkârâh). When the first foot is maf'ulun or maf'ulun, the third becomes maf'ulun or maf'ulun; when the second foot is maf'ulun or maf'ulun or maf'ulun, the third becomes maf'ulun or maf'ulun. The last foot which follows maf'ulun or maf'ulun becomes fa' (aṣkârâh) or even fa' (azalî); that which follows maf'ulun or maf'ulun becomes fa' (aṣkârâh) or even fa' (azalî) or even fa' (aṣkârâh)."

Further, according to Shams-i Kâis, some poets have written maqâdâmât (pieces of several lines) in this metre, e.g. Abû Ţûlîr Khâtûnî (from whom he quotes a passage); Farrâqî also deliberately composed a kaṣâda [q.v.] in the dib-bati metre, sometimes retaining the same rhyme in the two hemistichs so that some rubâ'î can be taken from it. It may be recalled that the formula fa' hawâlî wa-lâ kawâwi alâ bi 'llih (maflâlu' maf'ulun maf'ulun fa') was used as mi'dîrî in certain quatrains (quoted by Aghâ Ahmâd 'Alî, Kūsân-i Târîkh, ed. Blochmann, 1867, p. 9). Most Persian poets composed rubâ'î in the metre mentioned. Some owe their fame to this metre: Abû Sa'îd [q.v.]: 'Umar-i Khvâyânî; Bâbâ Aâfî al-Dîn Khâshî (ed. Sa'id Nâfîsî, Teherân i.d., p. 550); the attribution of this poem is attributed to Du'bâl al-Dîn Khámti (Stambul 1312, p. 37). On the other hand, the name rubâ'î is wrongly but traditionally associated to the quatrains of Bâbâ-Ta'îr [q.v.] in hada'i muqaddamân maflâlu' (maflâlu' maf'ulun fâllûn) and other quatrains in dialect (fâkhâriyat; cf. H. Kohî Khâmâni, Tâbân-i nîlî, Teherân 1310): these are really ba'tâs. On the quatrains in Arabic, cf. Dâyî, Supplement, s.v. Ben Chêbî, Thulif al-Albâfi Mi'âm Ablâr al-'Arîb (Algers 1928, p. 113-117); in Turkish: Gûbî, Ottoman Poetry, p. 85; in Hindûstânî: Garînî, Tâsûtî, Lût. hindouste, 2nd ed., i. p. 36-37 and his edition of the Dîwân of Wâlu (passim).


HENRI MASSE

RUDAKî, Abî 'Abd Allâh Diwâ'âr B. Muhammâd B. Hâkîm B. Abî al-Râjîmân B. Ādâm, a native of Rudak in the vicinity of Samarkand; he is said to have been the first good poet in the Persian language; according to al-Bâlîmî, vizier of Ismâ'îl b. Ahmad, emir of Khurasân, he had no equal among either Arabs or Persians; he died at Rudak in 329 (940-941) (Samâ'î, Jâmi'î, in G.M.S., vol. 262; similar text in E. G. Browne, Hand-List of Muhammadan MSS. in the University of Cambridge, p. 701). To be more accurate, Rudagi was born and died at Bannudj (Yâkût, Mu'âqâm, s.v.) near Rudak. Some writers wrongly say that his tabâlîni came from his skill in playing the lute (rud, rudâk). In any case the pronunciation Rûdâkî should be abandoned. We know few details of his life. From scattered allusions in his poems, it seems that Rudaki left his native village to go to Bâdhîs to the Sâmânid amir Nâsîr b. Ahmad, whose panegyrist he became. Later he accompanied the amir to Bâdhîs and Herât. There is located the incident, recounted by several biographers, of the courtiers desiring of returning to Bâdhîs to spend the winter there begging Rudaki to use his influence with the amir Nâsîr; the poet composed his famous poem ("The scent of the river Mûlyân", etc.) which decided the prince to return at once; richly rewarded, Rudaki returned to Samarkand, travelling sumptuously. Two verses attributed to Rudaki refer to journeys to Sarâghûs and to Nishâpur.

The poets Abd-al-Salâm and Samî both attribute to a certain 'Aliyân, the favourite slave of Rudaki. The biographers say that he was born blind, but a number of his verses which describe in glowing colours the beauties of the sensual world (quoted in Nâfîsî, p. 550 sqq.), prove that he lost his sight at an advanced age; it has been supposed that the blindness was caused either by a clumsy oculist or was a reappearance of the protégés of the vizier Bâ'ârî. Rudaki, banished from the Sâmânid court on the dismissal of the vizier (326), is said to have retired to his native village; from this period (his three last years) date the verses in which he regrets his youth and his brilliant past (Nâfîsî, p. 561). In his earlier days, according to his biographers and the allusions of later poets, his talents had considerably enriched him. Following Abî Sa'îd Idrîsî (d. 405), author of a history of Samarkand, Samînî says that Rudaki was buried at Bannudj, "behind the garden of the vizier", which text illuminates an ancient quatrains which proves his fame after death). According to some writers, Rudakî wrote 1,300,000 bâit six mâqânasî (the Farhâng-i Lâkhângî mentions one of them: Dawrânî, ûsîfî) in addition to his diwân of lyrics; on the other hand, Thâ'âlîbî, Firdâswî and others agree in saying that he put the Kâlîta wa-dînî (q.v.) into verse from a translation into Persian prose by order of the Sâmânid emir Nâsîr. Of his works only a few fragments remain. E. Denison Ross (J. R. A. S., 1924, p. 609 sqq.) has shown that the edition of the Dîwân of Rudakî (Teherân 1315) consists chiefly of the poems of Kafrân of Tabriz [q.v.] who lived a century later. Does this confusion come from the name Naşr, borne by the patron of both poets and figuring in their panegyrics? E. D. Ross agrees that this attribution took place early to supply the loss of the poems of Rudaki, whose fame had remained. Hasan Râzî b. Luft Allah in his madâkîrî entitled Maqûlîn (finished in 1409) says he had examined some copies of Rudaki's Diwân and only attributed a dozen haftâs and 20 quatrains after collation to Rudakî, the remainder to Kafrân. In all, according to Ross, we may attribute to Rudaki the authorship of the following:

1. the isolated verses quoted in the Lâkhângî Fûri of Asadî (ed. Horn, p. 18-19); 2. six distichs from the translation of the Kaflîa quoted in the Thulif al-Mulûk (J.R.A.S., 1924, p. 638); 3. four pieces quoted by Baihâkî (J.R.A.S., loc. cit., p. 639); 4. the 2 quotations in Shams-i Kâis (Maflâmî, ed. Mirzâ Muhammad and Ernc. index); 5. the famous ode on the river Mûlyân (Nâfîsî 'Arâdî, Cabâr Mâhlâ, transl. Browne, p. 33); 6. the haftâ (q.), No. 6 in Ethé's collection (Rudakî, der}
the pulpit mosque of the district was in Kardaji, known as Karadji Rūdhawar to distinguish it from the same place near Ḫisāḥān, Karadji Abī Dūlāf.

Burkiyaruk in 495 (1001–1002) went from Rūdhawar via Marjā Karatgein to Sāwā ( Ibn al-Ādīr, x, 137). Ḥamīd Allāh al-Mustawfī calls the district Ṣādūrdū with the towns of Sirkān and Tujū. On modern maps we still find Sirkān at the southern base of the Alwand, and Tujū after which the district is now called, a little farther south.

Not far from the village of Rūdhawar, i.e. presumably of Karadji, was a village called Muṣglān (al-Sayyid al-Murtada, Tādī al-ʿĀrūs, Cairo 1307, vii, 178; P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, v, 552).

The present ruins of Rūdišāwar (De Morgan, Mission en Perse, ii, 136) are certainly those of Karadji, capital of Rūdhawar (Le Strange, East Caliphs, p. 197, note 1).


(E. HONGMANN)

**Al-RUDHAWARI** ZAHR AL-DIN ABU SHUQAR MUḤAMMAD B. AL-IJUṢAIN B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABD ALLAH B. IBRĀHIM, an ABBASĪD vizier. Al-Rūdhawarī was born in al-Ahwāz in 437 (1045–1046); his father Abū Yaʿqūb al-Iṣausan, who had died just as he was about to take over the vizierate to which he had been appointed by the Caliph al-Kāʿim [q. v.] (460 = 1067–1068), was a native of Rūdhawar, a little town near Ḫamadhān. He studied in Baghdad under the direction of ʿAbd Abī Ḥašāk al-Sayyid and in 471 (1078–1079) was appointed vizier by the Caliph al-Muqtaṣad but dismissed after a short period of office. After the fall of ʿAmīd al-Dawla b. ʿAṭārī [see ʿAMĪD ʿAṬĀRĪ 2.] al-Muṣfadī again gave him the vizierate in Shībān 476 (Dec. 1083–Jan. 1084), and this time he held office for several years. In ʿAṣaf or Rābiʿ I, 484 (April or May 1091) he was dismissed at the instigation of the Sālīkān Malīkshāh [q. v.] and retired to Rūdhawar. From there he went in 487 (1094) on the pilgrimage to Mekka; in the vicinity of al-Rabādhā however, the caravan was attacked by Beduinos and al-Rūdhawarī is said to have been the only one who escaped. He then settled in Medina where he lived till his death in the middle of Dajmāyd II, 488 (June 1095). He was buried on the Bahīz al-Gharqad near the tomb of Ibrāhīm, the son of the Prophet.

Al-Rūḍhawarī is praised by eastern historians not only for his piety and devotion to duty, but also for his eloquence and poetical gifts. He wrote among other works a continuation of the Tafṣīr al-Umām of Ibn Miskawīh [q. v.] (Dīwān Ṯafṣīr Tafṣīr al-Umām) containing the years 385–389 (979–999), edited and translated by Amedroz and Margoliouth, The Eclipse of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate, Oxford 1920–1921.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khalīlīk, Wafâyāt al-Aʿyān (ed. Wustenfeld), No. 712 (transl. de
But the souls that turn away through asceticism from the sensual world, prepare themselves by good deeds and — this is the most important — purify and perfect themselves by love and knowledge, can, either in ecstasy ("Theology", p. 8; cf. thereon Massignon, _Timiæs inédits_, p. 131 sq.) or after death raise themselves to their origin (συνών, νυκτήν, τρίσφος, ταταξίθεν = Greek ἔφοβος), where they see the ἀφέλει and through it God himself in light and beauty. Plato had already spoken of this elevation (e.g. _Republic_, vii., p. 517 B: τὸ εἰκόνον τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἄνωτέρω ὁμοιόμορφον ἔφοβον). According to the "Theology" (p. 9 sq.), Herakleitos, Empedocles and Pythagoras also urged the soul to this ascent; the ἵππων al-Ṣā‘īd add Polémoy, the astronomer, and interpret the ascension of Christ and Muhammad’s journey to heaven (μετάνοια) in a spiritual sense. Muslim philosophers and mystics did the same.

After what has been said, it is evident that the elevation (συνών) of the soul to its origin (ιδιαὶ θείαι) can be called a return. It is more closely defined as a return to its interior, to its own being (ἰδιαὶ διάταξις). It is an entering into itself, a becoming conscious of one’s own self; not a losing of being, not a destruction. The speculative mystics in Islam went a great deal farther in this direction.

According to the "Theology" (p. 18 sq.), the return to the origin or being can only be a state (βαίνει) of the soul, not of the mind. The ἀφέλει always remains and therefore never needs to return to itself; thinking, thinker and thought are always one in its being. When in the _Liber de causis_ (ed. Bardenhewer, § 6, cf. § 14) a return to its being is predicated of the ἀφέλει, this can only be interpreted as an uninterrupted self-consciousness.

So far the doctrine of the fall and return of the soul can be presented as fairly uniform. It shows a pessimistic conception of the life of the soul in combination with the body. But it also finds an optimistic interpretation ("Theology", p. 10 sq.). With Plotinus it is observed that Plato talks in another language in the _Timaeus_ (cf. p. 28 sq.), that of the _Phaedo, Phainomena_ and _Republic_. According to the _Timaeus_, God created this beautiful world and equipped it in his great goodness with mind (ἀφέλει) and life (ς σοῦ). Not only has he sent the all-soul into the world but also our (part-)souls so that the world may be as perfect as possible. If the individual soul can only conceive the sensual world correctly, i.e. as the image of the intelligible world, its combination with the physical world will not be a misfortune for it. Both worlds have come from God, the pure good. The only question is, what is the purpose of the soul in this world.

To this the "Theology" answers (p. 43): that the union of the soul with a body is not a final aim for the individual soul. In any case, union with the world soul and the contemplation of the ἀφέλει and of God gives it a higher bliss for which it longs; but first of all it has to prepare itself for this. It has a divine task. If it descends into the corporeal world, it receives strength from above to form and guide a body. Provided it does not sink too low, it derives advantage and knowledge from it. Its previously dormant strength and the nature of this new become known to it. This is its very purpose, that it should come to know itself and its origin. The journey through the corporeal world is for it a course of training. Therefore (p. 80) the individual soul should not be blamed for leaving the spiritual world and coming into this world to...
adorn it and to reveal its own nature. After it completes its work it returns to its origin.

Both expositions of the fate of the soul, pessimist and optimistic, have influenced Muslim thinkers. With the gnostics, the Ikhwan al-Safa and many mystics, pessimism predominates, while from Fârâbî onwards the philosophers are more inclined to optimism. It is to be noted that the terminology of the «Theology» was only partially adopted. Rudjîn, for example, is found only when from the context neo-Platonic influence can be deduced; but it did not become a proper technical term. In place of rudji and marji we usually find ma'dâd and 'asad which are explained as return in the neo-Platonic sense.

That the teaching of the Ikhwan al-Safa turns almost entirely on the spiritual substantiality of the soul and its immortality is well-known. God's belief has often and expressly pointed out this out (e.g. Vortrâungen, p. 31, 163 and Koranauslegung, p. 183 sqq.). The third part of their encyclopaedia is wholly devoted to the soul (on ma'dâd, especially râsûl 32 and 38 sqq., Bombay ed.). The 38th treatise is entitled: Fi 'l-Ba'd wa 'l-Nâdîr wa 'l-Kiyâma: these are three synonyms for resurrection, here interpreted in a spiritual sense. But in other parts of this work also (i. 3, ii. 27—29; iv. 43 sq.), there is much to the point. The famous passage in the «Theology» on the Plotinian ecstasy (i. 3, p. 69) is quoted, and the pseudo-Aristotelian «Book of the Apple» modelled on the Phaedo of Plato is mentioned (iv. 2, p. 119 sqq.). The value of life in the world is, it is true, sometimes recognised but the misery of the wandering soul is more strongly emphasised. It is frequently pointed out that the weak souls cannot help themselves, that they require advice and instruction from prophets and philosophers as guides in the community of life. We believe so that they may be put upon the right path of return. The principal thing is the gnostic, for what food and drink are to the body, knowledge and wisdom (ilm and hikma) are to the soul (ib. 27, p. 313 sqq.). Like the physician Rasûl and the philosopher Kindi the Ikhwan chose the Socrates of Hellenistic tradition as their first leader; he is however not the only one. The individual souls require many philosophers and prophets and also living guides (generally a late Hellenistic principle). With their help the good, wise soul advances to union with the world-soul and through this with the 'âgd and God. The union of the individual soul with the world-soul is the minor resurrection (kîyâma); the major resurrection takes place when the world-soul separates itself entirely from matter and returns to the higher world of the spirits and of God (cf. Tj. de Boer, Wür- bezüge in den Islam, Haarlem 1921, p. 77 sqq., esp. p. 98 sqq.).

The doctrine of the ma'dâd became more complicated after the theory propounded by Fârâbî and more clearly developed by Ibn Sinâ of the ten spirits of the spheres (nûlî). The individual souls endowed with intelligence, according to this, do not descend from the world-soul as parts of it, but they are, like the bodies of the earthly world, products of the last spirit in the series of emanation, i.e. of the 'âgd fa'dâl. The purified soul longs for this spirit and its return is the first place to it. Its longing goes further, to come as near as possible to God and to become like him, so far as it is possible for man. The philosophers are distinguished from the speculative mystics by the fact that from Fârâbî to Ibn Rusîd the first question they put is: How is the union (littîqal) of our soul with its origin (the 'âgd fa'dâl) possible? The mystics, on the other hand, however differently their inner states and stations are described, desire nothing else than becoming one with God himself (littîhâd).

According to Fârâbî, the soul finds its return by the way of right knowledge and pious acts, but knowledge is esteemed more highly than deeds. Deeds remain in the world but knowledge enters into the spirit [cf. the article 'AMAL in the Supplement].

With the doctrine of the ecstatic conditions of the soul Fârâbî combines in exemplary fashion his prophetology, especially in the «Model State», a copy of Plato's republic, but interpreted in the metropolitan spirit of the Stoics. This turns upon in the harmony of religion and philosophy. The agreement is based on the fact that they both come from the same source: the difference is explained by the fact that the souls of the prophets and philosophers take up different attitudes. In their ascent in the ecstatic condition to the 'âgd fa'dâl the soul of the prophet receives revealed truth through its imagination, while the soul of the philosopher receives illuminating wisdom through its intellect. But the truth is one and the same, so the philosophers down to Ibn Rusîd and Ibn Sâhîn, (sixth = xiiith century), teach, and many mystics are of the same opinion. Cf. Fârâbî, Ab-handlungen ed. Dieterici, p. 69 sqq. and Muttersaat, p. 46 sqq.

According to Ibn Sinâ's «Division of the Sciences of the Mind» (Ikhân al-'Ulam al-'âshiyah in Tis. Rasûl, Constantinople, p. 76 sqq.), metaphysics (with Aristotle here called Theology) presents in the fundamental parts (mu'âal) among other things the theory of emanation, but on the other hand deals with the doctrine (ilm) of ma'dâd along with prophetology as derived or applied parts (furwî). This means that the theory of fa'id possesses a higher place than the doctrine of the return.

Ibn Sinâ here again supports Fârâbî. More definitely than the latter he adopts the neo-Platonic doctrine of the spirituality and immortality of the soul. This is not merely the form of its body, as Aristotle taught, of course inconsistently, but a spiritual and therefore indestructible substance. Against Plato and Pythagoras it is asserted that it has no pre-existence in the world-soul and does not migrate from one body to another. The 'âgd fa'dâl gives (presumably from an inexhaustible supply) a suitable soul to each body that is sufficiently prepared for it. In sense one can say that it has come into existence, but it will never perish. Fârâbî was, as Ibn Tufail (Ibad, ed. Gauthier, p. 11) remarks, what unbridled in his opinion on the return of all souls, even of the wicked, Ibn Sinâ, on the other hand, not; but both interpreted the rewards and punishments in the next world in a spiritual sense, as was also the case with the Ikhwan al-Safa. It is also to be noted that Ibn Sinâ, especially in his mystical writings, uses terms of a more Sûfi character than Fârâbî.

Ghâzâlî took over from the philosophers just mentioned the doctrine of the spirituality and immortality of the soul, without however, at least in his principal works, drawing from this its logical spiritual deductions regarding the next world. In his Tahâfut (ed. Bouyges, p. 344 sqq.) he defends
the orthodox doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies on the last day, while in his esoteric writings he speaks in allegory after the Sufi fashion (cf. Ibn Rushd, in Tuhfisit al-Tahifut, ed. Bouyges, p. 530 sqq.). Ibn Rushd therefore accuses him of contradiction, defends the philosophers and observes that the Sufis believe in a spiritual return (mdad țihdan) and are still regarded as good Muslims. But what is the personal opinion of this philosopher? It looks as if he hesitated to come out with his real opinion. It must therefore be sought in his larger works on metaphysics and psychology which have not yet been sufficiently investigated. But it is often very difficult to say where the commentator on Aristotle stops and the philosopher begins. Thory was the position to say that Ibn Rushd more than Fârâhi and Ibn Sinâ regards the soul as the form of its body. With this its spiritual substantiality and individual immortality would disappear.


(T. de Boer)

RÜH, [See NAFL.]

RÜH, HATIM b. KABIŞA, governor of IFRÎKIYA, was appointed to this high office by the caliph Hârûn al-Rashid in 171 (789). Under al-Manûrî he had been dâjîb, then governor of al-Haţarâ; then he was appointed by al-Mahdi successively governor of al-Kufa, Sînî, Tabâristân and Palestine. He must have been advanced in years when Hârûn al-Rashîd sent him to Ifrîkiya in the year after his accession to the throne. He belonged to the family of al-Muhammadî, which had already sent two governors to the same province and was to supply two more after him. "It seems that at this period the caliph thought of entrusting the affairs of IFRÎKIYA to a vassal family" (Vonderheyden). The governorship of the Muhamîdîs which preceded that of the Aghlabîs, was very successful. The rebel Berbers appeared to be finally overcome and the Khârijî agitation was suppressed; so successfully was the position that Rûh b. Hatim when he arrived at Kairawân in Rajab 171 (Dec. 787–Jan. 788) had no serious difficulties to face. Besides, he had brought with him new contingents of the djund, 500 horsemen, who were joined soon after by 1,500 others brought by his son Kabişa. For the three years of his governorship, the country was peaceful. Rûh even succeeded in concluding a peace with 'Abîd al-Walâhî (q. v.), the Rustamî mînâm of Tâhert. The authors who are our authorities upon him, notably Abu 1- 'Arab and Ibn 'Idâhî, make special mention of his generosity, his stoicism in face of adversity and of his skill in disarming his opponents. As he was showing signs of senility, the postmaster and a kâdî of the province requested the caliph to appoint a successor to him secretly, who could take his place if necessary. Following their advice. Hârûn al-Rashîd appointed Nasr b. 1âbîb. Rûh b. Hatim died on 10th Ramadan 174 (Feb. 3, 791), and his son Kabişa was formally recognised as his successor in the great mosque of Kairawân. But the postmaster and the kâdî informed Nasr, the governor designate, and Kabişa had to give way to him.

Bibliography: Abu 1-'Arab and Muhammad al-Khushâni, Classes des savants de l'Ifrîkiya, ed. and transl. Ben Cheneb, passim; Ibn 'Idâhî, al-Bayân al-mughibî, ed. Dozy, i. 74–75; transl. E. Fagnan, i. 100–101; al-Nuwardî (appendix to Ibn Khaldûn, Hist. des Berbères, transl. de Slane, i. 387–388); Vonderheyden, La Berbérie orientale sous la dynastie des Benît l'-Aghlabî, p. 8–9. (G. MARÇAIS)

AL-RÜHÀ: [See ORFA.]

RÜHî, is the maâkhir of the historian, whose work was until 1925 known only from the references in 'Ali's [q. v.] Kûnh al-Alkhârî and in Munêjdi-jîmbashi [q. v.], J. H. Mordtmann (M. O. G. ii., 129 sqq.) was the first to identify by conclusive arguments several manuscripts of the anonymous original work. They tell us practically nothing about the personality of the author and it is only a hypothesis (cf. F. Babinger Die friihemansischen Jahrhücher des Uruddh, Hanover 1925, p. xiii.) that connects the historian Rûhî with a certain Rûhî Fâdîl Efendî who, like Muhyî al-Dîn Djâmî (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 72 sqq.), was a son of Zenîbîlî 'Ali Efendî, distinguished himself as a poet and died young, in 927 (1528) it is said. As he is also called Rûhî Edrâseni, i.e. Rûhî of Adnânapol, this hypothesis may be correct. But elsewhere (cf. Sehl, Thihibîre, p. 127), this Rûhî Fâdîl Efendî is said to have been born and to have died in Stamboul.

The history of Rûhî entitled Tawârîkhi Alî 'Othmân is written in a simple style and divided into two parts (kîm). The author calls the first mekâbî, i.e. beginnings, the second mekalî, i.e. elucidations. The first part falls into two sections of a general nature, the second contains eight chapters each of which describes the reign of one sultan. The chronicle was written in the reign of Bâyazid II (1481–1512) and ends in 917 (beg. March 31, 1511). Rûhî's work has not been further investigated nor is there a critical edition of the text, which could easily be prepared from existing old and good manuscripts (Berlin, Oxford, Algiesir; cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 43). It is clear however that Lutfî Fâsha's [q. v.] Chronicle is dependent on that of Rûhî.

Bibliography: Id., xiii., 159; M. O. G., ii. 129 sqq. (J. H. Mordtmann); F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 42 sqq. In addition to Sehl, the following mention men named Rûhî: Lafîf, Tedhikir, p. 172 and Mehmed Thureyî, Siḏîjîl othmânî, ii. 421. Cf. Brûsa Mehmed Tahir, 'Othmânîl Mu'telifîlerî, iii. 54. (FRANZ BABINGER)

RUKN AL-DAWLA, ABU 'ALI AL-HASAN B. BOGE, second in age of the three brothers that founded the Buyid dynasty [q. v.]. His fortunes followed those of the elder brother 'Ali (later Imam al-Dawla [q. v.]) up to the latter's occupation of Fars in 322 (934); Rukn was then given the governorship of Kâzarun and other districts. But shortly afterwards he was forced by the Abbâsîd general Yûkî, at whose expense the Buyid conquest of Fars had been made, to seek refuge with his brother; and when Yûkî was in turn defeated by the Ziyârid Mardwîdî [q. v.], the Buyids' former overlord against whom they had revolted, Imam, who then found it advisable to conciliate Mardwîdî, sent Rukn to
him as a hostage. On Mardawīd's assassination in the following year (323 = 935), Rukn escaped and rejoined Ḳāmid, by whom he was supplied with troops to dispute the possession of the Ḫōljābī with Mardawīd's brother and successor, Washqanī. Rukn succeeded at the outset in taking Ḳāfṣān; but the first round of his contest with Washqanī ended in Rukn's ejection from that city in 327 (939), when he again fled to Fārs.

In the next year Rukn's help was sought by his younger brother al-Ḥusain (later Muʿizz al-Dawla [q.v.]), who had meanwhile set himself up in Khūzestān, against the Barīdī [q.v.]; whereupon Rukn, being possessed of no territory, attempted to take Wāṣīṣ but was obliged to retire when the caliph al-Rādi [q.v.] and the amīr Badjāk [q.v.] opposed him. Almost immediately afterwards, however, he succeeded in recovering Ḳāfṣān, owing to Washqanī's championship of Makān b. Ḳaṭārī in a quarrel with the Ṣamānid Naṣr b. Āḥmad [q.v.]; and when the latter ruler died in 331 (943), Rukn, who had meanwhile supported the Ṣamānid cause, was able to drive Washqanī as well from al-Raiy, of which he had momentarily regained possession on the retirement of the Ṣamānid general Ibn Muḥṭārī.

With al-Raiy Rukn gained control of the whole Ḫōljābī; but for two short intervals (of about a year in each case) retained it for the rest of his days. Up to 344 (955—956), however, his position was highly precarious. For not only Washqanī, but also the Ṣamānids continued to challenge it. It was only by playing them off against each other and sowing dissensions between the Ṣamānīd princes and the officers they sent against him that Rukn was able to maintain it. Even so (as indicated above) he was driven from al-Raiy, and his representatives were expelled from most parts of the province, once in 333 (944—945) and again in 339 (950—951), in each case by Ṣamānīd forces. Indeed he was obliged in the end to become the Ṣamānīds' tributary (at least two agreements for the payment of tribute being recorded); it was on this basis that he first made peace with them in 344 (955—956) as again in 361 (971—972). In the course of his long contest with Washqanī, who, until he killed himself in an accident in 357 (968) never ceased to intrigue with the Ṣamānīds against him, Rukn on several occasions invaded Ṭabaristān and Gurgān, but was unable to incorporate these provinces permanently in his dominions. And though in 337 (948—949), after he had defeated an attempt on al-Raiy made by the Sālrādī Marzubān b. Muḥammad, whom he took prisoner, he gained control of southern Ḳāhbarādijān, his election two years later from al-Raiy itself [see above] naturally cost him this as well.

Rukn received his lāfāb simultaneously with his brothers in 334 (945—946), on Muʿizz's entry into Baḡdād; and on Ḳāmid's death in 338 (949), succeeded him as head of the family and amīr al-ṣanṭur (though this title was also held by Muʿizz). The last two years of his life were rendered unhappy — so much so that he never recovered from the shock induced by the news — owing to the conduct of his son, Ḳādūd al-Dawla [q.v.], in taking advantage of an appeal for help sent by Baḡtītyār [q.v.] (son of Muʿizz and his successor in the rule of al-ṭrīk, to imprison the latter, and, in conjunction with Rukn's own amūlī, Abu l-Fāṭīm Ibn al-ʿĀmid [q.v.], who had been sent likewise with a force to Baḡtītyār's aid, to seize that province for himself. And though Ḳādūd obeyed his command to release Baḡtītyār and return to his government in Fārs, Rukn was only with difficulty persuaded to visit Ḳādūd in 365 (975—976) at Ḳāfṣān, in order to ensure that by receiving a confirmation of his appointment as heir, he should succeed without dispute. Rukn died at al-Raiy in Muharram of the next year (September 976).

Rukn al-Dawla was fortunate in his employment of the remarkable waṣīṣ Abu l-Faḍl Ibn al-ʿĀmid [q.v.] from 329 (941) for thirty years until his death in 359 (970), though, as that minister himself complained (see Miskawaih), he was prevented by the prince's lack of royal blood and of culture from governing properly. Rukn (so he said) was in fact no more than a predatory soldier, who could secure the allegiance of his supporters only by means of largesse, and was not able to forgo revenue in the expectation of subsequently increasing its yield. On the other hand he is said to have been just and humane towards his troops and his subjects, and gave proof — especially in connection with the episode of Ḳādūd al-Dawla mentioned above — of a tender sense of honour.


HAROLD BOWEN

RUKN AL-DIN, Sulaimān b. Khūdī Arslān II, a Salduk ruler in Asia Minor. His father Khūdī Arslān b. Masʿūd [q.v.] in his old age divided his kingdom among his many sons. The consequence of this was that the latter set up as independent rulers and began to fight with one another so that at his death in Shabān 588 (Aug. 1102) complete anarchy reigned. In the course of time however, Rukn al-Din brought the whole kingdom under his sway. Kuṭb al-Din Malikshāh who had received Siwās and Aḵṣarā at a beginning by his brother Nūr al-Din Mahāmid, lord of Kaisariya. The latter was killed and Kaisariya passed to Kuṭb al-Din. On the latter's death Rukn al-Din who ruled in Tok̄āt (Dikāt), attacked Siwās and took possession of it. He next seized the two towns of Aḵṣarā and Kaisariya. After some time, he turned against his other brother Ghiyath al-Din Kaḵīrsaw in Konya and laid siege to him. The latter had to give in and ceded his territory to his brother. In Ramadān 597 (June—July 1201) Malatya which belonged to Muʿizz al-Din Kaḵīrsaw b. Khūdī Arslān was captured. Erzurum was the next to pass to Rukn al-Din. When the latter's troops approached, the governor there, Aḥṣim al-Din b. Malikshāh, the last of the Saljuq dynasty, began negotiations by which the town was surrendered to Rukn al-Din, who gave it to his brother Tughrilshāh. Another of his brothers, Muḥyī al-Din, who had obtained Angora when the kingdom was divided, long resisted Rukn al-Din's lust for conquest, and only after a three years' siege found himself forced to capitulate when supplies were completely cut off, but was promised suitable compensation. Rukn al-Din promised him
RUKN AL-DIN — RUM

a fortress in a remote part, but laid an ambush for him in which he was attacked and killed as he left the town. Soon afterwards however, Rukn al-Din fell ill and died before the news of his brother’s murder reached him. He was succeeded by his son Kiliq Arslân III [q. v.], Ibn al-Atîr (xii. 128) gives the date of his death as the 6th Dhu lan Kà’dà 600 (July 1, 1204); according to another statement (xii. 59) however, the surrender of Angora and the death of Rukn al-Din did not take place till 601 (1205-1206).

Ibn al-Atîr describes Rukn al-Din as a strong and vigorous ruler; he is said to have held certain heretical views (mulkhab al-qalCEFîa) on religious matters, which however, he concealed from fear of his subjects.


RUKN AL-DIN. [See Bairârs I., Bârkhârûk, Tâhirî-Beg, Kiliq Arslân.]

RUKNÂBÁD (or Ab-i Ruknî: the water of Rukn al-Dawla), a canal (kânâtî) which runs from a mountain (called Kulà’sa: P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, u. 48, No. 7) about six miles from Shirâz. Enlarged by a secondary canal, it follows for a part of the way the road from Isfâhân to Shirâz. Its waters reach as far as the village of the town towards the cemetery in which it is buried, when they are not entirely absorbed for irrigation purposes. According to Hâfan Fâsâî’s (Firàns-nâmé Nâghtî, part ii. p. 20), “all the waters of the plain of Shirâz came by subterranean channels except the water from the spring of Dushek... The best waters are those of the Zangi and Ruknî canals... The Kânâtî Ruknî (i.e. Ruknâbâd) was made in 338 (949-950), one and a half farshâqs N. E. of Shirâz by Rukn al-Dawla Hasan the Dailamî (ed. Bïrûni): its waters rise in the ravine of Tâ’lîb Allah Akbar a mile north of Shirâz: it waters the plain of al-Musâligha [q. v.]... In the fourteenth century, Ruknâbâd is mentioned by Ibn Bâqîta and by Hâfiz Allah MiCCâwî Kâzîmî (Nizhât al-Kalâb, transl. Le Strange, in G.M.S. p. 113: “The water comes from subterranean canals and the best is that of Ruknâbâd”). But it is to the poets that this canal really owes its fame. In the sixteenth century Sâ’dî declares himself charmed by the land of Shirâz and the waters of Ruknâbâd (Kullihât, Calcutta 1791, fol. 296• l. 4). In the following century Tâ‘bîdî Zâkîn sings: “The rephrî which blows from al-Musâligha and the water of Ruknâbâd remove from the stranger the memory of his native land” (text quoted by E. G. Browne, who finds in it an echo of Sâ’dî, Persan lit. under Tartar Dominion, p. 238). Hâfîz in particular immortalized Ruknâbâd in his verses: “Pour cup, cup-bearer, the wine that is left, for in Paradise thou shalt find neither the stream of Ruknâbâd nor the promenade of al-Musâligha” (ed. Kûhâkhi, Teherân 1306, No. 3, v. 2): “Shirzî and the wave of Rukn and the sweet breeze of the rephrî, blame them not, for they are the pride of the universe” (ibid., No. 35, v. 7): “The rephrî which blows from al-Musâligha and the wave of Ruknâbâd will never allow me to depart” (ibid., No. 168, v. 9); “May God a hundred times preserve our Ruknâbâd, for its limpid waters give life as long: as that of Khidr” (q. v.) (ibid., No. 277, v. 2), and in a piece which may be apotropaic (ibid., part 2, No. 71): “The water of Ruknî, like sugar, rose in al-Tângi (i.e. Allah Akbar”). According to later writers, Ruknâbâd, which Ibn Bâqîta called a great water-course (al-nâkr al-kabîr), gradually dried up. Among the notable travellers of the eighth century, Chardin, almost alone in mentioning it, saw only a large stream and gives Ruknâbâd the fanciful meaning “Ruknenabat, vein or file de sucre” (Voyages, ed. Langles, viii. 241). At the end of the eight century, W. Franklin praises the sweetness and clearness of the waters of this little stream to which the natives attribute medicinal qualities. At the beginning of the ninth century Scott Waring notes that its breadth was nowhere more than six feet. Ker Porter observes that the canal has become choked up through neglect. The Khâtîmân nânché deplores the disappearance of the groves that surrounded it. At a later date we have the same observation by Godinou (Cet onde poétique ne m’apparut que sous l’aspect d’un trou bourgeois), Curzon (“a tiny channel filled with running water”) and Sykes (“a diminutive stream”).

The Firâns-nâmé Nâghtî mentions a second Ruknâbâd in Fars: “The source of the warm stream of Ruknâbâd is part of the district of Bîkheî Fâl (Lariûtân), it is over a farsâq north of the village of Ruknâbâd: having a bad flavour and an unpleasant smell, it is of no use for agriculture; it works in a few minutes eggs put into it; one can only bathe in it at some distance from the spring” (ii. 318 middle and 288).


RUM, the name in Persian and Turkish for the Byzantine empire. Rum means the land of the Romans (pâyiwa) or Byzantines although in Central Asia Rum is also used for the Roman empire. In course of time the conception
became narrower. While Rûm still is the old name for Konya (q. v., and Rûm-Salûqûs), in the early Ottoman period Rûm comprises the district of Amasia [q. v.] and Siwâs [q. v.], while Anatolia included the so-called province with the capital Kütîhiya [q. v.] (cf. Est., x., 1920, p. 144, note 1). From the earlier name Rûm for old Hellas (cf. Ishandar-i Rûmî, i. e. Alexander the Great), Eastern Roman and Byzantine, it was applied in Turkey to designate the modern Greeks (also Urûm) in contrast to the ancient Greeks who were called Yânîniyân or Ionians. Rûm also sometimes meant Turkey in general; cf. the expression Rûm Pâlîshâhî for the sultân. Rûm later was used in a derogatory sense. Rûm Meşkîrb was said of the Greek character, faithless, unreliable, flattering.

Cf. also Erzerum (i. e. Erëfi Rûmî) and Kumelia.

(Franz Baringer)

**Rûm Kâla**, a fortress in Northern Syria. According to Arnold Noldeke's description, it is situated on "a steeply sloping tongue of rock, lying along the right bank of the Euphrates, which bars the direct road to the Euphrates from the west for its tributary the Merzimian as it breaks through the edge of the plateau, so that it is forced to make a curve northwards around this tongue. The connection between this tongue of rock, some 1,500 feet long and about half as broad, and the plateau, which rises above it, broken by a ditch made by man about 100 feet deep. The walls of the citadel with towers and salients follow the outlines of the rock along its edge at an average height of 150 feet above the level of the Euphrates, while the ridge extending along the middle of the longer axis rises 100 to 120 feet higher" (A. Noldeke, in Petermanns Mitteil., 1920 p. 53 sqq., where the main road up to the citadel, the buildings etc. are also described).

The unusual position of the fortress on a high cliff suggests that it corresponds to the tower of Şaitamrat "hovering like a cloud in the sky", which Salmanassar III took in 855 B. C. (F. Hünemann, art. Syria, in Pauly-Wissowa, R. E., iv., A, coll. 1569, 1592).

While Th. Noldeke (V. G. W. Götze, 1876, p. 12, note 2) wished to distinguish Rûm Kâla clearly from Oûmay and identify with the former place the modern Orûm, Hûrum on the Euphrates, above Balkis, Urîma is now generally identified with Rûm Kâla (Marmier, B. Moritz, Cumont, Dussaud etc.). The name of the old bishopric of Urîma last appears in Mattëos of Edessa (ed. W. Rieger, 1868, p. 323): in 561 Arm. (1112—1113 a. D.) the Armenian Kögh Wasil returned to Tancerd of Antioch the lands of Harîn Murzî, Thôrîch and Ùremn, which he had taken from the Franks. The first two are Hezî Manşîr and Trîshî (Turush) and Ùremn is Urîma (Hist. or. des croisâ, Docum. arm., p. 102; J. Markwalt, Südarmenien und die Tigrisgebiete, Vienna 1930, p. 182, note 1 of p. 177). The Syriac chronicles record (Mich. Syr., iii. 199; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 279) that Kögh Basil or after his death Kurîg, who acted as governor for his widow, held the towns of Kaisâm, Ra’dân, Başhînesî and Kâla’ Rômâmaî. It is very probable that the latter, the Syriac for Rûm Kâla, here corresponds to the Ùremn of the Armenians, which is later in Armenian always named Hromklay and by similar names.

Rûm Kâla later belonged to the county of Edessa. The metropolitan Abu l-Parâd b. Shum-

In the decades following, the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius III (1264—1282) had to defend his possession of the Barṣawma monastery at Gargar in a desperate struggle with the physician Shem'ôn of Ka'ât Rûmâlat; both had received or alleged they had received new charters of ownership from Hülegü and Abâkâ (Barhebraeus, *Chron. eccl.*, i. 753—766; ii. 439 sqq.); later on they made up their quarrel (Barhebraeus, i. 769). After the death of Ignatius, the presbyter Yakûb ibn Kalât Rûmâlat made his nephew Philoxenos or Nematûn patriarch in 1283 (Ignatius IV). The latter died at the beginning of July 1292 in the monastery of Barṣawma (Barhebraeus, *Chron. eccl.*, i. 781); after his death the Jacobite patriarch disintegrated and three rivals appeared in Malatya, Cilicia (Gawîtûk monastery) and Nairûn and as a result of this permanent schism the Jacobite church sank to complete insufficiency (Barṣawma [2], additions to Barhebraeus, *Chron. eccl.*, i. 781 sqq.).

It was perhaps not merely chance that the end of the united Jacobite patriarchate which in recent years had been closely associated with the town of Rûm Ka'ât, happened almost at the same day as the collapse of the Armenian Catholicate of Hômîklî.

In the reign of Ka'âtûn an Egyptian army of 9,000 horse and 4,000 foot under Baisari as well as Syrian forces under Hûsâm al-Dîn of Aintab had come to Rûm Ka'ât and laid siege to the fortress of the Patriarch on May 19, 1280. The sultan demanded that the Catholics should surrender the fortress and move with his monks to Jerusalem, or if he preferred, to Cilicia. When the Catholics refused to do so, the Egyptians laid waste the country around the town which was inhabited by Armenians, on the next day forced their way over a wall only recently built into the town and set it on fire. The whole population fled into the citadel. After the Egyptians had ravaged and plundered the country round for five days, they retired.

In the reign of al-Ashraf Khalîl they undertook a new expedition against Rûm Ka'ât in 691 (1292) in which the prince of Hîmâm, Malik al-Muqaffar, took part with Abu 'l-Fida' in his retinue (Abu 'l-Fida', *Annales Musulmîni*, ed. Reiske-Adler, v. 102 sqq.). On Tuesday, the 8th Dju'mâ II, the Egyptians appeared before the town and erected 20 pieces of siege artillery. It fell after a siege of 33 days. On the 11th Kajab (June 29, 1292) it was plundered and a massacre carried out among the garrison of Armenians and Mongols. Among the 1,200 prisoners who were mostly taken to the sultan's arsenal on June 28 (al-Nuwarî, MS. Paris, fol. 100 sq., in Quatremer, *Hist. des Sult. Mamlûk*, ii., p. 141; note 30) was the Armenian Catholicos (Arab. *Khalîla al-Ma'ât*; now they call *Kâthûkia*; cf. Yakût, iv. 164), Stephanos IV of Rûm Ka'ât with his monks; he died a prisoner to surrender any authority over the monks living there. When they stubbornly refused, the patriarch excommunicated them and established himself in a cave on the Euphrates but was brought back by the Armenian Catholics. Later on he fell ill, and after a reconciliation with the Bnî Ishî through the offices of the Katholikos, died in Rûm Ka'ât on June 14, 1252 (Barhebraeus, *Chron. eccl.*, i. 691 sqq.).
in Damascus (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 579).
According to the inscription of ownership in a
manuscript (Brit. Mus., MS. Syr., N. 2057), it
belonged to a certain Rabban Barsawmā of Kaṭā
Rūmān, a high priest of Rābān who in a note refers
to the harsh imprisonment which he suffered from
the Egyptians; Armenian verses on the fall of
the fortress are preserved on a relic casket (Wright,
Catal. syr. Ms. Brit. Mus., i. 231 b; Carrière,
Inscription d'un reliquaire arménien, in Mélanges
orientaux, Paris 1883, p. 210, note 1; Promus,
Mem. dell' accad. di Torino, xxxv., 1884, p. 125–
130). The inscription on the gate of the
citadel which was restored by al-As̲hfāf (cf. above,
vol. ii., p. 235) speaks of him as a victor who
among other feasts had put the Armenians to flight,
an allusion to the capture of Rūm Kaṭā (van
Berchem, in F. A., 1902, May–June, p. 456; the
inscription published by Sobberman, in Isrl., xv.,
1926, p. 176). The siltān sent boastful bulletins
of victory to the cities of Syria in which he
proclaimed the capture of this impregnable citadel
as an unprecedented feat of arms and concluded
with the words: "After the capture of this fortress,
the road is open to us to conquer the whole of the
East, Asia Minor and the Ḩalq so that with
God's will we shall become owners of all the
lands from the rising of the sun to its setting".
(al-Nuwarī, MS. Leyden, fol. 58, transl. by Weil,
Gesch. d. Chalifen, iv. 189 sq.).
The fortress of Kaṭāl al-Rūm was rebuilt by
orders of the sultan by the sāls of Syria, Sanjar
Shuqalai, and given the name of Kaṭāl al-Rūm al-Mamlūn; another part of the town was left in ruins
however (Quatremère, Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks,
iii., p. 139 sq.).
The successor of the imprisoned Armenian
patriarch Stephanos, Grigor VII of Anavarza
(1293–1307) took up his residence in Sis in
Ciālia, which henceforth was the seat of the Catho-
licos. Rūm Kaṭā, in spite of its restoration as a
frontier fortress (cf. also Abu l-Fidā', ed. Reinaud,
p. 226; al-Dimashqī, ed. Mehren, p. 214), under
the Mamluks never seems to have recovered from
the blow. In 775 (1373–1374) much damage was
done by floods in Kaṭāl al-Mislūmūn as well as in
Ḥalab, al-Ruḥā, al-Bīra and Baghdād (al-Ḥasan
b. Ḥabīb, Durrat al-As̲hfāf li Dīwāl al-ʾArāk, in
Weijers, Orientalia, ii., Amsterdam 1846, p. 435).
In the spring of the year 1477 the Mamlūk siltīn
Kaṭālī māde a tour of inspection as far as Kaṭāl
al-Mislūmūn (described by al-Djīfār an Abu l-Bāγī,
ed. R. V. Lanezno, Flagio in Palesitina e Soria
di Kai ʾBa, Torino 1878; transl. R. L. Devonshire,
After the battle of Mardī Dābik, the fortress became
Ottoman and in modern times came under the
pāshālik of Ḥalab (Ḥādījī Khalīfa, Qibṭān-numa,
p. 598).

The Armenian and European authors give the
name Rūm Kaṭā or Kaṭāl al-Rūm in many forms.
Among the Armenians we find the forms Ḥrom-
klay, Ḥrom-Hofomakan, vulg. Arm. Outoum-gala
(ward of St. Nersēs, St. Petersburg, p. 86; his
poems, Venice, p. 224, 277; Indijjdean, Alter-
tamen Armeni, iii, 278; Saint-Martin, Mémories,
Tyrus (Histor., xvii. 16) writes Runcatbat; but it
is no doubt identical with his Rangulatūt (xi.
11; French text, ed. Paulin Paris, ii., Paris 1850,
p. 164), which however he takes to be a quarter

of Edessa. Schiltberger (Reise, p. 47) calls the
fortress Urunkūla.
Only a few remnants of the fortress now remain
as well as of an Armenian monastery and a mosque
(plans of the fortress in Moltke and following him
in Humann-Puchstein, Reise, ..., p. 175, and in
A. Noldeke, in Peterm. Mitt., 1920, pl. 3, map:
Plan von R. in. k. 1:2000; photographs: F.
Fiech, in Geogr. Zeitschr., xxii., 1916, p. 16;
Cumont, Études syriennes, p. 170, fig. 54: from
the north: Humann-Puchstein, op. cit., p. 176,
fig. 25; from the east with the Euphrates: A.
Noldeke, op. cit., pl. 13).

Bibliography: Yākūt, Muṣjam, ed. Wuten-
felden, iv. 164; Saft al-Din, Morāsīd al-ʾIṣṭīʿa, ed.
Juyonb, ii. 442; Abu l-ʾFidāʾ, ed. Reinaud,
p. 226, 279; al-Dimashqī, ed. Mehren, p. 206,
214; Ibn al-Šāhīna, al-Durr al-mutannāgh fī
Ṭūrīkh Mamlatik Ḥalab, Bāṭin 1909, S. 157,
238 sq.; R. Pococke, Description of the East,
London 1754, ii. 155–157; Saint-Martin, Měno-
ires sur l'Arménie, i., Paris 1818, p. 196;
K. Ritter, Erdkunde, x., 401 sqq, 931–942:
Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de
l'Egypte, i., Paris 1842, p. 209, note 2; Th.
Noldeke, in J. G. W. Götts, 1876, p. 12, note 2;
G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems,
London 1890, p. 42, 475 sq.; Humann-Puchstein,
Reisen in Kleinasien und Nord-Syrien, Berlin 1890,
p. 175–179 with pl. I, 1; Marmier, La route de
Samosate au Zeugma, in Société de Géographie de
l'Est, Bulletin trimestriel, Nancy 1890, p. 531–
534; van Berchem, in C. A., i. 503, note 1,
p. 504, note 1; B. Mott, in M. S. O. A., i.,
Berlin 1898, p. 131 sqq.; G. Rohrbach, in
Preuss. Jahrbucher, civ., 1901, p. 471; Papken
C. W. Guleserean, Cowšk, Cowš-Ṭālūk und Hrom-
Gally, eine historisch-topographische Studie, Vienna
1904, p. 61–88: Hist. crit. des croisées, Docum. armén., i., p. cxv.; K. J. Basmdjian,
in R. O. C., xix., 1914, p. 361 (Catholickoi of
Rūm Kaṭā); R. Hartmann, in Z.D.M.G., lxx.,
Zeitschr., xxii., 1916, p. 5; F. Cumont, Études
syriennes, Paris 1917, p. 167–171, 203, 247,
293, 329; A. Noldeke, in Petermanns Mit-
teilungen, 1920, p. 53 sq.; Gaudezfoy-Demom-
bynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris
1923, p. 86; R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de

RUMELI, RUMELIA. The name Rūm-ṭī, Rūm-ṭī (i.e. land of the Rhomaean) was given in the
narrower sense to the province proper of this
name, which comprised Thrace and Macedonia i.e. an area which was bounded on the north by the Balkans, in the east by the Black Sea and the Bosporus, in the south by the
sea of Marmara and the Aegean, the so-called
White Sea, then by the Olympus range and in the
west by the Pindos, Barnos and Shar-Dagh
(Šar planina), embracing the old territories of
Thrace, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia and Albania
as well as the ancient Hellas, with the exception
however of the strip of coast and all the islands
of the Aegean or Archipelago, which were a separate governorship (jičir-) under the Grand
Admiral (kapudan pașa; q. v.): after 1849 the
jičir-ı Bahri-i Şefid formed an eyalet, cf. Reise
der Orient, xvi., 117, and later a āyâlet).

The governorship of Rumelia (Rum-ṭī āyâlet)
was bounded in the north by Austria and Wallachia, in the northeast by Moldavia and Russia, in the east by the Black Sea, in the southwest by the Ionian Sea and in the west by the Adriatic, in the northwest by Austria and Bosnia [q. v.]. It is to be noted that these boundaries include the sanjak [q. v.] belonging to the governorship of the Archipelago (Izmir [= Ayvalik]) Gallipoli [q. v.], Negropont (Egirdir), Eufoea and Ainebakhhi (Nau-
pactos), the former of which comprised the coast from Stamul to the exit of the Kara Su into the Aegean Sea with a considerable stretch of land running into the interior, the second and third of which comprised the east and south coast of Greece proper with the exception of the Morea (Peloponnesus).

The area of the province at its greatest extent was estimated at about 5,100 square miles while the population was estimated at not more than 5–5½ million of different nationalities (millet), Turks (Ottomans), who, although the ruling nation, formed the smallest part), Tatars, Greeks, Slavs, Arnauts, Armenians, Jews and Gipsies. The predominant religion was Islam, while the Christian confessions of the so-called non-Quay Greeks was the largest.

The residence of the beylerbey of Rumelia was at first Philippopolis (Filiisi, now Plovdiv), which was conquered by the Ottomans in 1363. The first governor to reside there was Ilaš Sahin Paşa, conqueror of that country, whose turbe is still to be seen not far from Stara Zagora. In 1873 (1858) there appears Timurtash-Bey [q. v.] as beylerbey (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i, 191, following Ferđan-Bey) with his residence in Sofia.

The governorship of Rumelia was divided into sanjaqs, the number of which varied in course of time and the boundaries of which were constantly changing. About 1830 there were 24 of them, namely: Wiza, Kirk Kilise [q. v.], Silistra (Silistra), Nikopolis [q. v.], Vadin, Sofia, Çirme, Kustendil, Sejnik [q. v.], Tirčala (Tirikka; q. v.), Yama (Ioannina), Delvina (Delvina), Axhola (Axhola), Izin, Kalkans (cf. F. Baugniet, Die Grundlagen von Selanik in M.S.O.S., ii, vol. xxxiv., 1913, p. 84–93), Izskenderie (Scutari,entina, Bulgaria), Dukagin (Dukadzin), Okhr (Obard, Ochrida), Pirzerin (Prizren), Veler (Vëçtër), Uskub (Skopjes), Aladja Ilisu (Kruševec) and Semendra (Semendrija, Smolendrovo). By an imperial khatfi shrine of 6th Rabi I 1252 (June 21, 1836) the area under the Rumi-wilâyet, governor of Rumelia, was defined. As previously the position of Sofia as the centre of administration had favoured the rebellion of treacherous vassals and attempts to secure independence by the mountain tribes especially in Ali Pasha (Tolli Mustafar; now Bitolj) at the S. E. extremity of this area was chosen as the centre of government. The province of the Rumi-wilâyet was divided as follows: 1. the district of the town of Monastir directly under the governor, 2. the personal estates of the sultan's mother (wilâlet) or the land of Okhr, 3. the sanjaqs of Elbasan, Kavaja, Tirana [q. v.] and Lesh (Lesia), which were governed by Arnaut governors who could be dismissed, 4. the pashaliks of Ishkodra (Izskenderie, Scutari), Pirzerin (Prizren) and Ipek (Pec) which were under military officers (generals of division, ferik's), 5. the ayași's Podgorica, Bar (Antivari), Ulcinj (Dulcigno), which were under native hereditary ayași whose powers were very minutely regulated, 6. the districts of Zadrin, Mirdit, Dibra (Debar) which were under chiefs self-elected, the only Turkish officials being those who collected the taxes. The pashaliks of Pristina, Ili [q. v.] and Tetovo, originally part of the eyalet of Rumili, were transferred in 1839 to the millet of Sofia. The pashaliks of Uskub (Skopje) and Kalkandelen (Tetovo) were only under the political supervision and not the administration of the Rumili wilâyet, while the northern Arnaut tribes and Montenegro (Karađag), although nominally under the governor of Rumeli and in particular the pasha of Scutari, in reality was in no connection with the Ottoman government (cf. Josef Müller, Albanien, Rumelnien und die österreichisch-montenegrinischen Grenzen, Prague 1844, p. 2–3). The remainder of the former Rumili was divided into pashaliks of which Adri-

Anpoule (formerly called sanjaq of Çirme), as Adriano-
poule was the chief residence of the sultan; in 1840 there were still law-courts in Çirme) and the three Bulgarian pashaliks of Rusjak [q. v.], Vidin and Silistra were the most important (cf. Ami Boué, La Turquie d'Europe, vol. iii., Paris 1830, p. 181–189 with further details of the division and of the officials in 1840). The division continued to change frequently so that J. G. v. Hahn in 1860 found the eyalet of Rumelia divided into four divraks, namely Iliškodra, Okhr, Monastir and Kestrine (Kastoria) of which Ochrida comprised the whole of Central Albania i.e. down to the coast of the Adriatic (cf. J. G. v. Hahn, Reise von Belgrad nach Salonik, Vienna 1861, p. 116 = Denkschriften der Wiener Ak. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., vol. xi.). Rumelia remained divided in this way until 1864, when the first wilâyet law — i.e. the law the object of which was to create larger provinces and entrust them to able governors — was promulgated. The new governors were to carry through the progressive plans of the government with the help of expert officials and numerous subordinate governors (muttegriş). The government pashaliks, formerly eyalets, were now wilâyet (wilâyets) and the head of which was a wilâyet, remained divided into levâis, formerly sanjaqs, at the head of which was a muttegriş. A small model province the Danube wilâyet (Tuna wilâyêt) was first created in Radżab 1281 (Dec. 1864) and entrusted to Midjaž Pasha [q. v.] who had already made a name for himself as governor of Nis and Prizren. The wilâyet of Salonica and Yânia (Ioannina) were formed in 1867. The name Rumilli, Rumelia disappeared completely until it was revived in 1878. In this year by the treaty of Berlin, the new principality of Bulgaria, which was declared an independent tributary principality recognising the suzerainty of the sultan, was created and limited to Bulgaria on the Danube, the former Danube wilâyet (Tuna wilâyêt). From the trans-Balkan district of southern Bulgaria, an autonomous province of Turkey was formed and called eastern Rumelia (cf. Carl v. Sax, Geschichte des Macht-

versfalls der Turkei, Berlin 1913, p. 373, 446). Aleko Pasha from 1879 to 1884 and Gavrili Pasha from 1884 to 1885 acted as governors there. Western Rumelia formed part of the Ottoman empire and was divided into three wilâyet: Adrianople, Sandjak and Monastir. While Western Rumelia was occupied by the Bulgars in 1885, by the peace of Bucharest (1913) Monastir (Bitolj) was ceded to Serbia and Salonica to Greece and
only the wilayet of Adrianople [q. v.] remained to the Ottoman empire.

The history of Islam in Rumeli, which is closely associated with the expansion of Ottoman power on European soil, is still very obscure, at least as regards the xivth-xvith century. Political dissensions and the mixture of peoples favoured in Rumelia more than elsewhere the formation of sects, so that even directly after the arrival of the Ottoman on European soil (cf. Jh. Draseke, Der Ubergang der Osmanen nach Europa im XIV. Jahrh., in Neues Jahrbuch für das klassische Altertum, xxxi. 7 sqq. and H. A. Gibbons, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916), perhaps even earlier in the Byzantine period, as is clearly shown by the not sufficiently explained problem of the Shi'ite sectarian Şarî Saltık Dede (q. v.; i.e. “Father Yellow Pate,” as an English traveller of 1652 explains the strange name), not to speak of the obscure history of the Turks in the Wardar valley (Wardariantos), all kinds of Muslim sects developed in Rumeli, the study of which has not yet been begun. Islam has been built upon all kinds of religious ideas, and a kind of sectarianism was created which raises difficult problems for the study of religions.

In particular we must recall the converts to Islam, formerly Bogomiles, who inhabited certain areas of Bulgaria, Bosnia and the Herzegovina, and the Muslim sects and dervish monasteries of northern Bulgaria, where the Čălbaşlii have flourished down to the present day, being undoubtedly favoured in their rise by the remarkable sectarian Şaha'i Badr ed-Dîn Mahmûd (d. 1416 in Serres: cf. Ibn Kâfi Simavna and Fr. Babinger, Şaha'i Badr ed-Dîn, der Sohn des Richters von Simav, Berlin and Leipzig 1921), who gained an astonishingly large following in Southern Bulgaria, particularly in Deli Orman [q. v.]. Closely connected with the advance of Ottoman power is the history of the Bektâshi [q. v.] in Rumeli. They founded settlement everywhere (cf. F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, Oxford 1929, 2 vols.), and quickly propagated Şifa views as far as the coast of the Adriatic. At the same time in Bulgaria, in the inaccessible forests of the vast Deli Orman, the Čălbaşlii seem to have made considerable progress (cf. thereon also T. Kowalski, Les Turcs et la langue turque de la Bulgarie du Nord-Est, Cracow 1933). Their still unelucidated history there seems to be closely connected with the holy man Demir Baba and his brothers and descendants who are still to be found there (cf. F. Babinger, Das Bektashi-Kloster von Demir Baba, in M.S.O. S. ii., vol. xxiv., Berlin 1931, p. 84 sqq.; cf. thereon already Ewliyâ Celebi, Siyâṣatname, vol. v., p. 579). After the prohibition of the dervish orders in Turkey, banished shaihs and monks to some extent have sought refuge here and found followers. As well as in Bulgaria the dervishes have flourished in the modern Southern Serbia whose monasteries of the different orders are still to be found (cf. D. G. Gadzânov, in vol. i. of the Makedonski Pregled, Sofia 1925, p. 59—66). A problem not yet fully explained is raised by the Pomakas [q. v.] in the Rhodope mountains and round Loča (now Lovec; the so-called Pomâk nâmâye; cf. A. Boué, loc. cit., vol. ii., p. 24) and the Gâgauz on the coast of the Black Sea. But even the history of official Islam in Rumelia still requires investigation. It is certain that in many places like Adrianople [q. v.], Philippopolis, Sofia, Šumla (Šumen), Razgrad (Herzegrad), Dupnica, Kustendil, Loča (Lovec), Plevna (Pleven), where there were the numerous and rich mansions and buildings of the Mihâjlo-oglu; cf. Jordan Trifunov, Istoria na gradia Plevna do osvoboditelnata revoluta, Sofia 1933, p. 35—41), Uskub, Istip (Stip), Prizren, Pristina, Kalkandelen (Tetovo), Prilep, Monastir (Tolli-Monastir, Bitoli), and particularly in Thessaly and Macedonia, there were formed centres of Muslim culture, as the schools, mosques etc. founded there show. In these centres were born men who made a name for themselves in the intellectual history of Turkey, Uskub, Prizren and Pristina in particular are rich in such names and it may be assumed that their bearers were mainly South Slavs converted to and Islam. Epirus, Albania play a special part in the cultural history of Islam; from there the Ottoman empire, apart from Bosnia and the Herzegovina, drew its ablest and greatest statesmen and generals, for the supply was in the main maintained by the tribute of youths (devshirmes q. v.) levied in the Balkans. The remnant of men of religious, noble education which made an important part in the political and intellectual life of Turkey is legion. They were almost exclusively natives, not Ottoman immigrants, the number of whom must always have been small, as the Turks confined themselves to exploiting the land, divided into large and small fiefs (çanem and timâr; q. v.). Ami Boué put the number of Turkish fiefs at 614 çanem and 8,360 timâr (cf. A. Boué, La Turquie d'Europe, vol. iii., Paris 1840, p. 182, without however saying to what date his figures refer).

The rule of the Ottomans in Rumeli, which began with the crossing of the Turks to European soil (1356—1357) and soon found visible expression in the capture of Adrianople in the spring of 1361 (cf. F. Babinger, in M.O.G. u. 311 and the article oğlan), is only very superficially known, so far as the xivth and even the first half of the xvth century is concerned. It is to be supposed that certain bases such as Salonica frequently changed hands, which is the simplest way to explain the different dates given of the capture of this town for example. In view of the great political dismemberment of S. E. Europe the advance of the Ottomans met with varying degrees of resistance, and it looks as if the great Ottoman generals of the xivth and xvth centuries, who distinguished themselves on Rumelian soil and soon won tremendous influence as marques and great landowners — e.g. the Ewrenos-oglu, the Mikhal-oglu, the Timurtash-oglu, the Malkoč-oglu, the Kâwanoğlu, a “feudal family of Asia Minor” (C. J. Jireček), who ruled in and around Tatar Bazarić since the xvith century, but perhaps already much earlier, till the year 1835 when the wali of Rumelia for the second time Kâwanizade Hussein Pasha died (cf. Sülük-i ottomâni, ii. 223 sq. and ibid., ii. 206), families [see the articles on them] who were able to hold their hereditary estates in some cases down to the xith century — were able to win over by an elastic policy the people who had lost their own princes and chiefs. In the courses of centuries some of the tribal chiefs were here and there (especially in Albania and Epirus and in Thessaly) to make themselves more or less independent of the Porte so that they had to be granted a certain degree of autonomy. This is shown by the Yurükhegs, of whom there were 7 in Rumelia about 1840, and
particularly of the aýan in Albania who were able to make themselves more or less independent. The case of 'Ali Pasha of Janina [q. v.] and his whole family is the most eloquent example of this. Although the decline of Turkish rule in Rumelia has now been going on for over a century, the influence of Turkish culture there is in many ways so distinct that even if there were no monuments of the Muslim period to recall the past, it will remain in manners, customs and traditions.

Bibliography: In addition to the numerous books of travel of all periods which form the most important source for the history of Turkish rule in Rumelia and of which the following are specially important: A. Gireschbach, Reise durch Rumelien und nach Brausa im Jahre 1839, Gottingen 1841; Josef Muller, Albanien, Rumelien etc., Prague 1844; Ami Boné, La Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1840 (fundamental work also in German: Die europäische Türkei, Vienna 1889); also his Recueil d'itinéraires dans la Turquie d'Europe. Détails géographiques, topographiques et statistiques sur cet empire, Vienna 1854; the following may also be consulted: Maximilian Friedrich Thielen, Die europäische Türkei, intended as a work of reference for the newspaper reader, Vienna 1828; also A. M. Perrot, Itinéraire de la Turquie d'Europe et des provinces danubiennes. Description géographique et militaire de toutes les routes, villes, forteresses et ports de mer de cet empire, Paris 1855; C. Mostras, Dictionnaire géographique de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris 1873; E. Paris, Isambert, Itinéraire descriptif de l'Orient, Paris 1874; very full statistics regarding administration, population, religion etc. of Rumelia are given in the following: A. Ubicini and Pavet de Courteille, État présent de l'Empire Ottoman d'après le Satînîmeh (annuaire imposé) pour l'année 1203 de l'hégire (1817—1818), Paris 1876 and T. X. Bianchi, Le premier annuaire de l'empire ottoman, publié à Constantinople pour l'année de l'hégire 1247 (1857), Paris 1845; A. Ubicini, Lettres sur la Turquie, Paris 1834 (reprinted from the years 1850—1852 of the Moniteur Universel, also English Letters on Turkey, London 1851; and Italian Lettere sulla Turchia, Milan 1853); F. Crouse, La Péniène gréco-slave, son passé, son présent et son avenir, Paris 1876; Bianconi, Ethnographie et statistique de la Turquie, Paris 1877; Jovan Cvičić, La Péninsule balkanique, Paris 1918; Paul de Réglia, La Turquie officielle, Paris 1890; Guillaume Le Jean, Ethnographie de la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1886; an able survey of social conditions in Turkey in Europe about 1840 is given by Jérome-Adolphe Blanqui (1789—1854, called Blanqui aîné) in his Considerations sur l'état social des populations de la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1841, German by Hch. Roth: Betrachtungen über den gesellschaftlichen Zustand der europäischen Türkei, Sudenburg-Magdeburg 1846, based on a journey made in Rumelia for the French Academy on which he gave a Rapport sur l'état social des populations de la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1842, and described in his Voyage en Bulgarie pendant l'année 1841, Paris 1843. — On the educational system in European Turkey cf. François-Adolphe Belin, De l'instruction publique et du mouvement intellectuel en Orient, reprint from Le Contemporain, recue d'économie chrétienne, Paris 1866. — The Slav peoples of Rumelia are dealt with by: Albert Dumont, Le Balkan et l'Adriatique, Les Bulgares et les Albanais. L'administration en Turquie. La vie des campagnes. Le Panislamisme et l'Hellénisme, Paris 1873; Paris 1873; Cyprien Robert, Les Slaves de Turquie, Serbes, Monténégros, Bosniaks, Albanais et Bulgares, leurs sources, leurs tendances, et leur progrès politique, Paris 1844, with atlas; H. F. Toser, Recherches in the Highlands of Turkey, 2 vols., London 1869; Anton Tuma, Die östliche Balkan-Halbinsel, Vienna 1885; do., Griechenland, Makedonien oder die südliche Balkan-Halbinsel, Vienna 1888; Léon Hugonnott, La Turquie inconnue. Roumanie, Bulgarie, Macédoine, Albanie, Paris 1885; Dora d'Istria (i.e. Helene Prinstein Ghica), Excursions in Roumélie et en Morée, Paris 1882—1885; E. Parmentier, Voyage dans la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1890; James Baker, Turkey in Europe, London 1877 (German transl.: Die Türken in Europa, transl. by Karl Emil Franzos, 1st and 2nd [title] ed., Stuttgart 1878—1879; French: La Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1882); Sir Charles Eliot, Turkey in Europe, London 1908; Heinrich Barth, Reise gaur durch das Innere der europäischen Türk (in the Berlin Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde, 1863—1864, also separately). — The principal Ottoman sources for our knowledge of Rumelia are: Hajdiži Khalila [q. v.], Rumel und Bosna, transl. by Jos. v. Hammer, Vienna 1812 (cf. thereon Fr. Taeschner, in M.O.G., vol. ii., Hanover 1826, p. 308 sqq.); and the travels of Ewlija Celebi [q. v.], parts of whose sections on Rumelia have been translated into various European languages: Albanian: cf. Fr. Babinger, Ewlija Celebi's Reise in Albanien, Berlin 1930; Greek: S. A. Hadradoğlu Theotodotos, in Εξωτικα, vol. iv., Athens 1890, suppl. 1891; and Italian Evidenze sulla Turchia, Milan 1853. — Voyages in Rumelia during the XIXth century and Ioannis Spazarias, in Ουράνια, vol. iv., Athens 1933, p. 113—128, vol. v., Athens 1934, p. 179—217, also Jean Deny. Un voyageur turc en Transylvanie, in Hubert Pernet, Introduction à l'étude du dialecte Transylvain, Paris 1934, p. 497—508; Bulgaria: D. G. Gadjanov, in Periodičesko ispitanie na bulgarsko kătouhno drevnsto v' Sofija, vol. lxx., Plovdiv 1909; on South Slavia cf. the literature collected by F. Babinger, Ewlija Celebi's Reise in Albanien, p. 1 note; on the Dobrudzha, Rumänia etc. of the extensive literature collected by F. Babinger, Robert Begrage, Un voyages dans les pays roumains du temps de Basile Lupu (1652) (= Academia Română, Memoriile sectiunii istorice, seria III, tomat XVII, mem. 7, Bucarest 1936), p. 10, note 3. — On the Ottoman geographer Mehmed 'Aşılık b. Omer, who included Rumelia in his work, cf. F. Babinger, in M. O. G., i. 163 sqq. and do., G. O. W., p. 138 sq.

(Franz Babinger)
in the xivth and early xvth centuries the silver tanka [q.v.] of the sultans of Delhi had become so debased that when Sher Shâh (1530–1545) reformed the coinage, the name could no longer be given to a silver coin. To his new silver coin, corresponding to the original fine silver tanka, he therefore gave the name rupiya = rupee, i.e. the silver coin (Sanskrit, viḍyā, viḍakā), and tanka became a copper denomination. The weight of the rupee was 178 grains (11.53 grms.) and it rapidly established itself in popular favour. Under the Mughals it was struck all over India at over 200 mints and with the decline of Mughal power continued to be struck by their successors, notably the English East India Company. In the xvith century Akbar and Dâjangir struck many square rupees; on one coin of Akbar the name rupiya occurs. Dâjangir for a short period struck a heavy rupee of 220 grains (14.59 grms.), but on the whole rupee grains showed little variation in weight. In the xixth century the English rupee gradually drove the local issues out of circulation and with few exceptions the local mints have now been closed. Such native states as still issue their own rupees strike them on the same standard as the Indian government rupee.

Ahmad Shâh Durrânî adopted the rupee as his monetary unit on becoming independent and until quite recently it remained the standard coin of Afghanistan. The Hindu kings of Assam also struck the rupee.

The Indian rupee having become current in British East Africa, it was adopted in 1890 as the standard coin of German East Africa also.


RÚS, the Russians; at first the Normans, then the founders of the dukedom of Kiev.

The Rûs of the west. In his description of "pain Ya'âbî, B.G.A., vii. 354, says that in 1229 (843–844) "the Madjûs called Rûs" invaded Seville and committed all kinds of depredations. The name Madjûs [q.v.] is regularly applied to the Normans. The name even passed into the Spanish Primera Crónica General (xiiith century) according to which the Almâuis were worshippers of fire (!). The origin of this use of madjûs is obscure. Did the Arabs and Spaniards allude to such rites as the cremation of the dead? [cf. Ibn Faḍlân] Masûdî, Murâdî, i. 364–365, speaking of events in Spain about 300 (912–913) also uses the term Rûs although he gives it a special meaning.

The Rûs of the east. There is quite a literature on the origin of the name of the Russians. The "Norman" school claims that the name Rûs [q.v.] belongs to the Normans; the Finns call the Swedes Ruotsi whence in Russian Rûs (Pyma), the name of the Finns Suomi similarly becomes in Russian Sûm (Cyma); the basis of Ruotsi/Rûs must be a Scandinavian word (cf. the names of the coast Roslagen and of its inhabitants Rods-kurar "rowers"). The names of the earliest Russian princes are undoubtedly Scandinavian (Rûrûk < Hrueskr, Igor < Íngvar etc.); the testimony of Constantine Porphyrogenetus (chap. ix.) is equally positive; in his list of the cataracts on the Dniepr, he gives the names "in Russian" (porfíyrovite) and "in Slav" (válnyrovite), e.g. Òdârâpôce < in Scandinavian "ódlm isle" + fors "rapids" = Òdârâpôce < in Slav estreuley "of the isle" + prag "the cataract". The "anti-Norman" school pronounces in favour of the native origin of the name but its arguments are mainly useful to show certain contaminations of the term Rûs (in Greek ὶΘας, ὶΘοι) by names in Hebrew (Ṭâs, Ṭezék, Septuag., xxxviii. 2–3; xxxix. 1), Greek ὶΘάς ἔστειλε (the red boats) etc. [It is evident that the asjih al-Rûs mentioned in the Kur'an with the ʾAd and Thamîlid (Sūra xxv. 40 and l. 12) have nothing to do with the Araxes or the Russians, in spite of the latest texts, Diminski, text, p. 106, transl. Mehren, p. 131 and the families of European commentators like v. Hammer, Sur les origines de l'état russe, St. Petersburg 1825, p. 24–29].

According to the Russian Chronicle, the Varangians (Var'ag; see below) came from beyond the sea in 859 and leved tribute on certain Slav and Finnish peoples until in 862 they were driven away by the latter. The civil wars which broke out soon afterwards among them, however, forced these tribes to invite from beyond the sea "the Varangians called Rûs". The Rûs at first settled in the region of the great Russian lakes (Ilmen, Ladoga) but in 882 Oleg (< ÊHÎGû) moved to Kiev. This was certainly not the first appearance of the "Russians" for previously under 839 the Annales Bertiniani mention the arrival at the court of Louis the Flous of a Byzantine embassy accompanied by envoys from the Rûos whom their king Chacannus had sent to Constantinople and who now wished to return home. An enquiry as to their identity showed that they were Swedes (gratis esse Suevum). The Normans in Kiev were not numerous and their marriages with Slav women accelerated their assimilation. Svatoslav (born in 942) already has a Slav name and c. 1000 the process of slavisation of the Normans was complete (cf. Thomsen, cf. cit., p. 123–124).

The sources of the xth and xth centuries. The Muslim sources are acquainted with the Rûs from their first appearance in eastern Europe. Ibn Khurdadhâbîh, p. 154, mentions only Rûs merchants whom he regards as "a kind of Slavs" (dîns min al-Saâfilîh), and describes their journeys (by sea: from the remotest parts of the Saâfiha to the Black Sea, to the Khazar capital and the Caspian Sea, and by land: from Tangier to Damascus, Baghûdâ, Baasyr and then into India and China; or again they travelled still farther beyond = to the north of) Rome through the Slav countries to reach the Khazar capital, Balkh, the lands of the Toghuughuz and China; cf. Ibn Fa'âkhî, p. 271). Ibn Khurdadhâbîh does not assign any definite territory to the Rûs. It is true that the available text of his book is incomplete but another detail is significant. Ibn Khurdadhâbîh, p. 154, speaks of "nâm nahr al-Saâfiha" which de Goeje identifies with the Tanaïs (Don) [Marquart, Strifzügel, p. 352, reads Tín for Don]. The term later disappears from geographical literature but Ibn Hawkal, p. 276, and the Hudâd al-Ālôm
The meaning they give to the term is doubtful, it is possible that their nomenclature indicates the formation of the Slavinto Rūs while Ibn Khuradhdhibh reflects the situation before the consolidation of Norman power in Russia. [In Idriši, ii. 385, the Nahr al-Kūfiyā is certainly the Don].

On the other hand, the common source [Muslim b. Abi Muslim; cf. Masudi, Tanbih, p. 190] used by Ibn Kusta, the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, Gardizi, ʿAvfi, etc. formally distinguishes between the Kūs and the Slavs. The latter (probably the western Slavs) lived under their own princes, while the Kūs occupied an island three days' march in length and breadth, situated in the middle of a lake. Their king bore the title of ḥākrān Rūs. This version seems to refer to the sojourn of the Norman chiefs in the region of the great Russian lakes (cf. Novgorod, in Scandinavian Hölm garðr “the Town of the Lake”). The Hudūd al-ʿĀlam adds that the Russians have many towns and Gardizi says that the population of the island is 100,000 men (masūlām); these addenda may reflect the gradual expansion of the Kūs or rather their amalgamation with the Slavs.

The third tradition is represented by ʿIṣṭakhri and Ibn Hawkal (< Abū Zaid Balkhi) who place the Rūs between Bulghar and the Slavs. The point from which the description starts must be the town of Bulghar on the Volga. Three groups of Rūs are described. The king of the group nearest the Bulghar lives in Kūšāla (Kiev; Const. Porph., ch. 9: Kiefta, Kipr). The most remote are the ṣafāzān, probably the ancient inhabitants of Novgorod, the Svetlana. The third group are the ʿArṭāshān whose king lives in Arţā (many variants, reading doubtful). They are savages who kill strangers; they come down the rivers to export the skins of black saṃtār and lead (ṛiti). Since the time of Frazan, Arţā has usually been explained as Erz a, the name of the eastern branch of the Finnish people Mordva (in the basin of the Soura, a tributary of the Volga to the west of Kazan). Another explanation (Reinaud, Chwolson) which starts with the variant ʿArta and explains ʿArta ma by Biarmia (Perm) is very doubtful. In both cases, it is necessary to suppose the previous subjection of these regions by the Rūs. In a recent work P. Smirnov seeks to prove the existence of a Russian “ḥaḵkānaṭ” in the region between the Volga and the Oka, cf. the incident quoted above from the Annals Bertiniani. Cf. also M. Vasmer, Wikingerspreu in Russland, in S. B. Fr. Ak. W., 1931, p. 649-674, on the traces of Scandinavian place-names on the Irpin River on the Volga.

The fourth independent source is Masʿudi (cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 330-353). In the Murādī, ii. 15, he calls the Black Sea “sea of the Rūs” for they are the only people who sail upon it and they live on one of its shores. This last allusion may be to the Russian colony of Totmarakan (Tαυτομαράκας, the ancient Φαμαράκαν on the peninsula of Taman) [although Westberg and Marquart, op. cit., suppose the Baltic to be meant there]. Among the many tribes that composed the Rūs, Masʿudi, Murādī, ii. 18, mentions Ṣūrṭi, who trade with Spain, Rome, Constantinople and the Khazars. This name is probably identical with ʿArta ma = ʿArta ma al-Urdmān. 

Waranak. Another name applied to the Normans, Waranak (old Russ. Värjen), usually explained as “member of a merchant association who has taken the oath”, from the Scandinavian var “promise, contract”, is found in Muslim literature at a much later date. Abu 'l-Fida', ed. Reinaud, p. 35, says that he found the term Bahr-Waranak only in al-Bīrūnī and in the Tadhkīra of Nasir al-Dīn Tūsī. Cf. al-Bīrūnī, al-Tadhkīra, ed. R. Wright, 1934.
negotiations [cf. THERMAN]; a curious paragraph no. the Russians is to be found in the Bustan al-
Siya'ah of Zain al-Abidin Shirwân, Teheran 1315,
p. 299; of no value from the geographical point of view, it is curious as reflecting the ideas of the
Persians about 1830: the Russians, like the other
Firangs, are clever in worldly matters (dar sharārī),
but devoid of spirituality (dān naḍārān).

Bibliography: See the article SLAVS. A
bibliography of the Muslim sources will be
found in the commentary on the Hūdūd al-
Ālam by V. Minorsky (in G. M. S., in the press).
The principal studies on the Muhammadan sources
are: Frachm., Ibn Fussals and anderer Araber
Berichten über die Russen, St. Petersburg 1823;
Chwolson, Izvestiya lbn Dašta (read: lbn Rusta)
etc., St. Petersburg 1869; Garkavi (Harkavy),
Skazaniya musul'man. pisatel'ye, St. Petersburg 1870
and 1871 (translations from 26 + 6 Arab authors;
and the necessity for a new edition of these
texts and the preparation of a Corpus of Arabic
sources on the Russians etc. see Krackovskiy,
in Zap. Inst. Vost., 1932, i. 55—62); Dorn, and
Kunik, in Caspia, in Min. Ac. SPb., series vii.,
vol. xxiii., 1. 1, 1875 (Russian edition ibld.,
vol. xxvi., app. i., 1875); Kunik and Rosen,
Izvestiya al-Bekr, St. Petersburg, 1. (1878) and
ii. (1903); A. Seippel, Rerum Normannicarum
fontes arabici, fasciculus i., textum continem,
Christiania, i. (1898), ii. (1928) (volumes, critical
remarks), Westberg, Zi Klaung oriental.
Quellen, in Bull. Ac. SPb., 1899, vol. xi., 4
and 5, and Aknaticz rastotnikh ilošnikov, in
Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 330—353 (Mavdi on the
Russ). A general survey of the literature on
Russian origins has recently been given by V.
Mosin, Var'go-russkiy vopros, in Slavist., x.
(1931), 1—3. A still valuable survey is that of
Thomsen, The relations between Russia and
Scandinavia and the origin of the Russian state,
Oxford 1877 (new edition in Thomsen, Samlede
Afhandlingar, i., 1919, p. 231—444); many
difficult questions are dealt with in the works of
Kunik, Marquart, Streifzüge, paras., and West-
berg. Among recent works must be mentioned
P. Minorsky, Vosl'skii ish'ak ("The Volga route
and the early Russians"), Kiew 1928 (in Ukrainian;
an original work). (V. Minorsky)

AL-RUSĀFĀ (RUSAFAT AL-SHAṬ, RUSAFAT
HIGHĀM), a town in the desert in the Syrian
Palmyrene, 4 faršāk, or 25 miles
south of the Euphrates.

The town already bore this name in the pre-
Muhammadan period. The Assyrian lists of eponyms
mention it in the years 540, 583, 804, 725, 747,
and 737 n.C., a town Ra-sap-pa as the residence of
the Assyrian governor (shahīm). On a relief
state of Adānārī IV Raşappa is mentioned among
the lands governed by Urigallu-eresh and formed
with Kane (now Tell Dejjil on the Khabur) an
administrative district (Unger, Reliefsste Ada-
nārī's III. aus Saba', Publikationen der Klv.
Osmannen's Museum, ii., Stambul 1916, p. 10—12,
pl. 2, i. 23 sqq.). The identification of Raşappa
with Beled Sindjār by E. Förster (Provinzteilung
des assyr. Reiches, Leipzig 1921, p. 15) can hardly
be maintained (Musil, The Middle Euphrates, New
York 1927, p. 210 sq.). In the Bible (2 Kings
xix. 12; Isaiah xxxvii. 12) Rešef, for which we
should no doubt read Rašef, is mentioned along
with the Rocky Mountains. The
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About 434 the town was raised to be a bishopric against the otherwise usual practice by the patriarch Ioannes of Antioch, not by the Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis. It was than famous for its church of St. Sergios dedicated to the memory of the martyrdom of the two officers of the imperial palace Sergios and Bacchos ("in the reign of Maximianos") (the *Acta Martyr.*, ed. in Greek by Delahaye, in Anul. Boll., iv. 373—395; in Syriac by Bedjan, *Acta martyror. et sanctorum*, iii. 283—322, do not bear historical criticism; Harnack, *Chronologie der altchristl. Litteratur*, ii. 481, note; Delahaye, in Anul. Boll., xxiii. 478). The first bishop of *Tyvrqaw* was Marinianos, who is mentioned in 434, 444 and 451 (is not mentioned in the list of bishops of Resapha-Sergiopolis in Le Quien, in O. C., ii. 951 sq.; cf. E. Honigmann, in *Orientis Christiani*, xii. 214—217). The emperor Anastasius (491—518) had the thumb of St. Sergios brought from Resapha to Constantinople and stories of the miracles associated with this relic spread even as far as Gaul (Gregor. Turonensis, *Hist. Franci*, vii. 31). In honour of this event the town was given the name Sergiopolis and the privileges of an ecclesiastical metropolis (Ioannes Diakrinomenos in Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca et cod. Paris.*, ii. 109). Perhaps we have *Σεργίουσα* as early as 512 in the trilingual inscription of Zebed (Neubauer in Sachau, *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, p. 126, note 1; otherwise in Prentice, *Publ. of the Americ. Archel. Exped.*, Greek and Latin Insr., p. 262).

Georgios Kypros (ed. Gelzer, v. 863) knows as a third name of the town *Ἀρμανιαπολισσι*, the correctness of which has wrongly been doubted; probably the great basilica in al-Ruşafa also dates from this emperor (Jussaud, *Topographie de la Syrie*, p. 254, who however also wrongly takes Tetrapyrgeia to be a name of al-Ruşafa). The Syriac name also remained in use (στελεάζα; Ioannes Moschos, *Pratum spiritualis*, chap. 180, in Migne, *Patr. Græc.*, lxxxviii/iii., col. 3052). The Armenian Basileios who in the 6th century sought to transform the profane geography of Georgios Cypros into an ecclesiastical handbook added to the town the epithet ᵃ ὁ σάμαρος Τετταράς (M. Hartmann, in Ze. A., iv. 340 sq.; Chapot, *La Frontière de l’Euphrate*, p. 330, note 8).


The town, which was situated in the desert Ṣamāḥ al-ṣālī, (Procop., *Bell. Pers.*, ii. 5, 29; Theophyl. Simoc., ed. de Boor, v. 13, 3; Syriac, Barbarānā: Kugener, in *Oriens Christi*, 1907, p. 408—412), was at first defended against the Saracens only by fortifications of no great strength; Justinian is said to have been the first to surround it with proper walls (probably before 542 A.D.) (Procop., *De aedific.*, ii. 9, 3; 9), a statement which however the results of modern archeological research show to be exaggerated (Herzfeld in *Sarre-Herzfeld, Archäol. Reise*, i. 138; Geyer, *bibl.*, ii., 28, 37). Justinian also built bazaars and other fine buildings and large cisterns to provide the town with water (Procop., *De aed.*, ii. 9, 6 sqq.).

Khusraw I, who on his campaign to Syria in 530 had been promised by Kambis, bishop of Sergiopolis, 200 pounds of gold for the ransom of 12,000 captured inhabitants of Sīra on the Ephrates, in his third campaign in 541 took the bishop, who had come to meet him to make excuses for not carrying out his promises, and sent a force against the town, which had however soon to withdraw on account of the lack of water (Procop., *Bell. Pers.*, ii. 20, 9—14). Half a century later, the story was already told of the miraculous rescue of the defenceless city by St. Sergios and his heavenly forces (Euagrius, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 28).

About 570 there were five bishops under the metropolis of Sergiopolis (*Notitia Antiochena*, in *Byz. Zeitschr.*, xxv. 1924, p. 75, 83). Besides the already mentioned bishops Marinianos and Kambis we know of the following metropolitans: in 524 Sargis (Sergios) of Beth Rosfā (Guildi, in *Atti della R. Accad. dei Lincei*, 1881, p. 507); in 550 Joseph, bishop of the Sacred Monastery of Rasfīnā (Assemani, in B.O., i. 117), 553 Abrahimios (Mansi, ix. 390; Wright, *Catal. syr. MSS. Brit. Mus.*, ii. 797), between 793 and 986 Michael Syrus (Chron., transl. Chabot, iii. 451 sqq., 501 sq.) mentions eleven further Jacobite bishops and from inscriptions we know of a certain Sergios (between 910 and 922; cf. Mich. Syr., iii. 462, N°. 18) and Simeon, who, in 1093, restored the great Basilica (Musil, *Palmyrene*, p. 160, 267 sq.).

The veneration and pious awe which was generally felt with regard to the sanctity of the place is shown with particular clearness in the fact that the *Ghassānīd al-Mundhir* b. Ḥārith only dared to meet the Byzantine envoys here (summer of 578) as he felt himself safe nowhere else from their treachery (Johann. Ephes., vi. 4; Noldeke, in *Abh. Pr. Ak. W.*, 1887, p. 24). At this time the town was apparently not in the possession of the *Ghassānīd*; the inscription ascribed to him (on the basilica, which was found at the "Central Church *extra muros*" also indicates that the inner town was still Roman at this date.

In the sanctuary of Sergios at a later date among the gifts dedicated to the saint was shown a richly decorated cross given by Justinian and Thaddæus, then taken to Persia by Khusraw I after the plundering of Kallinikos and Barbalissos (Mich. Syr., iv. 296), but given back by his grandson Khusraw II with another cross and a gift, both of which bore long inscriptions (*Euagrius, Hist. eccl.*, iv. 28; vi. 21; Niceph. *Kallist.*, *Hist. eccl.*, xviii. 21 sq.; Theophyl. *Syr.*, vi. 13; Firdawsī 1946, in Noldeke, *Tabari*, 287; note 1; C. de Boor, in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, v. 315—322). On his flight to the Byzanitans Khusraw II lived in 590 in Edessa in the house of the general Johannes Rūṣāfāyā, a member of the family of the Bēl Rūṣāfāyē (Mich. Syr., ii. 380, 412; Barhebraeus, *Chron. eccl.*, i. 271). The cistern built by Justinian and later destroyed by a Lakhmid is said to have been restored by the *Ghassānīd* Nuʾman b. al-Harīth b. al-Alham (Hamza al-Isfahānī, *Taʾrikh*, ed. Gottwald, p. 120;
Yaqūt, ii. 784; against Noldeke, in *Abb. Pr. Ak. W.*, 1887, p. 51, who says al-Hārith b. Djabala, cf. E. Herzfeld, *Arch. Reise*, i. 138, note 5; *jahrb. d. Preuss. Kunstsammlungen*, 1921, p. 112 sq.). It was because of the desert town sprawling up to the edge of the caliph Hīşām b. 'Abd al-Malik, who as a prince had moved his bādiyya from the mide-flanked Euphrates thither, made it his residence in 105 (723–724); he died and was buried here in 125 (743) (al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrikh, ed. de Goeje, i. 1467, 1729 sq., 1731 sq.; al-Balādhurī, ed. de Goeje, p. 179 sq., 186; H. Lammens, in *M. F. O. B.*, iv. 94 sq.). The town therefore received the name of Rūṣafat Hīşām (al-Balādhurī, op. cit., to distinguish it from Rūṣafat Baghdād, the eastern suburb of Baghdād with the palace of the same name, cf. vol. i., p. 565); it was also called Rūṣafat al-Shā'īm. Whether Hīşām did a great deal of building is doubtful (cf. E. Reitemeyer, *Die Städtegründungen der Araber*, p. 72).

Fisher Umayyads also lived occasionally in this town; for example Marwān, Sulaimān b. Hīşām and Muḥammad b. al-Walīd (al-Ṭabarī, ii. 1897, 1908; iii. 95, 98; Yaqūt, ii. 786; Herzfeld, *Arch. Reise*, i. 139). Shortly after Hīşām's death, his successor al-Walīd ordered the confiscation of all his predecessor's property in al-Rūṣafā (al-Ṭabarī, ii. 1751). Sulaimān b. Hīşām gathered an army in al-Rūṣafā in 127 (745), and then encamped opposite Marwān II's army at Kinnsarīn; after his defeat he came back to al-Rūṣafā (al-Ṭabarī, i. 1896 sq., 1908; Mich. Schry., ii. 505). The ʿAbbāsid ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmmār came in 132 (749–750) to al-Rūṣafā and dishonoured and burned the embalmed body of Hīşām (al-Ṭabarī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 427 sq.). ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmmār (q. v.) spent a night here when fleeing before the army of his nephew Abū Dīʿār al-Manṣūr in 754 (Ṭabarī, iii. 98).

In the spring of 244 (858) Mutawakkil came from Damascus to devastate the town in order to see the palaces of Hīşām and Sulaimān and the old Byzantine monastery (al-Bakri, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 379). The sons of Zikrwa b. Mīhrwālī al-Karāmāt fell upon the town in 289 (902) along with the bāni al-Qabāgh by order of Subk al-Dailāmī, a mawla of the caliph Muḥtaṣib, murdered the inhabitants, burned the mosque and laid waste the neighbouring villages (Ṭabarī, iii. 2219). Ibn al-Fakhrī (in 295 = 908) again mentions al-Rūṣafā as a flourishing town. Saif al-Dawla passed in 344 (955) from Sulaimān via Tadmūr, ʿUrd and al-Rūṣafā to al-Raḵkā (M. Canard, *Sagy al-Dawla*, Algiers–Paris 1934, p. 226, 230).

The Arab geographers describe al-Rūṣafā as situated in the middle of barren desert land; its inhabitants drank only water from cisterns within its walls or when this failed they had to bring water from the Euphrates 3–4 farsākh distant. Al-ʾAsmaʾī, who died in 215 (830), tutor of Hārūn al-Rashīd, identifies the town with al-Zawārā and mentions the wonderful monastery there. The inhabitants had to pay tribute to the Banū Khafṣāja in return for which they were protected. The rich inhabitants were merchants or landowners, the Beduins were labourers. As a flourishing domestic industry the weaving of woollen garments is mentioned (al-ʾAsmaʾī in Yaqūt, ii. 784); in addition to articles of clothing, bags and sacks were manufactured (al-Kazwīnī, *Agāʾīb*, ed. Wu-

stenfeld, ii. 132 sq.). According to Ibn Butlān (in Yaqūt, ii. 784 sq.), Kaṣr al-Rūṣafā was smaller than the Dar al-Khilāla of Baghdād. He describes the church, the outside of which was adorned with gold mosaics, and says it was built by Constantinian son of Helen. Below this church and of the same dimensions was a subterranean cistern panelled with alabaster slabs. The inhabitants of the fortress were for the most part Christians who earned their living by guarding caravans and transporting merchandise, but they also made bargains with thieves and robbers. The desert around al-Rūṣafā is so flat that one can see to the horizon on all sides. According to al-ʾIṣrāḍī (transl. Jaubert, i. 137), the town in his day (1154) had a flourishing market; a much used road led from there through the desert to Salāmā and Ḥims. Yaqūt was still able to see in the centre of Rūṣafat Hīşām the monastery of al-Rūṣafā which, on account of its architectural beauty, he describes as one of the wonders of the world (Yaqūt, ii. 660 sq., s.v. *Dair al-Rūṣafā*). Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī (ed. Reinaud, p. 271) gives the distance of the towns from the Euphrates as less than a day's journey.

In 1240 the Khārīzmians on their return from Syria came via Salāmā to al-Rūṣafā; troops from Ḥalab followed them and fought them at Ṣifīn (Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī, *Annales Musulm.*, ed. Reiske–Adler, iv. 458). In 668 (1269) the inhabitants of al-Rūṣafā fled for fear of the Mongols to Salāmā; henceforth the town remained uninhabited (B. Moritz, in *Z. G. Erdh. Berl.*, xiii. 174 sqq.; *M. S. O. S. A.*, i. 1898, p. 144).

In 1300 al-Dimīšqī (ed. Meheren, p. 205) includes Ṣifīn and Rūṣafā Hīṣām, which, as he knew occupied the site of a Greek city, in the district of Bālīs, while Ḥājjī Khaṭīfī (Stambul 1445, p. 593) includes Bālīs and al-Rūṣafā in the province of Kinnsarīn with Ḥalab as capital. The imposing ruins of the town date almost entirely from ancient times. They have in modern times been several times surveyed, thoroughly examined and fully described.


**The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.**
Ar-Rušafa, Serviopolis; Antonin Mendl, A re-

RUSČUK, capital of a district and port on the Danube in Bulgaria (often wrongly written and pronounced Rusčuk) in Bulgarian Ruse (Pyzê; Roussé), is situated at the junction of the eastern Lom (Turk. Kara Lom) and the Danube, here 1,400 yards wide, opposite Grugria (Ujegorod, Turk. Ver Kold), in part high on the low plateau, on the state railway from Rusčuk to Varna (since 1866) and Rusčuk to Tarnovo and is one of Bulgaria's nine ports on the Danube (with about 50,000 inhabitants).

After the decay of the medieval Červen some 15 miles inland, which survived as the name of a Bulgarian eparchy and the ruins of which could still be seen in the xvith century (cf. Hadjidji Kjalifa, Rumići i Bana, transl. J. von Hammer, Vienna 1812, p. 44), the new Ruse arose on the Danube half a day's journey away. The Turkish name Rusčuk, by which the town is still almost exclusively known outside of Bulgaria, is undoubtedly a diminutive from Ruse (Ruse = Rusčuk; cf. the name of the island of Rhodes, Turk. Rodos and Rodosčyk for Rodosto; q. v.), but only seems to have come into being in the first third of the seventeenth century. In the two treaties concluded between the Porte and Hungary on Aug. 20, 1503 (cf. J. H. Hammer, G. O. K., 33, 1911, and the text on p. 618: Ruse = Ruse) and April 1, 1519 (cf. Theiner, Monumenta Hungariae, ii. 624: Rusčuk for Ruse) and in Mercator's map of 1584 the Bulgarian form still appears. The town must have already attained considerable prosperity in the xviith century. It quickly developed under Turkish rule and became an important centre of traffic, trade, industry and strategy in Danubian Bulgaria and surpassed the two fortified towns of Nicopolis [q. v.] and Silistria which played the leading part there at the beginning of Ottoman rule (cf. A. Birkov, Bulgaren, Land und Leute, Leipzig 1917, ii. 102 sq.). The French travelier Pierre Lescoloply, who reached Rusčuk on June 14, 1576, in his valuable journal, which has only been published in part, describes Rusčuk as a populous town: ceste ville est peuple et y a quantité de marchandises de toutes sortes et des vivres en abondance et a bon prix (cf. Ruse de l'Histoire d'Amérique, vol. xxxvi., Paris 1921, p. 49). Shortly before, the famous Ottoman architect Sinâr [q. v.] built a mosque there for the grand vizier Rustem Paša [q. v.] still admired in the xviith century, presumably in the north at the water's edge. The figure given for the population for as mosques varies; of the latter Rusčuk had at one time a considerable number. The Franciscan Peter Bogdan Bakić, later archbishop of Sofia, in 1640 found in Rusčuk 3,000 Turkish houses with 15,000 inhabitants and 10 mosques of stone (fate die piatra bianca), and 200 Armenian houses with over 1,000 inhabitants and a citadel with five towers (cf. Eug. Fermejour, Acta Bulgaricæ ecclesiasticae = vol. xviii. of the Monumenta specimina historiam Slavorum meridionalium, Agram 1887, p. 74). In 1659 Filip Stanislavov counted 6,000 Turkish wooden houses with over 30 mosques (ibid. p. 203; cf. also p. 7, 10, 26, 31, 38, 137, 299 [Russi o

Rudieh: 1685], 300 with further particulars) Ewliya Čelebi (Sevjetnâme, ili. 313 sq.); cf. the Bulgarian transl. by D. G. Gadzanov, in Periodičeska spisanie na bulgarskoto kniževno društvo v Sofija, vol. lxx., Plovdiv 1909, p. 554 sq.) about the same time mentions 2,200 houses of wood, also three Christian quarters, the mosque of the Rustem Paša, baths and three caravan-serais in "Rusčuk". The only Jews, he says, were those who visited the place on their trading journeys. The people, whom he praises for their hospitality, lived by commerce and spoke Bulgarian as well as the "language of Wallachia and Moldavia". Ewliya Čelebi says the pumpkin (pumpkin) there was particularly good, to be sold for 1 pen(e) (5 of which = 1 Vienna groschen or 3 kreuzers, 150 = 1 taler).

Rusčuk is regularly mentioned in the many records of travel on the Danube in the following centuries. References to the town in the xviiith and first half of the xixth century are in general agreement. The inhabitants seem at all times to have conducted a busy trade in wool, cotton, silk, leather and tobacco, which at an earlier period was for a considerable part in the hands of Ragusan merchants, who had a settlement there from 1673 to 1755. The English clergyman R. Walsh (1827) estimated the population at 18—20,000 souls. The streets of the town, which was surrounded by walls on three sides after the manner of Turkish fortresses, as a rule sloped steeply to the Danube which part was partly undefended. Turks, Greeks, Bulgars and Armenians lived in some 7,000 houses and conducted a busy trade (cf. R. Walsh, Narrative of a Journey from Constantinople to England, London 1828, p. 207). Helmuth v. Molthe who visited Rusčuk in 1835 and described it (cf. Briefe über Zustände und Begegnungen in der Türkei, Berlin 1877, p. 11 sqq., 132 sqq., 424 sqq.) was surprised that "this important Turkish fortress with its long, dominated and enfladed lines without outer works, half armed and defectively planned" could offer the enemy such resistance. As an important frontier fortress Rusčuk suffered a great deal in course of centuries. Sieges, conflagrations and bombardments (the last by the Rumanians during the world war on Aug. 28, 1916) continually altered the appearance of the town which with its regular streets and large open spaces no longer has anything of an oriental appearance. In the Turkish period Rusčuk was the residence of a sanjak-bey, at one time of a pasha (about 1840, when Bulgaria was divided into the three pashals of Rusčuk, Vidin and Silistria), until in 1864 it became the capital of the new Danube willyat (Tûns wilîyet) with the so-called tava's of Rusčuk, Varna, Vidin, Tulba, Tarnovo (Tarnovo), Sofia and Nik, created and administered by the reformer Midhat Paša [q. v.] and formed out of the eyâlets of Silistria, Vidin and Nik [q. v.]. A special printing press was instituted and in addition to a newspaper a salâmâne (Tûns Wilîyetê Sâlimâne) annually published, which gives a good survey of the administrative measures. After the devastation wrought in the Russo-Turkish wars of 1811 and 1828, Rusčuk attained new prosperity as the official residence of a governor (valîât). In 1854 Boucher de Perthes estimated that Rusčuk had about 30,000 inhabitants in 4,000 houses (cf. Voyage à Constantinople, vol. ii., Paris 1855, p. 413 sq.); the German physician C.
W. Wuterz who became acquainted with Rustück in the governor-generalship of Sa'id Mehmed Pasha, thought that the population was only 24—25,000. The number of mosques in Rustück is very variously given by travellers. In 1840 F. Hacklender says 29, C. W. Wuterz in 1856 only 16. The fact is that many mosques were destroyed in the fighting. Nowadays (1935) Rusçük has 19 mosques (See p. 308), 9 small mosques (naşırı) and the monastery of the Şahdilli darwishes founded in 1252 (1836). While in the great battle that raged on July 4, 1811 around Rusçük the fortune of war decided in favour of the Turks under the grand vizier Ahmed Pasha, and the Russians under Kutusov blew up the defences of the stronghold and retired across the Danube after setting the whole town on fire, in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877—1878 on Feb. 21, 1878, the Ottomans under Kaiserlich Ahmed Pasha had to surrender the town and fortress to the Russians after a long siege. The defences, renewed for the last time in 1877, were razed to the ground in 1881. Since that date the town has been a Bulgarian possession.

Rustück was the birth-place of the grand vizier Celebi-zade Sheriff Hasan Pasha (d. 1205 = 1791; q.v.), of the khârîjî Amâni Celebi (d. 1000 = 1591, according to J. v. Hammer, Geschichte der Osmanischen Dietkunst, iii. 83) and of the famous Ottoman author Ahmad Sheriff Hasan Midhat Bey (1841—1912; cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 389 sq.)


G. Popov, Opisanie na Rusčük. Russe 1928 (contains an account of the state of Rusçük in 1860—1879); Mihajl Hadži Kostov, Miniatol na Rus, Rusçük 1929; the periodical, publ. in Rusçük and now defunct, Litopis in its second year, Nrs. 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 contained contributions to the history of the town; Johs. Gellert, Rustück, in Mitteilungen des Vereins für die Geschichte der Universität Leipzig, Heft 14—15, Leipzig 1936; Sâmî Bey Frashëri, Kâmîs Al-Âlâm, iii. 2323. — The bookseller Simeon Simeonov in Rusçük in 1929 published a guide (96 p.) Rusce w miniatolu i dinni, historitski, geografski i statistitski bitelá z to k buti paid little attention to Rusçük’s past.

(Fromz Babiners)

RUSTAMIDS, a dynasty of Ibad Khâridjids of Tahtert. The first of the Rustamid imâms, Abd al-Rahman b. Rustam, of Persian origin, had been made governor of Kairawan when the Khâridj Berbers of the Djebel Nefusa, led by Abu ‘l-Khattâb al-Ma‘farâ [q. v.] seized the town in 141 (758). Three years later (144 = 761), Muhammad b. al-A‘bâb at the head of a strong Arab army recaptured Kairawan. Ibn Rustam fled to the west and founded Tahtert [q. v.] in a region where the Khâridjids must already have been very numerous. Fifteen years later, the Ibadis conferred the imâmâte upon him. Six members of the same family in turn succeeded him. The chronology of their reigns is however rather uncertain. With certain gaps it may be arranged as follows:

Abd al-Rahman b. Rustam 160—168 (776—784)
Abd al-Wahhab b. Abd al-Rahman 168—208 (784—823)
Sa‘id al-Afâlah b. Abd al-Wahhab 208—258 (823—871)
Bakr b. al-Afâlah, dethroned 258? (871?)
Abu ‘l-Ya‘qûn Muhammad b. al-Afâlah 281? (894?)
Hàtim ‘Usuf b. Muhammad, dethroned 281? (894?)
Ya‘kûb b. al-Afâlah, dethroned . . . . ?
Abû Hàtim ‘Usuf, restored . . . . ?
Yâkûb b. al-Afâlah, restored 294—296 (906—908)

The history of the foreign relations of the Rustamids, all that authors like Ibn Khalûdûn, Ibn ‘Idhârî or al-Bakrî, knew of them, is limited to a few facts. Although the kingdom of Tahtert was surrounded by enemies (the territory of the Aghlabids of Kairawan included the Zâb [q. v.] and the Idrisids of Fass were successors of the Idrisids [q. v.]), its existence was not directly threatened for 150 years. We find the second imâm, Abd al-Wahhab, associated in the attack by the Khâridj Berbers (Huwwâra and Nefûsa) on the town of Tripoli which was under the Aghlabid amirs. At the same time the Rustamids, who could not recognise the ‘Abbâsîd caliphate and had to defend themselves against the Aghlabids who were vassals of Baghûdâd, seem to have sought the friendship of the Umayyads of Cordova. Ibn ‘Idhârî under 207 (822) mentions the magnificent reception given by the Umayyad Abd al-Rahâm II to an embassy from Tajert which included the son of the imâm Abd al-Wahhab. We also know that this Umayyad had a Rustamid among his viziers (information supplied by E. Lèvi-Provençal) and that in 239 (853) al-Afâlah received a present of 100,000 dirhems from the
Umâyid Muḥammad I. The reign of this imām al-ʿAflah saw a conflict between the Rustamids and the Berbers of the region of Tlemcen, partisans of the Idrisids of Fās, in which Tāhert was victorious. Lastly we know how in 926 (989) the kingdom of Tāhert collapsed in a few days before the onslaught of the Kutāma Berbers led by the Shīʿi missionary Abū ʿAbd Allāh [q. v.]. Several Rustamids were put to death and their heads sent to Raqqāda and carried through the streets of Kairawān. Others, among whom according to some authors were the imām Yaʿkūb and his son Abū Sulamām, were able to escape and reach the oasis of Wargla.

What is of more importance than the relations with the other powers of Spain and Barbary is the internal life of the Rustamid state which our usual sources ignore but of which we get a glimpse from Ibn Ḥaḍīr chronicles like Abū Zakāriyyā'.

Although hereditary, the succession of imāms was in theory regulated by the vote of the lāhāt community. The imām, regarded as the most worthy, most honourable and best educated man, the temporal and spiritual chief of the state, whose prestige extended to the communities in the east, was in reality under the control of the religious castes: thūrāt, mathāʾīkh, ṭalāhā, the guardians of the strict observance of the laws of the sect.

In a theocratic state of this kind, crises naturally took the form of schisms. The most serious took place during the reign of the second imām, Abū al-Wahhāb. At the instigation of a rejected candidate, the majority of malcontents demanded that the elected imām should rule with the control of a regular assembly. This innovation was put to the lāhāt doctors in the east, who rejected it. The advocates of the reform separated from the community and formed the sect of the Nukūṭāris [q. v.].

A second schism took place in the region of Tripoli on the death of a governor of the province and the question of his successor designated by the imām of Tāhert. Cass's last serious which seem however to have been more of the character of dynastic rivalries disturbed the peace of Tāhert from the fourth imāmate. The claimants to the throne gained the support of an opposition formed of diverse elements.

No less than the religious prestige of the imāms, the resources of the region and the activity of its commerce attracted to Tāhert foreigners from Persia, the ancestral home of the Rustamids, or from different parts of Barbary, Arabs from Ifrīqiyya, Naftīsa from Tripoli, and Christian Berbers. The Zenāta nomads of Ifrīqiyya and the Central Maghreb frequented its markets and grew rich in them. Among these heterogeneous groups, some, like the Nefūsas, Persians and Christians, showed themselves regularly the supporters of the established authority; while others, the Arabs in particular, and very often the Muslimas, were disposed to encourage the ambitions of pretenders.

Exposed to the troubles stirred up by its guests and its neighbours, this ideal state had then a somewhat agitated existence. The dynasty included able politicians, like Abū al-ʿAflah who, using the maxim dividi et impera, secured peace and whose reign marks the apogee of Rustamid power. Several Rustamids were learned imāms, caring less for their tasks as rulers than for theological speculations. not to mention profound studies like astronomy. Their surprising tolerance of foreigners, even those hostile to the sect, encouraged the entrance of disdained elements into the administration and prepared the way for the collapse of Tāhert and the annexation of the kingdom by the victorious Shīʿīs.


**RUSTEM PASHA**, Ottoman grand vizier and historian, was born in 1500 in the vicinity of Sarajevo [q. v.; cf. the report of the Bali of Navagero in Albéri, *Relazioni degli ambasciatori recenti al senato*, ser. iii., vol. 3, p. 89: *d’un cavalier approfittò il servaggio da Bosma, i.e. Bosna-Serab*y, either in Bonom or perhaps on the western border of Sarajevo province [cf. Č. Truhelka, in *Bosnische Post*, Sarajevo 1912, no. 80, who comes to this conclusion because Rustem Pasha built a bridge with 15 arches over the Željenzica of which remains still exist], of parents probably originally Christian. In a *sidjill* of the Sherfīt court in Sarajevo. "Nefīsa Khana, daughter of Muṣṭafā and sister of Rustem Pasha" in the middle of Shāhān 964 (June 1557) sold through her agent Ḥādīdī Abī Beg b. Khair al-Dīn, *mītrūwil* of Rustem Pasha’s bēstisān in Sarajevo, her house there; this gave the name of the father Muṣṭafā. The family are said to have been originally called Opan, while Č. Truhelka, op. cit., says the name was Čigalic. The local tradition of Sarajevo knows Nefīsa Khana as a sister of Rustem Pasha and daughter of a Muṣṭafā Beg or Pasha. Rustem Pasha’s brother was the kūpadan pasha [q. v.; grand admiral] Sinān Pasha. As a boy Rustem entered the school for pages in Stambul and then the service of the court. He became stirrup-holder (*rihiḥādār*, q. v.), gained the favour of the sultan and was appointed governor of Dīyarbakr [q. v.], later of Anatolia in 1553 he became third and in 1541 second vizier. On Dec. 1, 1544 he received the imperial seal for the first time. In 1553 at his own request Rustem Pasha was relieved of office and retired to Scutari where his wife Miḥrān Māh [q. v.; a daughter of Sultan Ibn Khān], had built a palace. But by 1555 he was again grand vizier, and held this office until his death in July 10, 1561 (26th Shawwāl 968; of the various dates given, this must be the right one, v. H. Mordtmann, in *M. S. O. S.* xxiii, 2 (1929), 28; however, gives the 26th Shawwāl 978 ([July 8, 1561] as the day of his death). He was buried in his own splendid *türbe* in Stambul beside the Shāhāde mosque (cf. *Hadīkh al-Wusūr* p. 28 sqq.)
and Husain b. Isma'il, Ḥadiḥat al-Djawa'māt, i. 16; wrongly in Sīdīlī-i īṣāmān, ii. 378). In addition to the many buildings, notably mosques, which he erected with his vast wealth in various parts of the empire and for which he employed the great architect Sinān, Rustem Paşa made a reputation for himself by a chronicle of the Ottoman empire, Tawāriḵ-i Alī-ʾi Othmānī, which goes under his name. In the completed version that has survived, it comes down to 968 (1560–1561). The narrative, as regards the earlier period, closely follows the anonymous Tawāriḵ-i Alī-ʾi Othmānī, and the Annals of Muhýi al-dīn Yjemāl and Neqšā (q. v.). It is only from the reign of Mehmed II the Conqueror, that it shows a certain independence, although perhaps here also an original source may be found. It only becomes important when it describes the events of his time. Although Rustem Paşa is known to have encouraged historical studies (c.f. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 82, note), it is by no means certain whether he is himself the author of the Chronicle that bears his name or whether he only had it compiled. A German translation of part of it was published by Dr. Ludwig Forrer under the title Die osmanische Chronik des Rustem Pascha in der Türkische Bibliothek, xxii. (Leipzig 1923; cf. there, vol. II, 1925), p. 246 sq.; ibid. (1925), p. 154 sq., and Histor. Zeitschrift, vol. XXXVII (1928), p. 571 sq.).


RUYAN, a district comprising the western half of Māzandarān [q.v.].

Iranian tradition. According to Darasteteler, Avesta, ii. 416, Ruyan corresponds to the mountain called Raūtīa ("reddish") in Yagt, 19, 2, and Rūyān-i-mand in Bundakht, xii. 2, 27 (transl. West, p. 34). Būrūn, Chronologie, ed. Sachau, p. 220, makes Ruyan the scene of the exploit of the archer Arish (cf. Zahir al-Din, p. 18 (Yagt 8, 6. In this connection mentions the hill Aryūr-xshhān). In the letter addressed to the mobad Tansar by king Gushnasphāh (iiid century a.d.), the latter claims to be lord of Tabaristan, Paṭištahrār-gar, Gilan, Dailamān, Rūyān and Dāmāwand.

Geography. According to Ibn Rusta, p. 150, and Ibn al-Fakih, p. 504 (the latter cites Baladḫur as authority, but the passage is lacking in the Pahūṭ al-Baladān), Ruyan was at first an independent kūra attached to Dailam. It was conquered by "Omar b. al-ʾAlāʾ (after 141 = 758) who built a town there with a minārā and attached it to Tabaristan. Ruyan comprised an extensive area the districts of which lay between two mountains [Ibn al-Fakih: "between the mountains of Ruyan and Dailam"]; each township could supply from 400 to 1,000 soldiers [Ibn al-Fakih: in all 50,000]. The kharadji levied on Ruyan by Ḥārūn al-Raʾshid was 400,050 dirhams. The town of Ruyan called Kādijā was the headquarters of the wazīr. Ruyan was near the mountains of Ra'y and was reached via Ra'y. The text of the two authors above quoted suggests that between Ruyan and unsubjected Dailam was a region which formed the military zone from which operations were conducted against Dailam. To this zone belonged Shālūs ("Caïta"), a town called al-Kahira (situated opposite Kādijā), another (?) town called al-Muḥḍaṣa and lastly Muzn. [But on these frontiers see the Ḥudūd al-ʾAṣām and Zahir al-Din].

Iṣṭakhrī, p. 206, enumerates the mountains of "Dailam" [in the broad sense] as the following: Dīlāh Kārin, Dīlāh Shāhān and Dīlāh al-Rūyān (according to Barthold: al-Rūyānd = Ruyan). In these last named highlands there were formerly kingdoms (mamālīk); in the part adjoining Tabaristan the kings were of Tabaristan and in the part adjoining Ra'y were of Ra'y.

According to the Ḥudūd al-ʾAṣām (written in 372 = 982, ed. Barthold, fol. 30v), Nāṭil (according to Iṣṭakhrī, p. 217: one marhala west of Āmul) Čalūs, Ḳūḏān (= Ruyan) and Kalār (west of Čalūs) formed a province of Tabaristan but the authority there belonged to a king named Ustundar. Ḳūḏān produced red woolen materials for waterproofs and blue gilīn (a kind of carpet material).

Rustāmdār. From the Mongol period we find the geographical term Rustāmdār. According to the Naskat al-Kāfī, p. 161, the greater part of its territory was irrigated by the Šabārūd (=) and the Taʾrikh-i Khānī, ed. Dorn, p. 298, says that Taḵān (on the upper Šabārūd) adjoined Rustāmdār. On the other hand, Zahir al-Din gives the term a larger connotation and uses it sometimes as a synonym of Ruyan and sometimes with a special meaning. An examination of the passages leads R. Vasmer, op. cit., p. 123–124, to the conclusion that Rustāmdār in the proper sense was situated towards Kūḏār and Kalār while Ruyan primarily meant the country between Rustāmdār and ʿAskān (i.e. the country towards Ra'y). According to Zahir al-Din, p. 19–20, the eastern frontier of Rustāmdār was originally at Šīsangān (near the mouth of the river of Kūḏār), but in the time of the Šalduḵ Sangār was brought back to Alisā (near Āmul ?); the western frontier was at first at Malā (near Lengeri in Gilan), but in 590 (1193) was brought back to Sangīzar (on the eastern frontier of Gilan) and in 640 (1243) at Namak-evarūd (west of Kalārastāk). It is curious that Zahir al-Din, p. 17 seems to place the "town of Ruyan" (Kādijā of Ibn Rusta) at Kūḏār but the passage is not very explicit and the legend of the foundation of the town given by Zahir al-Din may belong to a period before the appearance of the term Rustāmdār.

The princes of Ruyan. The title attested for the dynasty is Ustundar (perhaps Ustāndar < Ūstāndar; cf. Tabarī, i. 2638). It is not clear if the dynasty also took the title of Pahūṭ al-Baladān (< pahūṭ al-baladān) in which Sāsānian terminology was first borne by the viceroy of the four great divisions of the empire, the prerogatives of which were lessened in time by the increase in power of the military commanders (pūṣhāh, cf. Christensen, L'empire des Sasanides, p. 41, 43). The fact is that in the passage in Iṣṭakhrī, p. 206, the mountain of Fāhūṭ al-baladān is mentioned separately and it seems, to the east of Rūyāndī but it is possible that the
two names only mean the two parts of "Ruyān" which at this time were under Ṣabāristān and Ra'y respectively. In any case, in the genealogy of the U'stundārs (Zahir al-Dīn, p. 146–154 and 320–321). Pāḏūsān appears as the personal name of the eponymous founder and of certain princes only. The eponym Pāḏūsān (towards the end of the 11th century) was regarded as one of the three sons of Gil-Gaḥbara, a descendant of the Sāsānian Ḥjamasp (who reigned 497–499). Towards the the beginning of the 12th century (Iṣṭahkī, p. 206 [see above]), the dynasty appears to have passed through a crisis which it survived. After the death of Djalāl-dawla Kāyāmuṭr b. Ḫusayn b. Gǔstāma in 857 (1453) his possessions were divided between his two sons: the line of Ka'ūs reigned in Nūr, in the valley of the left bank tributary of the river of Ṭāmūl (Ibaraz-pei), and that of Iskandar at Kudfūr, on the northern slopes of the mountains of Nūr.

On the feudal wars in Mazandaran see Zahir al-Dīn, ed. Dorn, index. The princes of Rūṣtantār retained their autonomy down to the time of the Safawīs. In 947 (1540) the expedition of Shāh Tahmāsp against Malik Djahānghīr b. Malik Kāūs who had shut himself up in the fortress of Lāridjān, was a failure (cf. Aḥsan al-Tawārikh, ed. Seddīn, p. 299). In 997 (1589) the maglis Djahānghīr b. 'Āzīz of Nūr and Djahānghīr b. Muḥammad of Kudfūr came to pay homage to Shāh 'Abbās but finally in 1003 (1594) they were both dispossessed of their lands: the ruler of Nūr submitted voluntarily while he of Kudfūr was seized by force (cf. 'Ālam-ārā̀, p. 265, 334, 354–357).


The names of the carpenters are Ahmad and Ḥusayn (?), cf. the name of Ahmad b. Ḥusayn who carved a gateway at Bārfūrūsh in 870, Rabino, op. cit., p. 115, and ibid., p. 79; Ḥusayn b. Ahmad who carved the gate of Buland-Imām, near Ashraf, dated 873 (1468).


V. Minorsky

Ruzzik R. Ṣalātī al-Malik al-ʿAdīd, Bādur al-Dīn Arūs Shūdhār, Māzūr al-ʿIlām, Fāṭimīd waṣīr, of Armenian origin, succeeded his father Ṣalātī [q.v.] after the latter's assassination on 20th Ramādān 556 (Sept. 12, 1164), and remained in office for fifteen months. The only event of importance during this period was a Berber invasion in 557 (1162) under Ḥusayn b. Nizār [see Nizār R. al-Mustansīr], who was captured and put to death. Ruzzik inherited the literary tastes of his father and is said to have governed well, but when, in the same year, he attempted to remove his rival ʿShawar [q.v.] from the governorship of the Upper Saʿīd, the latter, encouraged by the Caliph al-ʿAdīd [q.v.], rebelled and marched on Cairo. The waṣīr, deserted by his partisans (see ṢIRGHĀM), fled from the city (18th Muḥarram 558 = Dec. 29, 1162) but was betrayed, and executed by Taiby b. ʿShawar. The historian al-Makrizī remarks (Aḥṣaf, ii. 207–208) that Ruzzik was the last holder of the office of naẓīr al-maẓāmil in the Fāṭimid period.


(H. A. R. Gibb)
THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLĀM
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 1, read: M. is now a pretty little Arab town with 9,423 inhabitants. To the east of it is the Blad, which was formerly separated by a wall, now taken down, from the town which lay to the west of it. The whole area is surrounded by a wall which is pierced on the north by three, in the west by one, and in the south by three gates.

P. 41b, article LUR, l. 71, instead of: The clans (gurūkh), read: The tribes (gurūkh).

P. 42a, l. 28, instead of: mutuفاریka, read: mutuFarīka; l. 51, instead of: southern, read: northern.

P. 43a, l. 48, instead of: village, read: valley.

P. 43b, l. 62, instead of: like, read: as well as.

P. 44b, l. 11, instead of: Dūyāl, read: Ziyārid.

P. 45, l. 63, instead of: Mākān, read: Mīkān.

P. 62b, l. 37, instead of: Siyat, rend Siyāt.

P. 76b, l. 1 and p. 77a, l. 6 from below, read Rūmiya, for Rūmiya.

P. 76b, add on l. 22 from below: From January to March 1928, L. Waterman conducted excavations in the region of Tell ʿUmair for the American Schools of Oriental Research (cf. their Bulletin, No. 30, 1928). The mound seems to conceal a sīggratu (tower built in successive stages) with a large temple adjoining it which continued to be used in the Graeco-Roman period; a Roman cemetery was laid bare in another part of the ruined area. From inscriptions found here the equation Akabak-Upt (Opis)-Seleucia is made quite certain. For Aksahak, cf. also the article by Unger in the Reallexikon der Assyriologie, vol. i., Berlin 1928, p. 64–65.

P. 77b, read iv. 447, 7 for v. 447, 7.


Add to the Bibliography of the article AL-MADĀʾIN: Apart from the already mentioned poem of Patchachy, unimportant in matter, in the periodical Lughat al-ʿArab, Baghdaḍ, ii., 1914, p. 393, cf. especially the articles by F. Djebrān in the same periodical, iii. 136–141 (with corrections by Kāẓim al-Duḍjailī, op. cit., p. 292–294) and Kāẓim al-Duḍjailī, op. cit., p. 282–294. Djebrān deals particularly with the present settlements of Arab tribes in the region of al-Madāʾin, al-Duḍjailī also gives an account of the latter and gives interesting also of the pilgrimages to the tomb of Salmān al-Fārisī, describes the interior of this “sanctuary” and gives notes on various mounds of ruins in the region of al-Madāʾin which form a welcome addition to Herzfeld’s topography.


P. 224a, l. 29 and 33, instead of: Maʿmūnīn, read: Maʿmūnīds.

P. 224b, l. 3, instead of: Farīghūnīs, read: Farīghūnīds.

P. 432b, l. 11 af infra, add: According to Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg, i. 314, 375, cf. Yākūt, iv. 294) Kāwādīh destined al-Mundhar b. Maʿ al-Samāʿ because of his refusal to accept Mazdakism and appointed in his place the Kindīt al-Hāfīz b. Amr, who had embraced the new faith. Whatever may be the truth, the relations between the king of Persia and the Arab have been influenced by Mazdakism.

P. 496b, l. 11, 12 af infra, read: Timur who stayed in Balat (Milet) on his return from Smyrna in the winter after the battle of Angora (1402) (Ducas, p. 76, ed. Bonn, various reading).


P. 505b, l. 19, instead of: Nukāt, read: Nukāt.

P. 514b, art. MIRĀTH. To be added to the Bibliography: Peltier and Bousquet, Les successions agnaticques militées, Paris 1935.


P. 640, art. AL-MUBĀHDHĪN. Add: In modern times the name Muhādjiyīn has been applied to those Muḥammadan emigrants who, as a result of the transfer of Muḥammadan territory to the non-Muḥammadan rule left their native land and went to a Muslim country in order not to be impeded in the exercise of their religious duties. For example, towards the end of the xviith century and in the xviith century large bodies of such emigrants abandoned lands occupied by the Russians and sought a new home in Turkey. A similar phenomenon
accompanied the liberation of the Balkan peoples from Turkish rule and the rise of the independent Balkan states. The Muhammadans deported to Turkey from Greek territory after the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) as a result of an agreement with Greece were always called Muḥāǧirūn, even in official language. Their affairs were regulated by a "General Office for Nomads and Emigrants (Ashābir wa Muḥāǧirūn Muḍāriyya) umumiyiyiṣ)."

In modern Turkey the Muḥāǧirūn constitute an important domestic and cultural problem. Their settlements which are distributed over the whole of Anatolia are as a rule centre for the advancement of Turkish culture. The word Muḥāǧir also plays an important part in place-names in Turkish territory as an element in names, mainly of recent origin.


P. 673b, l. 22, instead of: 1101, read: 1108.

P. 674a, l. 43, instead of: Ghazar, read: Guillar.

P. 674b, l. 54, instead of: Sā'ūn, read: Sām.

P. 686a, l. 45, instead of: Wāḳi'ahīnigār, read: Wāḳi'ā nigār.

P. 688a, l. 43, 55, 63, instead of: Mrr, read: Mere.

P. 688b, l. 68, instead of: in May 1624, read: in May 1624m.

P. 691b, l. 23, to be added: Ḥal al-djawhar al-thamin (extract in L. Massignon, Recueil p. 171, note 1).

P. 692a, l. 29, to be added: He has been buried at the feet of the poet Niyaż Miṣrī at Kastoria ( Limnos), where his tomb was still shown in 1916 (cf. L. Massignon, Recueil, p. 164).

P. 701a, l. 48, to be added: In an early period Turkish has also known the form mulāz (from Sumerr it muvara, mong. mūza, cf. W. Bang and A. von Gabain, Türk. Turfan-Texte, v. 53)."
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I Personenmiete und andere Verträge über Arbeitsleistung im Keilschriftrecht.

II Die eigentliche Personenmiete des altbabylonischen Rechts. 
   1. Terminologie. Der Aussteller der Urkunde und das Vertrags-
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From the Preface:

"Die genaue Feststellung des rechtsgeschäftlichen Typus der Ernte-
arbeiterverträge und der Unterscheidungsmerkmale der beiden Ver-
tragsarten liess das Vorkommen bisher überschener Mischformen
erkennen. Der günstige Stand der Quellen ermöglichte es, von den
verschiedenen Arten rechtsgeschäftlicher Verwertung menschlicher
Arbeitskraft für einen wichtigen Zeitabschnitt Babyloniens ein anschau-
lisches Bild zu entwerfen, dessen Lebendigkeit durch Heranziehung
von Wirtschaftstexten erhöht werden konnte, die uns Aufschluss über
Arbeitsorganisation, Arbeitskontrolle und Lohnverrechnung gewähren".